TCP Part 3: Performance, Fairness, & Modern Congestion Controllers

15-441 Guest Lecture
Ranysha Ware
So far, you have learned about flow control, congestion control, and how TCP Reno works.

Turn to a partner and discuss:

1. What is the difference between flow control and congestion control?
2. What does ACK clocking mean?
3. You are sending packets over a network where the bottleneck link is 50Mbps, the round trip time is 150ms, and the queue at the bottleneck link can store up to 2MB of data. How large is the largest your window can be before you will see packet loss?
Today, you will learn:

- What’s good about TCP Reno?
- What’s bad about TCP Reno?
- What congestion control algorithms are deployed in the Internet today?
- Is the Internet fair?
What’s good about TCP Reno?
In 1989 paper, Chiu and Jain define 4 properties of a good CCA.

- Efficiency
- Fairness
- Convergence
- Distributness
In 1989 paper, Chiu and Jain define 4 properties of a good CCA.
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- Fairness
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- Distributness

**Let’s assume:** Applications always have data to send and are never limited by flow control. Only thing that affects performance is what the CCA is doing!
Efficiency: A good CCA should utilize available bandwidth without overloading the network.
Is this bandwidth allocation efficient?
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**Fairness:** A good CCA should equally share the network with among users.
Jain’s Fairness Index is used to quantify fairness. 1 means the allocation is equal (fair) and 0 means the allocation is unfair.

\[ F(x) = \frac{(\sum x_i)^2}{n(\sum x_j^2)} \]
What is Jain’s fairness Index?
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What is Jain’s fairness Index?

\[ F(x) = \frac{(\sum x_i)^2}{n(\sum x_i^2)} \]
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STRINGER THINGS
A good CCA needs to be **fair** and **efficient**.
What happens when senders are using MIMD?

Assume: Max capacity is 6. When over capacity user’s experience loss at the same time. (RTT is the same)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>time</th>
<th>$x_1$</th>
<th>$x_2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MIMD never converges to optimal point! A good CCA needs to converge.

Assume: Max capacity is 6. When over capacity user’s experience loss at the same time. (RTT is the same)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>time</th>
<th>$x_1$</th>
<th>$x_2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Turn to a partner: What happens when senders use AIAD, MIAD, and AIMD?

Assume: Max capacity is 6. When over capacity user’s experience loss at the same time. (RTT is the same).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>time</th>
<th>$x_1$</th>
<th>$x_2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AIMD converges around the optimal point. This is Chiu and Jain’s proof!

Assume: Max capacity is 6. When over capacity user’s experience loss at the same time. (RTT is the same)

User 2 Allocation $x_2$

User 1 Allocation $x_1$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>time</th>
<th>$x_1$</th>
<th>$x_2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A CCA is **distributed** if it doesn’t require cooperation between users or the network to operate well.

Why did Chiu and Jain think a good CCA needs to be **distributed**?
What’s good about TCP Reno?
- It meets the 4 criteria of a good CCA!
In 1989 paper, Chiu and Jain define 4 properties of a good CCA.

- **Efficiency:** TCP Reno can utilize available bandwidth.
- **Fairness:** TCP Reno is fair when competing with itself.
- **Convergence:** TCP Reno converges to an equal and efficient bandwidth allocation among users.
- **Distributness:** TCP Reno is an end-to-end CCA, which doesn’t require cooperation between users or the network to meet other 3 criteria.
What’s bad about TCP Reno?
In today’s high speed networks, TCP Reno’s additive increase is too slow, and multiplicative decrease is too aggressive.

- TCP RTT unfairness
- TCP throughput model
- TCP in highspeed networks & lossy networks
- TCP & bufferbloat
TCP Reno is great. It’s efficient, fair, converges, and is distributed! What more could you want!? 

Raj Jain
TCP Reno is great. It’s efficient, fair, converges, and is distributed! What more could you want!?

Raj Jain

Lies! These things are only true under certain conditions and I’ve evolved since 1989, man!

The Internet
TCP Reno is fair when competing with itself. I proved it!

What about when the users don’t experience loss at the same time?
Turn to a partner: What happens when senders use AIMD but do not receive feedback at the same time?

**Assume:** Max capacity is 6. User $x_1$ receives updates every time interval, User $x_2$ updates every 2 time intervals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>time</th>
<th>$x_1$</th>
<th>$x_2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AIMD senders with a shorter RTT can update faster than senders with a longer RTT. This is **RTT unfairness.**

**Assume:** Max capacity is 6. User $x_1$ receives updates every time interval, User $x_2$ updates every 2 time intervals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>time</th>
<th>$x_1$</th>
<th>$x_2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Well maybe it is not always fair, but TCP Reno is definitely efficient!

What about when the bandwidth is really large? Or the RTT is really large?
In 1997 paper, Mathis derived a simple model for a TCP flow’s throughput.

\[ BW < \left( \frac{MSS}{RTT} \right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \]
In 1997 paper, Mathis derived a simple model for a TCP flow’s throughput.

\[ BW < \left( \frac{MSS}{RTT} \right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \]

Assume, MSS is 1400 bytes and RTT is 100ms. Turn to a partner discuss:

- How big does TCP Reno’s cwnd need to be to utilize 10 Gbps available BW?
- To achieve 10 Gbps throughput, what does the loss probability have to be?
The Mathis equation shows why TCP Reno does not work well in highspeed networks and lossy networks, which are common today! This is TCP’s high bandwidth problem.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TCP Throughput (Mbps)</th>
<th>RTTs between losses</th>
<th>cwnd</th>
<th>Packet Loss Rate P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>$2 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>5555</td>
<td>8333</td>
<td>$2 \times 10^{-8}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>55555</td>
<td>83333</td>
<td>$2 \times 10^{-10}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Well maybe it is not always fair, but TCP Reno is definitely efficient!

