

Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Experimental
Expires: April 1, 2018

X. Zhu
R. Pan
M. Ramalho
S. Mena
P. Jones
J. Fu
Cisco Systems
S. D'Aronco
EPFL
September 28, 2017

NADA: A Unified Congestion Control Scheme for Real-Time Media
draft-ietf-rmcat-nada-05

Abstract

This document describes NADA (network-assisted dynamic adaptation), a novel congestion control scheme for interactive real-time media applications, such as video conferencing. In the proposed scheme, the sender regulates its sending rate based on either implicit or explicit congestion signaling, in a unified approach. The scheme can benefit from explicit congestion notification (ECN) markings from network nodes. It also maintains consistent sender behavior in the absence of such markings, by reacting to queuing delays and packet losses instead.

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 <https://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 April 1, 2018.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2017 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to [BCP 78](https://trustee.ietf.org/license-info) and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<https://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

1.	Introduction	3
2.	Terminology	3
3.	System Overview	3
4.	Core Congestion Control Algorithm	5
4.1.	Mathematical Notations	5
4.2.	Receiver-Side Algorithm	8
4.3.	Sender-Side Algorithm	10
5.	Practical Implementation of NADA	12
5.1.	Receiver-Side Operation	12
5.1.1.	Estimation of one-way delay and queuing delay	12
5.1.2.	Estimation of packet loss/marketing ratio	12
5.1.3.	Estimation of receiving rate	13
5.2.	Sender-Side Operation	13
5.2.1.	Rate shaping buffer	14
5.2.2.	Adjusting video target rate and sending rate	15
5.3.	Feedback Message Requirements	15
6.	Discussions and Further Investigations	16
6.1.	Choice of delay metrics	16
6.2.	Method for delay, loss, and marking ratio estimation	16
6.3.	Impact of parameter values	17
6.4.	Sender-based vs. receiver-based calculation	18
6.5.	Incremental deployment	18
7.	Implementation Status	18
8.	Suggested Experiments	19
9.	IANA Considerations	19
10.	Acknowledgements	19
11.	References	20
11.1.	Normative References	20
11.2.	Informative References	21
Appendix A.	Network Node Operations	22
A.1.	Default behavior of drop tail queues	22

A.2.	RED-based ECN marking	22
A.3.	Random Early Marking with Virtual Queues	23
	Authors' Addresses	24

1. Introduction

Interactive real-time media applications introduce a unique set of challenges for congestion control. Unlike TCP, the mechanism used for real-time media needs to adapt quickly to instantaneous bandwidth changes, accommodate fluctuations in the output of video encoder rate control, and cause low queuing delay over the network. An ideal scheme should also make effective use of all types of congestion signals, including packet loss, queuing delay, and explicit congestion notification (ECN) [[RFC3168](#)] markings. The requirements for the congestion control algorithm are outlined in [[I-D.ietf-rmcat-cc-requirements](#)].

This document describes an experimental congestion control scheme called network-assisted dynamic adaptation (NADA). The NADA design benefits from explicit congestion control signals (e.g., ECN markings) from the network, yet also operates when only implicit congestion indicators (delay and/or loss) are available. Such a unified sender behavior distinguishes NADA from other congestion control schemes for real-time media. In addition, its core congestion control algorithm is designed to guarantee stability for path round-trip-times (RTTs) below a prescribed bound (e.g., 250ms with default parameter choices). It further supports weighted bandwidth sharing among competing video flows with different priorities. The signaling mechanism consists of standard RTP timestamp [[RFC3550](#)] and RTCP feedback reports with non-standard messages.

2. Terminology

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 [[RFC2119](#)].

3. System Overview

Figure 1 shows the end-to-end system for real-time media transport that NADA operates in. Note that there also exist network nodes along the reverse (potentially uncongested) path that the RTCP feedback reports traverse. Those network nodes are not shown in the figure for sake of brevity.




Figure 1: System Overview

- o Media encoder with rate control capabilities. It encodes raw media (audio and video) frames into compressed bitstream which is later packetized into RTP packets. As discussed in [\[I-D.ietf-rmcat-video-traffic-model\]](#), the actual output rate from the encoder *r_vout* may fluctuate around the target *r_vin*. Furthermore, it is possible that the encoder can only react to bit rate changes at rather coarse time intervals, e.g., once every 0.5 seconds.
- o RTP sender: responsible for calculating the NADA reference rate based on network congestion indicators (delay, loss, or ECN marking reports from the receiver), for updating the video encoder with a new target rate *r_vin*, and for regulating the actual sending rate *r_send* accordingly. The RTP sender also generates a sending timestamp for each outgoing packet.
- o RTP receiver: responsible for measuring and estimating end-to-end delay (based on sender timestamp), packet loss (based on RTP sequence number), ECN marking ratios (based on [\[RFC6679\]](#)), and receiving rate (*r_rcv*) of the flow. It calculates the aggregated congestion signal (*x_curr*) that accounts for queuing delay, ECN markings, and packet losses. The receiver also determines the mode for sender rate adaptation (*rmode*) based on whether the flow has encountered any standing non-zero congestion. The receiver sends periodic RTCP reports back to the sender, containing values of *x_curr*, *rmode*, and *r_rcv*.
- o Network node with several modes of operation. The system can work with the default behavior of a simple drop tail queue. It can also benefit from advanced AQM features such as PIE, FQ-CoDel, RED-based ECN marking, and PCN marking using a token bucket algorithm. Note that network node operation is out of control for the design of NADA.

