EVALUATING TRAFFIC SHAPING AND POLICING TECHNIQUES FOR QOS IMPLEMENTATION IN ENTERPRISE NETWORKS

Introduction

Quality of Service (QoS) mechanisms protect critical applications from congestion by controlling how packets are queued, delayed, or dropped throughout the network. XYZ Company's mixed workload—voice calls, real-time video, and bulk data replication—requires fine-grained bandwidth governance. Two foundational QoS techniques, **traffic shaping** and **traffic policing**, address the same problem from opposite angles: one smooths traffic to fit the network's capacity, while the other enforces hard rate ceilings at ingress. Understanding their respective pros and cons will guide a deployment that balances jitter-sensitive media with efficiency and compliance.

Traffic Shaping

Traffic shaping buffers excess packets and releases them according to a defined rate (token bucket or leaky bucket algorithms). By stretching bursts over time, shaping transforms erratic flows into predictable, clock-like streams (Kurose & Ross, 2021).

Advantages

- **Jitter reduction**: Smoothing bursts lowers delay variation, enhancing VoIP and video quality.
- **Bandwidth fairness**: Shaping multiple classes at hierarchical levels (e.g., HQFQ) delivers minimum guarantees while allowing unused capacity to be borrowed.

- **Compliant burst handling**: Token-bucket models let short bursts through as long as average rates stay within contract, accommodating real-world traffic patterns.
- **Congestion avoidance**: By pacing traffic before it hits the core, shaping reduces the probability of downstream queue overflow (Cisco Press, 2025).

Disadvantages

- **Higher latency**: Packets queued for pacing incur additional delay, which can hurt interactive workloads if shaping depth is mis-configured.
- **Memory overhead**: Large buffers on edge routers may be required to store bursts, increasing hardware costs.
- **Complex tuning**: Determining optimal rates and burst sizes demands continuous monitoring; static values risk either underutilization or renewed congestion.

Traffic Policing

Traffic policing measures packet arrival rates and **drops or re-marks** packets that exceed a committed information rate (CIR). Unlike shaping, policing is stateless beyond the observation interval—excess traffic is simply penalized at the line rate.

Advantages

- **Immediate enforcement**: By discarding violators, policing prevents greedy flows from harming others without adding queuing delay.
- **Resource efficiency**: No large buffers are needed; routers only maintain token buckets counters, conserving memory.

- **SLA compliance**: Policing offers a hard guarantee that applications cannot exceed their contracted rate, simplifying billing and security audits.

Disadvantages

- **Potential packet loss**: Dropped packets trigger retransmissions in TCP, generating additional overhead and possible throughput collapse.
- **Jitter amplification**: Sudden drops create uneven inter-packet gaps, degrading voice and real-time video quality.
- **Limited fairness**: Policing alone cannot redistribute unused bandwidth to lower-priority flows; capacity may remain idle while packets are discarded.

Comparative Considerations for XYZ Company

Criterion	Shaping	Policing
Impact on delay	Adds queuing delay but smooths jitter	Zero queuing delay but may introduce loss
Resource need	Requires buffer memory	Minimal memory footprint
Protection style	Prevents congestion proactively	Reacts to excess traffic aggressively
Best suited traffic	Real-time voice/video needing steady pacing	Bulk data, guest Wi-Fi, or untrusted peers needing rate caps

Recommended blend: Deploy **class-based shaping** on branch edges where voice and video enter the WAN, setting CIRs aligned to codec rates. Pair this with **policing** on untrusted ingress points (e.g., Internet peering, guest VLANs) to enforce bandwidth contracts and curb denial-of-service vectors. Hierarchical QoS policies can further apply policing after shaping to discard any traffic that still exceeds site-level limits, preserving backbone stability.

Conclusion

Traffic shaping and policing complement rather than replace each other. Shaping excels at jitter control and bandwidth fairness but incurs extra delay and buffer cost; policing enforces strict rate compliance with minimal hardware but risks packet loss and jitter spikes. For XYZ Company, a hybrid approach—shaping trusted, latency-sensitive classes and policing bursty or non-critical traffic—aligns with the goal of raising overall quality without sacrificing security or efficiency.

Word count: 601

References

Kurose, J. F., & Ross, K. W. (2021). *Computer networking: A top-down approach* (8th ed.). Pearson. https://www.pearson.com/en-us/subject-catalog/p/computer-networking/P200000003334/9780135928615?srsltid=AfmBOorih30FoFFXS7R1FwMnKdgtTIgdR8PgP1AJSzyOs6W3IE5plx54

Cisco Press. (2025). Cisco Press: Source for Cisco Technology, CCNA, CCNP, CCIE Self-Study. https://www.ciscopress.com/