

Workgroup: Transport Area Working Group

Internet-Draft: draft-ietf-tsvwg-nqb-09

Updates: [rfc8325](#) (if approved)

Published: 11 February 2022

Intended Status: Standards Track

Expires: 15 August 2022

Authors: G. White      T. Fossati

CableLabs      ARM

## **A Non-Queue-Building Per-Hop Behavior (NQB PHB) for Differentiated Services**

### **Abstract**

This document specifies properties and characteristics of a Non-Queue-Building Per-Hop Behavior (NQB PHB). The purpose of this NQB PHB is to provide a separate queue that enables smooth, low-data-rate, application-limited traffic flows, which would ordinarily share a queue with bursty and capacity-seeking traffic, to avoid the latency, latency variation and loss caused by such traffic. This PHB is implemented without prioritization and without rate policing, making it suitable for environments where the use of either these features may be restricted. The NQB PHB has been developed primarily for use by access network segments, where queuing delays and queuing loss caused by Queue-Building protocols are manifested, but its use is not limited to such segments. In particular, applications to cable broadband links, Wi-Fi links, and mobile network radio and core segments are discussed. This document recommends a specific Differentiated Services Code Point (DSCP) to identify Non-Queue-Building flows.

### **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 15 August 2022.

## Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2022 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 (<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 Revised BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Revised BSD License.

## Table of Contents

<a href="#">1. Introduction</a>
<a href="#">2. Requirements Language</a>
<a href="#">3. Context</a>
<a href="#">3.1. Non-Queue-Building Behavior</a>
<a href="#">3.2. Relationship to the Diffserv Architecture</a>
<a href="#">3.3. Relationship to L4S</a>
<a href="#">4. DSCP Marking of NQB Traffic</a>
<a href="#">4.1. Non-Queue-Building Sender Requirements</a>
<a href="#">4.2. Aggregation of the NQB DSCP with other Diffserv PHBs</a>
<a href="#">4.3. End-to-end usage and DSCP Re-marking</a>
<a href="#">4.3.1. Unmanaged Networks</a>
<a href="#">4.4. The NQB DSCP and Tunnels</a>
<a href="#">5. Non-Queue-Building PHB Requirements</a>
<a href="#">5.1. Primary Requirements</a>
<a href="#">5.2. Traffic Protection</a>
<a href="#">5.3. Guidance for Very Low Rate Links</a>
<a href="#">6. Impact on Higher Layer Protocols</a>
<a href="#">7. Configuration and Management</a>
<a href="#">8. Example Use Cases</a>
<a href="#">8.1. DOCSIS Access Networks</a>
<a href="#">8.2. Mobile Networks</a>
<a href="#">8.3. WiFi Networks</a>
<a href="#">8.3.1. Interoperability with Existing WiFi Networks</a>
<a href="#">9. Acknowledgements</a>
<a href="#">10. IANA Considerations</a>
<a href="#">11. Security Considerations</a>
<a href="#">12. References</a>
<a href="#">12.1. Normative References</a>
<a href="#">12.2. Informative References</a>
<a href="#">Appendix A. DSCP Remarking Pathologies</a>
<a href="#">Authors' Addresses</a>

## 1. Introduction

This document defines a Differentiated Services per-hop behavior (PHB) called "Non-Queue-Building Per-Hop Behavior" (NQB PHB), which isolates traffic flows that are relatively low data rate and that do not themselves materially contribute to queueing delay and loss, allowing them to avoid the queueing delays and losses caused by other traffic. Such Non-Queue-Building flows (for example: interactive voice, gaming, machine-to-machine applications) are application limited flows that are distinguished from traffic flows managed by an end-to-end congestion control algorithm.

The vast majority of packets that are carried by broadband access networks are managed by an end-to-end congestion control algorithm, such as Reno, Cubic or BBR. These congestion control algorithms attempt to seek the available capacity of the end-to-end path (which can frequently be the access network link capacity), and in doing so generally overshoot the available capacity, causing a queue to build-up at the bottleneck link. This queue build up results in queueing delay (variable latency) and possibly packet loss that can affect all of the applications that are sharing the bottleneck link.

In contrast to traditional congestion-controlled applications, there are a variety of relatively low data rate applications that do not materially contribute to queueing delay and loss, but are nonetheless subjected to it by sharing the same bottleneck link in the access network. Many of these applications may be sensitive to latency or latency variation, as well as packet loss, and thus produce a poor quality of experience in such conditions.

Active Queue Management (AQM) mechanisms (such as [PIE](#) [[RFC8033](#)], [DOCSIS-PIE](#) [[RFC8034](#)], or [CoDel](#) [[RFC8289](#)]) can improve the quality of experience for latency sensitive applications, but there are practical limits to the amount of improvement that can be achieved without impacting the throughput of capacity-seeking applications. For example, AQMs generally allow a significant amount of queue depth variation in order to accommodate the behaviors of congestion control algorithms such as Reno and Cubic. If the AQM attempted to control the queue much more tightly, applications using those algorithms would not perform well. Alternatively, flow queueing systems, such as [fq\\_codel](#) [[RFC8290](#)] can be employed to isolate flows from one another, but these are not appropriate for all bottleneck links, due to complexity or other reasons.

The NQB PHB supports differentiating between these two classes of traffic in bottleneck links and queueing them separately in order that both classes can deliver satisfactory quality of experience for their applications.