4. Core Congestion Control Algorithm

Like TCP-Friendly Rate Control (TFRC) [[Floyd-CCR00](#)] [[RFC5348](#)], NADA is a rate-based congestion control algorithm. In its simplest form, the sender reacts to the collection of network congestion indicators in the form of an aggregated congestion signal, and operates in one of two modes:

- o Accelerated ramp-up: when the bottleneck is deemed to be underutilized, the rate increases multiplicatively with respect to the rate of previously successful transmissions. The rate increase multiplier (γ) is calculated based on observed round-trip-time and target feedback interval, so as to limit self-inflicted queuing delay.
- o Gradual rate update: in the presence of non-zero aggregate congestion signal, the sending rate is adjusted in reaction to both its value (x_{curr}) and its change in value (x_{diff}).

This section introduces the list of mathematical notations and describes the core congestion control algorithm at the sender and receiver, respectively. Additional details on recommended practical implementations are described in [Section 5.1](#) and [Section 5.2](#).

4.1. Mathematical Notations

This section summarizes the list of variables and parameters used in the NADA algorithm.

Notation	Variable Name
t_curr	Current timestamp
t_last	Last time sending/receiving a feedback
delta	Observed interval between current and previous feedback reports: $\text{delta} = \text{t_curr} - \text{t_last}$
r_ref	Reference rate based on network congestion
r_send	Sending rate
r_recv	Receiving rate
r_vin	Target rate for video encoder
r_vout	Output rate from video encoder
d_base	Estimated baseline delay
d_fwd	Measured and filtered one-way delay
d_queue	Estimated queueing delay
d_tilde	Equivalent delay after non-linear warping
p_mark	Estimated packet ECN marking ratio
p_loss	Estimated packet loss ratio
x_curr	Aggregate congestion signal
x_prev	Previous value of aggregate congestion signal
x_diff	Change in aggregate congestion signal w.r.t. its previous value: $\text{x_diff} = \text{x_curr} - \text{x_prev}$
rmode	Rate update mode: (0 = accelerated ramp-up; 1 = gradual update)
gamma	Rate increase multiplier in accelerated ramp-up mode
tloss_int	Measured average loss interval
tloss_exp	Time window for recently observed losses
rtt	Estimated round-trip-time at sender
buffer_len	Rate shaping buffer occupancy measured in bytes

Figure 2: List of variables.

Notation	Parameter Name	Default Value
PRI0	Weight of priority of the flow	1.0
RMIN	Minimum rate of application supported by media encoder	150 Kbps
RMAX	Maximum rate of application supported by media encoder	1.5 Mbps
XREF	Reference congestion level	10ms
KAPPA	Scaling parameter for gradual rate update calculation	0.5
ETA	Scaling parameter for gradual rate update calculation	2.0

TAU	Upper bound of RTT in gradual	500ms	
	rate update calculation		
DELTA	Target feedback interval	100ms	
+	+	+	+
DFILT	Bound on filtering delay	120ms	
LOGWIN	Observation window in time for	500ms	
	calculating packet summary		
	statistics at receiver		
QEPS	Threshold for determining queuing	10ms	
	delay build up at receiver		
GAMMA_MAX	Upper bound on rate increase	50%	
	ratio for accelerated ramp-up		
QBOUND	Upper bound on self-inflicted	50ms	
	queuing delay during ramp up		
+	+	+	+
MULTILOSS	Multiplier for self-scaling the	7.	
	recent observation time window		
	(tloss_exp) based on measured		
	average loss interval (tloss_int)		
QTH	Delay threshold for invoking	50ms	
	non-linear warping		
LAMBDA	Scaling parameter in the	0.5	
	exponent of non-linear warping		
+	+	+	+
PLRREF	Reference packet loss ratio	0.01	
PMRREF	Reference packet marking ratio	0.01	
DLOSS	Reference delay penalty for loss	10ms	
	when packet loss ratio is at		
	PLRREF		
DMARK	Reference delay penalty for ECN	2ms	
	marking when packet marking		
	is at PMRREF		
+	+	+	+
FPS	Frame rate of incoming video	30	
BETA_S	Scaling parameter for modulating	0.1	
	outgoing sending rate		
BETA_V	Scaling parameter for modulating	0.1	
	video encoder target rate		
ALPHA	Smoothing factor in exponential	0.1	
	smoothing of packet loss and		
	marking ratios		
+	+	+	+

Figure 3: List of algorithm parameters.

