

UiO : Department of Informatics
University of Oslo

Improving the performance of Web Services in Disconnected, Intermittent and Limited Environments

Joakim Johanson Lindquist
Master's Thesis Spring 2016



Abstract

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, cu sed suas apeirian, decore iudicabit at per, pro ne lorem dicit dictas. Cu quo aequae maiorum gubergren, principes complectitur ei ius, numquam veritus minimum mel id. Ea ius vedit soleat. Mel timeam laoreet tractatos no. Pro an sadipscing efficiantur, esse ludus diceret nam in. Vis percipit probatus in. Est noster moderatius dissentiet te. Eirmod latine dissentias in sea, perfecto omittantur at duo, mea vide exerci ut. Nec euismod vocibus consecetur eu.

Et fierent delectus sapientem eam, id eum dolore nullam. Cu his quod possit utamur, mel offendit copiosae forensibus ut, ius fabulas fierent sapientem an. Sed at vedit mentitum expetendis, utamur insolens ad cum, dicat dicta salutatus ei duo. Est tnce e numquam explicari posidonium. Vim amet nostrud at, ea nam graece mediocritatem, cu fabulas maiorum nostrum vix. Ius id zril nullam aperiam, at sint corpora repudiandae eam.

Contents

1	Introduction	13
1.1	Background and Motivation	13
1.1.1	Service Oriented Architecture	14
1.1.2	Military Networks	15
1.1.3	Disconnected, Intermittent and Limited Networks . .	16
1.2	Example scenario	17
1.3	A suggested solution	17
1.3.1	Proxies	18
1.4	Problem Statement	19
1.5	Premises of thesis	19
1.6	Scope and Limitations	20
1.7	Research Methodology	20
1.8	Contribution	20
1.9	Outline	20
2	Technical Background	21
2.1	Network layers	21
2.2	Web services	22
2.2.1	W3C Web services	22
2.2.2	Representational State Transfer	24
2.3	Hypertext Transfer Protocol	25
2.3.1	HTTP methods	26
2.4	Transmission Control Protocol	26
2.4.1	The Protocol	26
2.4.2	TCP Reliability	27
2.4.3	Flow Control	27
2.4.4	Congestion Control	28
2.5	Protocols for Tactical Networks	28
2.5.1	User Datagram Protocol	29
2.5.2	The Constrained Application Protocol	30
2.5.3	Advanced Message Queuing Protocol	30
2.5.4	MQTT	31
2.5.5	Stream Control Transmission Protocol	32
2.6	Performance testing	33
2.6.1	Network metrics	33
2.7	Summary	33

3 Related Work	35
3.1 Compression	35
3.2 Making SOA applicable at the tactical level	35
3.3 Previous evaluations of alternative protocols	37
3.4 Tuning application server parameters	37
3.5 Proxy optimization	38
3.5.1 DSProxy	38
3.5.2 AFRO	39
3.5.3 Suri	39
3.6 Summary	39
4 Requirement Analysis	41
4.1 HTTP Proxy	41
4.2 Cope with DIL	41
4.2.1 Disconnected	41
4.2.2 Intermittent	42
4.2.3 Limited	42
4.3 Support optimization techniques	42
4.3.1 Compression	42
4.3.2 Proxy protocol communication	42
4.4 Other considerations	42
4.5 Summary	43
5 Design and Implementation	45
5.1 Overall Design	45
5.2 Apache Camel	45
5.3 DIL Proxy	46
5.3.1 Configuration	46
5.3.2 Routes and processors	46
5.3.3 Proxy header	46
5.4 Summary	46
6 Testing and Evaluation	47
6.1 Types of DIL networks	47
6.2 Testing and Evaluation Tools	48
6.2.1 Linux network traffic control	49
6.2.2 Iperf 3	50
6.2.3 Wireshark	50
6.3 Test Setup	50
6.3.1 NetEm Setup	50
6.3.2 Military Radio Setup	51
6.3.3 Proxy setup	52
6.4 Test Execution	52
6.4.1 NFFI W3C Web service	53
6.4.2 RESTful car Web service	53
6.4.3 Request size application	53
6.4.4 Test parameters	54
6.5 Function tests	54

6.5.1	Results and Analysis	54
6.6	DIL Tests - Disconnected	55
6.6.1	Execution	55
6.6.2	Results and Analysis	56
6.7	DIL Tests - Intermittent	56
6.7.1	Execution	56
6.7.2	Results	56
6.8	DIL Tests - Limited	57
6.8.1	Satellite communication	57
6.8.2	Line-of-Sight	58
6.8.3	WiFi 1	59
6.8.4	WiFi 2	60
6.8.5	Combat Net Radio with Forward Error Correction	61
6.8.6	EDGE	62
6.8.7	Kongsberg Radio	63
6.9	Summary	64
7	Conclusion and Future Work	65
7.1	Conclusion	65
7.2	Future Work	65
Acronyms		71
Appendices		73
A Results		75
A.1	Function tests	75
A.2	Satellite tests	76
A.3	Line-of-Sight tests	76
A.4	WiFi 1 tests	77
A.5	WiFi 2 tests	78
A.6	Combat Net Radio tests	79
A.7	EDGE	79
A.8	Military radio tests	80

List of Tables

2.1	The layers of the Internet Protocol Suite	21
2.2	Example of REST operations	25
2.3	HTTP methods	26
2.4	AMQP Frames	31
2.5	MQTT Control packets	32
2.6	Summary of protocols	34
3.1	Optimization possibilities.	39
6.1	Different network types	49
6.2	Machines involved in the testing	50
6.3	W3C Web service results	56
6.4	RESTful Web service results	56
6.5	W3C Web service results	56
6.6	RESTful Web service results	57
A.1	NFFI Web service results	75
A.2	REST Web service results	75
A.3	Request message results	75
A.4	NFFI Web service results	76
A.5	REST Web service results	76
A.6	Request message results	76
A.7	NFFI Web service results	77
A.8	REST Web service results	77
A.9	Request message results	77
A.10	NFFI Web service results	77
A.11	REST Web service results	78
A.12	Request message results	78
A.13	NFFI Web service results	78
A.14	REST Web service results	78
A.15	Request message results	79
A.16	NFFI Web service results	79
A.17	REST Web service results	79
A.18	Request message results	79
A.19	NFFI Web service results	80
A.20	REST Web service results	80
A.21	Request message results	80
A.22	NFFI Web service results	81

A.23 REST Web service results 81

List of Figures

1.1	The three roles in SOA	14
1.2	Complexity of military networks(from [5])	16
1.3	Proposed proxy solution	18
2.1	W3C Web services	23
2.2	Message Brokers	29
2.3	Overview of CoAP	30
2.4	Overview of SCTP	33
5.1	Architectural overview of proposed design	45
6.1	Overview of tested networks	48
6.2	Testing environment	51
6.3	Testing environment	52
6.4	NFFI Web service	53
6.5	RESTful car service	54
6.6	W3C Web services results	55
6.7	REST results	55
6.8	W3C Web services results	57
6.9	REST results	58
6.10	W3C Web services results	58
6.11	REST results	59
6.12	W3C Web services results	59
6.13	REST results	60
6.14	W3C Web services results	61
6.15	REST results	61
6.16	W3C Web services results	62
6.17	REST results	62
6.18	W3C Web services results	63
6.19	REST results	63
6.20	W3C Web services results	64
6.21	REST results	64

Chapter 1

Introduction

Military units operate under conditions where the reliability of the network connection may be low. They can operate far from existing communication infrastructure and rely only on wireless communication. Such networks are often characterized by unreliable connections with low date rate and high error rates making data communication difficult. In a military scenario it is necessary for units at all levels to seamlessly exchange information across different types of communication systems. This ranges from remote combat units at tactical level, to commanding officers at operational level in a static headquarters packed with computer support. To the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), this concept is referred to as Network Enabled Capability (NEC). In a feasibility study, NATO identified the Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) paradigm and the Web Service technology as key enablers for information exchange in NATO[1].

Web service technology is well tested and in widespread use in civil applications where the network is stable and the data rate is abundant. However, certain military networks suffer from high error rates and very low date rate, which can leave Web services built for civilian use unusable. This thesis investigates how these challenges can be overcome by applying different optimization techniques. The main approach looks into how using alternative network transport protocols may increase speed and reliability.

1.1 Background and Motivation

NATO is a military alliance consisting of 28 member countries [2] and which primary goal is to protect the freedom and security of its members through political and military means. In joint military operations the relatively large number of member countries can be a challenge when setting up machine-to-machine information exchange. Differences in communication systems and equipment attribute to making the integration of such systems more difficult. In order to address this issue, NATO has chosen the SOA concept, which when built using open standards facilitates interoperability[1].

1.1.1 Service Oriented Architecture

SOA is an architectural pattern where application components provide services to other components over a network. SOA is built on concepts such as object-orientation and distributed computing and aims to get a loose coupling between clients and services. In their reference model for SOA, the Organization for the Advancement of Structured Information Standards (OASIS) define SOA as [3]:

Service Oriented Architecture is a paradigm for organizing and utilizing distributed capabilities that may be under the control of different ownership domains. It provides a uniform means to offer, discover, interact with and use capabilities to produce desired effects consistent with measurable preconditions and expectations.

In SOA, business processes are divided into smaller chunks of business logic, referred to as *services*. A service can be business related, e.g a patient register service, or a infrastructure service used by other services and not by a user application. OASIS define a service as [3]:

A service is a mechanism to enable access to one or more capabilities, where the access is provided using a prescribed interface and is exercised consistent with constraints and policies as specified by the service description




Figure 1.1: The three roles in SOA

Services are provided by *service providers* and are consumed by *service consumers* as illustrated in fig. 1.1. The service provider is responsible for creating a service description, making the service available to others and implementing the service according to the service description. Services are made available to service consumers through a form of *service discovery*. This can be a static configuration, or more dynamic with a central *service registry*, where service providers publish service descriptions. Service consumers find the services they need by contacting the service registry.

The communication between services occur through the exchange of standardized messages.

Following the SOA principles dictates a very loose coupling between services and the consumers of those. This allows software systems to be more flexible, as new components can be integrated with minimal impact on the existing system. Another aspect of loose coupling is with regard to time, which enable services and its consumers to not be available at the same instance of time. This enables asynchronous communication. Loose coupling with regards to location allows the location of a service to be changed without needing to reprogram, reconfigure, or restart the service consumers. This is possible through the usage of runtime service discovery, which is dynamic retrieval of the new location of the service.

Furthermore SOA enables service implementation neutrality. The implementation of service is completely separated from the service description. This allows re-implementation and alteration of a service without affecting the service consumers. Thus this can attribute to keep development costs low and avoiding proprietary solutions and vendor lock-in. Another benefit with SOA is re-usability by dividing common business processes into services, which may help cost reduction and avoids duplication.

