

Transport Area Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Updates: [2309](#) (if approved)  
Intended status: BCP  
Expires: August 23, 2012

B. Briscoe  
BT  
J. Manner  
Aalto University  
February 20, 2012

**Byte and Packet Congestion Notification**  
**draft-ietf-tsvwg-byte-pkt-congest-07**

Abstract

This memo concerns dropping or marking packets using active queue management (AQM) such as random early detection (RED) or pre-congestion notification (PCN). We give three strong recommendations: (1) packet size should be taken into account when transports read and respond to congestion indications, (2) packet size should not be taken into account when network equipment creates congestion signals (marking, dropping), and therefore (3) the byte-mode packet drop variant of the RED AQM algorithm that drops fewer small packets should not be used.

Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <http://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on August 23, 2012.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2012 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to [BCP 78](#) and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents

carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

## Table of Contents

<a href="#">1.</a>	Introduction . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">1.1.</a>	Terminology and Scoping . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">1.2.</a>	Example Comparing Packet-Mode Drop and Byte-Mode Drop . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	Recommendations . . . . .	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">2.1.</a>	Recommendation on Queue Measurement . . . . .	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">2.2.</a>	Recommendation on Encoding Congestion Notification . . . . .	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">2.3.</a>	Recommendation on Responding to Congestion . . . . .	<a href="#">10</a>
2.4.	Recommendation on Handling Congestion Indications when Splitting or Merging Packets . . . . .	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	Motivating Arguments . . . . .	<a href="#">11</a>
3.1.	Avoiding Perverse Incentives to (Ab)use Smaller Packets . . . . .	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">3.2.</a>	Small != Control . . . . .	<a href="#">13</a>
<a href="#">3.3.</a>	Transport-Independent Network . . . . .	<a href="#">13</a>
<a href="#">3.4.</a>	Scaling Congestion Control with Packet Size . . . . .	<a href="#">14</a>
<a href="#">3.5.</a>	Implementation Efficiency . . . . .	<a href="#">16</a>
<a href="#">4.</a>	A Survey and Critique of Past Advice . . . . .	<a href="#">16</a>
<a href="#">4.1.</a>	Congestion Measurement Advice . . . . .	<a href="#">16</a>
<a href="#">4.1.1.</a>	Fixed Size Packet Buffers . . . . .	<a href="#">17</a>
<a href="#">4.1.2.</a>	Congestion Measurement without a Queue . . . . .	<a href="#">18</a>
<a href="#">4.2.</a>	Congestion Notification Advice . . . . .	<a href="#">19</a>
<a href="#">4.2.1.</a>	Network Bias when Encoding . . . . .	<a href="#">19</a>
<a href="#">4.2.2.</a>	Transport Bias when Decoding . . . . .	<a href="#">21</a>
4.2.3.	Making Transports Robust against Control Packet Losses . . . . .	<a href="#">22</a>
4.2.4.	Congestion Notification: Summary of Conflicting Advice . . . . .	<a href="#">22</a>
<a href="#">5.</a>	Outstanding Issues and Next Steps . . . . .	<a href="#">24</a>
<a href="#">5.1.</a>	Bit-congestible Network . . . . .	<a href="#">24</a>
<a href="#">5.2.</a>	Bit- & Packet-congestible Network . . . . .	<a href="#">24</a>
<a href="#">6.</a>	Security Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">24</a>
<a href="#">7.</a>	Conclusions . . . . .	<a href="#">25</a>
<a href="#">8.</a>	Acknowledgements . . . . .	<a href="#">26</a>
<a href="#">9.</a>	Comments Solicited . . . . .	<a href="#">27</a>
<a href="#">10.</a>	References . . . . .	<a href="#">27</a>
<a href="#">10.1.</a>	Normative References . . . . .	<a href="#">27</a>
<a href="#">10.2.</a>	Informative References . . . . .	<a href="#">27</a>
<a href="#">Appendix A.</a>	Survey of RED Implementation Status . . . . .	<a href="#">31</a>
<a href="#">Appendix B.</a>	Sufficiency of Packet-Mode Drop . . . . .	<a href="#">32</a>
<a href="#">B.1.</a>	Packet-Size (In)Dependence in Transports . . . . .	<a href="#">33</a>
<a href="#">B.2.</a>	Bit-Congestible and Packet-Congestible Indications . . . . .	<a href="#">36</a>



<a href="#">Appendix C.</a>	Byte-mode Drop Complicates Policing Congestion Response . . . . .	<a href="#">37</a>
<a href="#">Appendix D.</a>	Changes from Previous Versions . . . . .	<a href="#">38</a>

## **1. Introduction**

This memo concerns how we should correctly scale congestion control functions with packet size for the long term. It also recognises that expediency may be necessary to deal with existing widely deployed protocols that don't live up to the long term goal.

When notifying congestion, the problem of how (and whether) to take packet sizes into account has exercised the minds of researchers and practitioners for as long as active queue management (AQM) has been discussed. Indeed, one reason AQM was originally introduced was to reduce the lock-out effects that small packets can have on large packets in drop-tail queues. This memo aims to state the principles we should be using and to outline how these principles will affect future protocol design, taking into account the existing deployments we have already.

The question of whether to take into account packet size arises at three stages in the congestion notification process:

Measuring congestion: When a congested resource measures locally how congested it is, should it measure its queue length in bytes or packets?

Encoding congestion notification into the wire protocol: When a congested network resource notifies its level of congestion, should it drop / mark each packet dependent on the byte-size of the particular packet in question?

Decoding congestion notification from the wire protocol: When a transport interprets the notification in order to decide how much to respond to congestion, should it take into account the byte-size of each missing or marked packet?

Consensus has emerged over the years concerning the first stage: whether queues are measured in bytes or packets, termed byte-mode queue measurement or packet-mode queue measurement. [Section 2.1](#) of this memo records this consensus in the RFC Series. In summary the choice solely depends on whether the resource is congested by bytes or packets.

The controversy is mainly around the last two stages: whether to allow for the size of the specific packet notifying congestion i) when the network encodes or ii) when the transport decodes the congestion notification.

Currently, the RFC series is silent on this matter other than a paper trail of advice referenced from [[RFC2309](#)], which conditionally



recommends byte-mode (packet-size dependent) drop [[pktByteEmail](#)]. Reducing drop of small packets certainly has some tempting advantages: i) it drops less control packets, which tend to be small and ii) it makes TCP's bit-rate less dependent on packet size. However, there are ways of addressing these issues at the transport layer, rather than reverse engineering network forwarding to fix the problems.

This memo updates [[RFC2309](#)] to deprecate deliberate preferential treatment of small packets in AQM algorithms. It recommends that (1) packet size should be taken into account when transports read congestion indications, (2) not when network equipment writes them.

In particular this means that the byte-mode packet drop variant of Random early Detection (RED) should not be used to drop fewer small packets, because that creates a perverse incentive for transports to use tiny segments, consequently also opening up a DoS vulnerability. Fortunately all the RED implementers who responded to our admittedly limited survey ([Section 4.2.4](#)) have not followed the earlier advice to use byte-mode drop, so the position this memo argues for seems to already exist in implementations.

However, at the transport layer, TCP congestion control is a widely deployed protocol that doesn't scale with packet size. To date this hasn't been a significant problem because most TCP implementations have been used with similar packet sizes. But, as we design new congestion control mechanisms, the current recommendation is that we should build in scaling with packet size rather than assuming we should follow TCP's example.

This memo continues as follows. First it discusses terminology and scoping. [Section 2](#) gives the concrete formal recommendations, followed by motivating arguments in [Section 3](#). We then critically survey the advice given previously in the RFC series and the research literature ([Section 4](#)), referring to an assessment of whether or not this advice has been followed in production networks (Appendix A). To wrap up, outstanding issues are discussed that will need resolution both to inform future protocol designs and to handle legacy ([Section 5](#)). Then security issues are collected together in [Section 6](#) before conclusions are drawn in [Section 7](#). The interested reader can find discussion of more detailed issues on the theme of byte vs. packet in the appendices.

This memo intentionally includes a non-negligible amount of material on the subject. For the busy reader [Section 2](#) summarises the recommendations for the Internet community.





### **1.1. Terminology and Scoping**

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [[RFC2119](#)].

**Congestion Notification:** Congestion notification is a changing signal that aims to communicate the probability that the network resource(s) will not be able to forward the level of traffic load offered (or that there is an impending risk that they will not be able to).

The 'impending risk' qualifier is added, because AQM systems (e.g. RED, PCN [[RFC5670](#)]) set a virtual limit smaller than the actual limit to the resource, then notify when this virtual limit is exceeded in order to avoid uncontrolled congestion of the actual capacity.

Congestion notification communicates a real number bounded by the range [0,1]. This ties in with the most well-understood measure of congestion notification: drop probability.

**Explicit and Implicit Notification:** The byte vs. packet dilemma concerns congestion notification irrespective of whether it is signalled implicitly by drop or using explicit congestion notification (ECN [[RFC3168](#)] or PCN [[RFC5670](#)]). Throughout this document, unless clear from the context, the term marking will be used to mean notifying congestion explicitly, while congestion notification will be used to mean notifying congestion either implicitly by drop or explicitly by marking.

**Bit-congestible vs. Packet-congestible:** If the load on a resource depends on the rate at which packets arrive, it is called packet-congestible. If the load depends on the rate at which bits arrive it is called bit-congestible.