4.2. Receiver-Side Algorithm

The receiver-side algorithm can be outlined as below:

On initialization:

```

set d_base = +INFINITY
set p_loss = 0
set p_mark = 0
set r_recv = 0
set both t_last and t_curr as current time

```

On receiving a media packet:

```

obtain current timestamp t_curr from system clock
obtain from packet header sending time stamp t_sent
obtain one-way delay measurement: d_fwd = t_curr - t_sent
update baseline delay: d_base = min(d_base, d_fwd)
update queuing delay: d_queue = d_fwd - d_base
update packet loss ratio estimate p_loss
update packet marking ratio estimate p_mark
update measurement of receiving rate r_recv

```

On time to send a new feedback report ($t_{curr} - t_{last} > \Delta$):

```

calculate non-linear warping of delay d_tilde if packet loss exists
calculate current aggregate congestion signal x_curr
determine mode of rate adaptation for sender: rmode
send RTCP feedback report containing values of: rmode, x_curr, and r_recv
update t_last = t_curr

```

In order for a delay-based flow to hold its ground when competing against loss-based flows (e.g., loss-based TCP), it is important to distinguish between different levels of observed queuing delay. For instance, a moderate queuing delay value below 100ms is likely self-inflicted or induced by other delay-based flows, whereas a high queuing delay value of several hundreds of milliseconds may indicate the presence of a loss-based flow that does not refrain from increased delay.

If packet losses are observed within the previous time window of t_{loss_exp} , the estimated queuing delay follows a non-linear warping:

$$\begin{aligned}
 d_tilde = & \begin{cases} d_queue, & \text{if } d_queue < QTH; \\ QTH \exp(-LAMBDA \frac{(d_queue - QTH)}{QTH}), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (1)
 \end{aligned}$$

In (1), the queuing delay value is unchanged when it is below the first threshold QTH; otherwise it is scaled down following a non-linear curve. This non-linear warping is inspired by the delay-adaptive congestion window backoff policy in [Budzisz-TON11], so as to "gradually nudge" the controller to operate based on loss-induced congestion signals when competing against loss-based flows. The exact form of the non-linear function has been simplified with respect to [Budzisz-TON11].

The value of `tloss_exp` is configured to self-scale with the average loss interval `tloss_int` with a multiplier `MULTILOSS`:

$$\text{tloss_exp} = \text{MULTILOSS} * \text{tloss_int}.$$

Estimation of the average loss interval `tloss_int`, in turn, follows [Section 5.4](#) of the TCP Friendly Rate Control (TFRC) protocol [RFC5348].

In practice, it is recommended to linearly interpolate between the warped (`d_tilde`) and non-warped (`d_queue`) values of the queuing delay during the transitional period lasting for the duration of `tloss_int`.

The aggregate congestion signal is:

$$x_{\text{curr}} = d_{\text{tilde}} + \text{DMARK} * (p_{\text{mark}} / \text{PMRREF})^2 + \text{DLOSS} * (p_{\text{loss}} / \text{PLRREF})^2. \quad (2)$$

Here, `DMARK` is prescribed reference delay penalty associated with ECN markings at the reference marking ratio of `PMRREF`; `DLOSS` is prescribed reference delay penalty associated with packet losses at the reference packet loss ratio of `PLRREF`. The value of `DLOSS` and `DMARK` does not depend on configurations at the network node. Since ECN-enabled active queue management schemes typically mark a packet before dropping it, the value of `DLOSS` SHOULD be higher than that of `DMARK`. Furthermore, the values of `DLOSS` and `DMARK` need to be set consistently across all NADA flows for them to compete fairly.

In the absence of packet marking and losses, the value of `x_curr` reduces to the observed queuing delay `d_queue`. In that case the NADA algorithm operates in the regime of delay-based adaptation.

Given observed per-packet delay and loss information, the receiver is also in a good position to determine whether the network is underutilized and recommend the corresponding rate adaptation mode

for the sender. The criteria for operating in accelerated ramp-up mode are:

- o No recent packet losses within the observation window LOGWIN; and
- o No build-up of queuing delay: $d_{\text{fwd}} - d_{\text{base}} < \text{QEPS}$ for all previous delay samples within the observation window LOGWIN.

Otherwise the algorithm operates in graduate update mode.

4.3. Sender-Side Algorithm

The sender-side algorithm is outlined as follows:

```

on initialization:
  set r_ref = RMIN
  set rtt = 0
  set x_prev = 0
  set t_last and t_curr as current system clock time

on receiving feedback report:
  obtain current timestamp from system clock: t_curr
  obtain values of rmode, x_curr, and r_recv from feedback report
  update estimation of rtt
  measure feedback interval: delta = t_curr - t_last
  if rmode == 0:
    update r_ref following accelerated ramp-up rules
  else:
    update r_ref following gradual update rules
  clip rate r_ref within the range of [RMIN, RMAX]
  x_prev = x_curr
  t_last = t_curr

```

In accelerated ramp-up mode, the rate r_{ref} is updated as follows:

$$\text{gamma} = \min(\text{GAMMA_MAX}, \frac{\text{QBOUND}}{\text{rtt} + \text{DELTA} + \text{DFILT}}) \quad (3)$$

$$r_{\text{ref}} = \max(r_{\text{ref}}, (1 + \text{gamma}) r_{\text{recv}}) \quad (4)$$

The rate increase multiplier gamma is calculated as a function of upper bound of self-inflicted queuing delay (QBOUND), round-trip-time (rtt), target feedback interval (DELTA) and bound on filtering delay for calculating d_{queue} (DFILT). It has a maximum value of GAMMA_MAX. The rationale behind (3)-(4) is that the longer it takes for the sender to observe self-inflicted queuing delay build-up, the

more conservative the sender should be in increasing its rate, hence the smaller the rate increase multiplier.