SOA is only a pattern and the concepts can be realized by a range of technologies. The most common used approach is the Web service family of standards, using the SOAP messaging protocol. To achieve interoperability between systems from different nations and vendors, NATO has chosen this technology in order to realize the SOA principles[4]. This allows member nations to implement their own technology as long as they adhere to the standards. The Web service technology is discussed in detail in section 2.2. Another approach to realize the SOA principles is Representational State Transfer (REST), an architecture style which has gained a lot of traction in the civil industry and is discussed further in section section 2.2.2.

The mentioned Web service technologies, both REST and W3C Web services, are in widespread use, both in the civil and military world. However, employing Web service solutions directly into military use may not be so straight forward. These technologies were not specifically designed to handle conditions found in certain military networks. In the following sections we discuss characteristics of such networks and the possible challenges of using Web services in them.

1.1.2 Military Networks

Military networks are complex and consist of many different heterogeneous network technologies. We can group them into layers, which have different characteristics as can been seen in fig. 1.2. At the highest level, there is fixed infrastructure and relatively static users, meaning that they seldom move around or disconnect. At the lower levels, there are fewer units, but they are much more dynamic. The lower level is called tactical networks, which is discussed in the next paragraph.




Figure 1.2: Complexity of military networks(from [5])

Tactical Networks

Tactical networks are characterized by that the units are deployed to operate on a battlefield. We distinguish between deployed and mobile tactical networks, where deployed may use existing communication infrastructure. Mobile tactical networks have no existing communication infrastructure and therefor have the largest communication challenges.

In tactical networks in general the users use tactical communication equipment, which includes technologies like VHF, UHF, HF, tactical broadband and satellites[6]. Examples of such units are mobile units like vehicles, foot soldiers and field headquarters. These types of networks are unpredictable and may have very low date rate, possibly high delay, high error rates and frequent disconnections. NATO studies[7] have identified such networks to have the following characteristics:

Disadvantaged grids are characterized by low bandwidth, variable throughput, unreliable connectivity, and energy constraints imposed by the wireless communications grid that link the nodes .

These types of networks are often called disadvantaged grids or Disconnected, Intermittent and Limited (DIL) environments, which is the term we use in this thesis.

1.1.3 Disconnected, Intermittent and Limited Networks

To improve the performance of Web services in limited military networks, it is important to understand the limitations we're dealing with. The DIL concept refers to three characteristics of a limited network: *Disconnected, Intermittent and Limited*.

Disconnected Military units that participate in a tactical network may be highly mobile and may disconnect from a network either voluntarily or not. Unplanned loss of connectivity can be due to various reasons, such as loss of signal or equipment malfunction. The disconnected term refers to that nodes in the network may be disconnected for a long time, possibly for multiple hours and even days.

Intermittent Nodes in a DIL environment may lose connection temporarily before reconnecting again. The duration can range from milliseconds to seconds. As an example, consider a military vehicle driving on a countryside road. It may temporary loose connection due to the signal being obstructed by trees beside the road, driving into tunnels or simply having a bad radio signal.

Limited Limited refers to various way a network can be limited. The Data rate may be low, the network delay may be high and the Packet Error Rate (PER) may be high. The term data rate refers to the amount of data that can be transmitted over a network per unit of time. Delay refers to the time it takes for a bit of data to travel across the network from machine to machine. PER means the number of incorrectly received packets divided by the total number of received packets. A packet is considered as incorrect if at least one bit is transmitted erroneous.

Other constraints

As well as being restricted by the communication link itself, military units may have other limitations as well. Consider that military foot patrols have limited battery capacity as they have to carry it with them in their backpacks. The transmission range of the communication equipment for mobile units may also be limited. Another factor that comes into play for military units is that in some cases they are required to enter radio silence in order to avoid being detected by the enemy. During such circumstances the soldiers may only receive data, but not send any.

1.2 Example scenario

Jeg tenkte her å introdusere et scenario som illustrerer problemer og utfordringer med DIL nettverk.

1.3 A suggested solution

The Web service technology enables interoperability between systems, but also increase the information overhead, requiring higher data rate demands. Employing Web services developed for use in civilian networks directly into a DIL environment may not perform satisfactorily. To increase the performance we can apply different optimization techniques. The task-group IST-090[6] investigated which improvements that could be made in

order to get SOA applicable at the tactical level. They did not find a magic bullet that would solve all problems, but identified factors that would offer measurable improvements. The most important findings were:

- Foundation on open-standards.
- Ease of management and configuration.
- Transparency to the user.
- The Web services should optimized without the need to incorporate proprietary, ad hoc solutions that ensure tighter coupling between providers and consumers of services.

The last bullet point refers to the issue of that when we have identified optimization techniques, where do we apply them? One approach could be to modify the Web service application itself. However, this would mean that every application deployed tactical network would require modification. This would require a lot of resources and severely limit the flexibility of using Web services. Another possible solution is, by using proxies, applying the optimization in them without altering the Web services themselves. With this approach, the only thing required to do is to configure the applications to send and receive data through the proxies. The proxies will then handle the optimization for tactical networks. This approach is identified in IST-090 and is explored in this thesis. Figure 1.3 illustrates a setup like this, where the client invoke Web services through a proxy pair over a DIL network.




Figure 1.3: Proposed proxy solution

1.3.1 Proxies

A proxy is an application which acts as an intermediary between a client and a server. Proxies are widely in use and their usage and type varies. Example of proxy usage is for load balancing, caching and security. Web proxies are

proxies that forward Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) requests, which is what we are investigating in this thesis. This proxy will support features for compression, delay tolerance and overcome network disruptions.

1.4 Problem Statement

Most of the Web service solutions used today are aimed for civilian use and do not necessarily perform well in military environments. In contrast to civilian networks where the date rate is abundant, mobile tactical networks may suffer from high error rates and low date rate. Adapting Web service solutions meant for civil networks directly for military purposes may not be possible. Therefore, Web services needs to be adapted in order to handle network challenges. However, it can be very expensive to alter existing Web service technology and incorporate proprietary solutions. A NATO research task group has previously identified the foundation on open standards to avoid tighter coupling between service providers and consumers[6]. It is much better to use Commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) software. By placing the optimization in proxies, the Web services can remain unchanged.

The goal of this thesis is to investigate different optimization techniques that can be applied in order to improve Web service performance in DIL networks. In order for the clients and services to remain interoperable the optimization techniques will be placed in proxies. The Web services will communicate as normal, while all network traffic is tunneled through a proxy. The Web service itself does not need to pay attention to the bad connectivity, the proxy will choose the appropriate protocol and configuration.

1.5 Premises of thesis

In this section we define the premises for the thesis and the proxy being developed as a part of this thesis. As we have previously discussed, W3C Web services are in widespread in use NATO, and the REST architectural style has identified as a technology of interest to NATO. The first and second premise is therefor that the proxies must support both REST and Web service communication between machines connected in a DIL network. Next, in order to optimize Web services in DIL environments, the applications themselves should not be required to be customized, all optimization should be placed in proxies. This retains the interoperability with standardized solutions(COTS). The forth and final premise is that the proxy must work with standard security mechanisms. In our case this means that any messages sent through the proxies, must be exactly the same at the receiver as it would have been without the proxies. This is due to both the header fields and the body of the message can be part of security mechanisms, such as checksums and the presence of authentication header fields.

To summarize, the premises of this thesis are listed here:

1. Support RESTful and W3C Web services.
2. Work in DIL networks.
3. Interoperable with standardized solutions(COTS).
4. Work with security mechanisms.

1.6 Scope and Limitations

The goal of this thesis is to investigate optimization techniques for Web services in DIL environments. We limit it to techniques that can be applied at the application or the transport layer of the Internet protocol suite(see table 2.1). The reason for this is that NATO has previously decided "everything over IP", a statement describing that all data communication in NATO should occur with IP packets[1]. We therefore limit our optimization possibilities to the mentioned layers.

Since we focus on performance of Web services in this thesis, security is not addressed. However, applications that are to be used in military networks need to be approved by security authorities. If the application is too complex, e.g. it has a very large code base or use a lot of external frameworks, the approval process can be very lengthy. It is therefore a important consideration to make the proxy as relatively simple as possible.

Finally, the proxy implemented as a part of this thesis, only accepts HTTP as input from the Web services. As we discuss later in section 2.2, this is a fair limitation since most Web services use HTTP to communicate with other applications.

1.7 Research Methodology

Denning.

1.8 Contribution

The outcome of this thesis is a recommendation regarding which optimizations techniques can be used in DIL to enhance the performance of Web services. As well as a prototype implementation of a DIL proxy.

1.9 Outline

Hvordan er resten av oppgaven strukturert.

Chapter 2

Technical Background

Before diving into the design and implementation of the proxy developed in this thesis, in this chapter we present the technical background of the central concepts and protocols. We first give an introduction to computer networks in general and how they are organized. Next, we discuss common Web services used for exchanging data in military systems. Then we look into a number of protocols that we can replace HTTP/TCP with in order to increase the performance of Web services. Finally, we introduce the concept of performance testing and network metrics.

2.1 Network layers

To reduce design complexity, networks are organized into layers, each one built upon the one below it. In the Internet Protocol Suite[8], networks is divided into 4 layers. As stated in the scope of this thesis, we only look into optimization techniques for the application and transport layer.

Application Layer
Transport Layer
Internet Layer
Link layer

Table 2.1: The layers of the Internet Protocol Suite

Link layer

The lowest layer is the link layer, where link refers to the physical network component used to interconnect nodes in a network. Link layer protocols operate between adjacent network nodes. An example of a link layer protocol is Ethernet.

Internet Layer

Where the link layer is only concerned of moving data over a wire to an adjacent node, the Internet layer is concerned of how to deliver data all the

way from a source to a destination, possibly passing through multiple nodes on its way. It does not guarantee delivery of data, since data can be lost on the way to the destination. Guaranteed delivery is usually handled on the higher levels of the Internet Protocol Suite.

The core protocol of the Internet layer is Internet Protocol (IP) and its routing function enables sending data over interconnected networks.

Transport layer

In the Internet protocol suite model, the transport layer provides end-to-end communication services for applications. It builds on top of the network layer, and takes responsibility of sending data all the way from a process on a source machine to a process on the destination machine. The by far most used transport protocol is the Transmission Control Protocol (TCP), which provides reliable transport of data to applications. With reliable transport we mean that if data in transmission is lost or received in the wrong order, this is all handled by the transport protocol. This provides an important abstraction for applications so that they don't need to deal with the characteristics of the physical network itself.

Application layer

The top layer is the application layer and is where applications real user use reside. The other layers provide transport services to applications found in this layer. When we talk about application layer protocols, we talk about protocols that applications use to communicate with other applications. Application layer protocols use the communication services the transport layer provides. Examples of application layer protocols is HTTP and File Transfer Protocol (FTP).

2.2 Web services

Web services are client and server applications that communicate over a network and can be used to realize a SOA. Web services are critical in any data systems and are in widespread use in both civilian and military systems. It is a broad term and can be used to describe different types of services that are available over a network. The most common usage of the term refers to the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) definition of SOAP-based Web services, but could also refer to more simple HTTP-based REST services.