To be clear, a network implementing the NQB PHB solely provides isolation for traffic classified as behaving in conformance with the NQB DSCP (and optionally enforces that behavior). It is the NQB senders' behavior itself which results in low latency and low loss.

## **2. Requirements Language**

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "NOT RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in BCP 14 [[RFC2119](#)] [[RFC8174](#)] when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

## **3. Context**

### **3.1. Non-Queue-Building Behavior**

There are many applications that send traffic at relatively low data rates and/or in a fairly smooth and consistent manner such that they are highly unlikely to exceed the available capacity of the network path between source and sink. These applications may themselves only cause very small, transient queues to form in network buffers, but nonetheless they can be subjected to packet delay and delay variation as a result of sharing a network buffer with applications that tend to cause large and/or standing queues to form. Many of these applications are negatively affected by excessive packet delay and delay variation. Such applications are ideal candidates to be queued separately from the applications that are the cause of queue buildup, latency and loss.

In contrast, Queue-building (QB) flows include those that use TCP or QUIC, with Cubic, Reno or other TCP congestion control algorithms that probe for the link capacity and induce latency and loss as a result. Other types of QB flows include those that frequently send at a high burst rate (e.g. several consecutive packets sent well in excess of 1 Mbps) even if the long-term average data rate is much lower.

### **3.2. Relationship to the Diffserv Architecture**

The IETF has defined the Differentiated Services architecture [[RFC2475](#)] with the intention that it allows traffic to be marked in a manner that conveys the performance requirements of that traffic either quantitatively or in a relative sense (i.e. priority). The architecture defines the use of the Diffserv field [[RFC2474](#)] for this purpose, and numerous RFCs have been written that describe recommended interpretations of the values (Diffserv Code Points) of the field, and standardized treatments (traffic conditioning and per-hop-behaviors) that can be implemented to satisfy the performance requirements of traffic so marked.

While this architecture is powerful, and can be configured to meet the performance requirements of a variety of applications and traffic categories, or to achieve differentiated service offerings, it has proven problematic to enable its use for these purposes end-to-end across the Internet.

This difficulty is in part due to the fact that meeting (in an end-to-end context) the performance requirements of an application involves all of the networks in the path agreeing on what those requirements are, and sharing an interest in meeting them. In many cases this is made more difficult due to the fact that the performance "requirements" are not strict ones (e.g. applications will degrade in some manner as loss/latency/jitter increase), so the importance of meeting them for any particular application in some cases involves a judgment as to the value of avoiding some amount of degradation in quality for that application in exchange for an increase in the degradation of another application.

Further, in many cases the implementation of Diffserv PHBs has historically involved prioritization of service classes with respect to one another, which sets up the zero-sum game alluded to in the previous paragraph, and results in the need to limit access to higher priority classes via mechanisms such as access control, admission control, traffic conditioning and rate policing, and/or to meter and bill for carriage of such traffic. These mechanisms can be difficult or impossible to implement in an end-to-end context.

Finally, some jurisdictions impose regulations that limit the ability of networks to provide differentiation of services, in large part based on the belief that doing so necessarily involves prioritization or privileged access to bandwidth, and thus a benefit to one class of traffic always comes at the expense of another.

In contrast, the NQB PHB has been designed with the goal that it avoids many of these issues, and thus could conceivably be deployed end-to-end across the Internet. The intent of the NQB DSCP is that it signals verifiable behavior that permits the sender to request differentiated treatment. Also, the NQB traffic is to be given a separate queue with priority equal to default traffic, and given no reserved bandwidth other than the bandwidth that it shares with default traffic. As a result, the NQB PHB does not aim to meet specific application performance requirements. Instead the goal of the NQB PHB is to provide statistically better loss, latency, and jitter performance for traffic that is itself only an insignificant contributor to those degradations. The PHB is also designed to minimize any incentives for a sender to mismark its traffic, since neither higher priority nor reserved bandwidth are being offered. These attributes eliminate many of the tradeoffs that underlie the handling of differentiated service classes in the Diffserv

architecture as it has traditionally been defined. They also significantly simplify access control and admission control functions, reducing them to simple verification of behavior.

### 3.3. Relationship to L4S

The NQB DSCP and PHB described in this draft have been defined to operate independently of the experimental L4S Architecture [[I-D.ietf-tsvwg-l4s-arch](#)]. Nonetheless, the NQB traffic flows are intended to be compatible with [[I-D.ietf-tsvwg-l4s-arch](#)], with the result being that NQB traffic and L4S traffic can share the low-latency queue in an L4S DualQ node [[I-D.ietf-tsvwg-aqm-dualq-coupled](#)]. Compliance with the DualQ Coupled AQM requirements ([Section 2.5](#) of [[I-D.ietf-tsvwg-aqm-dualq-coupled](#)]) is considered sufficient to support the NQB PHB requirement of fair allocation of bandwidth between the QB and NQB queues ([Section 5](#)).

## 4. DSCP Marking of NQB Traffic

### 4.1. Non-Queue-Building Sender Requirements

Non-queue-building (NQB) flows are typically UDP flows that don't seek the maximum capacity of the link (examples: online games, voice chat, DNS lookups, real-time IoT analytics data). Here the data rate is limited by the application itself rather than by network capacity - these applications send, at most, the equivalent of a few well-spaced packets per RTT, even if the packets are not actually RTT-clocked. In today's network this corresponds to an instantaneous data rate (packet size divided by packet inter-arrival time) of no more than about 1 Mbps (e.g. no more than one 1250 B packet every 10 ms), but there is no precise bound since it depends on the conditions in which the application is operating.