Examples of packet-congestible resources are route look-up engines and firewalls, because load depends on how many packet headers they have to process. Examples of bit-congestible resources are transmission links, radio power and most buffer memory, because the load depends on how many bits they have to transmit or store. Some machine architectures use fixed size packet buffers, so buffer memory in these cases is packet-congestible (see [Section 4.1.1](#)).

Currently a design goal of network processing equipment such as routers and firewalls is to keep packet processing uncongested even under worst case packet rates with runs of minimum size



packets. Therefore, packet-congestion is currently rare [RFC6077; S.3.3], but there is no guarantee that it will not become more common in future.

Note that information is generally processed or transmitted with a minimum granularity greater than a bit (e.g. octets). The appropriate granularity for the resource in question should be used, but for the sake of brevity we will talk in terms of bytes in this memo.

**Coarser Granularity:** Resources may be congestible at higher levels of granularity than bits or packets, for instance stateful firewalls are flow-congestible and call-servers are session-congestible. This memo focuses on congestion of connectionless resources, but the same principles may be applicable for congestion notification protocols controlling per-flow and per-session processing or state.

**RED Terminology:** In RED whether to use packets or bytes when measuring queues is called respectively "packet-mode queue measurement" or "byte-mode queue measurement". And whether the probability of dropping a particular packet is independent or dependent on its byte-size is called respectively "packet-mode drop" or "byte-mode drop". The terms byte-mode and packet-mode should not be used without specifying whether they apply to queue measurement or to drop.

## **1.2.   Example Comparing Packet-Mode Drop and Byte-Mode Drop**

A central question addressed by this document is whether to recommend that AQM uses RED's packet-mode drop and to deprecate byte-mode drop. Table 1 compares how packet-mode and byte-mode drop affect two flows of different size packets. For each it gives the expected number of packets and of bits dropped in one second. Each example flow runs at the same bit-rate of 48Mb/s, but one is broken up into small 60 byte packets and the other into large 1500 byte packets.

To keep up the same bit-rate, in one second there are about 25 times more small packets because they are 25 times smaller. As can be seen from the table, the packet rate is 100,000 small packets versus 4,000 large packets per second (pps).



Parameter	Formula	Small packets	Large packets
-----	-----	-----	-----
Packet size	$s/8$	60B	1,500B
Packet size	$s$	480b	12,000b
Bit-rate	$x$	48Mbps	48Mbps
Packet-rate	$u = x/s$	100kpps	4kpps
Packet-mode Drop			
Pkt loss probability	$p$	0.1%	0.1%
Pkt loss-rate	$p*u$	100pps	4pps
Bit loss-rate	$p*u*s$	48kbps	48kbps
Byte-mode Drop			
	MTU, $M=12,000b$		
Pkt loss probability	$b = p*s/M$	0.004%	0.1%
Pkt loss-rate	$b*u$	4pps	4pps
Bit loss-rate	$b*u*s$	1.92kbps	48kbps

Table 1: Example Comparing Packet-mode and Byte-mode Drop

For packet-mode drop, we illustrate the effect of a drop probability of 0.1%, which the algorithm applies to all packets irrespective of size. Because there are 25 times more small packets in one second, it naturally drops 25 times more small packets, that is 100 small packets but only 4 large packets. But if we count how many bits it drops, there are 48,000 bits in 100 small packets and 48,000 bits in 4 large packets--the same number of bits of small packets as large.

The packet-mode drop algorithm drops any bit with the same probability whether the bit is in a small or a large packet.

For byte-mode drop, again we use an example drop probability of 0.1%, but only for maximum size packets (assuming the link MTU is 1,500B or 12,000b). The byte-mode algorithm reduces the drop probability of smaller packets proportional to their size, making the probability that it drops a small packet 25 times smaller at 0.004%. But there are 25 times more small packets, so dropping them with 25 times lower probability results in dropping the same number of packets: 4 drops in both cases. The 4 small dropped packets contain 25 times less bits than the 4 large dropped packets: 1,920 compared to 48,000.

The byte-mode drop algorithm drops any bit with a probability proportionate to the size of the packet it is in.

## 2. Recommendations

This section gives recommendations related to network equipment in Sections [2.1](#) and [2.2](#), and in Sections [2.3](#) and [2.4](#) we discuss the implications on the transport protocols.



### **2.1. Recommendation on Queue Measurement**

Queue length is usually the most correct and simplest way to measure congestion of a resource. To avoid the pathological effects of drop tail, an AQM function can then be used to transform queue length into the probability of dropping or marking a packet (e.g. RED's piecewise linear function between thresholds).

If the resource is bit-congestible, the implementation SHOULD measure the length of the queue in bytes. If the resource is packet-congestible, the implementation SHOULD measure the length of the queue in packets. No other choice makes sense, because the number of packets waiting in the queue isn't relevant if the resource gets congested by bytes and vice versa.

What this advice means for the case of RED:

1. A RED implementation SHOULD use byte mode queue measurement for measuring the congestion of bit-congestible resources and packet mode queue measurement for packet-congestible resources.
2. An implementation SHOULD NOT make it possible to configure the way a queue measures itself, because whether a queue is bit-congestible or packet-congestible is an inherent property of the queue.

The recommended approach in less straightforward scenarios, such as fixed size buffers, and resources without a queue, is discussed in [Section 4.1](#).

### **2.2. Recommendation on Encoding Congestion Notification**

When encoding congestion notification (e.g. by drop, ECN & PCN), a network device SHOULD treat all packets equally, regardless of their size. In other words, the probability that network equipment drops or marks a particular packet to notify congestion SHOULD NOT depend on the size of the packet in question. As the example in [Section 1.2](#) illustrates, to drop any bit with probability 0.1% it is only necessary to drop every packet with probability 0.1% without regard to the size of each packet.

This approach ensures the network layer offers sufficient congestion information for all known and future transport protocols and also ensures no perverse incentives are created that would encourage transports to use inappropriately small packet sizes.

What this advice means for the case of RED:





1. AQM algorithms such as RED SHOULD NOT use byte-mode drop, which deflates RED's drop probability for smaller packet sizes. RED's byte-mode drop has no enduring advantages. It is more complex, it creates the perverse incentive to fragment segments into tiny pieces and it reopens the vulnerability to floods of small-packets that drop-tail queues suffered from and AQM was designed to remove.
2. If a vendor has implemented byte-mode drop, and an operator has turned it on, it is RECOMMENDED to turn it off. Note that RED as a whole SHOULD NOT be turned off, as without it, a drop tail queue also biases against large packets. But note also that turning off byte-mode drop may alter the relative performance of applications using different packet sizes, so it would be advisable to establish the implications before turning it off.

Note well that RED's byte-mode queue drop is completely orthogonal to byte-mode queue measurement and should not be confused with it. If a RED implementation has a byte-mode but does not specify what sort of byte-mode, it is most probably byte-mode queue measurement, which is fine. However, if in doubt, the vendor should be consulted.

A survey (Appendix A) showed that there appears to be little, if any, installed base of the byte-mode drop variant of RED. This suggests that deprecating byte-mode drop will have little, if any, incremental deployment impact.

### **2.3. Recommendation on Responding to Congestion**

When a transport detects that a packet has been lost or congestion marked, it SHOULD consider the strength of the congestion indication as proportionate to the size in octets (bytes) of the missing or marked packet.

In other words, when a packet indicates congestion (by being lost or marked) it can be considered conceptually as if there is a congestion indication on every octet of the packet, not just one indication per packet.

Therefore, the IETF transport area should continue its programme of;

- o updating host-based congestion control protocols to take account of packet size
- o making transports less sensitive to losing control packets like SYNs and pure ACKs.



What this advice means for the case of TCP:

1. If two TCP flows with different packet sizes are required to run at equal bit rates under the same path conditions, this should be done by altering TCP ([Section 4.2.2](#)), not network equipment (the latter affects other transports besides TCP).
2. If it is desired to improve TCP performance by reducing the chance that a SYN or a pure ACK will be dropped, this should be done by modifying TCP ([Section 4.2.3](#)), not network equipment.

#### **2.4. Recommendation on Handling Congestion Indications when Splitting or Merging Packets**

Packets carrying congestion indications may be split or merged in some circumstances (e.g. at a RTCP transcoder or during IP fragment reassembly). Splitting and merging only make sense in the context of ECN, not loss.

The general rule to follow is that the number of octets in packets with congestion indications SHOULD be equivalent before and after merging or splitting. This is based on the principle used above; that an indication of congestion on a packet can be considered as an indication of congestion on each octet of the packet.

The above rule is not phrased with the word "MUST" to allow the following exception. There are cases where pre-existing protocols were not designed to conserve congestion marked octets (e.g. IP fragment reassembly [[RFC3168](#)] or loss statistics in RTCP receiver reports [[RFC3550](#)] before ECN was added [[I-D.ietf-avtcore-ecn-for-rtp](#)]). When any such protocol is updated, it SHOULD comply with the above rule to conserve marked octets. However, the rule may be relaxed if it would otherwise become too complex to interoperate with pre-existing implementations of the protocol.

One can think of a splitting or merging process as if all the incoming congestion-marked octets increment a counter and all the outgoing marked octets decrement the same counter. In order to ensure that congestion indications remain timely, even the smallest positive remainder in the conceptual counter should trigger the next outgoing packet to be marked (causing the counter to go negative).

