Architectures for Quality of Service

Emmanuel Lochin

ISAE-SUPAERO
2017

Slides from J. Kurose textbook

Quality of Service

- Beyond Best Effort
- Scheduling and Policing Mechanisms
- Integrated Services and Differentiated Services
- RSVP

Improving QOS in IP Networks

Internet: best-effort network
Your ISP: network with QoS guarantees

- RSVP: signaling for resource reservations
- Differentiated Services: differential guarantees
- Integrated Services: firm guarantees

- simple model for sharing and congestion studies:



Principles for QOS Guarantees

- Example: 1Mbps IP phone, FTP share 1.5 Mbps link.
  - bursts of FTP can congest router, cause audio loss
  - want to give priority to audio over FTP



Principle 1
Packet marking needed for router to distinguish between different classes; and new router policy to treat packets accordingly

Principles for QOS Guarantees (more)

- what if applications misbehave (audio sends higher than declared rate)
  - policing: force source adherence to bandwidth allocations
- marking and policing at network edge:



Principle 2

Provide protection (*isolation*) for one class from others

Principles for QOS Guarantees (more)

- Allocating *fixed* (non-sharable) bandwidth to flow: *inefficient* use of bandwidth if flows doesn't use its allocation



Principle 3

While providing isolation, it is desirable to use resources as efficiently as possible

Principles for QOS Guarantees (more)

- *Basic fact of life:* can not support traffic demands beyond link capacity



Principle 4

Call Admission: flow declares its needs, network may block call (e.g., busy signal) if it cannot meet needs

Summary of QoS Principles



Let's next look at mechanisms for achieving this ....

Quality of Service

- Beyond Best Effort
- Scheduling and Policing Mechanisms
- Integrated Services and Differentiated Services
- RSVP

Scheduling And Policing Mechanisms

- scheduling: choose next packet to send on link
- FIFO (first in first out) scheduling: send in order of arrival to queue
  - discard policy: if packet arrives to full queue: who to discard?
    - tail drop: drop arriving packet
    - priority: drop/remove on priority basis
    - random: drop/remove randomly



Scheduling Policies: more

Priority scheduling: transmit highest priority queued packet

- multiple *classes*, with different priorities
  - class may depend on marking or other header info, e.g. IP source/dest, port numbers, etc..





Scheduling Policies: still more

round robin scheduling:

- multiple classes
- cyclically scan class queues, serving one from each class (if available)



Scheduling Policies: still more

Weighted Fair Queuing:

- generalized Round Robin
- each class gets weighted amount of service in each cycle



Policing Mechanisms

Goal: limit traffic to not exceed declared parameters

Three common-used criteria:

- *(Long term) Average Rate:* how many pkts can be sent per unit time (in the long run)
  - crucial question: what is the interval length: 100 packets per sec or 6000 packets per min have same average!
- *Peak Rate:* e.g., 6000 pkts per min. (ppm) avg.; 1500 ppm peak rate
- *(Max.) Burst Size:* max. number of pkts sent consecutively (with no intervening idle)

Policing Mechanisms

Token Bucket: limit input to specified Burst Size and Average Rate



- bucket can hold *b* tokens
- tokens generated at rate *r* token/sec unless bucket full
- *over interval of length t: number of packets admitted less than or equal to (r.t + b)*

Policing Mechanisms (more)

- token bucket, WFQ combine to provide guaranteed upper bound on delay, i.e., *QoS guarantee* !





Quality of Service

- Beyond Best Effort
- Scheduling and Policing Mechanisms
- Integrated Services and Differentiated Services
- RSVP

IETF Integrated Services

- architecture for providing QOS guarantees in IP networks for individual application sessions
- resource reservation: routers maintain state info (a la VC) of allocated resources, QoS req's
- admit/deny new call setup requests:

Question: can newly arriving flow be admitted with performance guarantees while not violated QoS guarantees made to already admitted flows?

Intserv: QoS guarantee scenario

- Resource reservation
  - call setup, signaling (RSVP)
  - traffic, QoS declaration
  - per-element admission control



- QoS-sensitive scheduling (e.g., WFQ)

Call Admission

Arriving session must :

- declare its QOS requirement
  - R-spec: defines the QOS being requested
- characterize traffic it will send into network
  - T-spec: defines traffic characteristics
- signaling protocol: needed to carry R-spec and T-spec to routers (where reservation is required)
  - RSVP

Intserv QoS: Service models [rfc2211, rfc 2212]

Guaranteed service:

- worst case traffic arrival: leaky-bucket-policed source
- simple (mathematically provable) *bound* on delay [Parekh 1992, Cruz 1988]

Controlled load service:

- "a quality of service closely approximating the QoS that same flow would receive from an unloaded network element."



