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TCP in High Speed Networks

Regular TCP is too slow in High Speed Networks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Throughput (Mbps)</th>
<th>RTT between Losses</th>
<th>Window size</th>
<th>Losses</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>55.5</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>555.5</td>
<td>833.3</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>5555.5=9 mins</td>
<td>8333.3</td>
<td>0.00002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10000</td>
<td>55555.5=1.5h</td>
<td>83333.3</td>
<td>0.000002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Packet size = 1500 bytes, RTT = 0.1s

A High Speed Protocol has to be:

- Scalable
- Stable
- Responsive
- Intra protocol fair
High Speed Protocols

- **HighSpeed TCP**
  - First standardized HighSpeed TCP
  - AIAD in log-scale
- **Scalable TCP**
  - MIMD in linear scale
- **BIC TCP**
  - Binary search for available bandwidth
- **FAST TCP**
  - Reacts to both packet loss and queueing delay
Motivation

• All High Speed variants of TCP scale over Gigabit linespeed with rule-of-thumb buffer size
  – Rule-of-thumb: Buffer Size = RTT * BW
  – Ideal static transmission window
    – high utilization and minimal loss

• Focus has been given to improve other High Speed TCP features.
Our Contribution

We investigate:

• Interaction between protocol and router buffer size and linespeed
• Do we need to increase buffer size linearly with linespeed?
• How Router Buffer affects HighSpeed TCP behavior?
Why Router Buffer is a concern

- **10Gb/s linecard**
  - Rule-of-thumb about 300Mbytes of buffer size
  - Read and write 40 byte packet every 32ns

- **Memory technologies**
  - SRAM: fast, require more devices, expensive, energy consuming
  - DRAM: slow, require less devices, cheap, less energy consuming

- **Problem gets severe**
  - At 40Gbps, 100Gbps, 
  - In an all-optical router for a backbone network where buffer size is limited to 5-10 packets in delay lines
Joint Model of HighSpeed TCP and Router Buffer Size

- Compute Throughput as a function of loss rate
- Compute Loss rate as a function of Throughput
- Iterate to compute fixed-point
HighSpeed TCP Window Dynamics

\[ W_{\text{high}} \]
\[ W_p \]
\[ W_p(1-b_p) \]
\[ W_{\text{low}} \]
\[ ssth \]

HighSpeed TCP

Regular TCP

\[ a(w) = \frac{2w^2b(w)p(w)}{2 - b(w)}; b(w) = \frac{\log\left(\frac{w}{w_{low}}\right)}{\log\left(\frac{w_{high}}{w_{low}}\right)}(b_{high} - 0.5) + 0.5 \]

\[ p(w) = e^{\log\left(\frac{w}{w_{low}}\right) - \log\left(\frac{p_{high}}{p_{low}}\right) + \log\left(p_{low}\right)} \]

\[ w_{t+R} = \begin{cases} 
2w_t, & w_t < ssth \\
w_t + 1, & ssth \leq w_t \leq w_{low} \\
w_t + a(w_t), & w_t > w_{low}
\end{cases} \]
HighSpeed TCP Window Dynamics

We derived Analytical Closed Form Expression for Throughput

\[
\frac{dw(t)}{dt} = \frac{a(w(t))}{RTT} = \frac{2w^2b(w)p(w)}{RTT \cdot (2 - b(w))}
\]

\[
\lambda = \frac{N_d}{t_2 - t_1} \approx \omega_i \left( \frac{p}{P_1} \right)^{\frac{\log(w_h/w_l)}{\log(p_h/p_l)}}
\]
Analytical Loss Rate Derivation

\[ \rho = \frac{1}{C} \sum_{i=0}^{N} \lambda_i (p, RTT_i), \]

**Drop Tail [M/M/1/K/FCFS]**

\[ p = \frac{(1 - \rho) \rho^K}{1 - \rho^{K+1}}, R_i(k) = 2d_i + \frac{MSS}{C} \left( \frac{1}{1 - \rho} - K \frac{\rho^K}{1 - \rho^K} \right) \]

**RED [M/M/1/K/RED]**

\[ p_{\text{red}} = \sum_{i=0}^{K} \pi(i)d(i), \quad \pi(j) = \frac{(1 - \rho) \rho^j}{1 - \rho^{K+1}}, d(k) = \begin{cases} 0, k \leq \min_{th} \\ (k - \min_{th})p_{\text{max}} \frac{\rho^K}{(\max_{th} - \min_{th})}, k > \min_{th} \end{cases} \]
Simulation Setup

- In traffic mix, long flows (elephants) dominate buffer requirements
- Buffer size varies as a fraction of bandwidth-delay product
Rule-of-Thumb Buffer Sizing

High utilization is achieved for a synchronized flows
Reduced Buffer Sizing

- Worse RTT fairness
- Increased synchronization
- High Utilization

Unfairness
Reduced Buffer Size (DropTail)

High Utilization even with small buffer size is due to aggregation

1Gbps bottleneck
10 desynchronized flows

2.5 Gbps bottleneck
10 desynchronized flows
Reduced Buffer Size (RED)

High Utilization is still achieved even with conservative behavior of RED.

1Gbps bottleneck
10 desynchronized flows

2.5 Gbps bottleneck
10 desynchronized flows
Summary

• Buffer size $\approx 10\%$ of BDP suffices to maintain high Utilization $> 90\%$

• Under high aggregation the results are insensitive to
  – Queue Management
  – Router Linespeed

• Small buffer size
  – worsens fairness among flows (due to less delay variability)
  – leads to synchronization (unlikely due to high aggregation and path diversity)
Future Work

- Analytically quantify degree of aggregation for our results to hold
- Improve model considering unsynchronized losses
- Experiments with other HighSpeed TCP variants
  - e.g., FAST TCP which reacts to both packet loss and queueing delay
- Model the effect of router buffer size on other High Speed TCP features
  - Stability, Responsiveness
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