### **3. Motivating Arguments**

This section is informative. It justifies the recommendations given in the previous section.



### **3.1.    Avoiding Perverse Incentives to (Ab)use Smaller Packets**

Increasingly, it is being recognised that a protocol design must take care not to cause unintended consequences by giving the parties in the protocol exchange perverse incentives [[Evol\\_cc](#)][RFC3426]. Given there are many good reasons why larger path maximum transmission units (PMTUs) would help solve a number of scaling issues, we do not want to create any bias against large packets that is greater than their true cost.

Imagine a scenario where the same bit rate of packets will contribute the same to bit-congestion of a link irrespective of whether it is sent as fewer larger packets or more smaller packets. A protocol design that caused larger packets to be more likely to be dropped than smaller ones would be dangerous in both the following cases:

Malicious transports: A queue that gives an advantage to small packets can be used to amplify the force of a flooding attack. By sending a flood of small packets, the attacker can get the queue to discard more traffic in large packets, allowing more attack traffic to get through to cause further damage. Such a queue allows attack traffic to have a disproportionately large effect on regular traffic without the attacker having to do much work.

Non-malicious transports: Even if a transport designer is not actually malicious, if over time it is noticed that small packets tend to go faster, designers will act in their own interest and use smaller packets. Queues that give advantage to small packets create an evolutionary pressure for transports to send at the same bit-rate but break their data stream down into tiny segments to reduce their drop rate. Encouraging a high volume of tiny packets might in turn unnecessarily overload a completely unrelated part of the system, perhaps more limited by header-processing than bandwidth.

Imagine two unresponsive flows arrive at a bit-congestible transmission link each with the same bit rate, say 1Mbps, but one consists of 1500B and the other 60B packets, which are 25x smaller. Consider a scenario where gentle RED [[gentle\\_RED](#)] is used, along with the variant of RED we advise against, i.e. where the RED algorithm is configured to adjust the drop probability of packets in proportion to each packet's size (byte mode packet drop). In this case, RED aims to drop 25x more of the larger packets than the smaller ones. Thus, for example if RED drops 25% of the larger packets, it will aim to drop 1% of the smaller packets (but in practice it may drop more as congestion increases [RFC4828; Appx B.4]). Even though both flows arrive with the same bit rate, the bit rate the RED queue aims to pass to the line will be 750kbps for the flow of larger packets but



990kbps for the smaller packets (because of rate variations it will actually be a little less than this target).

Note that, although the byte-mode drop variant of RED amplifies small packet attacks, drop-tail queues amplify small packet attacks even more (see Security Considerations in [Section 6](#)). Wherever possible neither should be used.

### **[3.2.](#)   Small != Control**

Dropping fewer control packets considerably improves performance. It is tempting to drop small packets with lower probability in order to improve performance, because many control packets are small (TCP SYNs & ACKs, DNS queries & responses, SIP messages, HTTP GETs, etc). However, we must not give control packets preference purely by virtue of their smallness, otherwise it is too easy for any data source to get the same preferential treatment simply by sending data in smaller packets. Again we should not create perverse incentives to favour small packets rather than to favour control packets, which is what we intend.

Just because many control packets are small does not mean all small packets are control packets.

So, rather than fix these problems in the network, we argue that the transport should be made more robust against losses of control packets (see 'Making Transports Robust against Control Packet Losses' in [Section 4.2.3](#)).

### **[3.3.](#)   Transport-Independent Network**

TCP congestion control ensures that flows competing for the same resource each maintain the same number of segments in flight, irrespective of segment size. So under similar conditions, flows with different segment sizes will get different bit-rates.

One motivation for the network biasing congestion notification by packet size is to counter this effect and try to equalise the bit-rates of flows with different packet sizes. However, in order to do this, the queuing algorithm has to make assumptions about the transport, which become embedded in the network. Specifically:

- o The queuing algorithm has to assume how aggressively the transport will respond to congestion (see [Section 4.2.4](#)). If the network assumes the transport responds as aggressively as TCP NewReno, it will be wrong for Compound TCP and differently wrong for Cubic TCP, etc. To achieve equal bit-rates, each transport then has to guess what assumption the network made, and work out how to





replace this assumed aggressiveness with its own aggressiveness.

- o Also, if the network biases congestion notification by packet size it has to assume a baseline packet size--all proposed algorithms use the local MTU. Then transports have to guess which link was congested and what its local MTU was, in order to know how to tailor their congestion response to that link.

Even though reducing the drop probability of small packets (e.g. RED's byte-mode drop) helps ensure TCP flows with different packet sizes will achieve similar bit rates, we argue this correction should be made to any future transport protocols based on TCP, not to the network in order to fix one transport, no matter how predominant it is. Effectively, favouring small packets is reverse engineering of network equipment around one particular transport protocol (TCP), contrary to the excellent advice in [[RFC3426](#)], which asks designers to question "Why are you proposing a solution at this layer of the protocol stack, rather than at another layer?"

In contrast, if the network never takes account of packet size, the transport can be certain it will never need to guess any assumptions the network has made. And the network passes two pieces of information to the transport that are sufficient in all cases: i) congestion notification on the packet and ii) the size of the packet. Both are available for the transport to combine (by taking account of packet size when responding to congestion) or not. [Appendix B](#) checks that these two pieces of information are sufficient for all relevant scenarios.

When the network does not take account of packet size, it allows transport protocols to choose whether to take account of packet size or not. However, if the network were to bias congestion notification by packet size, transport protocols would have no choice; those that did not take account of packet size themselves would unwittingly become dependent on packet size, and those that already took account of packet size would end up taking account of it twice.

### **[3.4.](#)    Scaling Congestion Control with Packet Size**

Having so far justified only our recommendations for the network, this section focuses on the host. We construct a scaling argument to justify the recommendation that a host should respond to a dropped or marked packet in proportion to its size, not just as a single congestion event.

The argument assumes that we have already sufficiently justified our recommendation that the network should not take account of packet size.



Also, we assume bit-congestible links are the predominant source of congestion. As the Internet stands, it is hard if not impossible to know whether congestion notification is from a bit-congestible or a packet-congestible resource (see [Appendix B.2](#)) so we have to assume the most prevalent case (see [Section 1.1](#)). If this assumption is wrong, and particular congestion indications are actually due to overload of packet-processing, there is no issue of safety at stake. Any congestion control that triggers a multiplicative decrease in response to a congestion indication will bring packet processing back to its operating point just as quickly. The only issue at stake is that the resource could be utilised more efficiently if packet-congestion could be separately identified.

Imagine a bit-congestible link shared by many flows, so that each busy period tends to cause packets to be lost from different flows. Consider further two sources that have the same data rate but break the load into large packets in one application (A) and small packets in the other (B). Of course, because the load is the same, there will be proportionately more packets in the small packet flow (B).

If a congestion control scales with packet size it should respond in the same way to the same congestion notification, irrespective of the size of the packets containing the bytes that contribute to congestion.

A bit-congestible queue suffering congestion has to drop or mark the same excess bytes whether they are in a few large packets (A) or many small packets (B). So for the same amount of congestion overload, the same amount of bytes has to be shed to get the load back to its operating point. For smaller packets (B) more packets will have to be discarded to shed the same bytes.

If both the transports interpret each drop/mark as a single loss event irrespective of the size of the packet dropped, the flow of smaller packets (B) will respond more times to the same congestion. On the other hand, if a transport responds proportionately less when smaller packets are dropped/marked, overall it will be able to respond the same to the same amount of congestion.

Therefore, for a congestion control to scale with packet size it should respond to dropped or marked bytes (as TFRC-SP [[RFC4828](#)] effectively does), instead of dropped or marked packets (as TCP does).

For the avoidance of doubt, this is not a recommendation that TCP should be changed so that it scales with packet size. It is a recommendation that any future transport protocol proposal should respond to dropped or marked bytes if it wishes to claim that it is



scalable.

### **3.5. Implementation Efficiency**

Allowing for packet size at the transport rather than in the network ensures that neither the network nor the transport needs to do a multiply operation--multiplication by packet size is effectively achieved as a repeated add when the transport adds to its count of marked bytes as each congestion event is fed to it. This isn't a principled reason in itself, but it is a happy consequence of the other principled reasons.

## **4. A Survey and Critique of Past Advice**

This section is informative, not normative.

The original 1993 paper on RED [[RED93](#)] proposed two options for the RED active queue management algorithm: packet mode and byte mode. Packet mode measured the queue length in packets and dropped (or marked) individual packets with a probability independent of their size. Byte mode measured the queue length in bytes and marked an individual packet with probability in proportion to its size (relative to the maximum packet size). In the paper's outline of further work, it was stated that no recommendation had been made on whether the queue size should be measured in bytes or packets, but noted that the difference could be significant.

When RED was recommended for general deployment in 1998 [[RFC2309](#)], the two modes were mentioned implying the choice between them was a question of performance, referring to a 1997 email [[pktByteEmail](#)] for advice on tuning. A later addendum to this email introduced the insight that there are in fact two orthogonal choices:

- o whether to measure queue length in bytes or packets ([Section 4.1](#))
- o whether the drop probability of an individual packet should depend on its own size ([Section 4.2](#)).

The rest of this section is structured accordingly.

### **4.1. Congestion Measurement Advice**

The choice of which metric to use to measure queue length was left open in [RFC2309](#). It is now well understood that queues for bit-congestible resources should be measured in bytes, and queues for packet-congestible resources should be measured in packets [[pktByteEmail](#)].