In this thesis we investigate optimization techniques that should support both W3C Web services and RESTful web services.

2.2.1 W3C Web services

W3C has defined Web services as [9]:

A Web service is a software system designed to support interoperable machine-to-machine interaction over a network. It has an interface described in a machine-processable format (specifically WSDL). Other systems interact with the Web service in a manner prescribed by its description using SOAP-messages, typically conveyed using HTTP with an XML serialization in conjunction with other Web-related standards.

This definition points out a set of standards that enables machine-to-machine interactions. Web service interfaces are described in documents called WSDL, and communication is based on sending XML-based SOAP messages. There exist many definitions of Web services where the core principles are the same, but the finer details may vary. Figure 2.1 illustrates these fundamental principles. Web service technology is a realization of the SOA principles, which provides loose coupling and eases integration between systems.




Figure 2.1: W3C Web services

These standards that together make W3C Web services are presented in the following sections.

Extensible Markup Language

The Extensible Markup Language (XML)[10] is considered as the base standard for Web services. An XML document consists of data surrounded by tags and is designed to be both machine and user readable. Tags describe the data they enclose. The tags can be standardized, which allows exchange and understanding of data in a standardized, machine-readable way.

Web Services Description Language

Web Services Description Language (WSDL) is an XML-based interface definition language that describes functionality offered by a Web service[11]. The interface describes available functions, data types for message requests and responses, binding information about the transport protocol,

as well as address information for locating the service. This enables a formal, machine-readable description of Web service which clients can invoke.

SOAP

SOAP is an application level, XML-based protocol specification for information exchange[12] in the implementation of Web services. Data communication in SOAP is done by nodes sending each other what's called SOAP messages. A SOAP message can be considered as an "envelope" consisting of an optional message header and a required message body. The header can contain information not directly related to the message such as routing information for the message and security information. The body contains the data being sent, known as the payload.

SOAP is transport protocol agnostic, which means it can be carried over various underlying protocols. The far most used transport protocol is HTTP over TCP, but other protocols such as UDP and SMTP can be used as well.

2.2.2 Representational State Transfer

In the previous sections we looked into the standards and specifications that compose W3C Web services. However, there also exist other types of Web services which does not follow these standards. In 2000, the computer scientist Roy Fielding introduced REST where he presented a model of how he thought the Web *should* work. This idealized model of interactions within a Web application[13] is what we refer to as the REST architectural style. REST attempts to minimize latency and network communication while maximizing the independence and scalability of component implementations. This is done by placing constraints on connector semantics rather than on component semantics like W3C Web services. REST is based on a client-server model where a client requests data from a server when needed. While W3C Web services is service oriented, we can look at REST as being more data oriented.

Web services that adhere to the REST style is called RESTful Web services. They are closely associated with HTTP and use HTTP verbs(e.g GET, POST, DELETE) to operate on information located on a server. RESTful Web services typically expose some sort of information, called resources in REST. Resources are identified by a resource identifier. Table 2.2 illustrates how a component exposes a set of operations of the car resource.

REST is easy to understand and has gained a lot of traction in the civil industry in the latest years. Although NATO has chosen W3C Web services as the technology to do information exchange, REST is identified as a technology of interest to certain groups in NATO[14]. One downside to NATO with REST is that it lacks standardization, which may cause interoperability issues.

In the next section we will look into HTTP, which is closely associated with REST and is the most used transport protocol for W3C Web services.

Resource identifier	HTTP Method	Meaning
/vehicles/cars/1234	GET	Return a car with ID 1234 from the system.
/vehicles/cars/	POST	Create a new car which will be added to the list of cars.
/vehicles/cars/1234	DELETE	Delete a car with ID 1234 from the system.

Table 2.2: Example of REST operations

2.3 Hypertext Transfer Protocol

As we have seen in the previous sections, both RESTful and W3C Web services utilize the HTTP as their way to communicate with other services. The usage of HTTP is very widespread and it is the foundation of data communication for the World Wide Web since the early 90's. Its protocol specification is coordinated by Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) and the W3C, and is defined as[15]:

The Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) is an application-level protocol for distributed, collaborative, hypermedia information systems. It is a generic, stateless, protocol which can be used for many tasks beyond its use for hypertext, such as name servers and distributed object management systems, through extension of its request methods, error codes and headers

HTTP started out as a simple protocol for raw data transfer across the Internet and has since been updated in HTTP/1.0, HTTP/1.1 and most recently a major update with HTTP/2.0. It is a request-reply protocol which means that all data exchanges are initiated with a client invoking a HTTP-request and then waits until a server responds with a HTTP response. A HTTP-request consist of the request method, Uniform Resource Identifier (URI), protocol version, client information, and a optional body. The server responds with a message containing a status line, protocol version, a code indicating the success or error of the request, and a optional body. Both HTTP requests and responses use a generic message format and can contain zero or more HTTP headers. Headers are used to provide information about the request/reply or about the message body, e.g information about the encoding and caching information.

HTTP, being an application level protocol, relies on a transport protocol to actually transfer data to an another machine. HTTP communication most often, but not necessarily, occurs over TCP/IP connections. The only requirement in the HTTP specification is that a reliable transport protocol is used.

2.3.1 HTTP methods

Associated with all HTTP requests is a request method, which indicates the desired action to be performed on a resource located on a Web server. The set of HTTP methods defined in HTTP/1.1 is listed in table 2.3.

HTTP Method	Purpose
OPTIONS	Asks the server which HTTP methods and header field it supports.
GET	Retrieve information identified by the resource identifier(Request-URI).
HEAD	Identical to GET, except that the HTTP-body is not returned from the server.
POST	Asks the server to accept the message payload from the client as a new resource.
PUT	Similar to POST but allows the client to ask the server to update a resource identified by the request-uri
DELETE	Requests that the resource identified by the request-uri is deleted
TRACE	Echoes the HTTP request. Used for debugging
CONNECT	For use with a proxy that can dynamically switch to being a tunnel

Table 2.3: HTTP methods

2.4 Transmission Control Protocol

TCP is called the workhorse of the Internet because it is so critical for how the Internet works. It is the primary transport protocol of the Internet Protocol Suite[8] and provides reliable, in-sequence delivery of two-way traffic(full-duplex) data. TCP was defined in RFC 793[16] back in September 1981 and has since been improved in various RFC's. The main motivation behind TCP was to provide reliable end-to-end byte streams over unreliable networks. HTTP most often uses TCP as its transport protocol. In this section we present the characteristics of TCP and some of the issues we may encounter working with it.

2.4.1 The Protocol

TCP is a connection-oriented protocol, which means that a connection between a sender and the receiver must be established before any data can

be transferred. A connection is specified by a pair of sockets identifying its two sides. Associated with each connection TCP initialize and maintains some status information for each connection. This includes window size, socket information and sequence numbers.

Computers supporting TCP has a piece of software which manages TCP streams and interfaces to the IP layer. Most often this software is a part of the kernel[17]. It accepts data streams from local processes, and breaks them up into pieces, before sending them to the IP layer. The pieces are called TCP segments, which consist of a fixed 20 byte header, followed by zero or more data byte. The TCP software decide how big the segment should be, but for performance reasons they should not exceed the Maximum Transfer Unit (MTU) of the link(the physical network). Each segment should be so small that they can be sent in a single, unfragmented package over the entire network. This usually limits the size of each segment to the MTU of the Ethernet, which is 1500 bytes.

When the TCP software receives data from applications, it is not necessarily sent immediately as it may be buffered before its sent. At the receiver, data is delivered to the TCP software, which reconstructs the original byte streams and deliver them to the target application.

2.4.2 TCP Reliability

When transferring data over the Internet, the data may pass through various networks, routers and physical networks. Some of the routers may not work correctly, a bit may be flipped when transferring data wirelessly, or some other factor may come in to play. For those reasons, we have to accept that some of the data will be damaged, lost, duplicated or delivered out of order.

TCP recovers from such faults by assigning sequence number to each packet being sent. It then requires an positive acknowledgement from the receiver that the data was actually received. If the acknowledgement is not received within a timeout interval, the data is transmitted again. For the receiver the sequence numbers are used to ensure that data is received in the correct order, as well as eliminating duplicates. Furthermore, to detect damaged data, TCP applies checksums to each segment transmitted. At the receiver the checksum is then checked and damaged segments are discarded.

2.4.3 Flow Control

If a fast receiver sends data faster than a slow receiver is able to process, the receiver will be swamped with data and may experience serious performance reduction. Flow control is a mechanism to manage the rate of the data transmission to avoid overflowing a receiver. TCP provides this by using a window of acceptable sequence numbers that the receiver is willing to accept. With every acknowledgement sent back to the sender, the window is specified. This allows the receiver to control which segments, and how fast, the sender can send.

2.4.4 Congestion Control

Congestion control is about controlling the data traffic entry into a network in order to avoid network congestion. On its way from the sender to the receiver, an IP packet may pass through different subnets with different capabilities. Network congestion may occur if a node in a network receives more data than it is able to pass forward. The consequence of this is that an increase in network traffic to this node, would only lead to a small increase, or even a decrease, of the network throughput[18].

To avoid congestion TCP uses a number of mechanisms. These aims to control the rate of data packets entering into the networks to avoid congestion, but still get as high throughput as possible. One of these mechanisms is *slow-start*, which general idea is to start transmitting with a low packet rate, then gradually increasing the packet rate. When TCP notice that a packet is eventually lost, it considers it as a sign of network congestion and reduces its packet rate.

2.5 Protocols for Tactical Networks

DIL networks are characterized by their high delay, low data rate and relatively high error rate. Since TCP's congestion control interprets this as evidence of congestion, it will back off and use a lower data rate. This cause that TCP sends with a lower rate than the network actually can provide. Furthermore it could also ultimately lead to the TCP connection terminating due to those effects[7].

For those reasons we're in this thesis looking into alternative protocols and other optimization techniques. In networks with low data rate, protocols with low overhead per IP packet is beneficial. With frequents disconnects, protocols that are connection-less may be more suitable than connection-oriented. One important limitation is that NATO has chosen the "everything over IP", which means that all optimization must occur on the top of the network layer. Of this follows that we will evaluate protocols in the transport and application layer of the Internet Protocol Suite.

In the following sections we will give a short introduction to the protocols we're investigating in this thesis. The protocols have been selected because of their prevalence in the civil and military world or their reported performance in the "Internet of Things". These protocols are from two different paradigms:

Request-reply

Request-reply is a common message pattern where a requester sends a request to a system. The system then process the request and responds with a response message.

Publish-subscribe

Publish-subscribe is a message pattern where subscribers express their interest in a type of messages, often called topics or classes. A message publisher then creates messages of a certain class and publishes them without knowing who is actually subscribing to these types of messages. Many publish-subscribe system employs a *message broker* as seen in fig. 2.2. The message broker handles published messages from publishers and receives subscriptions from subscribers. The broker can perform various tasks, such as message filtering and prioritize queuing.




