


Congestion Control in the Network

Brighten Godfrey
CS 538 February 5 2018



How TCP congestion control is broken

A partial list...



Efficiency

Tends to fill queues

- creates latency and loss

Slow to converge

- for short flows or links with high bandwidth•delay product

Loss \neq congestion

Often does not fully utilize bandwidth



Fairness

Unfair to large-RTT flows (less throughput)

Unfair to short flows if *ssthresh* starts small

Equal rates isn't necessarily "fair" or best

Vulnerable to selfish & malicious behavior

- TCP assumes everyone is running TCP!

Limitations of TCP CC



Fills queues: adds loss, latency

Slow to converge

Loss \neq congestion

May not utilize full bandwidth

Unfair to large-RTT

Unfair to short flows

Is equal rates really “fair”?

Vulnerable to selfishness

Limitations of TCP CC



Fills queues: adds loss, latency

Slow to converge

Loss \neq congestion

May not utilize full bandwidth

Unfair to large-RTT

Unfair to short flows

Is equal rates really “fair”?

Vulnerable to selfishness

Hard to use only
end-to-end
information to find
‘right’ rate

Obvious solution:
Get more info
from network

Limitations of TCP CC



Fills queues: adds loss, latency

Slow to converge

Loss \neq congestion

May not utilize full bandwidth

Unfair to large-RTT

Unfair to short flows

Is equal rates really “fair”?

Vulnerable to selfishness

Hard to use only
end-to-end
information to find
‘right’ rate

Obvious solution:
Get more info
from network


Incentive issues

Congestion control with help from the network



Random early detection (RED)

- Drops more packets (randomly) as congestion increases
- Mechanism is entirely within routers
- More recently: CoDel (see paper list)



Explicit Congestion Notification (ECN)

- Mark bit in header instead of dropping

But what does the source really want?


- Just tell me the right rate, already!
- eXplicit Control Protocol (XCP)
- Rate Control Protocol (RCP)

Flows finish slowly



[Dukkipati & McKeown '05]


= fair
queueing



Many flows waiting



[Dukkipati & McKeown '05]





Rate Control Protocol [Dukkipati, Kobayashi, Zhang-Shen, McKeown, IWQoS 2005]

Router's algorithm:

- Compute fair per-flow rate $R(t)$ at time t as whatever will fill up the link capacity (roughly)
- Tell end-hosts about this by putting the value in packets
 - $\text{pkt.rate} = \min(\text{pkt.rate}, \text{locally-calculated rate})$
- Recompute every RTT

RCP rate computation



$$R(t) = \underbrace{R(t - d_0)}_{\text{old rate}} + \frac{\alpha \underbrace{(C - y(t))}_{\text{spare capacity}} - \beta \underbrace{\frac{q(t)}{d_0}}_{\text{queue size}}}{\underbrace{\hat{N}(t)}_{\text{estimated \# of flows}}}$$

Simpler than window-based control (e.g. XCP):

- rates instead of windows
- thus, feedback doesn't depend on a flow's RTT
- thus, same feedback to everyone

(How can you estimate # flows?)

Estimating the number of flows




$$\hat{N}(t) = \frac{C}{R(t - d_0)}$$

If guess is wrong, what happens?

- Changes magnitude but not sign of rate change
- Possibly this estimator could be improved

RCP finishes flows quickly



Enforcing fairness and isolation

Based on slides by Ion Stoica


Problem: no isolation across flows



Assume router uses **First In First Out (FIFO)** queue


No protection: if a flow misbehaves it will hurt the other flows

Example: 1 UDP (10 Mbps) and 31 TCP's sharing a 10 Mbps link



Round robin among different flows [Nagle '87]

- One queue per flow
- while (1) { send one packet from each queue }





Advantages: protection among flows

- Misbehaving flows will not affect the performance of well-behaving flows
- FIFO does not have such a property

Disadvantages:

- More complex than FIFO: per flow queue/state
- Biased toward large packets: a flow receives service proportional to the number of packets

Fair Queueing (FQ) [DKS'89]



Define a fluid flow system: a system in which flows are served continuously

- essentially, **bit-by-bit round robin**

Advantages


- Each flow will receive exactly its max-min fair rate
- ...and exactly its fair per-packet delay
- ...regardless of packet sizes

Def'n of fairness: Max-Min fairness



If link congested, compute f such that

$$\sum_i \min(r_i, f) = C$$



$$f = 4:$$
$$\min(8, 4) = 4$$
$$\min(6, 4) = 4$$
$$\min(2, 4) = 2$$

Implementing Fair Queueing



What we just saw was bit-by-bit round robin


But can't interrupt transfer of a packet (why not?)

Idea: serve packets in **the order in which they would have finished transmission in the fluid flow system**

Strong guarantees: nearly the same as having a virtual link of the max-min fair capacity. Each flow gets:

- Exactly its max-min fair rate (+/- one packet size)
- Exactly its max-min fair per-packet delay (+/- one packet size) *or better!*

Example



Problem



Recall: “serve packets in the order in which they would have finished transmission in the fluid flow system”

So, need to compute finish time of each packet in the fluid flow system

... but new packet arrival can change finish times of existing packets (perhaps all)!

Updating those times would be expensive

Solution: **virtual time**

Solution: Virtual Time



Key Observation: finish **times** may change when a new packet arrives, but the finish **order** doesn't

- Only the order is important for scheduling

Solution: maintain the number of rounds needed to send the remaining bits of the packet

- New packet arrival doesn't change # remaining rounds
- Does change rounds executed per unit time, but that's ok


System virtual time = index of the final round in the bit-by-bit round robin scheme

System Virtual Time: $V(t)$




Measure service, instead of time

- Slope of $V(t)$ = rate at which an active flow is serviced
- C = link capacity
- $N(t)$ = # of active flows in fluid flow system at time t



Service
in fluid flow
system



real time

Fair Queueing implementation



Define

- F_i^k = virtual finishing time of packet k of flow i
- a_i^k = arrival time of packet k of flow i
- L_i^k = length of packet k of flow i

Virtual finishing time of packet $k+1$ of flow i is

$$F_i^{k+1} = \max(V(a_i^k), F_i^k) + L_i^{k+1}$$

Order packets by increasing virtual finishing time, and send them in that order

Weighted Fair Queueing (WFQ)



What if we don't want exact fairness?

- Maybe web traffic is more important than file sharing

Assign weight w_i to each flow i

And change virtual finishing time to

$$F_i^{k+1} = \max(V(a_i^k), F_i^k) + \frac{L_i^{k+1}}{w_i}$$



FQ does not eliminate congestion; it just manages the congestion

Provides **isolation** between flows

- complete isolation?

Both end-host and router-based congestion control matter

- End-host congestion control to adapt rate
- Router congestion control to isolate flows, inform end-hosts

Rethinking "fairness": Congestion pricing

“ “ *The Internet routes money;
packets are just a side effect.* ” ”

– Unknown, via Dave Clark

What is "fair"?



Flow rate equality!

Easily circumvented

Doesn't even optimize for
any metric of interest




Fig. 1: Poppycock.



Plentiful: use as much as you want

- air
- advisor's grant money

Scarce: pay for what you want

- price set by market
- result (under assumptions): socially optimal allocation

Fig. 2: Invisible hand
of the market.

Briscoe's main points



Flow rate fairness (FRF) is not useful

Cost fairness is useful

Flow rate fairness is hard to enforce

Cost fairness is feasible to enforce



Fig 3: Briscoe.