Congestion in some legacy bit-congestible buffers is only measured in packets not bytes. In such cases, the operator has to set the thresholds mindful of a typical mix of packets sizes. Any AQM algorithm on such a buffer will be oversensitive to high proportions of small packets, e.g. a DoS attack, and undersensitive to high proportions of large packets. However, there is no need to make allowances for the possibility of such legacy in future protocol design. This is safe because any undersensitivity during unusual traffic mixes cannot lead to congestion collapse given the buffer will eventually revert to tail drop, discarding proportionately more large packets.

#### **4.1.1. Fixed Size Packet Buffers**

The question of whether to measure queues in bytes or packets seems to be well understood. However, measuring congestion is not straightforward when the resource is bit congestible but the queue is packet congestible or vice versa. This section outlines the approach to take. There is no controversy over what should be done, you just need to be expert in probability to work it out. And, even if you know what should be done, it's not always easy to find a practical algorithm to implement it.

Some, mostly older, queuing hardware sets aside fixed sized buffers in which to store each packet in the queue. Also, with some hardware, any fixed sized buffers not completely filled by a packet are padded when transmitted to the wire. If we imagine a theoretical forwarding system with both queuing and transmission in fixed, MTU-sized units, it should clearly be treated as packet-congestible, because the queue length in packets would be a good model of congestion of the lower layer link.

If we now imagine a hybrid forwarding system with transmission delay largely dependent on the byte-size of packets but buffers of one MTU per packet, it should strictly require a more complex algorithm to determine the probability of congestion. It should be treated as two resources in sequence, where the sum of the byte-sizes of the packets within each packet buffer models congestion of the line while the length of the queue in packets models congestion of the queue. Then the probability of congesting the forwarding buffer would be a conditional probability--conditional on the previously calculated probability of congesting the line.

In systems that use fixed size buffers, it is unusual for all the buffers used by an interface to be the same size. Typically pools of different sized buffers are provided (Cisco uses the term 'buffer carving' for the process of dividing up memory into these pools [[IOSArch](#)]). Usually, if the pool of small buffers is exhausted,





arriving small packets can borrow space in the pool of large buffers, but not vice versa. However, it is easier to work out what should be done if we temporarily set aside the possibility of such borrowing. Then, with fixed pools of buffers for different sized packets and no borrowing, the size of each pool and the current queue length in each pool would both be measured in packets. So an AQM algorithm would have to maintain the queue length for each pool, and judge whether to drop/mark a packet of a particular size by looking at the pool for packets of that size and using the length (in packets) of its queue.

We now return to the issue we temporarily set aside: small packets borrowing space in larger buffers. In this case, the only difference is that the pools for smaller packets have a maximum queue size that includes all the pools for larger packets. And every time a packet takes a larger buffer, the current queue size has to be incremented for all queues in the pools of buffers less than or equal to the buffer size used.

We will return to borrowing of fixed sized buffers when we discuss biasing the drop/mark probability of a specific packet because of its size in [Section 4.2.1](#). But here we can give at least one simple rule for how to measure the length of queues of fixed buffers: no matter how complicated the scheme is, ultimately any fixed buffer system will need to measure its queue length in packets not bytes.

#### **[4.1.2](#). Congestion Measurement without a Queue**

AQM algorithms are nearly always described assuming there is a queue for a congested resource and the algorithm can use the queue length to determine the probability that it will drop or mark each packet. But not all congested resources lead to queues. For instance, wireless spectrum is usually regarded as bit-congestible (for a given coding scheme). But wireless link protocols do not always maintain a queue that depends on spectrum interference. Similarly, power limited resources are also usually bit-congestible if energy is primarily required for transmission rather than header processing, but it is rare for a link protocol to build a queue as it approaches maximum power.

Nonetheless, AQM algorithms do not require a queue in order to work. For instance spectrum congestion can be modelled by signal quality using target bit-energy-to-noise-density ratio. And, to model radio power exhaustion, transmission power levels can be measured and compared to the maximum power available. [[ECNFixedWireless](#)] proposes a practical and theoretically sound way to combine congestion notification for different bit-congestible resources at different layers along an end to end path, whether wireless or wired, and whether with or without queues.



## **4.2. Congestion Notification Advice**

### **4.2.1. Network Bias when Encoding**

#### **4.2.1.1. Advice on Packet Size Bias in RED**

The previously mentioned email [[pktByteEmail](#)] referred to by [[RFC2309](#)] advised that most scarce resources in the Internet were bit-congestible, which is still believed to be true ([Section 1.1](#)). But it went on to offer advice that is updated by this memo. It said that drop probability should depend on the size of the packet being considered for drop if the resource is bit-congestible, but not if it is packet-congestible. The argument continued that if packet drops were inflated by packet size (byte-mode dropping), "a flow's fraction of the packet drops is then a good indication of that flow's fraction of the link bandwidth in bits per second". This was consistent with a referenced policing mechanism being worked on at the time for detecting unusually high bandwidth flows, eventually published in 1999 [[pBox](#)]. However, the problem could and should have been solved by making the policing mechanism count the volume of bytes randomly dropped, not the number of packets.

A few months before [RFC2309](#) was published, an addendum was added to the above archived email referenced from the RFC, in which the final paragraph seemed to partially retract what had previously been said. It clarified that the question of whether the probability of dropping/markings a packet should depend on its size was not related to whether the resource itself was bit congestible, but a completely orthogonal question. However the only example given had the queue measured in packets but packet drop depended on the byte-size of the packet in question. No example was given the other way round.

In 2000, Cnoder et al [[REDbyte](#)] pointed out that there was an error in the part of the original 1993 RED algorithm that aimed to distribute drops uniformly, because it didn't correctly take into account the adjustment for packet size. They recommended an algorithm called RED\_4 to fix this. But they also recommended a further change, RED\_5, to adjust drop rate dependent on the square of relative packet size. This was indeed consistent with one implied motivation behind RED's byte mode drop--that we should reverse engineer the network to improve the performance of dominant end-to-end congestion control mechanisms. This memo makes a different recommendations in [Section 2](#).

By 2003, a further change had been made to the adjustment for packet size, this time in the RED algorithm of the ns2 simulator. Instead of taking each packet's size relative to a 'maximum packet size' it was taken relative to a 'mean packet size', intended to be a static



value representative of the 'typical' packet size on the link. We have not been able to find a justification in the literature for this change, however Eddy and Allman conducted experiments [[REDbias](#)] that assessed how sensitive RED was to this parameter, amongst other things. However, this changed algorithm can often lead to drop probabilities of greater than 1 (which gives a hint that there is probably a mistake in the theory somewhere).

On 10-Nov-2004, this variant of byte-mode packet drop was made the default in the ns2 simulator. It seems unlikely that byte-mode drop has ever been implemented in production networks (Appendix A), therefore any conclusions based on ns2 simulations that use RED without disabling byte-mode drop are likely to behave very differently from RED in production networks.

#### **4.2.1.2.    Packet Size Bias Regardless of RED**

The byte-mode drop variant of RED is, of course, not the only possible bias towards small packets in queueing systems. We have already mentioned that tail-drop queues naturally tend to lock-out large packets once they are full. But also queues with fixed sized buffers reduce the probability that small packets will be dropped if (and only if) they allow small packets to borrow buffers from the pools for larger packets. As was explained in [Section 4.1.1](#) on fixed size buffer carving, borrowing effectively makes the maximum queue size for small packets greater than that for large packets, because more buffers can be used by small packets while less will fit large packets.

In itself, the bias towards small packets caused by buffer borrowing is perfectly correct. Lower drop probability for small packets is legitimate in buffer borrowing schemes, because small packets genuinely congest the machine's buffer memory less than large packets, given they can fit in more spaces. The bias towards small packets is not artificially added (as it is in RED's byte-mode drop algorithm), it merely reflects the reality of the way fixed buffer memory gets congested. Incidentally, the bias towards small packets from buffer borrowing is nothing like as large as that of RED's byte-mode drop.

Nonetheless, fixed-buffer memory with tail drop is still prone to lock-out large packets, purely because of the tail-drop aspect. So a good AQM algorithm like RED with packet-mode drop should be used with fixed buffer memories where possible. If RED is too complicated to implement with multiple fixed buffer pools, the minimum necessary to prevent large packet lock-out is to ensure smaller packets never use the last available buffer in any of the pools for larger packets.



#### **4.2.2.    Transport Bias when Decoding**

The above proposals to alter the network equipment to bias towards smaller packets have largely carried on outside the IETF process. Whereas, within the IETF, there are many different proposals to alter transport protocols to achieve the same goals, i.e. either to make the flow bit-rate take account of packet size, or to protect control packets from loss. This memo argues that altering transport protocols is the more principled approach.

A recently approved experimental RFC adapts its transport layer protocol to take account of packet sizes relative to typical TCP packet sizes. This proposes a new small-packet variant of TCP-friendly rate control [[RFC5348](#)] called TFRC-SP [[RFC4828](#)]. Essentially, it proposes a rate equation that inflates the flow rate by the ratio of a typical TCP segment size (1500B including TCP header) over the actual segment size [[PktSizeEquCC](#)]. (There are also other important differences of detail relative to TFRC, such as using virtual packets [[CCvarPktSize](#)] to avoid responding to multiple losses per round trip and using a minimum inter-packet interval.)

