Congestion Control

EECS 122
February 16, 2006

- Hw 2 due today
- Hw 3 and first phase of project out today

Lecture today:

- Impact of network congestion on end-to-end performance
- Approaches to congestion control
- How TCP does it.

Impact of Network Congestion

Congestion:

- informally: "too many sources sending too much data too fast for *network* to handle"
- different from flow control!
- manifestations:
  - lost packets (buffer overflow at routers)
  - long delays (queueing in router buffers)

Causes/costs of congestion: scenario 1

- two senders, two receivers
- one router, infinite buffers
- no retransmission







- large delays when congested
- maximum achievable throughput

Causes/costs of congestion: scenario 2

- one router, *finite* buffers
- sender retransmission of lost packet



Causes/costs of congestion: scenario 2

- always: $\lambda_{in} = \lambda_{out}$ (goodput)
- "perfect" retransmission only when loss: $\lambda'_{in} > \lambda_{out}$
- retransmission of delayed (not lost) packet makes λ'_{in} larger (than perfect case) for same λ_{out}



"costs" of congestion:

- more work (retrans) for given "goodput"
- unneeded retransmissions: link carries multiple copies of pkt

Causes/costs of congestion: scenario 3

- four senders
- multihop paths
- timeout/retransmit

Q: what happens as λ_{in} and λ'_{in} increase ?



Causes/costs of congestion: scenario 3



Another "cost" of congestion:

- when packet dropped, any "upstream transmission capacity used for that packet was wasted!

Approaches towards congestion control

Two broad approaches towards congestion control:

End-end congestion control:

- no explicit feedback from network
- congestion inferred from end-system observed loss, delay
- approach taken by TCP

Network-assisted congestion control:

- routers provide feedback to end systems
  - single bit indicating congestion (SNA, DECbit, TCP/IP ECN, ATM)
  - explicit rate sender should send at

Case study: ATM congestion control



- Virtual circuit architecture
- Switches inside the network cognizant of individual connections.
- Explicit rate notification from each switch fed back to sender.
- Intelligence inside the network vs at the endpoints.

TCP congestion control: additive increase, multiplicative decrease

- *Approach:* increase transmission rate (window size), probing for usable bandwidth, until loss occurs
  - *additive increase:* increase **CongWin** by 1 MSS every RTT until loss detected
  - *multiplicative decrease:* cut **CongWin** in half after loss

Saw tooth behavior: probing for bandwidth



TCP Congestion Control: details

- sender limits transmission: `LastByteSent-LastByteAcked ≤ CongWin`
- Roughly,

$$\text{rate} = \frac{\text{CongWin}}{\text{RTT}} \text{ Bytes/sec}$$

- **CongWin** is dynamic, function of perceived network congestion

How does sender perceive congestion?

- loss event = timeout *or* 3 duplicate acks
- TCP sender reduces rate (**CongWin**) after loss event

three mechanisms:

- AIMD
- slow start
- conservative after timeout events

TCP Slow Start

- When connection begins, **CongWin** = 1 MSS
  - Example: MSS = 500 bytes & RTT = 200 msec
  - initial rate = 20 kbps
- available bandwidth may be >> MSS/RTT
  - desirable to quickly ramp up to respectable rate

- When connection begins, increase rate exponentially fast until first loss event

TCP Slow Start (more)

- When connection begins, increase rate exponentially until first loss event:
  - double **CongWin** every RTT
  - done by incrementing **CongWin** for every ACK received
- Summary: initial rate is slow but ramps up exponentially fast



Refinement

Q: When should the exponential increase switch to linear?

A: When **CongWin** gets to 1/2 of its value before timeout.

Q: What happens when there is loss?

A: Threshold is set to 1/2 of CongWin just before loss event

Refinement: inferring loss

- After 3 dup ACKs:
  - **CongWin** is cut in half
  - window then grows linearly
- But after timeout event:
  - **CongWin** instead set to 1 MSS;
  - window then grows exponentially
  - to a threshold, then grows linearly

Philosophy:

- 3 dup ACKs indicates network capable of delivering some segments
- timeout indicates a "more alarming" congestion scenario

Summary: TCP Congestion Control

- When **CongWin** is below **Threshold**, sender in slow-start phase, window grows exponentially.
- When **CongWin** is above **Threshold**, sender is in congestion-avoidance phase, window grows linearly.
- When a triple duplicate ACK occurs, **Threshold** set to **CongWin/2** and **CongWin** set to **Threshold**.
- When timeout occurs, **Threshold** set to **CongWin/2** and **CongWin** is set to 1 MSS.

TCP throughput

- What's the average throughout of TCP as a function of window size and RTT?
  - Ignore slow start
- Let W be the window size when loss occurs.
- When window is W, throughput is W/RTT
- Just after loss, window drops to W/2, throughput to W/2RTT.
- Average throughout: .75 W/RTT

TCP Reno vs Tahoe



TCP Reno vs Vegas

- Quick reaction needed on observing losses => halving the window
- Throuhput reduction
- If sender can anticipate losses beforehand, can react more gradually (linear instead of halving).
- Some clues can be obtained by monitoring the RTT's of the segments.

Fast TCP

- Example: 1500 byte segments, 100ms RTT, want 10 Gbps throughput
- Requires window size W = 83,333 in-flight segments
- Throughput in terms of loss rate:

$$\frac{1.22 \cdot MSS}{RTT\sqrt{L}}$$

- ➜ L = $2 \cdot 10^{-10}$ *Wow*
- New versions of TCP for high-speed needed!

TCP Fairness

Fairness goal: if K TCP sessions share same bottleneck link of bandwidth R, each should have average rate of R/K



Why is TCP fair?

Two competing sessions:

- Additive increase gives slope of 1, as throughout increases
- multiplicative decrease decreases throughput proportionally



Fairness (more)

Fairness and UDP

- Multimedia apps often do not use TCP
  - do not want rate throttled by congestion control
- Instead use UDP:
  - pump audio/video at constant rate, tolerate packet loss
- Research area: TCP friendly

Fairness and parallel TCP connections

- nothing prevents app from opening parallel connections between 2 hosts.
- Web browsers do this
- Example: link of rate R supporting 9 cnctions;
  - new app asks for 1 TCP, gets rate R/10
  - new app asks for 11 TCPs, gets R/2 !