Figure 2.2: Message Brokers

We'll get started by discussing User Datagram Protocol (UDP), which alongside TCP is one of the core protocols of the Internet protocol suite.

2.5.1 User Datagram Protocol

The Internet has two main protocols in transport layer, UDP and TCP. They have fundamentally different characteristics and use cases, which we go through in this section. UDP was formally defined in 1980 in RFC 768[19] and is a more simpler protocol than TCP. It sends messages, called datagrams, to nodes over the IP network. While TCP provides reliable transmission along with flow control and congestion control, does UDP only support the sending of IP datagrams. Furthermore it is a connectionless protocol, which means that the protocol can send messages *without* first establishing a connection. Since UDP does not provide guaranteed delivery or in-order delivery of messages, it should only be used by applications that does not require this.

To summarize, UDP is a more lightweight protocol than TCP. It has smaller headers and less overhead, which makes it a faster protocol. The downside is that it does not provide any mechanisms for reliability. However, it is worth to note that applications can build their own reliability on top of UDP. This is done by the next protocol we're looking into.

2.5.2 The Constrained Application Protocol

The Constrained Application Protocol (CoAP) is a specialized Web transfer protocol designed for use with constrained nodes and networks[20]. It is designed for machine-to-machine applications, typically in the Internet of Things. Furthermore it is designed with a similar interface as HTTP, in order to easily integrate with Web services. CoAP is based on the REST model, where the server makes resources available under a resource identifier(URI). Clients access these resources using the HTTP-verbs GET, PUT, POST and DELETE. CoAP main features includes:

- UDP transport with optional reliability supporting unicast and multi-cast requests.
- Asynchronous message exchanges.
- A stateless HTTP mapping, allowing proxies to be built providing access to CoAP resources via HTTP in a uniform way or for HTTP simple interfaces to be realized alternatively over CoAP.
- Low header overhead and parsing complexity.

CoAP works similar to HTTP in the way that they use a client-server interaction model. CoAP requests is sent from a client to request an action on a resource located on a server. The server then responds with a response code and a possible response body. Unlike HTTP which uses TCP as its transport protocol, CoAP uses UDP. Since UDP does not guarantee delivery, CoAP provide mechanisms for optional reliability.




Figure 2.3: Overview of CoAP

2.5.3 Advanced Message Queuing Protocol

Advanced Message Queuing Protocol (AMQP) is an application layer protocol for sending messages. It support both request/response and the publish/subscribe communication paradigms. AMQP uses TCP for reliable delivery.

An important observation about AMQP is that it has two major versions which are fundamentally different, version 0.9.1 and 1.0. The latter has been standardized by OASIS[21], and is a more narrow protocol as it

only defines the network wire-level protocol for the exchange of messages between two endpoints. Wire-level protocols refers to the means for a application running at one machine to communicate with an application running at another machine using the Internet. Another difference between the versions is that version 1.0 does not specify the details of broker implementation. We investigate version 1.0 since it is the newest and has been standardized.

An AMQP network consist of nodes connected via *links*. Nodes can be producers, consumers and queues. Producers generate messages, consumers process messages, while queues store and forward them. These nodes lives inside *containers*, which can be client applications and brokers. Each container can have multiple nodes. AMQP version 1.0 is does not specify the internal workings of those nodes, but defines the protocol for transferring messages between them. The basis data unit in AMQP is called a *frame* and is used to initiate, control and tear down the transfer of a message between two nodes. The 9 different frames are listen in table 2.4.

Prior to any communication, an AMQP connection must be established making AMQP a connection-oriented protocol. A connection is divided into independent unidirectional *channels*. AMQP *session* correlates two unidirectional channels to form a bidirectional, sequential conversation between two containers. To establish an connection the first operation is to establishing a TCP connection between the nodes. Then the protocol header are exchanged, allowing the nodes agree on a common protocol version. This is exchanged in plaintext (not in AMQP frame). The message itself is sent with the *transfer* frame. Larger messages can be split into multiple frames.

AMQP Frame	Purpose
Open	Describes the capabilities and limits of the node.
Begin	Begin a session on a channel
Attach	Attach a link to a session
Flow	Update link state
Transfer	Transfer a message
Disposition	Inform remote peer of delivery state changes
Detach	Detach the link endpoint from the session
End	End the session
Close	Signal a connection close

Table 2.4: AMQP Frames

2.5.4 MQTT

MQTT is like AMQP also a publish/subscribe messaging transport protocol [22]. It emerged in 1999 and recently became an OASIS standard in 2014.

MQTT is considered to be light weight and simple to implement, making it suitable for use in networks where the data rate is limited and/or a low code footprint is needed. MQTT is broker-based and runs on top of the TCP/IP protocols.

The protocol provides message sending services to applications by exchanging different MQTT control packets. The different packets are listed in table 2.5 It offers different levels of Quality of Service (QoS), specifying the delivery policies for messages. This is beneficial in networks where messages may be lost while traveling through a network. The lowest level of QoS is *at most once*, which specifies that a message should arrive at the receiver either once or not at all. Next, the policy *At least once* ensures that the message arrives at the receiver at least once, but possible more. The last and highest level of MQTT's QoS, *exactly once*, guarantees one, and only one, delivery of the message. Only *exactly once* requires the usage of the control packets PUBREC, PUBREL and PUBCOMP.

MQTT Control Packet	Purpose
CONNECT	Client request a connection with Server
CONNACK	Acknowledge connection request
PUBLISH	Publish a message
PUBACK	Publish acknowledgement
PUBREC	Publish received
PUBREL	Response to a PUBREC Packet
PUBCOMP	Publish complete
SUBSCRIBE	Subscribe to topics
SUBACK	Subscribe acknowledgement
UNSUBSCRIBE	Unsubscribe from topics
UNSUBACK	Unsubscribe acknowledgement
PINGREQ	PING request
PINGRESP	PING response
DISCONNECT	Disconnect notification

Table 2.5: MQTT Control packets

2.5.5 Stream Control Transmission Protocol

Stream Control Transmission Protocol (SCTP) is transport-layer protocol, which offers functionality from both UDP and TCP[23]. The motivation behind the protocol was that many developers found TCP too limiting, but still required more reliability than UDP could provide. SCTP tries to solve these issues. It is message-oriented like UDP, but ensure reliable, in sequence transport of messages with congestion control like TCP. SCTP is a connection-oriented protocol and provide features like multi-homing and multi-streaming. Multi-homing is the possibility to use more than one network path between two nodes. This increases reliability since if one path fails, messages can still be sent over the other link(s). Multi-streaming

refers to SCTP ability to transmit several independent streams of data at the same time, for example sending an image at the same time as a HTML Web page.




Figure 2.4: Overview of SCTP

2.6 Performance testing

To determine which optimization techniques that have a positive effect on the performance of Web services in DIL environments, we do performance testing.

2.6.1 Network metrics

Network metrics are used to describe various aspects of data transfer from a point to another.

Data throughput The data throughput is influenced by how large distance there is between the nodes communicating.

Reliability How much of the arriving data that is correct. This is called *bit error rate* or *packet error rate*. With high error rates, more data to be transmitted again due to the data arriving being incorrect. This contributes to longer transmission time. In a military setting, an enemy may deliberate sabotage the network with jamming, causing higher error rates.

Latency The communication technology in use influences how fast data transmission can be done. Long delay may cause that the application sending data times out.

2.7 Summary

In this chapter we have presented computer networks in general, before we discussed the two most common type of Web services. Moreover, we have discussed the protocols that these Web services use in order to transmit messages over the Internet. We also introduced some new protocols designed to work in "Internet of things" networks, which have many of the

same characteristics as DIL networks. Finally, we introduced the concept of performance testing and important network metrics when doing such testing.

Many of the mentioned protocols has been previously researched for use in DIL networks. In the next chapter we will present relevant work in this area.

Protocol	Network layer	Summary
HTTP	Application. Uses TCP.	Widely used. Breaks down in DIL environments.
TCP	Transport	The well-known transport protocol.
UDP	Transport	Lacks reliability, but frameworks exist that provides it.
CoAP	Application. Uses UDP.	Designed for use in the Internet of Things.
AMQP	Application. Uses TCP.	Messaging middleware with store-and-forward capabilities.
MQTT	Application. Uses TCP	Pub/sub designed for use in the Internet of Things
SCTP	Transport	Similar to UDP but also provide reliable, in sequence transport of messages like TCP.

Table 2.6: Summary of protocols

Chapter 3

Related Work

In this chapter we will discuss earlier relevant work in the area of improving the performance of Web services in DIL environments. Improving Web services is critical for both civil and military users as increasing the performance means that applications become faster, less money needs to be put into network capacity. From this comes that quite amount of research has been done in the area of optimizing network applications. Improving the performance of Web services in DIL environments has been explored, but mostly for SOAP-based Web services and not REST.

In the following sections we identify results and recommendations that are applicable to this thesis. We get started by presenting compression, the obvious technique of reducing the size of data being sent over the network.

3.1 Compression

Quite an amount of research has been done in the area of compression. Data compression is the technique of encoding information using fewer bits than the original representation. The goal is to reduce data transmission time or the storage requirements. We divide compression lossy and lossless compression. Lossy compression is used to compress data such as images and movies where the consequence of loosing some of the data is not critical. Lossless compression utilize repeating patterns in the data in order to represents the same data in a more efficient way.

XML is the data format used by Web services and has a significant overhead. Previous studies have evaluated different compressions algorithms for Web services. Previous experiments shows EFX has the best compression results with GZIP as the second best alternative[24].

3.2 Making SOA applicable at the tactical level

In the report IST-090, a task group investigated solutions for making SOA applicable at the tactical level. As a follow-on to IST-090, the research group IST-118 was created with the goal to create a recommendation for using SOA in DIL networks. In the paper IST-118[25] they summarized

the findings of IST-090. Although the papers only looked into W3C Web services, many of their recommendations are also applicable to RESTful Web services. They identified three key issues that need to be addressed in order to apply Web services in tactical networks[6, 25]:

End-to-end connections

Web services transport protocols depend on a direct, end-to-end connection between the client and the service. Attempting to establish and maintaining connections in DIL environments can lead to increased communication overhead and possible complete breakdown of communication. Most Web services use TCP as the transport protocol, which is a connection-oriented protocol designed for wired networks. In DIL environments with high error rates and high latencies, the congestion control of TCP will cause sub-optimal utilization of the network due to frequent connection timeouts. Similar, HTTP, which is the application layer protocol most often used together with TCP, struggles in such environments. HTTP is a synchronous protocol, which means that the HTTP connection is kept open until a response is received. Long response times cause timeouts. IST-090 points out the obvious solution to replace HTTP and TCP with other, more suitable protocols.

The IST-90 report mentions two approaches to replace HTTP/TCP. The clients and services themselves can be modified to support other protocols, or proxies which support alternative protocols can be used[6]. With employing a proxy solution, standards compliance can be retained.