[Section 4.5.1](#) of this TFRC-SP spec discusses the implications of operating in an environment where queues have been configured to drop smaller packets with proportionately lower probability than larger ones. But it only discusses TCP operating in such an environment, only mentioning TFRC-SP briefly when discussing how to define fairness with TCP. And it only discusses the byte-mode dropping version of RED as it was before Cnodder et al pointed out it didn't sufficiently bias towards small packets to make TCP independent of packet size.

So the TFRC-SP spec doesn't address the issue of which of the network or the transport `_should_` handle fairness between different packet sizes. In its [Appendix B.4](#) it discusses the possibility of both TFRC-SP and some network buffers duplicating each other's attempts to deliberately bias towards small packets. But the discussion is not conclusive, instead reporting simulations of many of the possibilities in order to assess performance but not recommending any particular course of action.

The paper originally proposing TFRC with virtual packets (VP-TFRC) [[CCvarPktSize](#)] proposed that there should perhaps be two variants to cater for the different variants of RED. However, as the TFRC-SP authors point out, there is no way for a transport to know whether some queues on its path have deployed RED with byte-mode packet drop (except if an exhaustive survey found that no-one has deployed it!-- see [Appendix A](#)). Incidentally, VP-TFRC also proposed that byte-mode RED dropping should really square the packet-size compensation-factor





(like that of Cnoder's RED\_5, but apparently unaware of it).

Pre-congestion notification [[RFC5670](#)] is an IETF technology to use a virtual queue for AQM marking for packets within one Diffserv class in order to give early warning prior to any real queuing. The PCN marking algorithms have been designed not to take account of packet size when forwarding through queues. Instead the general principle has been to take account of the sizes of marked packets when monitoring the fraction of marking at the edge of the network, as recommended here.

#### **4.2.3.    Making Transports Robust against Control Packet Losses**

Recently, two RFCs have defined changes to TCP that make it more robust against losing small control packets [[RFC5562](#)] [[RFC5690](#)]. In both cases they note that the case for these two TCP changes would be weaker if RED were biased against dropping small packets. We argue here that these two proposals are a safer and more principled way to achieve TCP performance improvements than reverse engineering RED to benefit TCP.

Although there are no known proposals, it would also be possible and perfectly valid to make control packets robust against drop by explicitly requesting a lower drop probability using their Diffserv code point [[RFC2474](#)] to request a scheduling class with lower drop.

Although not brought to the IETF, a simple proposal from Wischik [[DupTCP](#)] suggests that the first three packets of every TCP flow should be routinely duplicated after a short delay. It shows that this would greatly improve the chances of short flows completing quickly, but it would hardly increase traffic levels on the Internet, because Internet bytes have always been concentrated in the large flows. It further shows that the performance of many typical applications depends on completion of long serial chains of short messages. It argues that, given most of the value people get from the Internet is concentrated within short flows, this simple expedient would greatly increase the value of the best efforts Internet at minimal cost.

#### **4.2.4.    Congestion Notification: Summary of Conflicting Advice**



transport	RED_1 (packet mode drop)	RED_4 (linear byte mode drop)	RED_5 (square byte mode drop)
TCP or cc	$s/\sqrt{p}$	$\sqrt{s/p}$	$1/\sqrt{p}$
TFRC			
TFRC-SP	$1/\sqrt{p}$	$1/\sqrt{sp}$	$1/(s.\sqrt{p})$

Table 2: Dependence of flow bit-rate per RTT on packet size,  $s$ , and drop probability,  $p$ , when network and/or transport bias towards small packets to varying degrees

Table 2 aims to summarise the potential effects of all the advice from different sources. Each column shows a different possible AQM behaviour in different queues in the network, using the terminology of Cnoder et al outlined earlier (RED\_1 is basic RED with packet-mode drop). Each row shows a different transport behaviour: TCP [RFC5681] and TFRC [RFC5348] on the top row with TFRC-SP [RFC4828] below. Each cell shows how the bits per round trip of a flow depends on packet size,  $s$ , and drop probability,  $p$ . In order to declutter the formulae to focus on packet-size dependence they are all given per round trip, which removes any RTT term.

Let us assume that the goal is for the bit-rate of a flow to be independent of packet size. Suppressing all inessential details, the table shows that this should either be achievable by not altering the TCP transport in a RED\_5 network, or using the small packet TFRC-SP transport (or similar) in a network without any byte-mode dropping RED (top right and bottom left). Top left is the 'do nothing' scenario, while bottom right is the 'do-both' scenario in which bit-rate would become far too biased towards small packets. Of course, if any form of byte-mode dropping RED has been deployed on a subset of queues that congest, each path through the network will present a different hybrid scenario to its transport.

Whatever, we can see that the linear byte-mode drop column in the middle would considerably complicate the Internet. It's a half-way house that doesn't bias enough towards small packets even if one believes the network should be doing the biasing. [Section 2](#) recommends that all bias in network equipment towards small packets should be turned off--if indeed any equipment vendors have implemented it--leaving packet-size bias solely as the preserve of the transport layer (solely the leftmost, packet-mode drop column).

In practice it seems that no deliberate bias towards small packets has been implemented for production networks. Of the 19% of vendors who responded to a survey of 84 equipment vendors, none had



implemented byte-mode drop in RED (see [Appendix A](#) for details).

## **5. Outstanding Issues and Next Steps**

### **5.1. Bit-congestible Network**

For a connectionless network with nearly all resources being bit-congestible the recommended position is clear--that the network should not make allowance for packet sizes and the transport should. This leaves two outstanding issues:

- o How to handle any legacy of AQM with byte-mode drop already deployed;
- o The need to start a programme to update transport congestion control protocol standards to take account of packet size.

A survey of equipment vendors ([Section 4.2.4](#)) found no evidence that byte-mode packet drop had been implemented, so deployment will be sparse at best. A migration strategy is not really needed to remove an algorithm that may not even be deployed.

A programme of experimental updates to take account of packet size in transport congestion control protocols has already started with TFRC-SP [[RFC4828](#)].

### **5.2. Bit- & Packet-congestible Network**

The position is much less clear-cut if the Internet becomes populated by a more even mix of both packet-congestible and bit-congestible resources (see [Appendix B.2](#)). This problem is not pressing, because most Internet resources are designed to be bit-congestible before packet processing starts to congest (see [Section 1.1](#)).

The IRTF Internet congestion control research group (ICCRG) has set itself the task of reaching consensus on generic forwarding mechanisms that are necessary and sufficient to support the Internet's future congestion control requirements (the first challenge in [[RFC6077](#)]). The research question of whether packet congestion might become common and what to do if it does may in the future be explored in the IRTF (the "Challenge 3: Packet Size" in [[RFC6077](#)]).

## **6. Security Considerations**

This memo recommends that queues do not bias drop probability towards small packets as this creates a perverse incentive for transports to break down their flows into tiny segments. One of the benefits of



implementing AQM was meant to be to remove this perverse incentive that drop-tail queues gave to small packets.

In practice, transports cannot all be trusted to respond to congestion. So another reason for recommending that queues do not bias drop probability towards small packets is to avoid the vulnerability to small packet DDoS attacks that would otherwise result. One of the benefits of implementing AQM was meant to be to remove drop-tail's DoS vulnerability to small packets, so we shouldn't add it back again.

If most queues implemented AQM with byte-mode drop, the resulting network would amplify the potency of a small packet DDoS attack. At the first queue the stream of packets would push aside a greater proportion of large packets, so more of the small packets would survive to attack the next queue. Thus a flood of small packets would continue on towards the destination, pushing regular traffic with large packets out of the way in one queue after the next, but suffering much less drop itself.

[Appendix C](#) explains why the ability of networks to police the response of any transport to congestion depends on bit-congestible network resources only doing packet-mode not byte-mode drop. In summary, it says that making drop probability depend on the size of the packets that bits happen to be divided into simply encourages the bits to be divided into smaller packets. Byte-mode drop would therefore irreversibly complicate any attempt to fix the Internet's incentive structures.

## **[7.](#) Conclusions**

This memo identifies the three distinct stages of the congestion notification process where implementations need to decide whether to take packet size into account. The recommendations provided in [Section 2](#) of this memo are different in each case:

- o When network equipment measures the length of a queue, whether it counts in bytes or packets depends on whether the network resource is congested respectively by bytes or by packets.
- o When network equipment decides whether to drop (or mark) a packet, it is recommended that the size of the particular packet should not be taken into account
- o However, when a transport algorithm responds to a dropped or marked packet, the size of the rate reduction should be proportionate to the size of the packet.





In summary, the answers are 'it depends', 'no' and 'yes' respectively

For the specific case of RED, this means that byte-mode queue measurement will often be appropriate although byte-mode drop is strongly deprecated.

At the transport layer the IETF should continue updating congestion control protocols to take account of the size of each packet that indicates congestion. Also the IETF should continue to make protocols less sensitive to losing control packets like SYNs, pure ACKs and DNS exchanges. Although many control packets happen to be small, the alternative of network equipment favouring all small packets would be dangerous. That would create perverse incentives to split data transfers into smaller packets.

The memo develops these recommendations from principled arguments concerning scaling, layering, incentives, inherent efficiency, security and policeability. But it also addresses practical issues such as specific buffer architectures and incremental deployment. Indeed a limited survey of RED implementations is discussed, which shows there appears to be little, if any, installed base of RED's byte-mode drop. Therefore it can be deprecated with little, if any, incremental deployment complications.