And what about in lossy networks like Wi-Fi?
Well maybe it is not always fair, but TCP Reno is definitely efficient!

TCP Reno assumes EVERY packet loss is because of congestion! That’s wack!
Fine. But, there’s no way you can tell me Reno doesn’t converge to the optimal point though!

Is it REALLY optimal though?
bottleneck bandwidth
Filling the bottleneck queue, let’s a flow fully utilize the available flow.
But what happens to delay when the bottleneck queue is full?
But what happens to delay when the bottleneck queue is full?
But what happens to delay when the bottleneck queue is full?
But what happens to delay when the bottleneck queue is full?
TCP Reno fills the bottleneck queue to find BDP causing large queueing delays. (bufferbloat)
In 1976, Leonard Kleinrock showed optimal operating point for a CCA is maximal throughput and minimal delay.
Gah! How could any CCA possibly work in all scenarios!?

Good question! I don’t know, man. I just deliver packets.

Raj Jain

The Internet
What’s bad about TCP Reno?
- It’s performance sucks!
TCP Reno’s implicit assumptions hurt performance in modern networks!

- Reno takes too long to find BDP in large BDP networks
- Reno assumes every loss is because of packet loss (bad for Wi-Fi networks and high speed networks)
- Reno’s cwnd update speed is proportional to RTT - super slow for long RTT’s (satellite networks), causes RTT unfairness (can lead to starvation when RTT diff is 100:1)
- Reno fills queues causing large queuing delays (delay sensitive applications like Web apps, gaming)
What CCAs are deployed in the Internet today?
The CCA in TCP is plug-and-play. It does not have to be Reno! In Linux, you can actually change the CCA per socket!

```c
#include <netinet/in.h>
#include <netinet/tcp.h>
...
char * cong_algorithm = "bbr";
int slen = strlen( cong_algorithm ) + 1;
int rc = setsockopt( sock, IPPROTO_TCP, TCP_CONGESTION, cong_algorithm, slen);
if (rc < 0) { /* error */ }
```
Over the past 30 years, there have been an alphabet soup of alternatives to AIMD/TCP Reno proposed and deployed.

- **Fix highspeed TCP problem:** Cubic, CompoundTCP
- **Fix bufferbloat problem:** BBR
- **Network-assisted CCAs and Active Queue Management (AQM)** popular in datacenters: RED, RCP, XCP, ECN, DCTCP, TIMELY
- **Fancy machine learning approaches** (not really deployed yet thought): PCC, Remy
TCP Cubic is similar to TCP Reno but its window growth function is cubic instead of linear.

\[ W_{\text{max}} = \text{size of congestion window before last packet loss} \]
Initially, TCP Cubic sending rate rapidly approaches available capacity.
Cubic responds to packet loss by reducing the congestion window by 20%.
To ensure fairness, Cubic reduces window by 40% if it’s estimation of maximum cwnd grows smaller.
After packet loss, Cubic’s window growth function is cubic.
BBR aims to minimize delay and maximize throughput by sending data at BDP rate.
BBR’s core algorithm builds a ‘model’ of the network path and tries to send at bottleneck bandwidth rate, with no more than 2BDP packets in flight.

On ACK update model of network path:

\[
\text{BWE} = \text{windowed}_\text{max}(\text{delivered/elapsed}, 10 \text{ RTT})
\]

\[
\text{RTT}_{\text{min}} = \text{windowed}_\text{min}(\text{rtt}, 10s)
\]

\[
\text{pacing\_rate} = \text{pacing\_gain} \times \text{BWE}
\]

\[
\text{cwnd} = \max(2 \times \text{BWE} \times \text{RTT}, 4)
\]
Initially, BBR increases the sending rate exponentially to estimate bandwidth.
BBR reduces sending rate to drain the queue that could have built up during STARTUP phase.
BBR reduces sending rate to drain the queue that could have built up during STARTUP phase.
To ensure fairness, every 10s, if the RTTmin estimate hasn’t gotten smaller then BBR reduces the cwnd to 4 and updates RTTmin estimate.
What CCAs are deployed in the Internet today?
- We can guess but we don’t really know.
- Lots of possible algorithms floating out there in the Internet.
My research attempts to answer this question through empirical measurement! We conduct a census of what CCAs are deployed on some popular websites.

Downloading a large file from a website, how can we determine what CCA the website is using?
We build a testbed that allows us to control the bottleneck queue and see a TCP sender’s queue occupancy over time.
We build a testbed that allows us to control the bottleneck queue and see a TCP sender’s queue occupancy over time.

![Queue Occupancy Graphs](image)
Is the Internet fair?
- This is my research!
- You are not expected to know the material in this section for a test or homework.
When heterogenous algorithms compete, fairness can be a problem.

CUBIC vs BBR goodput: bw = 10Mbps, RTT = 40ms, 4 min. bulk xfer, varying buffer sizes
What happens when Cubic flows compete with 1 BBR flow?
We define a model that explains BBR’s behavior when competing with loss-based CCAs.
Is the Internet fair?
- Maybe? It depends.
Congestion control is one of the oldest topics in networking, and yet is still an active area of research!
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Today, you learned:

- **What’s good about Reno:** Reno meets 4 criteria of a good CCA as defined by Chiu and Jain: efficiency, fairness, distributedness, and convergence.
- **What’s bad about Reno:** Reno’s use of packet loss as congestive signal hurts performance in modern networks.
- **What’s CCA’s are deployed today:** Many. Examples include Cubic, the default CCA in Linux and Google’s BBR.
- **Is the Internet fair:** Not always. When heterogenous algorithms compete, fairness can be a problem.
Questions?
- I am also a lead TA for P2 so if you have P2 questions, I can answer them.