Network heterogeneity

Another issue is when heterogeneous networks are interconnected. Different performance in networks may lead to buildup of data in buffers, risking loss of information. A proposed solution to this is to have store-and-forward support, which can support that messages are not dropped, but stored and forwarded when possible.

Web service overhead

W3C Web services are associated with a considerable amount of overhead. Web Service technology is based on SOAP, which use XML-based messages. It is a textual data format and produce much larger messages than binary formats. Optimization approaches should seek to reduce the network traffic generated by Web services by using techniques as compression to reduce the size of messages. Another approach is to reduce the number of messages being sent, which was looked into in IST-090[6]. In their work they investigated three different ways to do this:

1. Employing caching near the client in order to reuse older messages.

2. Using publish/subscribe paradigm, which allows clients to subscribe to information instead of requesting it. This allows the same message to be sent to multiple clients.
3. Employing content filtering, which filters out unnecessary data.

3.3 Previous evaluations of alternative protocols

Previous studies have investigated potential gains from replacing HTTP/TCP with alternative protocols [26]. They looked into TCP, UDP, SCTP and AMQP for conveying Web services traffic under typical military networking conditions. The researchers found that SCTP had the highest success rate in military tactical communication. However, on the lower bandwidth links the protocols tends to generate more overhead than TCP. They pointed out that this was due to SCTP having a more complex connection handshake procedure and in addition use heartbeat packets.

3.4 Tuning application server parameters

When setting up an application server, several parameters which can affect the performance of Web services running on the application server can be configured. Wrong or bad configuration may cause inaccurate timeouts and congestion in the network. In a paper written by researchers at Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU) and FFI, the authors investigated how such tuning affected the performance of Web services in different emulated tactical networks[14]. In their study they investigated how tuning server parameters affect the performs of both REST and SOAP Web services. They identified a number of key HTTP and TCP tuning parameters:

HTTP Timeout Controls how long a HTTP connection can be deemed as idle and kept in the "keep-alive" state. Having a to low timeout on networks with low bandwidth, can potentially flood the network with packets that have timed out. Consideration should therefor be taken when setting this parameter for mobile tactical networks.

HTTP Compression Enables HTTP/1.1 GZIP compression.

HTTP Chunking Allows the server to send data in dynamic chunks.

HTTP Header and Send Buffer Sizes Can vary the size of the buffers that hold the request and send data, respectively.

TCP Idle Key Timeout Sets the time before an idle TCP channel closes.

TCP Read and Write Timeouts Set the timeout for TCP read and write operations, respectively.

TCP Selector Poll Timeout Sets the time a Java new/non-blocking I/O (NIO) selector will block waiting for user requests.

TCP Buffer Size Sets the size of the buffer that holds input streams created by the network listener.

TCP Batching/TCP NO_DELAY Batches together small TCP packets into larger packets.

MTU Size The maximum transmission unit size regulates the largest data unit that can be passed onwards. In tactical military communication the MTU size can be very low(down to 128 bytes).

After running their experiments they concluded that few of the parameters actually had any significant impact on the performance of the Web Service. However, they identified HTTP Chunking configuration as having the most impact on the performance. It significantly improved the performance in different types of networks and for both SOAP and RESTful Web services.

3.5 Proxy optimization

One of the recommendations of IST-090 was the usage of proxies. This recommendation has been picked-up by other research group and a set of proxies for optimizing Web services in DIL networks already exist. However, many of them does not fulfill all the requirements we have for our proxy. Some of them does only support SOAP Web services and others are unusable due to security reasons. This section lists and discuss previous implementations of such proxies.

3.5.1 DSProxy

DSProxy is a proxy solution developed by Norwegian Defence Research Establishment (FFI), which transports SOAP messages over DIL networks[27]. It reduces bandwidth needs by employing different optimization techniques such as compression. DSProxy also provides delay tolerance, which allows COTS clients to function in DIL networks.

The downside with DSProxy is that it only support SOAP, which leaves RESTful Web services out of the picture.

3.5.2 AFRO

Adaption Framework foR Web Services prOvision (AFRO) is an edge proxy which offers different levels of QoS to Web services through performance monitoring and application of the context-aware service provision paradigm[6]. It perform so called adaption actions, which modifies the SOAP XML messages by changing their encoding to more efficient data representation. It also cuts out information that is accepted to be removed by the service requester.

However, since the proxy modifies the data being sent, the digital signature of the data is also changed. In applications where we want to be sure that no one has tampered with the data before arriving, checksums are often used. Therefore this solution would not work for such applications.

3.5.3 Suri

To be done.

3.6 Summary

In this chapter we looked into efforts previously undertaken in order to improve the performance of Web services in networks with the DIL characteristics. We identified compression with EFX as proven technique to reduce the size of messages sent over the network. Next, we looked into the paper IST-090 and the challenges that comes with DIL networks. We saw how IST-090 pointed to the usage of proxies. Furthermore, we investigated previous attempts with the usage of alternative transport protocols, before we looked into previous efforts in the area of tuning application server parameters. Finally, we discussed previously developed proxies for DIL networks and discovered that they do not fulfill all the requirements that we have. Proxies previously created are either limited to SOAP-based Web services or are inadequate to be used due to security reasons.

Protocol Stack	optimization possibilities
The application	Optimize the application
Web service messaging: SOAP	Optimize SOAP, e.g XML compression
HTTP/TCP, UDP or other transport protocols	SOAP is transport agnostic. Other protocols can be used.
IP	NATO NEC feasibility study states that all protocols should be over IP.
Lower layers	Not in the scope of this thesis.

Table 3.1: Optimization possibilities.

Chapter 4

Requirement Analysis

In this chapter we discuss the requirements for the proxy being developed as a part of this thesis. Those requirements build on the scope and premises discussed in the introduction. To recap, these defining premisses were:

1. Support both REST and Web service communication between machines connected in a DIL network.
2. Work on top of the IP-layer.
3. All optimization techniques must be placed in a proxy, and not in the Web service applications themselves.

4.1 HTTP Proxy

The first requirement implies that our proxy must accept HTTP, as this is the far most used Web service protocol. Our proxy must be able to accept a HTTP requests from a Web service, forward it to the other proxy, which in turn delivers it to the intended receiver. The communication between the proxies are not required to be HTTP, but rather a protocol than deals with DIL networks in a better way. However, since ultimately a HTTP request should be delivered to the intended receiver, the HTTP properties must be retained. This means that the proxy must preserve the HTTP Method and HTTP headers. Also, since REST is payload agnostic, the proxy must be able to support different types of data being sent through it(XML, JSON etc.).

Furthermore, the proxy must be able to handle the difficult network conditions of DIL. The specific requirements are outlined in the following sections.

4.2 Cope with DIL

4.2.1 Disconnected

Support disconnects over a longer period of time. Previous work identified the removal of end-to-end dependencies as important. By employing

proxies, the end-to-end dependency is instead between the client and the proxy locally. However, the connection between the proxies over a DIL network can still be lost. This means that the proxy must be able to maintain the connection with the local application, while managing loss of connection with the other proxy. When the connection are reestablished, the proxy should continue sending the data and finally delivering a response back to the client.

This requires the proxy to have some sort of redeliver mechanism, which after a time tries to retransmit the data. If still unsuccessful, the proxy waits an amount of time before attempting again. This should be done indefinitely until the connection is reestablished. One consideration about this is the risk of overflowing the receiver. It is therefore common to use an exponential back off. This mechanism grants that the proxy tries frequently immediately after loss of connection, but gradually tries more and more seldom. Different use cases may require different parameters, so back-off and redeliver delay should be able to alter via proxy configuration.

4.2.2 Intermittent

Handle brief disconnects. Same requirements as for disconnected. The proxy should "hide" disconnects from the client.

4.2.3 Limited

It must handle very low data rates.

4.3 Support optimization techniques

4.3.1 Compression

In order to perform compression the proxy must be able to modify the payload of the message. Due to security mechanisms that detect changes to the payload(checksums), the payload must be restored back to its original form before being forwarded to the final receiver.

4.3.2 Proxy protocol communication

One of the optimization techniques identified was the usage of alternative protocols. The proxy should therefore support a subset of them, and be easily configured to use other protocols for testing purposes.

MQTT is pub/sub, unfit for our request/reply setup.

"Ren" TCP dropper vi fordi vi vet at den brekker fra tidligere forsøk.

UDP krever så mye tid å implementere at vi dropper det.

4.4 Other considerations

Since we're creating a proxy aimed for use in a military context, military operational requirements are part of the requirements for this proxy.

Mobile units have to carry batteries with them and the capacity is therefore limited. Advanced compression techniques may reduce the overhead, but also requires more battery. This trade-off needs to be considered.

4.5 Summary

In this chapter we have discussed the requirements for our proxy, which are summarized here:

1. Receive and forward HTTP requests
2. Retain HTTP request and response headers.
3. Support GZIP compression of payload.
4. Handle frequent disconnects.
5. Handle disconnects over longer periods of time.
6. Handle very low data rate.
7. Allow for configuration of redelivery delay.
8. Support usage of HTTP, AMQP and CoAP between proxies.

Next we discuss the design and implementation of our proxy.

Chapter 5

Design and Implementation

In this chapter we will introduce the design and implementation details of our proxy solution for improving the performance of Web services in DIL environments. We will first look into the overall design before we dive into the details.

5.1 Overall Design

The proposed design in this thesis includes a proxy pair.




Figure 5.1: Architectural overview of proposed design

5.2 Apache Camel

This does the work of converting the specific input/request (like an HTTP request) into something generic - a Camel Exchange - that can travel down a Route. - quoute. må skrives om.

5.3 DIL Proxy

5.3.1 Configuration

5.3.2 Routes and processors

5.3.3 Proxy header

5.4 Summary

Chapter 6

Testing and Evaluation

In this chapter we present how the testing and evaluation of the proxy was performed and present the results we obtained. The goal is to measure any possible improvements (or deterioration) of the performance of Web services when the proxy developed as a part of this thesis is being used. Since the proxy was developed as a prototype for military usage, we wanted to use test scenarios that resembles actual military and civilian usage. For the purpose of testing, we therefor originally developed two set of applications, one W3C Web service and one RESTful Web service. These applications were then put to test in networks with different characteristics. During testing, we discovered that some of the protocols were very sensitive to the size of the messages being sent. We therefor also developed a complementary test service which allowed us to test sending messages of different sizes.

We'll get started by discussing the test and evaluation tools used, before we introduce the different test applications, test cases and the different types of networks used for testing. Then we present the test results for each of the three aspects of DIL, *disconnected*, *intermittent* and *limited*. The aspects were tested separately. We started with the disconnected and intermittent tests, where we investigated the behaviour when connection was lost. For the limited tests, we saw how different types of networks influenced the performance of Web services. The base case was to test without any intentional limitations to the network and without the actual usage of the proxy. Then we introduced usage of the proxy and evaluated it in different types of limited networks.