The recommendations have been developed on the well-founded basis that most Internet resources are bit-congestible not packet-congestible. We need to know the likelihood that this assumption will prevail longer term and, if it might not, what protocol changes will be needed to cater for a mix of the two. The IRTF Internet Congestion Control Research Group (ICCRG) is currently working on these problems [[RFC6077](#)].

## **8. Acknowledgements**

Thank you to Sally Floyd, who gave extensive and useful review comments. Also thanks for the reviews from Philip Eardley, David Black, Fred Baker, Toby Moncaster, Arnaud Jacquet and Mirja Kuehlewind as well as helpful explanations of different hardware approaches from Larry Dunn and Fred Baker. We are grateful to Bruce Davie and his colleagues for providing a timely and efficient survey of RED implementation in Cisco's product range. Also grateful thanks to Toby Moncaster, Will Dormann, John Regnault, Simon Carter and Stefaan De Cnodder who further helped survey the current status of RED implementation and deployment and, finally, thanks to the anonymous individuals who responded.

Bob Briscoe and Jukka Manner were partly funded by Trilogy, a research project (ICT- 216372) supported by the European Community



under its Seventh Framework Programme. The views expressed here are those of the authors only.

## **9. Comments Solicited**

Comments and questions are encouraged and very welcome. They can be addressed to the IETF Transport Area working group mailing list <tsvwg@ietf.org>, and/or to the authors.

## **10. References**

### **10.1. Normative References**

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [RFC2309] Braden, B., Clark, D., Crowcroft, J., Davie, B., Deering, S., Estrin, D., Floyd, S., Jacobson, V., Minshall, G., Partridge, C., Peterson, L., Ramakrishnan, K., Shenker, S., Wroclawski, J., and L. Zhang, "Recommendations on Queue Management and Congestion Avoidance in the Internet", [RFC 2309](#), April 1998.
- [RFC3168] Ramakrishnan, K., Floyd, S., and D. Black, "The Addition of Explicit Congestion Notification (ECN) to IP", [RFC 3168](#), September 2001.
- [RFC3426] Floyd, S., "General Architectural and Policy Considerations", [RFC 3426](#), November 2002.

### **10.2. Informative References**

- [CCvarPktSize] Widmer, J., Boutremans, C., and J-Y. Le Boudec, "Congestion Control for Flows with Variable Packet Size", ACM CCR 34(2) 137--151, 2004, <<http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/997150.997162>>.
- [CHoKe\_Var\_Pkt] Psounis, K., Pan, R., and B. Prabhaker, "Approximate Fair Dropping for Variable Length Packets", IEEE Micro 21(1):48--56, January-



February 2001, <<http://www.stanford.edu/~balaji/papers/01approximatefair.pdf>>.

- [DRQ]                    Shin, M., Chong, S., and I. Rhee, "Dual-Resource TCP/AQM for Processing-Constrained Networks", IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking Vol 16, issue 2, April 2008, <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/TNET.2007.900415>>.
- [DupTCP]                Wischik, D., "Short messages", Royal Society workshop on networks: modelling and control , September 2007, <<http://www.cs.ucl.ac.uk/staff/ucacdjw/Research/shortmsg.html>>.
- [ECNFixedWireless]    Siris, V., "Resource Control for Elastic Traffic in CDMA Networks", Proc. ACM MOBICOM'02 , September 2002, <[http://www.ics.forth.gr/netlab/publications/resource\\_control\\_elastic\\_cdma.html](http://www.ics.forth.gr/netlab/publications/resource_control_elastic_cdma.html)>.
- [Evol\_cc]                Gibbens, R. and F. Kelly, "Resource pricing and the evolution of congestion control", Automatica 35(12)1969--1985, December 1999, <<http://www.statslab.cam.ac.uk/~frank/evol.html>>.
- [I-D.ietf-avtcore-ecn-for-rtp]    Westerlund, M., Johansson, I., Perkins, C., O'Hanlon, P., and K. Carlberg, "Explicit Congestion Notification (ECN) for RTP over UDP", [draft-ietf-avtcore-ecn-for-rtp-06](#) (work in progress), February 2012.
- [I-D.ietf-conex-concepts-uses]    Briscoe, B., Woundy, R., and A. Cooper, "ConEx Concepts and Use Cases", [draft-ietf-conex-concepts-uses-03](#) (work in progress), October 2011.
- [IOSArch]                Bollapragada, V., White, R., and C.



Murphy, "Inside Cisco IOS Software Architecture", Cisco Press: CCIE Professional Development ISBN13: 978-1-57870-181-0, July 2000.

- [PktSizeEquCC]            Vasallo, P., "Variable Packet Size Equation-Based Congestion Control", ICSI Technical Report tr-00-008, 2000, <<http://http.icsi.berkeley.edu/ftp/global/pub/techreports/2000/tr-00-008.pdf>>.
- [RED93]                  Floyd, S. and V. Jacobson, "Random Early Detection (RED) gateways for Congestion Avoidance", IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking 1(4) 397--413, August 1993, <<http://www.icir.org/floyd/papers/red/red.html>>.
- [REDbias]                Eddy, W. and M. Allman, "A Comparison of RED's Byte and Packet Modes", Computer Networks 42(3) 261--280, June 2003, <<http://www.ir.bbn.com/documents/articles/redbias.ps>>.
- [REDbyte]                De Cnodder, S., Elloumi, O., and K. Pauwels, "RED behavior with different packet sizes", Proc. 5th IEEE Symposium on Computers and Communications (ISCC) 793--799, July 2000, <<http://www.icir.org/floyd/red/Elloumi99.pdf>>.
- [RFC2474]                Nichols, K., Blake, S., Baker, F., and D. Black, "Definition of the Differentiated Services Field (DS Field) in the IPv4 and IPv6 Headers", [RFC 2474](#), December 1998.
- [RFC3550]                Schulzrinne, H., Casner, S., Frederick, R., and V. Jacobson, "RTP: A Transport Protocol for Real-Time Applications", STD 64, [RFC 3550](#), July 2003.
- [RFC3714]                Floyd, S. and J. Kempf, "IAB Concerns Regarding Congestion Control for





- Voice Traffic in the Internet",  
[RFC 3714](#), March 2004.
- [RFC4828]            Floyd, S. and E. Kohler, "TCP  
Friendly Rate Control (TFRC): The  
Small-Packet (SP) Variant", [RFC 4828](#),  
April 2007.
- [RFC5348]            Floyd, S., Handley, M., Padhye, J.,  
and J. Widmer, "TCP Friendly Rate  
Control (TFRC): Protocol  
Specification", [RFC 5348](#),  
September 2008.
- [RFC5562]            Kuzmanovic, A., Mondal, A., Floyd,  
S., and K. Ramakrishnan, "Adding  
Explicit Congestion Notification  
(ECN) Capability to TCP's SYN/ACK  
Packets", [RFC 5562](#), June 2009.
- [RFC5670]            Eardley, P., "Metering and Marking  
Behaviour of PCN-Nodes", [RFC 5670](#),  
November 2009.
- [RFC5681]            Allman, M., Paxson, V., and E.  
Blanton, "TCP Congestion Control",  
[RFC 5681](#), September 2009.
- [RFC5690]            Floyd, S., Arcia, A., Ros, D., and J.  
Iyengar, "Adding Acknowledgement  
Congestion Control to TCP", [RFC 5690](#),  
February 2010.
- [RFC6077]            Papadimitriou, D., Welzl, M., Scharf,  
M., and B. Briscoe, "Open Research  
Issues in Internet Congestion  
Control", [RFC 6077](#), February 2011.
- [Rate\_fair\_Dis]        Briscoe, B., "Flow Rate Fairness:  
Dismantling a Religion", ACM  
CCR 37(2)63--74, April 2007, <[http://  
portal.acm.org/  
citation.cfm?id=1232926](http://portal.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1232926)>.
- [gentle\_RED]            Floyd, S., "Recommendation on using  
the "gentle\_" variant of RED", Web  
page , March 2000, <[http://  
www.icir.org/floyd/red/gentle.html](http://www.icir.org/floyd/red/gentle.html)>.







	Response	No. of vendors	%age of vendors
	Not implemented	14	17%
	Not implemented (probably)	2	2%
	Implemented	0	0%
	No response	68	81%
	Total companies/orgs surveyed	84	100%

Table 3: Vendor Survey on byte-mode drop variant of RED (lower drop probability for small packets)

Where reasons have been given, the extra complexity of packet bias code has been most prevalent, though one vendor had a more principled reason for avoiding it--similar to the argument of this document.

Our survey was of vendor implementations, so we cannot be certain about operator deployment. But we believe many queues in the Internet are still tail-drop. The company of one of the co-authors (BT) has widely deployed RED, but many tail-drop queues are bound to still exist, particularly in access network equipment and on middleboxes like firewalls, where RED is not always available.

Routers using a memory architecture based on fixed size buffers with borrowing may also still be prevalent in the Internet. As explained in [Section 4.2.1](#), these also provide a marginal (but legitimate) bias towards small packets. So even though RED byte-mode drop is not prevalent, it is likely there is still some bias towards small packets in the Internet due to tail drop and fixed buffer borrowing.

## [Appendix B](#). Sufficiency of Packet-Mode Drop

This Appendix is informative, not normative.