Note that, while such flows ordinarily don't implement a traditional congestion control mechanism, they nonetheless are expected to comply with existing guidance for safe deployment on the Internet, for example the requirements in [[RFC8085](#)] and [Section 2](#) of [[RFC3551](#)] (also see the circuit breaker limits in [Section 4.3](#) of [[RFC8083](#)] and the description of inelastic pseudowires in [Section 4](#) of [[RFC7893](#)]). To be clear, the description of NQB flows in this document should not be interpreted as suggesting that such flows are in any way exempt from this responsibility.

Applications that align with the description of NQB behavior in the preceding paragraphs SHOULD identify themselves to the network using a Diffserv Code Point (DSCP) of 45 (decimal) so that their packets can be queued separately from QB flows. The choice of the value 45 is motivated in part by the desire to achieve separate queuing in existing WiFi networks (see [Section 8.3](#)). In networks where another

(e.g. a local-use) codepoint is designated for NQB traffic, or where specialized PHBs are available that can meet specific application requirements (e.g. a guaranteed-latency path for voice traffic), it may be preferred to use another DSCP.

If the application's traffic exceeds more than a few packets per RTT, or exceeds the expected path capacity on an instantaneous (e.g. inter-packet or a suitably short time interval) basis, the application SHOULD NOT mark its traffic with the NQB DSCP. In such a case, the application has to instead implement a relevant congestion control mechanism, for example as described in [Section 3.1](#) of [\[RFC8085\]](#) or [\[I-D.ietf-tsvwg-ecn-l4s-id\]](#). At the time of writing, it is believed that 1 Mbps is a reasonable expectation of path capacity, but this value is of course subject to the context in which the application is expected to be deployed.

An application that marks its traffic as NQB but happens to exceed the available path capacity (even on an instantaneous basis) runs the risk of being subjected to a Traffic Protection algorithm (see [Section 5.2](#)), which could result in the excess traffic being discarded or queued separately as default traffic (and thus potentially delivered out of order). As a result, applications that aren't clearly beneath the threshold described above would need to weigh the risk of additional loss or out-of-order delivery against the expected latency benefits of NQB treatment in determining whether or not to mark their packets as NQB.

#### **4.2. Aggregation of the NQB DSCP with other Diffserv PHBs**

It is RECOMMENDED that networks and nodes that do not support the NQB PHB be configured to treat NQB marked traffic the same as traffic marked "Default". It is additionally RECOMMENDED that such networks and nodes simply classify the NQB DSCP into the same treatment aggregate as Default traffic, or encapsulate the NQB marked packet, rather than re-marking NQB traffic as Default. This preservation of the NQB marking enables hops further along the path to provide the NQB PHB successfully.

In backbone and core network switches (particularly if shallow-buffered), and nodes that do not typically experience congestion, treating NQB marked traffic the same as Default may be sufficient to preserve loss/latency/jitter performance for NQB traffic. In other nodes, treating NQB marked traffic as Default could result in degradation of loss/latency/jitter performance but is recommended nonetheless in order to preserve the incentives described in [Section 5](#). An alternative, in controlled environments where there is no risk of mismarking of traffic, would be to aggregate NQB marked traffic with real-time, latency sensitive traffic. Similarly, networks and nodes that aggregate service classes as discussed in [\[RFC5127\]](#) and



[[RFC8100](#)] may not be able to provide a PDB/PHB that meets the requirements of this document. In these cases it is RECOMMENDED that NQB-marked traffic be aggregated into the Elastic Treatment Aggregate (for [[RFC5127](#)] networks) or the Default / Elastic Treatment Aggregate (for [[RFC8100](#)] networks), although in some cases a network operator may instead choose to aggregate NQB traffic into the (Bulk) Real-Time Treatment Aggregate. Either approach comes with trade-offs: when the aggregated traffic encounters a bottleneck, aggregating with Default/Elastic traffic could result in a degradation of loss/latency/jitter performance for NQB traffic, while aggregating with Real-Time (assuming such traffic is provided a prioritized PHB) risks creating an incentive for mismarking of non-compliant traffic as NQB (except in controlled environments). In either case, the NQB DSCP SHOULD be preserved (possibly via encapsulation) in order to limit the negative impact that such networks would have on end-to-end performance for NQB traffic. This aligns with recommendations in [[RFC5127](#)].

Nodes that support the NQB PHB may choose to aggregate other service classes into the NQB queue. Candidate service classes for this aggregation would include those that carry inelastic traffic that has low to very-low tolerance for loss, latency and/or jitter as discussed in [[RFC4594](#)]. These could include Telephony (EF/VA), Signaling (CS5), Real-Time Interactive (CS4) and Broadcast Video (CS3).

#### **4.3. End-to-end usage and DSCP Re-marking**

In contrast to some existing standard PHBs, many of which are typically only meaningful within a Diffserv Domain (e.g. an AS or an enterprise network), this PHB is expected to be used end-to-end across the Internet, wherever suitable operator agreements apply. Under the [[RFC2474](#)] model, this requires that the corresponding DSCP is recognized by all operators and mapped across their boundaries accordingly.