In gradual update mode, the rate r_{ref} is updated as:

$$x_{offset} = x_{curr} - PRI0 * XREF * RMAX / r_{ref} \quad (5)$$

$$x_{diff} = x_{curr} - x_{prev} \quad (6)$$

$$r_{ref} = r_{ref} - KAPPA * \frac{\Delta}{TAU} * \frac{x_{offset}}{TAU} * r_{ref} - KAPPA * \frac{x_{diff}}{TAU} * r_{ref} \quad (7)$$

The rate changes in proportion to the previous rate decision. It is affected by two terms: offset of the aggregate congestion signal from its value at equilibrium (x_{offset}) and its change (x_{diff}).

Calculation of x_{offset} depends on maximum rate of the flow ($RMAX$), its weight of priority ($PRI0$), as well as a reference congestion signal ($XREF$). The value of $XREF$ is chosen so that the maximum rate of $RMAX$ can be achieved when the observed congestion signal level is below $PRI0 * XREF$.

At equilibrium, the aggregated congestion signal stabilizes at $x_{curr} = PRI0 * XREF * RMAX / r_{ref}$. This ensures that when multiple flows share the same bottleneck and observe a common value of x_{curr} , their rates at equilibrium will be proportional to their respective priority levels ($PRI0$) and maximum rate ($RMAX$). Values of $RMIN$ and $RMAX$ will be provided by the media codec, as specified in [\[I-D.ietf-rmcat-cc-codec-interactions\]](#). In the absence of such information, NADA sender will choose a default value of 0 for $RMIN$, and 2Mbps for $RMAX$.

As mentioned in the sender-side algorithm, the final rate is clipped within the dynamic range specified by the application:

$$r_{ref} = \min(r_{ref}, RMAX) \quad (8)$$

$$r_{ref} = \max(r_{ref}, RMIN) \quad (9)$$

The above operations ignore many practical issues such as clock synchronization between sender and receiver, filtering of noise in

delay measurements, and base delay expiration. These will be addressed in [Section 5](#)

5. Practical Implementation of NADA

5.1. Receiver-Side Operation

The receiver continuously monitors end-to-end per-packet statistics in terms of delay, loss, and/or ECN marking ratios. It then aggregates all forms of congestion indicators into the form of an equivalent delay and periodically reports this back to the sender. In addition, the receiver tracks the receiving rate of the flow and includes that in the feedback message.

5.1.1. Estimation of one-way delay and queuing delay

The delay estimation process in NADA follows a similar approach as in earlier delay-based congestion control schemes, such as LEDBAT [[RFC6817](#)]. Instead of relying on RTP timestamps, the NADA sender generates its own timestamp based on local system clock and embeds that information in the transport packet header. The NADA receiver estimates the forward delay as having a constant base delay component plus a time varying queuing delay component. The base delay is estimated as the minimum value of one-way delay observed over a relatively long period (e.g., tens of minutes), whereas the individual queuing delay value is taken to be the difference between one-way delay and base delay. All delay estimations are based on sender timestamps with higher granularity than RTP timestamps.

The individual sample values of queuing delay should be further filtered against various non-congestion-induced noise, such as spikes due to processing "hiccup" at the network nodes. Current implementation employs a 15-tap minimum filter over per-packet queuing delay estimates.

5.1.2. Estimation of packet loss/marketing ratio

The receiver detects packet losses via gaps in the RTP sequence numbers of received packets. Packets arriving out-of-order are discarded, and count towards losses. The instantaneous packet loss ratio p_{inst} is estimated as the ratio between the number of missing packets over the number of total transmitted packets within the recent observation window LOGWIN. The packet loss ratio p_{loss} is obtained after exponential smoothing:

$$p_{\text{loss}} = \text{ALPHA} * p_{\text{inst}} + (1 - \text{ALPHA}) * p_{\text{loss}}. \quad (10)$$

The filtered result is reported back to the sender as the observed packet loss ratio p_{loss} .

Estimation of packet marking ratio p_{mark} follows the same procedure as above. It is assumed that ECN marking information at the IP header can be passed to the receiving endpoint, e.g., by following the mechanism described in [[RFC6679](#)].

[5.1.3](#). Estimation of receiving rate

It is fairly straightforward to estimate the receiving rate r_{recv} . NADA maintains a recent observation window with time span of LOGWIN, and simply divides the total size of packets arriving during that window over the time span. The receiving rate (r_{recv}) is included as part of the feedback report.