Here we check that packet-mode drop (or marking) in the network gives sufficiently generic information for the transport layer to use. We check against a 2x2 matrix of four scenarios that may occur now or in the future (Table 4). The horizontal and vertical dimensions have been chosen because each tests extremes of sensitivity to packet size in the transport and in the network respectively.

Note that this section does not consider byte-mode drop at all. Having deprecated byte-mode drop, the goal here is to check that packet-mode drop will be sufficient in all cases.



Transport		a) Independent of congestion notifications	b) Dependent on packet size of congestion notifications
Network			
1) Predominantly bit-congestible network		Scenario a1)	Scenario b1)
2) Mix of bit-congestible and pkt-congestible network		Scenario a2)	Scenario b2)

Table 4: Four Possible Congestion Scenarios

[Appendix B.1](#) focuses on the horizontal dimension of Table 4 checking that packet-mode drop (or marking) gives sufficient information, whether or not the transport uses it--scenarios b) and a) respectively.

[Appendix B.2](#) focuses on the vertical dimension of Table 4, checking that packet-mode drop gives sufficient information to the transport whether resources in the network are bit-congestible or packet-congestible (these terms are defined in [Section 1.1](#)).

Notation: To be concrete, we will compare two flows with different packet sizes,  $s_1$  and  $s_2$ . As an example, we will take  $s_1 = 60B = 480b$  and  $s_2 = 1500B = 12,000b$ .

A flow's bit rate,  $x$  [bps], is related to its packet rate,  $u$  [pps], by

$$x(t) = s.u(t).$$

In the bit-congestible case, path congestion will be denoted by  $p_b$ , and in the packet-congestible case by  $p_p$ . When either case is implied, the letter  $p$  alone will denote path congestion.

### [B.1.](#) Packet-Size (In)Dependence in Transports

In all cases we consider a packet-mode drop queue that indicates congestion by dropping (or marking) packets with probability  $p$  irrespective of packet size. We use an example value of loss (marking) probability,  $p=0.1\%$ .

A transport like [RFC5681](#) TCP treats a congestion notification on any packet whatever its size as one event. However, a network with just the packet-mode drop algorithm does give more information if the transport chooses to use it. We will use Table 5 to illustrate this.





We will set aside the last column until later. The columns labelled "Flow 1" and "Flow 2" compare two flows consisting of 60B and 1500B packets respectively. The body of the table considers two separate cases, one where the flows have equal bit-rate and the other with equal packet-rates. In both cases, the two flows fill a 96Mbps link. Therefore, in the equal bit-rate case they each have half the bit-rate (48Mbps). Whereas, with equal packet-rates, flow 1 uses 25 times smaller packets so it gets 25 times less bit-rate--it only gets  $1/(1+25)$  of the link capacity ( $96\text{Mbps}/26 = 4\text{Mbps}$  after rounding). In contrast flow 2 gets 25 times more bit-rate (92Mbps) in the equal packet rate case because its packets are 25 times larger. The packet rate shown for each flow could easily be derived once the bit-rate was known by dividing bit-rate by packet size, as shown in the column labelled "Formula".

Parameter	Formula	Flow 1	Flow 2	Combined
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Packet size	$s/8$	60B	1,500B	(Mix)
Packet size	$s$	480b	12,000b	(Mix)
Pkt loss probability	$p$	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
EQUAL BIT-RATE CASE				
Bit-rate	$x$	48Mbps	48Mbps	96Mbps
Packet-rate	$u = x/s$	100kpps	4kpps	104kpps
Absolute pkt-loss-rate	$p*u$	100pps	4pps	104pps
Absolute bit-loss-rate	$p*u*s$	48kbps	48kbps	96kbps
Ratio of lost/sent pkts	$p*u/u$	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Ratio of lost/sent bits	$p*u*s/(u*s)$	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
EQUAL PACKET-RATE CASE				
Bit-rate	$x$	4Mbps	92Mbps	96Mbps
Packet-rate	$u = x/s$	8kpps	8kpps	15kpps
Absolute pkt-loss-rate	$p*u$	8pps	8pps	15pps
Absolute bit-loss-rate	$p*u*s$	4kbps	92kbps	96kbps
Ratio of lost/sent pkts	$p*u/u$	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Ratio of lost/sent bits	$p*u*s/(u*s)$	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%

Table 5: Absolute Loss Rates and Loss Ratios for Flows of Small and Large Packets and Both Combined

So far we have merely set up the scenarios. We now consider congestion notification in the scenario. Two TCP flows with the same round trip time aim to equalise their packet-loss-rates over time. That is the number of packets lost in a second, which is the packets per second ( $u$ ) multiplied by the probability that each one is dropped ( $p$ ). Thus TCP converges on the "Equal packet-rate" case, where both flows aim for the same "Absolute packet-loss-rate" (both 8pps in the table).



Packet-mode drop actually gives flows sufficient information to measure their loss-rate in bits per second, if they choose, not just packets per second. Each flow can count the size of a lost or marked packet and scale its rate-response in proportion (as TFRC-SP does). The result is shown in the row entitled "Absolute bit-loss-rate", where the bits lost in a second is the packets per second ( $u$ ) multiplied by the probability of losing a packet ( $p$ ) multiplied by the packet size ( $s$ ). Such an algorithm would try to remove any imbalance in bit-loss-rate such as the wide disparity in the "Equal packet-rate" case (4kbps vs. 92kbps). Instead, a packet-size-dependent algorithm would aim for equal bit-loss-rates, which would drive both flows towards the "Equal bit-rate" case, by driving them to equal bit-loss-rates (both 48kbps in this example).

The explanation so far has assumed that each flow consists of packets of only one constant size. Nonetheless, it extends naturally to flows with mixed packet sizes. In the right-most column of Table 5 a flow of mixed size packets is created simply by considering flow 1 and flow 2 as a single aggregated flow. There is no need for a flow to maintain an average packet size. It is only necessary for the transport to scale its response to each congestion indication by the size of each individual lost (or marked) packet. Taking for example the "Equal packet-rate" case, in one second about 8 small packets and 8 large packets are lost (making closer to 15 than 16 losses per second due to rounding). If the transport multiplies each loss by its size, in one second it responds to  $8 \cdot 480\text{b}$  and  $8 \cdot 12,000\text{b}$  lost bits, adding up to 96,000 lost bits in a second. This double checks correctly, being the same as 0.1% of the total bit-rate of 96Mbps. For completeness, the formula for absolute bit-loss-rate is  $p(u_1 \cdot s_1 + u_2 \cdot s_2)$ .

Incidentally, a transport will always measure the loss probability the same irrespective of whether it measures in packets or in bytes. In other words, the ratio of lost to sent packets will be the same as the ratio of lost to sent bytes. (This is why TCP's bit rate is still proportional to packet size even when byte-counting is used, as recommended for TCP in [\[RFC5681\]](#), mainly for orthogonal security reasons.) This is intuitively obvious by comparing two example flows; one with 60B packets, the other with 1500B packets. If both flows pass through a queue with drop probability 0.1%, each flow will lose 1 in 1,000 packets. In the stream of 60B packets the ratio of bytes lost to sent will be 60B in every 60,000B; and in the stream of 1500B packets, the loss ratio will be 1,500B out of 1,500,000B. When the transport responds to the ratio of lost to sent packets, it will measure the same ratio whether it measures in packets or bytes: 0.1% in both cases. The fact that this ratio is the same whether measured in packets or bytes can be seen in Table 5, where the ratio of lost to sent packets and the ratio of lost to sent bytes is always 0.1% in



all cases (recall that the scenario was set up with  $p=0.1\%$ ).

This discussion of how the ratio can be measured in packets or bytes is only raised here to highlight that it is irrelevant to this memo! Whether a transport depends on packet size or not depends on how this ratio is used within the congestion control algorithm.

So far we have shown that packet-mode drop passes sufficient information to the transport layer so that the transport can take account of bit-congestion, by using the sizes of the packets that indicate congestion. We have also shown that the transport can choose not to take packet size into account if it wishes. We will now consider whether the transport can know which to do.

## **B.2.   Bit-Congestible and Packet-Congestible Indications**

As a thought-experiment, imagine an idealised congestion notification protocol that supports both bit-congestible and packet-congestible resources. It would require at least two ECN flags, one for each of bit-congestible and packet-congestible resources.

1. A packet-congestible resource trying to code congestion level  $p_p$  into a packet stream should mark the idealised 'packet congestion' field in each packet with probability  $p_p$  irrespective of the packet's size. The transport should then take a packet with the packet congestion field marked to mean just one mark, irrespective of the packet size.
2. A bit-congestible resource trying to code time-varying byte-congestion level  $p_b$  into a packet stream should mark the 'byte congestion' field in each packet with probability  $p_b$ , again irrespective of the packet's size. Unlike before, the transport should take a packet with the byte congestion field marked to count as a mark on each byte in the packet.

This hides a fundamental problem--much more fundamental than whether we can magically create header space for yet another ECN flag, or whether it would work while being deployed incrementally.

Distinguishing drop from delivery naturally provides just one implicit bit of congestion indication information--the packet is either dropped or not. It is hard to drop a packet in two ways that are distinguishable remotely. This is a similar problem to that of distinguishing wireless transmission losses from congestive losses.