To support NQB, networks MUST preserve a DSCP marking distinction between NQB traffic and Default traffic when forwarding via an interconnect from or to another network. To facilitate the default treatment of NQB traffic in backbones and core networks discussed in the previous section (where IP Precedence may be deployed), networks that support NQB SHOULD NOT use the value 45 for NQB at network interconnects unless that usage is explicitly documented in the TCA (Traffic Conditioning Agreement, see [[RFC2475](#)]) for that interconnection. Rather, networks SHOULD remap NQB traffic to DSCP 5 prior to interconnection, unless agreed otherwise between the interconnecting partners. To be clear, interconnecting networks are not precluded from negotiating (via an SLA, TCA, or some other agreement) a different DSCP to use to signal NQB across an



interconnect. Additionally, the fact that this PHB is intended for end-to-end usage does not preclude networks from mapping the NQB DSCP to a value other than 45 or 5 for internal usage, as long as the appropriate NQB DSCP is restored when forwarding to another network.

Furthermore, in other network environments where IP Precedence ([\[RFC0791\]](#)) is deployed, it is RECOMMENDED that the network operator re-mark NQB traffic to DSCP 5 in order to ensure that it is aggregated with Default traffic.

In order to enable interoperability with WiFi equipment as described in [Section 8.3.1](#), networks SHOULD re-mark NQB traffic (e.g. DSCP 5) to DSCP 45 prior to a customer access link, subject to the safeguards described below and in that section.

Thus, this document recommends two DSCPs to designate NQB, the value 45 for use by hosts and in WiFi networks, and the value 5 for use across network interconnections.

#### **4.3.1. Unmanaged Networks**

In cases where a network operator is delivering traffic into an unmanaged network outside of their control (e.g. a residential ISP delivering traffic to a customer's home network), the network operator should presume that the existing network equipment in the user network supports the WiFi default DSCP mapping (see [Section 8.3](#)) and/or IP Precedence, and does not support the safeguards that are provided by the NQB PHB requirements. As a result, the network operator should take precautions to prevent issues. When the data rate of the access network segment is less than the expected data rate of the user network, this is unlikely to be an issue. However, if the access network rate exceeds the expected rate of the user network, the operator SHOULD deploy a policing function on NQB marked traffic that minimizes the potential for negative impacts on traffic marked Default, for example by limiting the rate of such traffic to a set fraction of the customer's service rate, with excess traffic either dropped or re-marked as Default.

As an additional safeguard, and to prevent the inadvertent introduction of problematic traffic into unmanaged user networks, network equipment that is intended to deliver traffic into unmanaged user networks (e.g. an access network gateway for a residential ISP) MUST by default ensure that NQB traffic is marked with a DSCP that selects the WiFi "Best Effort" Access Category and the "Routine" IP Precedence level (i.e. DSCP 0-7). Such equipment MUST support the ability to configure the remapping, so that (when appropriate safeguards are in place) traffic can be delivered as NQB-marked.

#### 4.4. The NQB DSCP and Tunnels

[[RFC2983](#)] discusses tunnel models that support Diffserv. It describes a "uniform model" in which the inner DSCP is copied to the outer header at encapsulation, and the outer DSCP is copied to the inner header at decapsulation. It also describes a "pipe model" in which the outer DSCP is not copied to the inner header at decapsulation. Both models can be used in conjunction with the NQB PHB. In the case of the pipe model, any DSCP manipulation (re-marking) of the outer header by intermediate nodes would be discarded at tunnel egress, potentially improving the possibility of achieving NQB treatment in subsequent nodes.

As is discussed in [[RFC2983](#)], tunnel protocols that are sensitive to reordering can result in undesirable interactions if multiple DSCP PHBs are signaled for traffic within a tunnel instance. This is true for NQB marked traffic as well. If a tunnel contains a mix of QB and NQB traffic, and this is reflected in the outer DSCP in a network that supports the NQB PHB, it would be necessary to avoid a reordering-sensitive tunnel protocol.

### 5. Non-Queue-Building PHB Requirements

It is worthwhile to note again that the NQB designation and marking is intended to convey verifiable traffic behavior, as opposed to simply a desire for differentiated treatment. Also, it is important that incentives are aligned correctly, i.e. that there is a benefit to the application in marking its packets correctly, and a disadvantage (or at least no benefit) to an application in intentionally mismarking its traffic. Thus, a useful property of nodes (i.e. network switches and routers) that support separate queues for NQB and QB flows is that for NQB flows, the NQB queue provides better performance than the QB queue; and for QB flows, the QB queue provides better performance than the NQB queue (this is discussed further in this section and [Section 11](#)). By adhering to these principles, there is no incentive for senders to mismark their traffic as NQB, and further, any mismarking can be identified by the network.

#### 5.1. Primary Requirements

A node supporting the NQB PHB makes no guarantees on latency or data rate for NQB marked flows, but instead aims to provide a bound on queuing delay for as many such marked flows as it can, and shed load when needed.

A node supporting the NQB PHB MUST provide a queue for non-queue-building traffic separate from any queue used for queue-building traffic.

NQB traffic, in aggregate, SHOULD NOT be rate limited or rate policed separately from queue-building traffic of equivalent importance.