Furthermore we performed tests with two setups, first with machine-to-machine over an Ethernet cable, then we supplemented with testing over actual military communication equipment. The usage of actual military equipment allowed us to get as realistic results as possible.

6.1 Types of DIL networks

Military communication can occur over a wide range of different technologies and environments. These include Satellite Communcation (SATCOM), Line of Sight (LOS), Combat Net Radio (CNR) and WiFi. WiFi is divided

into two types to illustrate both with good connection and one with less. Some communication technology, such as Satellite communication, is characterized by long communication delay while others may be by their low data rate. An overview of military communication technologies can be seen in fig. 6.1.




Figure 6.1: Overview of tested networks

An infinite number of possible network combinations exists, so we have in this thesis chosen to focus on five different network types identified by the task group IST-118 for DIL-testing. We also investigated Long-Term Evolution (LTE), commonly known as 4G, a network technology which has become in widespread use in the latest years. The reason for including LTE in addition to the ones from IST-118, is that the Norwegian Defense is looking into the possibility of using LTE. Thus making it interesting for us to investigate the performance under this type of network as well. However, we eventually found out that LTE has gotten so fast and reliable, that it is not really relevant from a DIL perspective. We therefor instead looked into Enhanced Data rates for GSM Evolution (EDGE), which is used as a fall back in geographical areas where LTE and 3G is not available. The different networks and their properties are summarized in table 6.1.

6.2 Testing and Evaluation Tools

In order to evaluate how our solution impacts the performance of Web services in DIL environments, we needed some way of simulating such environments. Obviously, we would have got the most realistic test environment by testing "out in the field" ourself. However, this would require of a considerable amount of effort and it would be difficult to

Network	Data Rate	Delay	PER
Satellite Communication	250 kbps	550 ms	0 %
Line of Sight	2 mbps	5 ms	0 %
Wireless Fidelity (WiFi) 1	2 mbps	100 ms	1 %
WiFi 2	2 mbps	100 ms	20 %
Combat Net Radio with Forward Error Correction	9.6 kbps	100 ms	1 %
Edge	50/200 kbps	200 ms	0 %

Table 6.1: Different network types

reproduce the exact same environment and test results. We therefor choose to instead emulate DIL networks. For testing we used two approaches, the first one connecting two machines through a third machine. The third machine used a component in the Linux kernel to control the flow of the network traffic flowing through it, allowing us to simulate DIL networks. The second approach involved using actual military equipment in a laboratory at FFI. The benefit of using actual equipment, is that we got as realistic tests as possible.

6.2.1 Linux network traffic control

The Linux kernel offers a rich set of tools for managing and manipulating the transmission of packets. **tc**(traffic control) is a Linux program to configure and control the Linux kernels Network scheduler. Network Emulator (NetEm) is an enhancement of the traffic control facilities that allows us to control delay, packet loss and other characteristics to packets outgoing from a selected network interface[28]. These tools allow us to emulate many of the network characteristics that makes DIL.

Delays

NetEm can emulate delays on packets on a specific link. In listing 6.3 we add a fixed delay on 100 ms to all packets going out of local Ethernet.

Listing 6.1: "Emulating delay"

```
tc qdisc add dev eth0 parent 1:1 handle 10: \
    netem delay 100ms
```

Data rate

Listing 6.2: "Emulating delay"

```
tc qdisc add dev eth0 handle 1: \
    root tbm rate 50kbit burst 15000 limit 15000
```

Corrupt rate

The corrupt rate allows us to insert random data into a chosen percent of packets.

Listing 6.3: "Emulating delay"

```
tc qdisc add dev etho parent 1:1 handle 10: \
    netem delay 100ms corrupt 20%
```

6.2.2 Iperf 3

iperf is a tool for performing network throughput measurements. Together with ping we, used this tool to confirm that the NetEm configuration worked as expected.

6.2.3 Wireshark

Wireshark is a packet analyzer and allows for network analysis and let us see the network traffic. Using this tool, we could investigate the behaviour of each protocol used for testing.

6.3 Test Setup

The majority of testing was performed at the FFI-lab at Kjeller. All the test applications consisted of one client and one Web service, where the client would request the service for some sort of data. The client were hosted on one computer and the service at another computer. The majority of testing was done using NetEm to emulate DIL networks, and some testing was done using actual military radios. The machines used for testing is listed in table 6.2.

Machine	Client	Application server	Router
Model	Asus UX 31A Notebook	HP EliteBook 6930p	HP Compaq
OS	Debian 8.2	Ubuntu 14.04	Ubuntu 14.04
Kernel	3.16.0-4-amd64	3.13.0-79-generic	3.19.0-25-gen
CPU	Intel i7 @ 1.90GHz	Intel Duo T95550	Intel Quad Q
Cores	4	2	4
Memory	4 GB	4 GB	12 GB
Network hardware	ASIX AX88772 USB 2.0	82567LM Gigabit	82567LM-3 C
Network interface capacity	100 Mbit/s	1 Gbit/s	1 Gbit/s

Table 6.2: Machines involved in the testing

6.3.1 NetEm Setup

In this setup, the client and Web service machines were connected to each other through a third computer, acting as a router. This router machine had

two network cards and networked together the other machines by Ethernet cables. The setup can be seen in fig. 6.2. In order for the router machine to forward IP packets back and forth between the client and server, IP forwarding was enabled on the kernel.




Figure 6.2: Testing environment

The server and client are assigned an IP address in two different subnets. This is done by the Linux network interface administration program *ifconfig*. In listing 6.4 the client machine is assigned the IP address 192.168.2.44.

Listing 6.4: "Configuring a network interface of the router"

```
ifconfig eth0 192.168.2.1 up
```

After setting up the IP addresses we need to configure the routing so that the kernel knows where to route the network traffic. In this case we want all traffic to go through the routing machine. In listing 6.5 we configure all IP traffic bound for the subnet 192.168.1.X to be routed through the router machine with IP 192.168.2.1.

Listing 6.5: "Configuring routing rules for the client"

```
ip route add unicast 192.168.1.0/24 via 192.168.2.1
```

Emulating different types of networks

Since all network traffic passes through the routing machine, we can control the flow of IP packets here. As previously discussed, we use NetEm. For each network configuration, a bash script is run. This script configures the network interfaces in order to get the correct network behaviour. Both interfaces are configured so the network is symmetrical in both directions.

6.3.2 Military Radio Setup

Although testing on regular machines with emulated network gives us a good indication, to get as realistic results as possible we also performed tests on military communication equipment. The setup is illustrated in fig. 6.3.




Figure 6.3: Testing environment

6.3.3 Proxy setup

In order to enable the applications to tunnel all their HTTP traffic through our proxy, we needed a way to setup a proxy without altering the applications themselves. Fortunately, Java provide mechanisms to deal with proxies[29]. We configured the Java Virtual Machine (JVM) to get the applications to tunnel all HTTP traffic through our proxy. This is done by setting properties to the JVM:

Listing 6.6: "Setting a proxy on the JVM"

```
java -Dhttp.proxyHost=localhost \
-Dhttp.proxyPort=3001 \
-Dhttp.nonProxyHosts= \
-jar target/client.jar
```

In listing 6.6 the application **client.jar** is started and all HTTP traffic will go through the proxy server at localhost on port 3001.

6.4 Test Execution

For our tests we use originally used two different sets of applications. One for W3C Web services and one for RESTful Web services. While W3C web Services only uses HTTP simply as a transport mechanism, REST utilizes the different HTTP methods to indicate which operation to perform on a resource. Each test scenario was therefor performed with both a W3C Web service application and RESTful Web service application. Each service is deployed in Glassfish 4, while the client is executed either from the command line or directly from the Netbeans IDEA. Data being sent between the client and server is by default sent uncompressed.

During testing we discovered that especially CoAP was very sensitive to the size of the messages being sent. We therefor developed a test application that allowed the client to request a number of bytes from the server. This allowed us to see how CoAP performed with different message sizes.

6.4.1 NFFI W3C Web service

For the purpose of testing W3C Web service applications we created a mock system which allows a client to request a service to report positions of friendly forces. The position reports use the NATO Friendly Force Information (NFFI) format, which has an associated XML schema with it. One test run is illustrated in fig. 6.4 and consist of the client making a HTTP POST request to the Web service. Associated with the request is an XML payload which tells the Web service which operation to invoke. In our case, the service then returns an XML message containing a large number of positions in the NFFI format.




Figure 6.4: NFFI Web service

6.4.2 RESTful car Web service

The RESTful Web service is an example service keeping order of cars in a “car system”. The service exposes an Application Program Interface (API) which offers different operations to manage the car system. Clients can invoke these operations by using HTTP requests and utilizing the associated HTTP method to indicate what to do with an resource. Since RESTful services are payload agnostic, we choose JSON to represent the data being sent between the server and the client. JSON is a lightweight data-format. Each test run consist of a client sequentially invoking the server with different API requests. The most common HTTP-methods GET, PUT, POST, and DELETE are all part of the testing. An example, not inclusive, test run is illustrated in fig. 6.5.

6.4.3 Request size application

This application allowed us to test with different message sizes.




Figure 6.5: RESTful car service

6.4.4 Test parameters

The tests were performed with the following parameters.

- GZIP compression on/off.
- Without and with proxies.
- Transport protocol used.

6.5 Function tests

The first phase of the testing was performed without any actual intended limitations to the network. The objective of this testing is to validate that the proxy is working correctly and have a benchmark to compare other results with. This phase was again divided into two phases, one without the usage of proxy and one with. Doing this allowed us to investigate any potential overhead associated with the usage of the proxy. We used the NetEm setup with a third machine acting as a router, although without any NetEm limitations turned on.

6.5.1 Results and Analysis

Enabling compression yields an improvement in the performance, especially for W3C Web services which had much larger messages. We also notice that HTTP and CoAP has almost identical performance, while AMQP has significant longer average response time. Furthermore we can observe that the default solution without proxies has the best performance in this unlimited network.




Figure 6.6: W3C Web services results




Figure 6.7: REST results

6.6 DIL Tests - Disconnected

In this scenario we evaluate the performance with the DIL characteristic *disconnected*, which refers to the network suddenly going down when the application is sending data. The objective of this testing is to evaluate how the proxy manages disconnects over longer periods of time. We define the success criteria for this test to be that the client is able to eventually process his request after the connection is reestablished. The client HTTP request should not be interrupted in any way, other than it taking longer time to process the request.

6.6.1 Execution

The tests are performed on a unlimited network. During testing the Ethernet cable between the client machine and the router was removed for

about 60 seconds. It was then reconnected.

6.6.2 Results and Analysis

For both the REST and W3C Web service test scenarios the results were identical. Without using proxies, the connection timed out and the applications were unable to continue. With proxies the connection did not time out, and the protocols retransmission mechanism were able to continue transmission when connection was reestablished.