[5.2](#). Sender-Side Operation

Figure 4 provides a detailed view of the NADA sender. Upon receipt of an RTCP feedback report from the receiver, the NADA sender calculates the reference rate r_{ref} as specified in [Section 4.3](#). It further adjusts both the target rate for the live video encoder r_{vin} and the sending rate r_{send} over the network based on the updated value of r_{ref} and rate shaping buffer occupancy buffer_len .

The NADA sender behavior stays the same in the presence of all types of congestion indicators: delay, loss, and ECN marking. This unified approach allows a graceful transition of the scheme as the network shifts dynamically between light and heavy congestion levels.




Figure 4: NADA Sender Structure

5.2.1. Rate shaping buffer

The operation of the live video encoder is out of the scope of the design for the congestion control scheme in NADA. Instead, its behavior is treated as a black box.

A rate shaping buffer is employed to absorb any instantaneous mismatch between encoder rate output r_{vout} and regulated sending rate r_{send} . Its current level of occupancy is measured in bytes and is denoted as buffer_len .

A large rate shaping buffer contributes to higher end-to-end delay, which may harm the performance of real-time media communications. Therefore, the sender has a strong incentive to prevent the rate shaping buffer from building up. The mechanisms adopted are:

- o To deplete the rate shaping buffer faster by increasing the sending rate r_{send} ; and
- o To limit incoming packets of the rate shaping buffer by reducing the video encoder target rate r_{vin} .

5.2.2. Adjusting video target rate and sending rate

The target rate for the live video encoder deviates from the network congestion control rate r_{ref} based on the level of occupancy in the rate shaping buffer:

$$r_{vin} = r_{ref} - BETA_V * 8 * buffer_len * FPS. \quad (11)$$

The actual sending rate r_{send} is regulated in a similar fashion:

$$r_{send} = r_{ref} + BETA_S * 8 * buffer_len * FPS. \quad (12)$$

In (11) and (12), the first term indicates the rate calculated from network congestion feedback alone. The second term indicates the influence of the rate shaping buffer. A large rate shaping buffer nudges the encoder target rate slightly below -- and the sending rate slightly above -- the reference rate r_{ref} .

Intuitively, the amount of extra rate offset needed to completely drain the rate shaping buffer within the duration of a single video frame is given by $8 * buffer_len * FPS$, where FPS stands for the frame rate of the video. The scaling parameters $BETA_V$ and $BETA_S$ can be tuned to balance between the competing goals of maintaining a small rate shaping buffer and deviating from the reference rate point.

5.3. Feedback Message Requirements

The following list of information is required for NADA congestion control to function properly:

- o Recommended rate adaptation mode ($rmode$): a 1-bit flag indicating whether the sender should operate in accelerated ramp-up mode ($rmode=0$) or gradual update mode ($rmode=1$).
- o Aggregated congestion signal (x_{curr}): the most recently updated value, calculated by the receiver according to [Section 4.2](#). This information is expressed with a unit of 100 microsecond (i.e., 1/10 of a millisecond) in 15 bits. This allows a maximum value of x_{curr} at approximately 3.27 second.
- o Receiving rate (r_{recv}): the most recently measured receiving rate according to [Section 5.1.3](#). This information is expressed with a unit of bits per second (bps) in 32 bits (unsigned int). This allows a maximum rate of approximately 4.3Gbps.

The above list of information can be accommodated by 48 bits, or 6 bytes, in total. Choice of the feedback message interval Δ is

discussed in [Section 6.3](#) A target feedback interval of DELTA=100ms is recommended.

6. Discussions and Further Investigations

6.1. Choice of delay metrics

The current design works with relative one-way-delay (OWD) as the main indication of congestion. The value of the relative OWD is obtained by maintaining the minimum value of observed OWD over a relatively long time horizon and subtract that out from the observed absolute OWD value. Such an approach cancels out the fixed difference between the sender and receiver clocks. It has been widely adopted by other delay-based congestion control approaches such as [\[RFC6817\]](#). As discussed in [\[RFC6817\]](#), the time horizon for tracking the minimum OWD needs to be chosen with care: it must be long enough for an opportunity to observe the minimum OWD with zero standing queue along the path, and sufficiently short so as to timely reflect "true" changes in minimum OWD introduced by route changes and other rare events.

The potential drawback in relying on relative OWD as the congestion signal is that when multiple flows share the same bottleneck, the flow arriving late at the network experiencing a non-empty queue may mistakenly consider the standing queuing delay as part of the fixed path propagation delay. This will lead to slightly unfair bandwidth sharing among the flows.

Alternatively, one could move the per-packet statistical handling to the sender instead and use relative round-trip-time (RTT) in lieu of relative OWD, assuming that per-packet acknowledgements are available. The main drawback of RTT-based approach is the noise in the measured delay in the reverse direction.

Note that the choice of either delay metric (relative OWD vs. RTT) involves no change in the proposed rate adaptation algorithm. Therefore, comparing the pros and cons regarding which delay metric to adopt can be kept as an orthogonal direction of investigation.

6.2. Method for delay, loss, and marking ratio estimation

Like other delay-based congestion control schemes, performance of NADA depends on the accuracy of its delay measurement and estimation module. [Appendix A in \[RFC6817\]](#) provides an extensive discussion on this aspect.