The NQB queue SHOULD be given equivalent forwarding preference compared to queue-building traffic of equivalent importance. The node SHOULD provide a scheduler that allows QB and NQB traffic of equivalent importance to share the link in a fair manner, e.g. a deficit round-robin scheduler with equal weights. Compliance with these recommendations helps to ensure that there are no incentives for QB traffic to be mismarked as NQB. In environments where mismarking is not a potential issue (e.g. a network where a marking policy is enforced by other means), these requirements may not be necessary.

A node supporting the NQB PHB SHOULD treat traffic marked as Default (DSCP=0) as QB traffic having equivalent importance to the NQB marked traffic. A node supporting the NQB DSCP MUST support the ability to configure the classification criteria that are used to identify QB and NQB traffic of equivalent importance.

The NQB queue SHOULD have a buffer size that is significantly smaller than the buffer provided for QB traffic (e.g. single-digit milliseconds). It is expected that most QB traffic is engineered to work well when the network provides a relatively deep buffer (e.g. on the order of tens or hundreds of ms) in nodes where support for the NQB PHB is advantageous (i.e. bottleneck nodes). Providing a similarly deep buffer for the NQB queue would be at cross purposes to providing very low queueing delay, and would erode the incentives for QB traffic to be marked correctly.

## **5.2. Traffic Protection**

It is possible that due to an implementation error or misconfiguration, a QB flow would end up getting mismarked as NQB, or vice versa. In the case of an NQB flow that isn't marked as NQB and ends up in the QB queue, it would only impact its own quality of service, and so it seems to be of lesser concern. However, a QB flow that is mismarked as NQB would cause queuing delays and/or loss for all of the other flows that are sharing the NQB queue.

To prevent this situation from harming the performance of the real NQB flows, network elements that support differentiating NQB traffic SHOULD support a "traffic protection" function that can identify QB flows that are mismarked as NQB, and either reclassify those flows/packets to the QB queue or discard the offending traffic. Such a function SHOULD be implemented in an objective and verifiable manner, basing its decisions upon the behavior of the flow rather than on application-layer constructs. It may be advantageous for a

traffic protection function to employ hysteresis to prevent borderline flows from being reclassified capriciously.

One example traffic protection algorithm can be found in [[I-D.briscoe-docsis-q-protection](#)].

There are some situations where such function may not be necessary. For example, a network element designed for use in controlled environments (e.g. enterprise LAN) may not require a traffic protection function. Additionally, some networks may prefer to police the application of the NQB DSCP at the ingress edge, so that in-network traffic protection is not needed.

### **5.3. Guidance for Very Low Rate Links**

The NQB sender requirements in [Section 4.1](#) place responsibility in the hands of the application developer to determine the likelihood that the application's sending behavior could result in a queue forming along the path. These requirements rely on application developers having a reasonable sense for the network context in which their application is to be deployed. Even so, there will undoubtedly be networks that contain links having a data rate that is below what is considered "typical", and even potentially below the instantaneous sending rate of certain NQB-marked applications.

To limit the consequences of this scenario, operators of such networks SHOULD utilize a traffic protection function that is more tolerant of burstiness (i.e. a temporary queue). Alternatively, operators of such networks MAY choose to disable NQB support on these low speed links. In particular, for links that are far below "typical" path rates, it is RECOMMENDED that NQB support be disabled.

## **6. Impact on Higher Layer Protocols**

Network elements that support the NQB PHB and that support traffic protection as discussed in the previous section introduce the possibility that flows classified into the NQB queue could experience out of order delivery or packet loss if their behavior is not consistent with NQB. This is particularly true if the traffic protection algorithm makes decisions on a packet-by-packet basis. In this scenario, a flow that is (mis)marked as NQB and that causes a queue to form in this bottleneck link could see some of its packets forwarded by the NQB queue, and some of them either discarded or redirected to the QB queue. In the case of redirection, depending on the queueing latency and scheduling within the network element, this could result in packets being delivered out of order. As a result, the use of the NQB DSCP by a higher layer protocol carries some risk that an increased amount of out of order delivery or packet loss

will be experienced. This characteristic provides one disincentive for mis-marking of traffic.

## **7. Configuration and Management**

As required above, nodes supporting the NQB PHB provide for the configuration of classifiers that can be used to differentiate between QB and NQB traffic of equivalent importance. The default for such classifiers is recommended to be the assigned NQB DSCP (to identify NQB traffic) and the Default (0) DSCP (to identify QB traffic).

## **8. Example Use Cases**

### **8.1. DOCSIS Access Networks**

Residential cable broadband Internet services are commonly configured with a single bottleneck link (the access network link) upon which the service definition is applied. The service definition, typically an upstream/downstream data rate tuple, is implemented as a configured pair of rate shapers that are applied to the user's traffic. In such networks, the quality of service that each application receives, and as a result, the quality of experience that it generates for the user is influenced by the characteristics of the access network link.

To support the NQB PHB, cable broadband services **MUST** be configured to provide a separate queue for NQB marked traffic. The NQB queue **MUST** be configured to share the service's rate shaped bandwidth with the queue for QB traffic.

