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

Table of Contents

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 queuing 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
   queuing 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 queueuing
   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 queuing 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 bandwith 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) and by the desire to make

implementation of the PHB simpler in network gear that has the ability to classify traffic based on ranges of DSCP value (see Section 4.2 for further discussion). 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. In end systems where the choice of using DSCP 45 is not available to the application, the CS5 DSCP (40 decimal) could be used as a fallback. See Section 4.2 for rationale as to why this choice could be fruitful.

If the application's traffic exceeds more than a few packets per RTT, or exceeds a fairly small fraction of 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 could instead consider implementing a low latency congestion control mechanism as described in [I-D.ietf-tsvwg-ecn-l4s-id]. At the time of writing, it is believed that 1 Mbps is a reasonable upper bound on instantaneous traffic rate for an NQB-marked application, 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. This is particularly useful in cases where specialized PHBs for these other service classes are not provided. 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). Or, in some networks, equipment limitations may necessitate aggregating all traffic marked with DSCPs 40-47 (i.e., whose three MSBs are 0b101). As noted in [Section 4.1](#), the choice of the value 45 is motivated in part by the desire to make this aggregation simpler in network equipment that can classify packets via comparing the DSCP value to a range of configured values.

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.

If NQB support is extended across a DiffServ domain boundary, the
interconnected networks agreeing to support NQB SHOULD use the value
45 for NQB at network interconnection, unless a different DSCP is
explicitly documented in the TCA (Traffic Conditioning Agreement,
see [RFC2475]) for that interconnection. Similar to the handling of
DSCPs for other PHBs (and as discussed in [RFC2475]), networks can
re-mark NQB traffic to a DSCP other than 45 for internal usage. To
ensure reliable end-to-end NQB PHB treatment, the appropriate NQB
DSCP should be restored when forwarding to another network.

In order to enable interoperability with WiFi equipment as described
in Section 8.3.1, networks SHOULD ensure NQB traffic is marked DSCP
45 prior to a customer access link, subject to the safeguards
described below and in that section.

4.3.1. Unmanaged Networks

As discussed in Section 4 of [RFC2475], there may be cases where a
network operator is delivering traffic into a network outside of
their control, where there is no knowledge of the traffic management
capabilities of the downstream domain, and no agreement in place
(e.g. a residential ISP delivering traffic to a customer's home
network). In such cases, the network operator should presume that
the existing network equipment in the downstream domain might
prioritize traffic marked with the NQB DSCP, and that it likely does
not support the safeguards that are provided by the NQB PHB
requirements. In these cases, the network operator SHOULD take
precautions to prevent issues that could be caused by excessive NQB
traffic and/or traffic mismarked as NQB.

Network equipment that is intended to deliver traffic into such
unmanaged networks (e.g. an access network gateway for a residential
ISP) SHOULD by default ensure that NQB traffic is re-marked with a
DSCP that is unlikely to result in prioritized treatment in the
downstream domain, such as DSCP 0 (Default). Such equipment SHOULD
support the ability to configure the re-marking, so that (when
appropriate safeguards are in place) traffic can be delivered as
NQB-marked. As an alternative to re-marking, the operator could
deploy a traffic protection (see Section 5.2) or policing function
on NQB marked traffic that minimizes the potential for negative
impacts on Default traffic, for example by limiting the rate of NQB
traffic to a set fraction of the interconnection data rate, with
excess NQB traffic being either dropped or re-marked as Default.

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.

In some cases, existing network gear has been deployed that cannot
readily be upgraded or configured to support the PHB requirements.
This equipment may however be capable of loosely supporting an NQB
service - see Section 8.3.1 for details and an example where this is
particularly important. A similar approach may prove necessary in
other network environments.

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 is RECOMMENDED that traffic protection algorithms base their decisions on the detection of actual queuing, as opposed to simply packet arrival rates. 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 the lower end of what is considered "typical", and some of these links may even be below the instantaneous sending rate of some 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 (and thus aggregate NQB marked traffic with Default traffic) 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 mismarking 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 the case of some managed WiFi gear, this
mapping can be controlled by the network operator, e.g. via TR-369
[TR-369].

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 match those of the Best Effort Access Category. This recommendation is primarily applicable to WiFi systems deployed in a managed environment or those deployed by an ISP, and is intended for situations when the vast majority of traffic that would use AC_VI is NQB. 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 Gorry 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 Codepoint (DSCP) 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 codepoint for Non-Queue-Building behavior.

IANA should update this registry as follows:

   *Name: NQB

   *Value (Binary): 101101

   *Value (Decimal): 45

   *Reference: this document

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

[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-06, 13 May 2022, <https://
             www.ietf.org/archive/id/draft-briscoe-docsis-q-
             protection-06.txt>.

[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-25, 29

August 2022, <https://www.ietf.org/archive/id/draft-ietf-tsvwg-aqm-dualq-coupled-25.txt>.

[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-05,
          10 August 2022, <https://www.ietf.org/archive/id/draft-
          ietf-tsvwg-dscp-considerations-05.txt>.

[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-29, 29 August 2022,
          <https://www.ietf.org/archive/id/draft-ietf-tsvwg-ecn-
          l4s-id-29.txt>.

[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-20, 29 August
          2022, <https://www.ietf.org/archive/id/draft-ietf-tsvwg-
          l4s-arch-20.txt>.

[IEEE802-11] IEEE-SA, "IEEE 802.11-2020", IEEE 802, December 2020,
          <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., McKenney, 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.

[TR-369]   Broadband Forum, "The User Services Platform", January
            2022, <https://usp.technology/specification/index.html>.

Appendix A. DSCP Re-marking Policies

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 re-mark all traffic to a
particular (non-zero) DSCP value.

Regarding the DSCP value 45, there were no observations of DSCP
manipulation reported in which traffic was marked 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 re-marked 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 (see
Section 4.2 of [I-D.ietf-tsvwg-dscp-considerations]), the NQB value
(45) would receive the same marking as would the currently
unassigned Pool 3 DSCPs 5,13,21,29,37,53,61, with all of these code
points getting re-marked 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 reserved for
Standards Action, it is believed that they are not widely used
currently, but this may vary based on local-usage, and could change
in the future. If networks in which this sort of re-marking occurs
(or networks downstream) classify the resulting code point (i.e. 5,
13, or 21) to the NQB PHB, or re-mark such traffic as 45, they risk
treating as NQB other traffic, which was not originally marked as
NQB. In addition, as described in Section 6 of [I-D.ietf-tsvwg-dscp-
considerations] future assignments of these 0bxxx101 code points
would need to be made with consideration of the potential that they
all are treated as NQB in some networks.

For the policy in which the low three bits are set to 0b000, the NQB
(45) value would be re-marked 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.

Authors' Addresses

Greg White
CableLabs

Email: g.white@cablelabs.com

Thomas Fossati
ARM

Email: Thomas.Fossati@arm.com