This problem would not be solved even if ECN were universally deployed. A congestion notification protocol must survive a transition from low levels of congestion to high. Marking two states is feasible with explicit marking, but much harder if packets are



dropped. Also, it will not always be cost-effective to implement AQM at every low level resource, so drop will often have to suffice.

We are not saying two ECN fields will be needed (and we are not saying that somehow a resource should be able to drop a packet in one of two different ways so that the transport can distinguish which sort of drop it was!). These two congestion notification channels are a conceptual device to illustrate a dilemma we could face in the future. [Section 3](#) gives four good reasons why it would be a bad idea to allow for packet size by biasing drop probability in favour of small packets within the network. The impracticality of our thought experiment shows that it will be hard to give transports a practical way to know whether to take account of the size of congestion indication packets or not.

Fortunately, this dilemma is not pressing because by design most equipment becomes bit-congested before its packet-processing becomes congested (as already outlined in [Section 1.1](#)). Therefore transports can be designed on the relatively sound assumption that a congestion indication will usually imply bit-congestion.

Nonetheless, although the above idealised protocol isn't intended for implementation, we do want to emphasise that research is needed to predict whether there are good reasons to believe that packet congestion might become more common, and if so, to find a way to somehow distinguish between bit and packet congestion [[RFC3714](#)].

Recently, the dual resource queue (DRQ) proposal [[DRQ](#)] has been made on the premise that, as network processors become more cost effective, per packet operations will become more complex (irrespective of whether more function in the network is desirable). Consequently the premise is that CPU congestion will become more common. DRQ is a proposed modification to the RED algorithm that folds both bit congestion and packet congestion into one signal (either loss or ECN).

Finally, we note one further complication. Strictly, packet-congestible resources are often cycle-congestible. For instance, for routing look-ups load depends on the complexity of each look-up and whether the pattern of arrivals is amenable to caching or not. This also reminds us that any solution must not require a forwarding engine to use excessive processor cycles in order to decide how to say it has no spare processor cycles.

## [Appendix C](#).    Byte-mode Drop Complicates Policing Congestion Response

This section is informative, not normative.





There are two main classes of approach to policing congestion response: i) policing at each bottleneck link or ii) policing at the edges of networks. Packet-mode drop in RED is compatible with either, while byte-mode drop precludes edge policing.

The simplicity of an edge policer relies on one dropped or marked packet being equivalent to another of the same size without having to know which link the drop or mark occurred at. However, the byte-mode drop algorithm has to depend on the local MTU of the line--it needs to use some concept of a 'normal' packet size. Therefore, one dropped or marked packet from a byte-mode drop algorithm is not necessarily equivalent to another from a different link. A policing function local to the link can know the local MTU where the congestion occurred. However, a policer at the edge of the network cannot, at least not without a lot of complexity.

The early research proposals for type (i) policing at a bottleneck link [[pBox](#)] used byte-mode drop, then detected flows that contributed disproportionately to the number of packets dropped. However, with no extra complexity, later proposals used packet mode drop and looked for flows that contributed a disproportionate amount of dropped bytes [[CHOKe Var Pkt](#)].

Work is progressing on the congestion exposure protocol (ConEx [[I-D.ietf-conex-concepts-uses](#)]), which enables a type (ii) edge policer located at a user's attachment point. The idea is to be able to take an integrated view of the effect of all a user's traffic on any link in the internetwork. However, byte-mode drop would effectively preclude such edge policing because of the MTU issue above.

Indeed, making drop probability depend on the size of the packets that bits happen to be divided into would simply encourage the bits to be divided into smaller packets in order to confuse policing. In contrast, as long as a dropped/marked packet is taken to mean that all the bytes in the packet are dropped/marked, a policer can remain robust against bits being re-divided into different size packets or across different size flows [[Rate fair Dis](#)].

#### **[Appendix D](#). Changes from Previous Versions**

To be removed by the RFC Editor on publication.

Full incremental diffs between each version are available at  
<<http://tools.ietf.org/wg/tsvwg/draft-ietf-tsvwg-byte-pkt-congest/>>  
(courtesy of the rfcdiff tool):



From -06 to -07:

- \* A mix-up with the corollaries and their naming in 2.1 to 2.3 fixed.

From -05 to -06:

- \* Primarily editorial fixes.

From -04 to -05:

- \* Changed from Informational to BCP and highlighted non-normative sections and appendices
- \* Removed language about consensus
- \* Added "Example Comparing Packet-Mode Drop and Byte-Mode Drop"
- \* Arranged "Motivating Arguments" into a more logical order and completely rewrote "Transport-Independent Network" & "Scaling Congestion Control with Packet Size" arguments. Removed "Why Now?"
- \* Clarified applicability of certain recommendations
- \* Shifted vendor survey to an Appendix
- \* Cut down "Outstanding Issues and Next Steps"
- \* Re-drafted the start of the conclusions to highlight the three distinct areas of concern
- \* Completely re-wrote appendices
- \* Editorial corrections throughout.

From -03 to -04:

- \* Reordered Sections [2](#) and [3](#), and some clarifications here and there based on feedback from Colin Perkins and Mirja Kuehlewind.

From -02 to -03 (this version)

- \* Structural changes:
  - + Split off text at end of "Scaling Congestion Control with Packet Size" into new section "Transport-Independent



Network"

- + Shifted "Recommendations" straight after "Motivating Arguments" and added "Conclusions" at end to reinforce Recommendations
- + Added more internal structure to Recommendations, so that recommendations specific to RED or to TCP are just corollaries of a more general recommendation, rather than being listed as a separate recommendation.
- + Renamed "State of the Art" as "Critical Survey of Existing Advice" and retitled a number of subsections with more descriptive titles.
- + Split end of "Congestion Coding: Summary of Status" into a new subsection called "RED Implementation Status".
- + Removed text that had been in the Appendix "Congestion Notification Definition: Further Justification".
- \* Reordered the intro text a little.
- \* Made it clearer when advice being reported is deprecated and when it is not.
- \* Described AQM as in network equipment, rather than saying "at the network layer" (to side-step controversy over whether functions like AQM are in the transport layer but in network equipment).
- \* Minor improvements to clarity throughout

From -01 to -02:

- \* Restructured the whole document for (hopefully) easier reading and clarity. The concrete recommendation, in [RFC2119](#) language, is now in [Section 7](#).

From -00 to -01:

- \* Minor clarifications throughout and updated references

From briscoe-byte-pkt-mark-02 to ietf-byte-pkt-congest-00:

- \* Added note on relationship to existing RFCs



- \* Posed the question of whether packet-congestion could become common and deferred it to the IRTF ICCRG. Added ref to the dual-resource queue (DRQ) proposal.
- \* Changed PCN references from the PCN charter & architecture to the PCN marking behaviour draft most likely to imminently become the standards track WG item.

From -01 to -02:

- \* Abstract reorganised to align with clearer separation of issue in the memo.
- \* Introduction reorganised with motivating arguments removed to new [Section 3](#).
- \* Clarified avoiding lock-out of large packets is not the main or only motivation for RED.
- \* Mentioned choice of drop or marking explicitly throughout, rather than trying to coin a word to mean either.
- \* Generalised the discussion throughout to any packet forwarding function on any network equipment, not just routers.
- \* Clarified the last point about why this is a good time to sort out this issue: because it will be hard / impossible to design new transports unless we decide whether the network or the transport is allowing for packet size.
- \* Added statement explaining the horizon of the memo is long term, but with short term expediency in mind.
- \* Added material on scaling congestion control with packet size ([Section 3.4](#)).
- \* Separated out issue of normalising TCP's bit rate from issue of preference to control packets ([Section 3.2](#)).
- \* Divided up Congestion Measurement section for clarity, including new material on fixed size packet buffers and buffer carving ([Section 4.1.1](#) & [Section 4.2.1](#)) and on congestion measurement in wireless link technologies without queues ([Section 4.1.2](#)).
- \* Added section on 'Making Transports Robust against Control Packet Losses' ([Section 4.2.3](#)) with existing & new material included.





- \* Added tabulated results of vendor survey on byte-mode drop variant of RED (Table 3).

From -00 to -01:

- \* Clarified applicability to drop as well as ECN.
- \* Highlighted DoS vulnerability.
- \* Emphasised that drop-tail suffers from similar problems to byte-mode drop, so only byte-mode drop should be turned off, not RED itself.
- \* Clarified the original apparent motivations for recommending byte-mode drop included protecting SYNs and pure ACKs more than equalising the bit rates of TCPs with different segment sizes. Removed some conjectured motivations.
- \* Added support for updates to TCP in progress (ackcc & ecn-syn-ack).
- \* Updated survey results with newly arrived data.
- \* Pulled all recommendations together into the conclusions.
- \* Moved some detailed points into two additional appendices and a note.
- \* Considerable clarifications throughout.
- \* Updated references

#### Authors' Addresses

Bob Briscoe  
BT  
B54/77, Adastral Park  
Martlesham Heath  
Ipswich IP5 3RE  
UK

Phone: +44 1473 645196  
EMail: bob.briscoe@bt.com  
URI: <http://bobbbriscoe.net/>



Jukka Manner  
Aalto University  
Department of Communications and Networking (Comnet)  
P.O. Box 13000  
FIN-00076 Aalto  
Finland

Phone: +358 9 470 22481  
EMail: [jukka.manner@aalto.fi](mailto:jukka.manner@aalto.fi)  
URI:    <http://www.netlab.tkk.fi/~jmanner/>