Test	Result
Without proxy	Connection timeout
Proxy with HTTP	Success
Proxy with AMQP	Success
Proxy with CoAP	Success

Table 6.3: W3C Web service results

Test	Result
Without proxy	Connection timeout
Proxy with HTTP	Success
Proxy with AMQP	Success
Proxy with CoAP	Success

Table 6.4: RESTful Web service results

6.7 DIL Tests - Intermittent

Intermittent refers to the network connection being lost, but then regained again. The objective of this testing is to evaluate how the proxy manages frequent temporary loss of connections. The success criteria is the same as for disconnected, the client should not notice any disruption of service.

6.7.1 Execution

Not done yet. Similar to disconnect.

6.7.2 Results

Test	Result
Without proxy	X
Proxy with HTTP	X
Proxy with AMQP	X
Proxy with CoAP	X

Table 6.5: W3C Web service results

Test	Result
Without proxy	X
Proxy with HTTP	X
Proxy with AMQP	X
Proxy with CoAP	X

Table 6.6: RESTful Web service results

6.8 DIL Tests - Limited

The third DIL characteristic, *limited*, refers to different ways a network can be limited. This includes high delays, packet loss and low bandwidth. In this section we present the testing performed for the different types of networks identified in table 6.1.

6.8.1 Satellite communication

In this test scenario we emulate Satellite Communication (SATCOM). With satellite communication all data is relayed through a communication satellite in orbit around the earth. This type of communication is characterized by its low data rate and high delay.

Results and analysis

AMQP has a very long response time for both test scenarios, while also CoAP struggles with large uncompressed XML messages of the NFFI service. For both with and without compression, we observe that employing HTTP proxies yields a small improvement of performance, compared to the default. We can also notice that for the RESTful service, CoAP has better performance than default, and similar performance to HTTP proxies.




Figure 6.8: W3C Web services results




Figure 6.9: REST results

6.8.2 Line-of-Sight

In this test scenario we emulate so-called Line of Sight (LOS) networks, which are characterized by being a radio-based type of network with no physical obstacles between the nodes in the network. High data rate, low delay and zero error.

Results and analysis

Again we notice CoAP really struggling with uncompressed XML messages, as well as AMQP performing significantly poorer than the other protocols. However, when the message is compressed CoAP has roughly equal performance as the default. When we look on the RESTful test application results, we see that CoAP performs better than default and HTTP with compressed messages.




Figure 6.10: W3C Web services results




Figure 6.11: REST results

6.8.3 WiFi 1

With this type of network we emulate communication over WiFi where the conditions are relatively good. The data rate is high, the delay is moderate and the packet error rate is around 1 %.

Results and analysis

HTTP proxies with compression enabled yields the best performance. CoAP has worse performance than the HTTP proxies, but roughly equal for the compressed REST tests.




Figure 6.12: W3C Web services results




Figure 6.13: REST results

6.8.4 WiFi 2

This type of network also emulate wireless communication, but instead in the “outer” areas of the wireless range. It has good data rate, moderate delay and very high packet error rate(20 %).

Results and analysis

Compared to WiFi 1, we see that all response times has increased significantly. The importance of compression has increased, the tests with compression turned on yields a large performance increase. In the uncompressed NFFI test scenario, CoAP reached it's time out, and were unable to finish. In the scenarios where CoAP did finish it still performed worse than default and HTTP. HTTP proxies with compression yielded the best results.




Figure 6.14: W3C Web services results




Figure 6.15: REST results

6.8.5 Combat Net Radio with Forward Error Correction

This type of network is characterized by very low data rate, moderate timeout and packet error rate on around 1 %.

Results and analysis

Again we can observe the importance of compression in this type of networks. CoAP has the best performance.




Figure 6.16: W3C Web services results




Figure 6.17: REST results

6.8.6 EDGE

About this type of network.

Results and analysis




Figure 6.18: W3C Web services results




Figure 6.19: REST results

6.8.7 Kongsberg Radio

Two KDA WM 600.

Results and analysis

For NFFI tests, compression yields a lot of increase in performance.




Figure 6.20: W3C Web services results




Figure 6.21: REST results

6.9 Summary

In this section the results from the tests are presented. These results lead up to the discussion and conclusion in the next chapter.

- AMQP has the worst performance in almost every test scenario.
- Compression almost always yields in performance increase.
- CoAP struggles with larger messages.
- CoAP has the best performance with smaller messages in networks with low data rate.

Chapter 7

Conclusion and Future Work

7.1 Conclusion

7.2 Future Work

Bibliography

- [1] P. Bartolomasi et al. *NATO network enabled capability feasibility study*. 2005.
- [2] NATO. *NATO - Member Countries*. http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/nato_countries.htm. Accessed: 2015-05-04.
- [3] OASIS et al. *Reference Model for Service Oriented Architecture 1.0 OASIS standard*. <http://docs.oasis-open.org/soa-rm/v1.0/soa-rm.pdf>. Accessed: 06. 10. 2015. Oct. 2006.
- [4] NATO C3 Board. *Core Enterprise Services Standards Recommendations - The SOA Baseline Profile*. 1.7. 2011.
- [5] Frank T. Johnsen. “Pervasive Web Services Discovery and Invocation in Military Networks”. In: *FFI-rapport 2011/00257* (2011).
- [6] F. Annunziata et al. *IST-090 SOA challenges for disadvantaged grids*. <https://www.cso.nato.int/pubs/rdp.asp?RDP=STO-TR-IST-090>. Apr. 2014.
- [7] A. Gibb et al. “Information Management over Disadvantaged Grids”. In: *Task Group IST-030/ RTG-012, RTO-TR-IST-030* (2007). Final report of the RTO Information Systems Technology Panel.
- [8] R. Braden. *RFC 1122 – Requirements for Internet Hosts – Communication Layers*. <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc1122>. Accessed: 06. 01. 2016. Oct. 1989.
- [9] Hugo Haas and Allen Brown. *Web Services Glossary*. <http://www.w3.org/TR/ws-gloss/\#wservice>. Accessed: 2015-05-06.
- [10] W3C. *Extensible markup language (XML) 1.0*. Nov. 2008. URL: <https://www.w3.org/TR/REC-xml/> (visited on 02/25/2016).
- [11] Erik Christensen et al. *W3C - Web service definition language (WSDL)*. Mar. 2001. URL: <https://www.w3.org/TR/wsdl> (visited on 02/27/2016).
- [12] Martin Gudgin et al. *W3C - SOAP version 1.2 part 1: Messaging framework (Second edition)*. Apr. 2007. URL: <https://www.w3.org/TR/soap12-part1/> (visited on 02/27/2016).

- [13] Roy T. Fielding and Richard N. Taylor. “Principled Design of the Modern Web Architecture”. In: *Proceedings of the 22Nd International Conference on Software Engineering*. ICSE '00. Limerick, Ireland: ACM, 2000, pp. 407–416. ISBN: 1-58113-206-9. DOI: 10.1145/337180.337228. URL: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/337180.337228>.
- [14] Frank. T Johnsen, Trude Bloebaum, and Kristoffer R. Karud. “Recommendations for increased efficiency of Web services in the tactical domain”. In: International Conference on Military Communications and Information Systems (ICMCIS). Krakow, Poland, May 2015.
- [15] R. Fielding et al. *RFC 2616 – Hypertext Transfer Protocol – HTTP/1.1*. <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc2616>. Accessed: 10. 02. 2016. June 1999.
- [16] Information Sciences Institute - University of Southern California. *RFC 793 – Transmission Control Protocol*. <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc793>. Accessed: 10. 02. 2016. Sept. 1981.
- [17] David J. Wetherall Andrew S. Tanenbaum. *Computer Networks*. Fifth Edition. Pearson New International Edition.
- [18] Hussein Al-Bahadili. *Simulation in computer network design and modeling: Use and analysis*. IGI Global, Feb. 2012.
- [19] J Postel. *RFC 768 - User Datagram protocol*. Aug. 1980. URL: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc768> (visited on 02/28/2016).
- [20] Z. Shelby et al. *RFC 7252 – The Constrained Application Protocol (CoAP)*. <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc7252>. Accessed: 10. 02. 2016. June 2014.
- [21] OASIS. *Advanced message queuing protocol (AMQP) version 1.0*. Oct. 2012. URL: <http://docs.oasis-open.org/amqp/core/v1.0/os/amqp-core-overview-v1.0-os.html%5C#toc> (visited on 02/28/2016).
- [22] OASIS, Andrew Banks, and Rahul Gupta. *MQTT Version 3.1.1 Specification*. <http://docs.oasis-open.org/mqtt/mqtt/v3.1.1/mqtt-v3.1.1.html>. Accessed: 06. 01. 2016. Oct. 2014.
- [23] R Stewart. *RFC 4960 - Stream control transmission protocol*. Sept. 2007. URL: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc4960> (visited on 02/29/2016).
- [24] Frank T. Johnsen and Trude Bloebaum. “Using NFFI Web Services on the tactical level: An evaluation of compression techniques”. In: 13th International Command and Control Research and Technology Symposium (ICCRTS). Seattle, WA, USA, 2008.
- [25] Frank T. Johnsen et al. “IST-118 - SOA recommendations for Disadvantaged Grids in the Tactical Domain”. In: *18th ICCRTS* (2013).

- [26] Frank T. Johnsen et al. “Evaluation of Transport Protocols for Web Services”. In: *MCC 2013* (2013).
- [27] Ketil Lund et al. “Robust Web Services in Heterogeneous Military Networks”. In: *IEEE Communications Magazine, Special Issue on Military Communications* (Oct. 2010).
- [28] Fabio Ludovici and Hagen Paul Pfeifer. *Tc-netem(8) - Linux manual page*. Nov. 2011. URL: <http://man7.org/linux/man-pages/man8/tc-netem.8.html> (visited on 03/29/2016).
- [29] Oracle. *Java Networking and Proxies*. <https://docs.oracle.com/javase/8/docs/technotes/guides/net/proxies.html>.

Acronyms

- AFRO** Adaption Framework foR Web Services prOvision. 39
- AMQP** Advanced Message Queuing Protocol. 30
- API** Application Program Interface. 53
- CoAP** The Constrained Application Protocol. 30
- COTS** Commercial off-the-shelf. 19, 38
- DIL** Disconnected, Intermittent and Limited. 16, 17, 19, 20, 35
- EDGE** Enhanced Data rates for GSM Evolution. 48
- FFI** Norwegian Defence Research Establishment. 38
- FTP** File Transfer Protocol. 22
- HTTP** Hypertext Transfer Protocol. 19, 20, 22, 24, 25
- IETF** Internet Engineering Task Force. 25
- IP** Internet Protocol. 22, 29
- JVM** Java Virtual Machine. 52
- LOS** Line of Sight. 58
- LTE** Long-Term Evolution. 48
- MTU** Maximum Transfer Unit. 27
- NATO** North Atlantic Treaty Organization. 13
- NEC** Network Enabled Capability. 13
- NetEm** Network Emulator. 49, 50
- NFFI** NATO Friendly Force Information. 53
- NIO** Java new/non-blocking I/O. 38

NTNU Norwegian University of Science and Technology. 37

OASIS Organization for the Advancement of Structured Information Standards. 14, 30, 31

PER Packet Error Rate. 17

QoS Quality of Service. 32, 39

REST Representational State Transfer. 15, 22, 24, 37

SATCOM Satellite Communcation. 57

SCTP Stream Control Transmission Protocol. 32, 33, 37

SOA Service Oriented Architecture. 13–15, 22, 23, 35

TCP Transmission Control Protocol. 22, 26, 29, 32

UDP User Datagram Protocol. 29, 30, 32

URI Uniform Resource Identifier. 25

W3C World Wide Web Consortium. 22, 25

WSDL Web Services Description Language. 23

XML Extensible Markup Language. 23, 35

Appendices

Appendix A

Results

A.1 Function tests

- Ping measured to ~1 ms.
- Iperf3 measured data rate: 7.76 Mbits/sec.