The current recommended practice of simply applying a 15-tab minimum filter suffices in guarding against processing delay outliers

observed in wired connections. For wireless connections with a higher packet delay variation (PDV), more sophisticated techniques on de-noising, outlier rejection, and trend analysis may be needed.

More sophisticated methods in packet loss ratio calculation, such as that adopted by [[Floyd-CCR00](#)], will likely be beneficial. These alternatives are currently under investigation.

6.3. Impact of parameter values

In the gradual rate update mode, the parameter TAU indicates the upper bound of round-trip-time (RTT) in feedback control loop. Typically, the observed feedback interval delta is close to the target feedback interval DELTA, and the relative ratio of delta/TAU versus ETA dictates the relative strength of influence from the aggregate congestion signal offset term (x_{offset}) versus its recent change (x_{diff}), respectively. These two terms are analogous to the integral and proportional terms in a proportional-integral (PI) controller. The recommended choice of TAU=500ms, DELTA=100ms and ETA = 2.0 corresponds to a relative ratio of 1:10 between the gains of the integral and proportional terms. Consequently, the rate adaptation is mostly driven by the change in the congestion signal with a long-term shift towards its equilibrium value driven by the offset term. Finally, the scaling parameter KAPPA determines the overall speed of the adaptation and needs to strike a balance between responsiveness and stability.

The choice of the target feedback interval DELTA needs to strike the right balance between timely feedback and low RTCP feedback message counts. A target feedback interval of DELTA=100ms is recommended, corresponding to a feedback bandwidth of 16Kbps with 200 bytes per feedback message --- approximately 1.6% overhead for a 1 Mbps flow. Furthermore, both simulation studies and frequency-domain analysis have established that a feedback interval below 250ms will not break up the feedback control loop of NADA congestion control.

In calculating the non-linear warping of delay in (1), the current design uses fixed values of QTH for determining whether to perform the non-linear warping). It is possible to adapt its value based on past observed patterns of queuing delay in the presence of packet losses.

In calculating the aggregate congestion signal x_{curr} , the choice of DMARK and DLOSS influence the steady-state packet loss/marking ratio experienced by the flow at a given available bandwidth. Higher values of DMARK and DLOSS result in lower steady-state loss/marking ratios, but are more susceptible to the impact of individual packet loss/marking events. While the value of DMARK and DLOSS are fixed

and predetermined in the current design, a scheme for automatically tuning these values based on desired bandwidth sharing behavior in the presence of other competing loss-based flows (e.g., loss-based TCP) is under investigation.

6.4. Sender-based vs. receiver-based calculation

In the current design, the aggregated congestion signal `x_curr` is calculated at the receiver, keeping the sender operation completely independent of the form of actual network congestion indications (delay, loss, or marking). Alternatively, one can move the logics of (1) and (2) to the sender. Such an approach requires slightly higher overhead in the feedback messages, which should contain individual fields on queuing delay (`d_queue`), packet loss ratio (`p_loss`), packet marking ratio (`p_mark`), receiving rate (`r_recv`), and recommended rate adaptation mode (`rmode`).

6.5. Incremental deployment

One nice property of NADA is the consistent video endpoint behavior irrespective of network node variations. This facilitates gradual, incremental adoption of the scheme.

To start off with, the proposed congestion control mechanism can be implemented without any explicit support from the network, and relies solely on observed one-way delay measurements and packet loss ratios as implicit congestion signals.

When ECN is enabled at the network nodes with RED-based marking, the receiver can fold its observations of ECN markings into the calculation of the equivalent delay. The sender can react to these explicit congestion signals without any modification.

Ultimately, networks equipped with proactive marking based on token bucket level metering can reap the additional benefits of zero standing queues and lower end-to-end delay and work seamlessly with existing senders and receivers.

7. Implementation Status

The NADA scheme has been implemented in [[ns-2](#)] and [[ns-3](#)] simulation platforms. Extensive ns-2 simulation evaluations of an earlier version of the draft are documented in [[Zhu-PV13](#)]. Evaluation results of the current draft over several test cases in [[I-D.ietf-rmcat-eval-test](#)] have been presented at recent IETF meetings [[IETF-90](#)][[IETF-91](#)]. Evaluation results of the current draft over several test cases in [[I-D.ietf-rmcat-wireless-tests](#)] have been presented at [[IETF-93](#)].

The scheme has also been implemented and evaluated in a lab setting as described in [[IETF-90](#)]. Preliminary evaluation results of NADA in single-flow and multi-flow scenarios have been presented in [[IETF-91](#)].

8. Suggested Experiments

NADA has been extensively evaluated under various test scenarios, including the collection of test cases specified by [[I-D.ietf-rmcat-eval-test](#)] and the subset of WiFi-based test cases in [[I-D.ietf-rmcat-wireless-tests](#)]. Additional evaluations have been carried out to characterize how NADA interacts with various active queue management (AQM) schemes such as RED, CoDel, and PIE. Most of these evaluations have been carried out in simulators. A few key test cases have also been evaluated in implementations embedded in video conferencing clients.