### **8.2. Mobile Networks**

Historically, 3GPP mobile networks have utilised "bearers" to encapsulate each user's user plane traffic through the radio and core networks. A "dedicated bearer" may be allocated a Quality of Service (QoS) to apply any prioritisation to its flows at queues and radio schedulers. Typically an LTE operator provides a dedicated bearer for IMS VoLTE (Voice over LTE) traffic, which is prioritised in order to meet regulatory obligations for call completion rates; and a "best effort" default bearer, for Internet traffic. The "best effort" bearer provides no guarantees, and hence its buffering characteristics are not compatible with low-latency traffic. The 5G radio and core systems offer more flexibility over bearer allocation, meaning bearers can be allocated per traffic type (e.g. loss-tolerant, low-latency etc.) and hence support more suitable treatment of Internet real-time flows.

To support the NQB PHB, the mobile network **SHOULD** be configured to give UEs a dedicated, low-latency, non-GBR, EPS bearer, e.g. one

with QCI 7, in addition to the default EPS bearer; or a Data Radio Bearer with 5QI 7 in a 5G system (see Table 5.7.4-1: Standardized 5QI to QoS characteristics mapping in [[SA-5G](#)]).

A packet carrying the NQB DSCP SHOULD be routed through the dedicated low-latency EPS bearer. A packet that has no associated NQB marking SHOULD NOT be routed through the dedicated low-latency EPS bearer.

### **8.3. WiFi Networks**

WiFi networking equipment compliant with 802.11e/n/ac/ax [[IEEE802-11](#)] generally supports either four or eight transmit queues and four sets of associated Enhanced Multimedia Distributed Control Access (EDCA) parameters (corresponding to the four WiFi Multimedia (WMM) Access Categories) that are used to enable differentiated media access characteristics. As discussed in [[RFC8325](#)], most existing WiFi implementations use a default DSCP to User Priority mapping that utilizes the most significant three bits of the Diffserv Field to select "User Priority" which is then mapped to the four WMM Access Categories. [[RFC8325](#)] also provides an alternative mapping that more closely aligns with the DSCP recommendations provided by the IETF.

In addition to the requirements provided in other sections of this document, to support the NQB PHB, WiFi equipment (including equipment compliant with [[RFC8325](#)]) SHOULD map the NQB codepoint 45 into a separate queue in the same Access Category as the queue that carries default traffic (i.e. the Best Effort Access Category).

#### **8.3.1. Interoperability with Existing WiFi Networks**

While some existing WiFi equipment may be capable (in some cases via firmware update) of supporting the NQB PHB requirements, many currently deployed devices cannot be configured in this way. As a result the remainder of this section discusses interoperability with these existing WiFi networks, as opposed to PHB compliance.

In order to increase the likelihood that NQB traffic is provided a separate queue from QB traffic in existing WiFi equipment that uses the default mapping, the 45 code point is recommended for NQB. This maps NQB to UP\_5 which is in the "Video" Access Category. While this DSCP to User Priority mapping enables these WiFi systems to support the NQB PHB requirement for segregated queuing, it does not support the remaining NQB PHB requirements in [Section 5](#). The ramifications of, and remedies for this are discussed further below.

Existing WiFi devices are unlikely to support a traffic protection algorithm, so traffic mismarked as NQB is not likely to be detected and remedied by such devices.

Furthermore, in their default configuration, existing WiFi devices utilize EDCA parameters that result in statistical prioritization of the "Video" Access Category above the "Best Effort" Access Category. If left unchanged, this would violate the NQB PHB requirement for equal prioritization, and could erode the principle of alignment of incentives. In order to preserve the incentives principle for NQB, WiFi systems SHOULD be configured such that the EDCA parameters for the Video Access Category to match those of the Best Effort Access Category. This recommendation is presumably most applicable to WiFi systems deployed in a managed environment or those deployed by an ISP. In other situations (e.g. consumer-grade WiFi gear deployed by an ISP's customer) this configuration may not be possible, and the requirements and recommendations in [Section 4.3.1](#) would apply.

Similarly, systems that utilize [[RFC8325](#)] but that are unable to fully support the PHB requirements, SHOULD map the recommended NQB code point 45 (or the locally determined alternative) to UP\_5 in the "Video" Access Category.

## **9. Acknowledgements**

Thanks to Diego Lopez, Stuart Cheshire, Brian Carpenter, Bob Briscoe, Greg Skinner, Toke Hoeiland-Joergensen, Luca Muscariello, David Black, Sebastian Moeller, Ruediger Geib, Jerome Henry, Steven Blake, Jonathan Morton, Roland Bless, Kevin Smith, Martin Dolly, and Kyle Rose for their review comments. Thanks also to Gorrry Fairhurst, Ana Custura, and Ruediger Geib for their input on selection of appropriate DSCPs.

## **10. IANA Considerations**

This document requests that IANA assign the Differentiated Services Field Codepoints (DSCP) 5 ('0b000101', 0x05) and 45 ('0b101101', 0x2D) from the "Differentiated Services Field Codepoints (DSCP)" registry (<https://www.iana.org/assignments/dscp-registry/>) ("DSCP Pool 3 Codepoints", Codepoint Space xxxx01, Standards Action) as the RECOMMENDED codepoints for Non-Queue-Building behavior.

## **11. Security Considerations**

When the NQB PHB is fully supported in bottleneck links, there is no incentive for a queue-building application to mismark its packets as NQB (or vice versa). If a queue-building flow were to mark its packets as NQB, it would be unlikely to receive a benefit by doing so, and it could experience excessive packet loss, excessive latency variation and/or excessive out-of-order delivery (depending on the nature of the traffic protection function). If a non-queue-building flow were to fail to mark its packets as NQB, it could suffer the



latency and loss typical of sharing a queue with capacity seeking traffic.

