



Rate Control and Medium priority traffic behaviour.

Lessons Learned from Java Simulations

Stein Gjessing Simula Research Laboratory and University of Oslo

January 16. 2002

802-17-01-00174, sg_java_02.pdf





Contents

- Part 1
 - Granularity of rate control
 - Fine grained vs bursty rate control 1. Simple version
 - 1. Simple version
 - 2. Choke point version
- Part 2
 - Performance of medium priority traffic





Bursty rate control

- Gandalf (and Darwin ?) today:
 - OK to send if (myUsage < allowUsage)</pre>
 - myUsage is increased when packet sent
- Result:

e.g. 100 microsec intervals:







This is bad because:

• Downstream node receives the packets and checks if it is congested with the same 100 us intervals:





Then the downstream node will find that it **is not** congested





This is bad because:

• Downstream node receives the packets and checks if it is congested with the same 100 us intervals:





Then the downstream node will find that it **is** congested





This is bad because:

- Even if the downstream node receives the packets and is congested almost all the time, it might seem not to be:
- Case 3:



Then the downstream node will find that it is not congested





Fine grained rate control

- Send at all packets at **allowUsage / maxRate** rate
- Implemented in my Java simulator
- Result:

Thesis: This is much better for everyone "downstream"





Experiment – new upstream flow



When the flow from 2 starts, it will congest station 4. Station 4 sends upstream congestion notification to station 2.

January 16. 2002

802-17-01-00174, sg_java_02.pdf





Simulation results

- Sequence of packets passing station 5
 - 500 bytes packets
- Number of packets received per unit time (100 microsec) at stations 6 and 8



[simula . research laboratory]





Packets passing station 5 – bursty rate control

MS-DOS-ledetekst	_ & ×
Tr 9 x 15	
	:::::::::
	:::::::::
	:::::::::
	:::::::::

	a concensió
24000000 time units passed	
C:\rpr\jan02\progs\	

: packet from station 2

. packet from station 4

January 16. 2002

802-17-01-00174, sg_java_02.pdf

simula . research laboratory





Packets passing station 5 – with fine grained rate control

MS-DOS-ledetekst
Tr 9 × 15 . □ 🖻 🛍 🛃 🛃 🗛
24000000 time units passed
C:\rpr\jan02\progs\ny-jan4>_
packet from station 2 . packet from station 4

January 16. 2002

802-17-01-00174, sg_java_02.pdf



simula . research laboratory



Number of packets received per 100 microsec. number of is the same



^{802-17-01-00174,} sg_java_02.pdf





New experiment new downstream flow



When the flow from 4 starts, station 4 will be congested. Station 4 sends upstream congestion notification to station 2.

- Same pattern as before for packets passing by staion 5 (not shown)

January 16. 2002

802-17-01-00174, sg_java_02.pdf

number of

simula . research laboratory



New downstream flow

packets per 100 microsec





Fine grained rate control

Fine grained rate control makes congestion discovery more precise!

January 16. 2002

802-17-01-00174, sg_java_02.pdf



Choke points and fine grained rate control

- Java simulator with VOQ's, up to N choke points and fine grained rate control
 - (The full ring is N stations)
- The allowed rate at each choke point i, is allowUsage[i] / maxRate (or maxRate[i])







New experiment

- Three flows (500 byte packets)
 - -2 to 8 sends all the time
 - 3 to 7 sends from time 60 to 240 ms.
 - -4 to 6 sends from time 120 to 180 ms.
- Station 2 will experience a change of choke point and its rate
- However in this example VOQ's are not used (only choke points)





The new experiment – three flows



802-17-01-00174, sg_java_02.pdf

simula . research laboratory





Packet passings station 5

Fine grained rate control does not give bursts

🖾 java-dos 📃 🗌 🗙
50000000 time upits passed
51000000 time units passed
M:\PC\rpr\jan02\progs\W-ck-leaky-234>

• from 2

from 3

from 4

2.5 Gbit/s One time unit is three ns.

January 16. 2002

802-17-01-00174, sg_java_02.pdf





Packets received



January 16. 2002

802-17-01-00174, sg_java_02.pdf





Part 2 Performance of Medium priority traffic

Latency of medium priority traffic vs high priority traffic vs low priority traffic

January 16. 2002

802-17-01-00174, sg_java_02.pdf



simula . research laboratory







[simula . research laboratory]



Starts to measure latency when first in queue



January 16. 2002

802-17-01-00174, sg_java_02.pdf











Latency of medium priority packets

- Congestion threshold in the low/medium transit buffers are 25 000 bytes in my simulations
- At 1Gbyte/sec this is 25 microsec delay
- From station 8 to station 15 there are 6 transit buffers: 6 * 25 microsec = 150 microsec
- In my experiment (previous slide), with overloaded ring, medium priority traffic have ~270 microsec mean (which is ~100 microsec more than in an empty ring)





Conclusion 1 (rate control)

- Fine grained rate control is easy to implement
 - Also together with choke points and VOQs
 - Rate beyond choke point is allowedUsage[i] / maxRate where i is the choke point
- Fine grained rate control makes congestion detection more precise and hence improves fairness
- Thesis: Fine grained rate control smooth traffic and decreases overall buffer needs.





Conclusion 2 (medium priority traffic)

- Medium priority traffic behaves as expected:
 - Medium priority traffic enters the ring immediately
 - The maximum delay is the number of stations times the delay in each transit buffer
 - High priority traffic may delay medium priority traffic even more