Further experiments are suggested for the following scenarios:

- o Experiments reflecting the set up of a typical WAN connection.
- o Experiments with ECN marking capability turned on at the network for existing test cases.
- o Experiments with multiple RMCAT streams bearing different user-specified priorities.
- o Experiments with additional access technologies, especially over cellular networks such as 3G/LTE.
- o Experiments with various media source contents, including audio only, audio and video, and application content sharing (e.g., slide shows).

9. IANA Considerations

This document makes no request of IANA.

10. Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Randell Jesup, Luca De Cicco, Piers O'Hanlon, Ingemar Johansson, Stefan Holmer, Cesar Ilharco Magalhaes, Safiqul Islam, Mirja Kuhlewind, and Karen Elisabeth Egede Nielsen for their valuable questions and comments on earlier versions of this draft. Thanks to Charles Ganzhorn for contributing to the testbed-based evaluation of NADA during an early stage of its development.

11. References

11.1. Normative References

- [I-D.ietf-rmcat-cc-codec-interactions]
Zanaty, M., Singh, V., Nandakumar, S., and Z. Sarker,
"Congestion Control and Codec interactions in RTP
Applications", [draft-ietf-rmcat-cc-codec-interactions-02](#)
(work in progress), March 2016.
- [I-D.ietf-rmcat-cc-requirements]
Jesup, R. and Z. Sarker, "Congestion Control Requirements
for Interactive Real-Time Media", [draft-ietf-rmcat-cc-requirements-09](#) (work in progress), December 2014.
- [I-D.ietf-rmcat-eval-test]
Sarker, Z., Singh, V., Zhu, X., and M. Ramalho, "Test
Cases for Evaluating RMCAT Proposals", [draft-ietf-rmcat-eval-test-05](#) (work in progress), April 2017.
- [I-D.ietf-rmcat-video-traffic-model]
Zhu, X., Cruz, S., and Z. Sarker, "Modeling Video Traffic
Sources for RMCAT Evaluations", [draft-ietf-rmcat-video-traffic-model-03](#) (work in progress), July 2017.
- [I-D.ietf-rmcat-wireless-tests]
Sarker, Z., Johansson, I., Zhu, X., Fu, J., Tan, W., and
M. Ramalho, "Evaluation Test Cases for Interactive Real-
Time Media over Wireless Networks", [draft-ietf-rmcat-wireless-tests-04](#) (work in progress), May 2017.
- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate
Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#),
DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997,
<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.
- [RFC3168] Ramakrishnan, K., Floyd, S., and D. Black, "The Addition
of Explicit Congestion Notification (ECN) to IP",
[RFC 3168](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC3168, September 2001,
<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3168>>.
- [RFC3550] Schulzrinne, H., Casner, S., Frederick, R., and V.
Jacobson, "RTP: A Transport Protocol for Real-Time
Applications", STD 64, [RFC 3550](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC3550,
July 2003, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3550>>.

- [RFC6679] Westerlund, M., Johansson, I., Perkins, C., O'Hanlon, P., and K. Carlberg, "Explicit Congestion Notification (ECN) for RTP over UDP", [RFC 6679](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6679, August 2012, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6679>>.

11.2. Informative References

- [Budzisz-TON11] Budzisz, L., Stanojevic, R., Schlote, A., Baker, F., and R. Shorten, "On the Fair Coexistence of Loss- and Delay-Based TCP", *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking* vol. 19, no. 6, pp. 1811-1824, December 2011.
- [Floyd-CCR00] Floyd, S., Handley, M., Padhye, J., and J. Widmer, "Equation-based Congestion Control for Unicast Applications", *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communications Review* vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 43-56, October 2000.
- [IETF-90] Zhu, X., Ramalho, M., Ganzhorn, C., Jones, P., and R. Pan, "NADA Update: Algorithm, Implementation, and Test Case Evaluation Results", July 2014, <<https://tools.ietf.org/agenda/90/slides/slides-90-rmcat-6.pdf>>.
- [IETF-91] Zhu, X., Pan, R., Ramalho, M., Mena, S., Ganzhorn, C., Jones, P., and S. D'Aronco, "NADA Algorithm Update and Test Case Evaluations", November 2014, <<http://www.ietf.org/proceedings/interim/2014/11/09/rmcat/slides/slides-interim-2014-rmcat-1-2.pdf>>.
- [IETF-93] Zhu, X., Pan, R., Ramalho, M., Mena, S., Ganzhorn, C., Jones, P., D'Aronco, S., and J. Fu, "Updates on NADA", July 2015, <<https://www.ietf.org/proceedings/93/slides/slides-93-rmcat-0.pdf>>.
- [ns-2] "The Network Simulator - ns-2", <<http://www.isi.edu/nsnam/ns/>>.
- [ns-3] "The Network Simulator - ns-3", <<https://www.nsnam.org/>>.
- [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](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC2309, April 1998, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2309>>.