$D_{max} = b/R$

IETF Differentiated Services

Concerns with Intserv:

- Scalability: signaling, maintaining per-flow router state difficult with large number of flows
- Flexible Service Models: Intserv has only two classes. Also want "qualitative" service classes
  - "behaves like a wire"
  - relative service distinction: Platinum, Gold, Silver

Diffserv approach:

- simple functions in network core, relatively complex functions at edge routers (or hosts)
- Do't define define service classes, provide functional components to build service classes

Diffserv Architecture

Edge router:

- per-flow traffic management
- marks packets as in-profile and out-profile

Core router:

- per class traffic management
- buffering and scheduling based on marking at edge
- preference given to in-profile packets
- Assured Forwarding



Edge-router Packet Marking

- profile: pre-negotiated rate A, bucket size B
- packet marking at edge based on per-flow profile



Possible usage of marking:

- class-based marking: packets of different classes marked differently
- intra-class marking: conforming portion of flow marked differently than non-conforming one

Classification and Conditioning

- packet is marked in the Type of Service (TOS) in IPv4, and Traffic Class in IPv6
- 6 bits used for Differentiated Service Code Point (DSCP) and determine PHB that the packet will receive
- 2 bits are currently unused



Classification and Conditioning

may be desirable to limit traffic injection rate of some class:

- user declares traffic profile (e.g., rate, burst size)
- traffic metered, shaped if non-conforming



Forwarding (PHB)

- PHB result in a different observable (measurable) forwarding performance behavior
- PHB does not specify what mechanisms to use to ensure required PHB performance behavior
- Examples:
  - Class A gets x% of outgoing link bandwidth over time intervals of a specified length
  - Class A packets leave first before packets from class B

Forwarding (PHB)

PHBs being developed:

- Expedited Forwarding: pkt departure rate of a class equals or exceeds specified rate
  - logical link with a minimum guaranteed rate
- Assured Forwarding: 4 classes of traffic
  - each guaranteed minimum amount of bandwidth
  - each with three drop preference partitions

Quality of Service

- Beyond Best Effort
- Scheduling and Policing Mechanisms
- Integrated Services and Differentiated Services
- RSVP

Signaling in the Internet

connectionless (stateless) forwarding by IP routers + best effort service = no network signaling protocols in initial IP design

- New requirement: reserve resources along end-to-end path (end system, routers) for QoS for multimedia applications
- RSVP: Resource Reservation Protocol [RFC 2205]
  - " … allow users to communicate requirements to network in robust and efficient way." i.e., signaling !
- earlier Internet Signaling protocol: ST-II [RFC 1819]

RSVP Design Goals

1. accommodate heterogeneous receivers (different bandwidth along paths)
2. accommodate different applications with different resource requirements
3. make multicast a first class service, with adaptation to multicast group membership
4. leverage existing multicast/unicast routing, with adaptation to changes in underlying unicast, multicast routes
5. control protocol overhead to grow (at worst) linear in # receivers
6. modular design for heterogeneous underlying technologies

RSVP: does not…

- specify how resources are to be reserved
  - rather: a mechanism for communicating needs
- determine routes packets will take
  - that's the job of routing protocols
  - signaling decoupled from routing
- interact with forwarding of packets
  - separation of control (signaling) and data (forwarding) planes

RSVP: overview of operation

- senders, receiver join a multicast group
  - done outside of RSVP
  - senders need not join group
- sender-to-network signaling
  - *path message:* make sender presence known to routers
  - path teardown: delete sender's path state from routers
- receiver-to-network signaling
  - *reservation message:* reserve resources from sender(s) to receiver
  - reservation teardown: remove receiver reservations
- network-to-end-system signaling
  - path error
  - reservation error

Path msgs: RSVP *sender-to-network* signaling

- path message contents:
  - *address:* unicast destination, or multicast group
  - *flowspec:* bandwidth requirements spec.
  - *filter flag:* if yes, record identities of upstream senders (to allow packets filtering by source)
  - *previous hop:* upstream router/host ID
  - *refresh time:* time until this info times out
- path message: communicates sender info, and reverse-path-to-sender routing info
  - later upstream forwarding of receiver reservations

Summary

- making the best of today's best effort service
- scheduling and policing mechanisms
- QoS architectures: Intserv, Diffserv
- signalling: RSVP