Test	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance	Test runs
Without proxy	122 ms	29	869	300
Proxy with HTTP	163 ms	25	601	300
Proxy with HTTP & GZIP	99 ms	19	346	300
Proxy with AMQP	529 ms	60	3690	300
Proxy with AMQP & GZIP	490 ms	62	3847	300
Proxy with CoAP	285 ms	33	1122	300
Proxy with CoAP & GZIP	122 ms	33	1091	300

Table A.1: NFFI Web service results

Test	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance	Test runs
Without proxy	30 ms	12	147	100
Proxy with HTTP	160 ms	97	9486	100
Proxy with HTTP & GZIP	159 ms	76	5822	100
Proxy with AMQP	1919 ms	128	16388	100
Proxy with AMQP & GZIP	1880 ms	109	11919	100
Proxy with CoAP	124 ms	64	4079	100
Proxy with CoAP & GZIP	128 ms	64	4109	100

Table A.2: REST Web service results

Protocol	1 byte	2500 bytes	100 000 bytes
Default	43	8	112
HTTP	53	54	121
AMQP	155	199	283

Table A.3: Request message results

A.2 Satellite tests

- Ping measured to ~1100 ms.
- Iperf3 measured data rate: 402/291 Kbits/sec.

Test	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance	Test runs
Without proxy	4978 ms	378	142762	10
Proxy with HTTP	4511 ms	71	5009	10
Proxy with HTTP & GZIP	3530 ms	50	2472	10
Proxy with AMQP	25709 ms	793	628112	10
Proxy with AMQP & GZIP	25780 ms	1159	1343947	10
Proxy with CoAP	111636 ms	59	3437	10
Proxy with CoAP & GZIP	12347 ms	41	1652	10

Table A.4: NFFI Web service results

Test	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance	Test runs
Without proxy	13386 ms	401	160523	10
Proxy with HTTP	13643 ms	427	182464	10
Proxy with HTTP & GZIP	13825 ms	897	804893	10
Proxy with AMQP	102748 ms	3065	9396423	10
Proxy with AMQP & GZIP	94163 ms	568	322659	10
Proxy with CoAP	13545 ms	217	47260	10
Proxy with CoAP & GZIP	13562 ms	223	49522	10

Table A.5: REST Web service results

Protocol	1 byte	2500 bytes	100 000 bytes
Default	2246	2210	3987
HTTP	1121	1121	4035
AMQP	7939	8210	9388

Table A.6: Request message results

A.3 Line-of-Sight tests

- Ping measured to ~11 ms.
- Iperf3 measured data rate: 2.34/2.15 Mbits/sec.

Test	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance	Test runs
Without proxy	242 ms	26	663	100
Proxy with HTTP	299 ms	40	1577	100
Proxy with HTTP & GZIP	162 ms	34	1177	100
Proxy with AMQP	821 ms	60	3588	100
Proxy with AMQP & GZIP	693 ms	75	5632	100
Proxy with CoAP	1359 ms	45	1988	100
Proxy with CoAP & GZIP	262 ms	36	1314	100

Table A.7: NFFI Web service results

Test	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance	Test runs
Without proxy	156 ms	15	214	100
Proxy with HTTP	288 ms	77	6000	100
Proxy with HTTP & GZIP	292 ms	86	7382	100
Proxy with AMQP	2567 ms	102	10333	100
Proxy with AMQP & GZIP	2579 ms	129	16595	100
Proxy with CoAP	256 ms	69	4775	100
Proxy with CoAP & GZIP	263 ms	69	4693	100

Table A.8: REST Web service results

Protocol	1 byte	2500 bytes	100 000 bytes
Default	64	27	420
HTTP	62	68	423
AMQP	214	274	592

Table A.9: Request message results

A.4 WiFi 1 tests

- Ping measured to ~200 ms.
- Iperf3 measured data rate: 1.72/1.67 Mbits/sec.

Test	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance	Test runs
Without proxy	1202 ms	162	26326	100
Proxy with HTTP	1213 ms	354	125628	100
Proxy with HTTP & GZIP	820 ms	154	23586	100
Proxy with AMQP	5026 ms	460	211385	100
Proxy with AMQP & GZIP	4964 ms	637	405390	100
Proxy with CoAP	25615 ms	3185	10142866	10
Proxy with CoAP & GZIP	2823 ms	1425	2031770	100

Table A.10: NFFI Web service results

Test	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance	Test runs
Without proxy	2581 ms	265	70406	100
Proxy with HTTP	2728 ms	270	73000	100
Proxy with HTTP & GZIP	2818 ms	369	136307	100
Proxy with AMQP	19236 ms	490	240174	10
Proxy with AMQP & GZIP	18925 ms	722	521008	10
Proxy with CoAP	3184 ms	1565	2447810	100
Proxy with CoAP & GZIP	3024 ms	946	894686	100

Table A.11: REST Web service results

Protocol	1 byte	2500 bytes	100 000 bytes
Default	467	410	962
HTTP	221	244	1372
AMQP	1605	1666	2295

Table A.12: Request message results

A.5 WiFi 2 tests

- Ping measured to ~200 ms.
- Iperf3 measured data rate: 125/99.6 Kbits/sec.

Test	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance	Test runs
Without proxy	13235 ms	9070	82266227	10
Proxy with HTTP	12042 ms	6908	47717943	10
Proxy with HTTP & GZIP	3938 ms	4793	22970668	20
Proxy with AMQP	31096 ms	20578	423443967	10
Proxy with AMQP & GZIP	15243 ms	9267	85874508	10
Proxy with CoAP	0 ms	-	-	1
Proxy with CoAP & GZIP	37073 ms	46459	2158462617	20

Table A.13: NFFI Web service results

Test	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance	Test runs
Without proxy	8132 ms	7853	61661813	20
Proxy with HTTP	7259 ms	1764	3111671	20
Proxy with HTTP & GZIP	8611 ms	2815	7924419	20
Proxy with AMQP	85609 ms	26355	694606921	10
Proxy with AMQP & GZIP	76636 ms	34666	1201698634	10
Proxy with CoAP	24183 ms	14067	197893185	10
Proxy with CoAP & GZIP	21096 ms	11300	127698638	10

Table A.14: REST Web service results

Protocol	1 byte	2500 bytes	100 000 bytes
Default	3426	4637	-
HTTP	441	1254	19515
AMQP	5490	5186	-

Table A.15: Request message results

A.6 Combat Net Radio tests

- Ping measured to ~200 ms.
- Iperf3 measured data rate: 41/36 Kbits/sec.

Test	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance	Test runs
Without proxy	44332 ms	773	597167	10
Proxy with HTTP	48434 ms	3255	10595445	10
Proxy with HTTP & GZIP	5696 ms	522	272157	10
Proxy with AMQP	0 ms	-	-	1
Proxy with AMQP & GZIP	13241 ms	1071	1147182	10
Proxy with CoAP	48302 ms	1046	1095139	10
Proxy with CoAP & GZIP	3803 ms	1218	1482324	10

Table A.16: NFFI Web service results

Test	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance	Test runs
Without proxy	4055 ms	960	921629	20
Proxy with HTTP	11478 ms	2842	8077362	10
Proxy with HTTP & GZIP	9526 ms	2701	7292955	10
Proxy with AMQP	41255 ms	3171	10057224	10
Proxy with AMQP & GZIP	36540 ms	3281	10767443	10
Proxy with CoAP	5872 ms	2056	4226612	10
Proxy with CoAP & GZIP	3840 ms	1366	1865202	10

Table A.17: REST Web service results

Protocol	1 byte	2500 bytes	100 000 bytes
Default	447	2179	103260
HTTP	312	2805	92259
AMQP	2204	5183	-

Table A.18: Request message results

A.7 EDGE

- Ping measured to ~400 ms.

- Iperf3 measured data rate: 140/97 Kbits/sec.

Test	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance	Test runs
Without proxy	2437 ms	18	340	20
Proxy with HTTP	2587 ms	40	1583	20
Proxy with HTTP & GZIP	1381 ms	38	1477	20
Proxy with AMQP	9334 ms	65	4216	20
Proxy with AMQP & GZIP	8909 ms	158	24930	20
Proxy with CoAP	40855 ms	46	2151	20
Proxy with CoAP & GZIP	4630 ms	38	1481	20

Table A.19: NFFI Web service results

Test	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance	Test runs
Without proxy	4884 ms	132	17328	20
Proxy with HTTP	5116 ms	139	19459	20
Proxy with HTTP & GZIP	5061 ms	138	18960	20
Proxy with AMQP	35393 ms	764	583712	20
Proxy with AMQP & GZIP	35192 ms	446	199015	20
Proxy with CoAP	5063 ms	59	3488	20
Proxy with CoAP & GZIP	5064 ms	60	3604	20

Table A.20: REST Web service results

Protocol	1 byte	2500 bytes	100 000 bytes
Default	847	810	4201
HTTP	427	426	4229
AMQP	2925	2972	5963

Table A.21: Request message results

A.8 Military radio tests

- Ping measured to ~23 ms.
- Iperf3 measured data rate: 99/82 Kbits/sec.

Test	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance	Test runs
Without proxy	1379 ms	230	52988	100
Proxy with HTTP	1313 ms	139	19430	100
Proxy with HTTP & GZIP	464 ms	77	5874	100
Proxy with AMQP	2838 ms	318	101162	100
Proxy with AMQP & GZIP	1841 ms	220	48240	100
Proxy with CoAP	2720 ms	120	14457	100
Proxy with CoAP & GZIP	463 ms	25	618	100

Table A.22: NFFI Web service results

Test	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance	Test runs
Without proxy	1061 ms	X	X	100
Proxy with HTTP	1522 ms	X	X	100
Proxy with HTTP & GZIP	1404 ms	X	X	100
Proxy with AMQP	7353 ms	X	X	100
Proxy with AMQP & GZIP	7241 ms	X	X	100
Proxy with CoAP	906 ms	X	X	100
Proxy with CoAP & GZIP	840 ms	X	X	100

Table A.23: REST Web service results