- [RFC5348] Floyd, S., Handley, M., Padhye, J., and J. Widmer, "TCP Friendly Rate Control (TFRC): Protocol Specification", [RFC 5348](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5348, September 2008, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5348>>.
- [RFC6660] Briscoe, B., Moncaster, T., and M. Menth, "Encoding Three Pre-Congestion Notification (PCN) States in the IP Header Using a Single Diffserv Codepoint (DSCP)", [RFC 6660](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6660, July 2012, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6660>>.
- [RFC6817] Shalunov, S., Hazel, G., Iyengar, J., and M. Kuehlewind, "Low Extra Delay Background Transport (LEDBAT)", [RFC 6817](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6817, December 2012, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6817>>.
- [Zhu-PV13] Zhu, X. and R. Pan, "NADA: A Unified Congestion Control Scheme for Low-Latency Interactive Video", in Proc. IEEE International Packet Video Workshop (PV'13) San Jose, CA, USA, December 2013.

[Appendix A.](#) Network Node Operations

NADA can work with different network queue management schemes and does not assume any specific network node operation. As an example, this appendix describes three variants of queue management behavior at the network node, leading to either implicit or explicit congestion signals.

In all three flavors described below, the network queue operates with the simple first-in-first-out (FIFO) principle. There is no need to maintain per-flow state. The system can scale easily with a large number of video flows and at high link capacity.

[A.1.](#) Default behavior of drop tail queues

In a conventional network with drop tail or RED queues, congestion is inferred from the estimation of end-to-end delay and/or packet loss. Packet drops at the queue are detected at the receiver, and contributes to the calculation of the aggregated congestion signal `x_curr`. No special action is required at network node.

[A.2.](#) RED-based ECN marking

In this mode, the network node randomly marks the ECN field in the IP packet header following the Random Early Detection (RED) algorithm

[RFC2309]. Calculation of the marking probability involves the following steps:

on packet arrival:

update smoothed queue size q_{avg} as:

$q_{avg} = w*q + (1-w)*q_{avg}$.

calculate marking probability p as:

```

      / 0,                if q < q_lo;
      |
      |      q_avg - q_lo
p = <  p_max * -----, if q_lo <= q < q_hi;
      |      q_hi - q_lo
      |
      \ p = 1,           if q >= q_hi.

```

Here, q_{lo} and q_{hi} corresponds to the low and high thresholds of queue occupancy. The maximum marking probability is p_{max} .

The ECN markings events will contribute to the calculation of an equivalent delay x_{curr} at the receiver. No changes are required at the sender.

A.3. Random Early Marking with Virtual Queues

Advanced network nodes may support random early marking based on a token bucket algorithm originally designed for Pre-Congestion Notification (PCN) [RFC6660]. The early congestion notification (ECN) bit in the IP header of packets are marked randomly. The marking probability is calculated based on a token-bucket algorithm originally designed for the Pre-Congestion Notification (PCN) [RFC6660]. The target link utilization is set as 90%; the marking probability is designed to grow linearly with the token bucket size when it varies between 1/3 and 2/3 of the full token bucket limit.

Calculation of the marking probability involves the following steps:


```

upon packet arrival:
    meter packet against token bucket (r,b);

    update token level b_tk;

    calculate the marking probability as:

        / 0,                if b-b_tk < b_lo;
        |
        |      b-b_tk-b_lo
p = <  p_max* -----, if b_lo<= b-b_tk <b_hi;
        |      b_hi-b_lo
        |
        \ 1,                if b-b_tk>=b_hi.

```

Here, the token bucket lower and upper limits are denoted by b_{lo} and b_{hi} , respectively. The parameter b indicates the size of the token bucket. The parameter r is chosen to be below capacity, resulting in slight under-utilization of the link. The maximum marking probability is p_{max} .

The ECN markings events will contribute to the calculation of an equivalent delay x_{curr} at the receiver. No changes are required at the sender. The virtual queuing mechanism from the PCN-based marking algorithm will lead to additional benefits such as zero standing queues.

Authors' Addresses

Xiaoqing Zhu
 Cisco Systems
 12515 Research Blvd., Building 4
 Austin, TX 78759
 USA

Email: xiaoqzhu@cisco.com

Rong Pan
 Cisco Systems
 3625 Cisco Way
 San Jose, CA 95134
 USA

Email: ropan@cisco.com

Michael A. Ramalho
Cisco Systems, Inc.
8000 Hawkins Road
Sarasota, FL 34241
USA

Phone: +1 919 476 2038
Email: mramalho@cisco.com

Sergio Mena de la Cruz
Cisco Systems
EPFL, Quartier de l'Innovation, Batiment E
Ecublens, Vaud 1015
Switzerland

Email: semena@cisco.com

Paul E. Jones
Cisco Systems
7025 Kit Creek Rd.
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709
USA

Email: paulej@packetizer.com

Jiantao Fu
Cisco Systems
707 Tasman Drive
Milpitas, CA 95035
USA

Email: jianfu@cisco.com

Stefano D'Aronco
Ecole Polytechnique Federale de Lausanne
EPFL STI IEL LTS4, ELD 220 (Batiment ELD), Station 11
Lausanne CH-1015
Switzerland

Email: stefano.daronco@epfl.ch