FRF not useful




Doesn't equalize benefits

- e.g., SMS message vs. a packet of a video stream

Doesn't equalize costs

- e.g., “parking lot” network:
long flow causes significant congestion but is given equal rate by fair queueing

Therefore, doesn't equalize cost or benefit



FRF not useful



Myopic: no notion of fairness across time

In summary, FRF **does not optimize utility**

- except for strange definitions of utility...

So, **even cooperating entities** should not use it!

Cost fairness is useful



Economic entities pay for the costs they incur

- This is “fair” (in a real-world sense), not “equal”—and that’s fine

In other words, networks charge packets for the congestion they cause

- Can networks lie about congestion?
- Yes. So it’s really a market price, not exactly congestion


Result: senders want to maximize utility

- Will balance benefit with cost (**utility** = benefit – cost)


Example: light & heavy traffic





[Briscoe 2009]



'unfair' TCP sharing



throttling heavy usage



weighted TCP sharing

Key point: Benefit per bit is high for light flow and low for heavy flow.

CF is provably useful



Frank Kelly 1997: Cost fairness maximizes aggregate utility

i.e.: any different outcome results in suboptimal utility

Why
won't anyone listen to Kelly?
Hello??! ... where did everybody
go?



Kelly's model (one congested link)



Each user i has utility $U_i(r_i)$ for rate r_i

Each user i pays p_i for access to link (its own choice)

Link sets price per unit bandwidth: $p = (\text{Sum } p_j) / C$

- thus, $r_i = p_i / p = C p_i / (\text{Sum } p_j)$

Theorem: assuming U_i concave, strictly increasing, and continuously differentiable, then

- A competitive equilibrium exists: setting of p_i s in which no user can improve their utility given current price
- This equilibrium maximizes $\text{Sum } U_i(r_i)$



FRF is hard to enforce



Run your flow **longer**

Create **more flows** (similar to sybil attack)

- Multiple TCP connections between same source/destination (web browsers)
- Spoof source IP / MAC address
- Multiple flows to other destinations (BitTorrent)



Cost fairness is enforceable




You send me a packet; I handle delivery and charge you for it

How much do I charge?

- Depends on cost on entire remainder of path!

Not the only way of arranging payments, but it is convenient


- payments are **between neighbors** that already have an economic relationship



Mechanism: Re-Feedback



Key property: every hop knows total congestion along downstream path



Not necessarily about \$\$



Previous explanation was in terms of money, but doesn't have to directly involve money

- Re-feedback is a mechanism
- Doesn't imply a particular way of implementing congestion pricing

Possible variants of congestion pricing

- pay per packet?
- monthly allowance?
- only at edges?
- between all ISPs?

Discussion: What if...



Host running a persistent “light” job is interrupted by heavy flows congesting the net?

Host is compromised? (botnet) Who pays?

If we want cost fairness, is Weighted Fair Queueing useless?

- No: provides mechanism to isolate flows, virtualize links
- e.g., could use congestion pricing to set WFQ’s weights

Conclusion (Briscoe style!)



“It just isn’t realistic to create a system the size of the Internet and define fairness within the system without reference to fairness outside the system.”

Cost fairness optimizes aggregate utility and is feasible to enforce

Flow rate fairness does not optimize utility and is not feasible to enforce

- Cease publication on the topic and stop teaching it in undergraduate courses

Announcements

Announcements



Wed: Modern congestion control

Mon: Project proposals due



Project proposals due I Iam Monday Feb 13

- Submit via email to Brighten
- 1/2 page, plaintext

Describe:

- Problem you plan to address and why solution is valuable
- Your first steps at a technical approach
- What is the most closely related work, and why it has not addressed your problem
 - at least 3 full academic paper citations (title, authors, publication venue, year) plus paper URLs
- If there are multiple people on your project team, who they are and how you plan to partition the work

Project proposals



Talk to us if...

- You need a project idea
- You'd like advice on a project idea
- You need partners
- You're just a nice person and want to say hi

After submission

- Course staff will give feedback and approve or request changes
- Proposal is 5% of course grade

See also course syllabus