In order to preserve low latency performance for NQB traffic, networks that support the NQB PHB will need to ensure that mechanisms are in place to prevent malicious NQB-marked traffic from causing excessive queue delays. This document recommends the implementation of a traffic protection mechanism to achieve this goal, but recognizes that other options may be more desirable in certain situations.

Notwithstanding the above, the choice of DSCP for NQB does allow existing WiFi networks to readily (and by default) support some of the PHB requirements, but without a traffic protection function, and (when left in the default state) by giving NQB traffic higher priority than QB traffic. This does open up the NQB marking to potential abuse on these WiFi links, but since these existing WiFi networks already give one quarter of the DSCP space this same treatment, and further they give another quarter of the DSCP space even higher priority, the NQB DSCP does not seem to be of any greater risk for abuse than these others.

The NQB signal is not integrity protected and could be flipped by an on-path attacker. This might negatively affect the QoS of the tampered flow.

## **12. References**

### **12.1. Normative References**

- [RFC0791]** Postel, J., "Internet Protocol", STD 5, RFC 791, DOI 10.17487/RFC0791, September 1981, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc791>>.
- [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>>.
- [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, DOI

10.17487/RFC2474, December 1998, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2474>>.

- [RFC2983] Black, D., "Differentiated Services and Tunnels", RFC 2983, DOI 10.17487/RFC2983, October 2000, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2983>>.
- [RFC8085] Eggert, L., Fairhurst, G., and G. Shepherd, "UDP Usage Guidelines", BCP 145, RFC 8085, DOI 10.17487/RFC8085, March 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8085>>.
- [RFC8174] Leiba, B., "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in RFC 2119 Key Words", BCP 14, RFC 8174, DOI 10.17487/RFC8174, May 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8174>>.
- [RFC8325] Szigeti, T., Henry, J., and F. Baker, "Mapping Diffserv to IEEE 802.11", RFC 8325, DOI 10.17487/RFC8325, February 2018, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8325>>.

## 12.2. Informative References

- [Barik] Barik, R., Welzl, M., Elmokashfi, A., Dreibholz, T., and S. Gjessing, "Can WebRTC QoS Work? A DSCP Measurement Study", ITC 30, September 2018.
- [Custura] Custura, A., Venne, A., and G. Fairhurst, "Exploring DSCP modification pathologies in mobile edge networks", TMA , 2017.
- [I-D.briscoe-docsis-q-protection] Briscoe, B. and G. White, "The DOCSIS(r) Queue Protection Algorithm to Preserve Low Latency", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-briscoe-docsis-q-protection-02, 31 January 2022, <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-briscoe-docsis-q-protection-02>>.
- [I-D.ietf-tsvwg-aqm-dualq-coupled] Schepper, K. D., Briscoe, B., and G. White, "DualQ Coupled AQMs for Low Latency, Low Loss and Scalable Throughput (L4S)", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-ietf-tsvwg-aqm-dualq-coupled-21, 1 February 2022, <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-tsvwg-aqm-dualq-coupled-21>>.
- [I-D.ietf-tsvwg-dscp-considerations] Custura, A., Fairhurst, G., and R. Secchi, "Considerations for Assigning a new Recommended DiffServ Codepoint (DSCP)", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-ietf-tsvwg-dscp-considerations-01, 24 January 2022, <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-tsvwg-dscp-considerations-01>>.

**[I-D.ietf-tsvwg-ecn-l4s-id]**

Schepper, K. D. and B. Briscoe,  
"Explicit Congestion Notification (ECN) Protocol for Very  
Low Queuing Delay (L4S)", Work in Progress, Internet-  
Draft, draft-ietf-tsvwg-ecn-l4s-id-24, 1 February 2022,  
<<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-tsvwg-ecn-l4s-id-24>>.

**[I-D.ietf-tsvwg-l4s-arch]** Briscoe, B., Schepper, K. D., Bagnulo, M.,  
and G. White, "Low Latency, Low Loss, Scalable Throughput  
(L4S) Internet Service: Architecture", Work in Progress,  
Internet-Draft, draft-ietf-tsvwg-l4s-arch-16, 1 February  
2022, <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-tsvwg-l4s-arch-16>>.

**[IEEE802-11]** IEEE-SA, "IEEE 802.11-2020", IEEE 802, December 2020,  
<[https://standards.ieee.org/standard/802\\_11-2020.html](https://standards.ieee.org/standard/802_11-2020.html)>.

**[RFC2475]** Blake, S., Black, D., Carlson, M., Davies, E., Wang, Z.,  
and W. Weiss, "An Architecture for Differentiated  
Services", RFC 2475, DOI 10.17487/RFC2475, December 1998,  
<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2475>>.

**[RFC3551]** Schulzrinne, H. and S. Casner, "RTP Profile for Audio and  
Video Conferences with Minimal Control", STD 65, RFC  
3551, DOI 10.17487/RFC3551, July 2003, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3551>>.

**[RFC4594]** Babiarz, J., Chan, K., and F. Baker, "Configuration  
Guidelines for DiffServ Service Classes", RFC 4594, DOI  
10.17487/RFC4594, August 2006, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4594>>.

**[RFC5127]** Chan, K., Babiarz, J., and F. Baker, "Aggregation of  
Diffserv Service Classes", RFC 5127, DOI 10.17487/  
RFC5127, February 2008, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5127>>.

**[RFC7893]** Stein, Y(J)., Black, D., and B. Briscoe, "Pseudowire  
Congestion Considerations", RFC 7893, DOI 10.17487/  
RFC7893, June 2016, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7893>>.

**[RFC8033]** Pan, R., Natarajan, P., Baker, F., and G. White,  
"Proportional Integral Controller Enhanced (PIE): A  
Lightweight Control Scheme to Address the Bufferbloat

Problem", RFC 8033, DOI 10.17487/RFC8033, February 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8033>>.

[RFC8034] White, G. and R. Pan, "Active Queue Management (AQM) Based on Proportional Integral Controller Enhanced PIE for Data-Over-Cable Service Interface Specifications (DOCSIS) Cable Modems", RFC 8034, DOI 10.17487/RFC8034, February 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8034>>.

[RFC8083] Perkins, C. and V. Singh, "Multimedia Congestion Control: Circuit Breakers for Unicast RTP Sessions", RFC 8083, DOI 10.17487/RFC8083, March 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8083>>.

[RFC8100] Geib, R., Ed. and D. Black, "Diffserv-Interconnection Classes and Practice", RFC 8100, DOI 10.17487/RFC8100, March 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8100>>.

[RFC8289] Nichols, K., Jacobson, V., McGregor, A., Ed., and J. Iyengar, Ed., "Controlled Delay Active Queue Management", RFC 8289, DOI 10.17487/RFC8289, January 2018, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8289>>.

[RFC8290] Hoeiland-Joergensen, T., McKeeney, P., Taht, D., Gettys, J., and E. Dumazet, "The Flow Queue CoDel Packet Scheduler and Active Queue Management Algorithm", RFC 8290, DOI 10.17487/RFC8290, January 2018, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8290>>.

[SA-5G] 3GPP, "System Architecture for 5G", TS 23.501, 2019.

## Appendix A. DSCP Remarking Pathologies

Some network operators typically bleach (zero out) the Diffserv field on ingress into their network [[I-D.ietf-tsvwg-dscp-considerations](#)][[Custura](#)][[Barik](#)], and in some cases apply their own DSCP for internal usage. Bleaching the NQB DSCP is not expected to cause harm to default traffic, but it will severely limit the ability to provide NQB treatment end-to-end. Reports on existing deployments of DSCP manipulation [[Custura](#)][[Barik](#)] categorize the re-marking behaviors into the following six policies: bleach all traffic (set DSCP to zero), set the top three bits (the former Precedence bits) on all traffic to 0b000, 0b001, or 0b010, set the low three bits on all traffic to 0b000, or remark all traffic to a particular (non-zero) DSCP value.

Regarding the DSCP values of 5 & 45, there were no observations of DSCP manipulation reported in which traffic was marked 5 or 45 by any of these policies. Thus it appears that these re-marking policies would be unlikely to result in QB traffic being marked as

NQB (45). In terms of the fate of NQB-marked traffic that is subjected to one of these policies, the result would be that NQB marked traffic would be indistinguishable from some subset (possibly all) of other traffic. In the policies where all traffic is remarked using the same (zero or non-zero) DSCP, the ability for a subsequent network hop to differentiate NQB traffic via DSCP would clearly be lost entirely.

In the policies where the top three bits are overwritten, both NQB values (5 & 45) would receive the same marking as would the currently unassigned Pool 3 DSCPs 13,21,29,37,53,61, with all of these code points getting mapped to DSCP=5, 13 or 21 (depending on the overwrite value used). Since none of the DSCPs in the preceding lists are currently assigned by IANA, and they all are set aside for Standards Action, it is believed that they are not widely used currently, but this may vary based on local-usage.

For the policy in which the low three bits are set to 0b000, the NQB (45) value would be mapped to CS5 and would be indistinguishable from CS5, VA, EF (and the unassigned DSCPs 41, 42, 43). Traffic marked using the existing standardized DSCPs in this list are likely to share the same general properties as NQB traffic (non capacity-seeking, very low data rate or relatively low and consistent data rate). Similarly, any future recommended usage for DSCPs 41, 42, 43 would likely be somewhat compatible with NQB treatment, assuming that IP Precedence compatibility (see [Section 1.5.4](#) of [\[RFC4594\]](#)) is maintained in the future. Here there may be an opportunity for a node to provide the NQB PHB or the CS5 PHB to CS5-marked traffic and retain some of the benefits of NQB marking. This could be another motivation to (as discussed in [Section 4.2](#)) classify CS5-marked traffic into NQB queue. For this same re-marking policy, the NQB (5) value would be mapped to CS0/default and would be indistinguishable from CS0, LE (and the unassigned DSCPs 2,3,4,6,7). In this case, NQB traffic is likely to be given default treatment in all subsequent nodes, which would eliminate the ability to provide NQB treatment in those nodes, but would be relatively harmless otherwise.

## Authors' Addresses

Greg White  
CableLabs

Email: [g.white@cablelabs.com](mailto:g.white@cablelabs.com)

Thomas Fossati  
ARM

Email: [Thomas.Fossati@arm.com](mailto:Thomas.Fossati@arm.com)