

Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: September 1, 2016

P. Jones
S. Dhesikan
C. Jennings
Cisco Systems
D. Druta
AT&T
February 29, 2016

DSCP and other packet markings for WebRTC QoS
draft-ietf-tsvwg-rtcweb-qos-13

Abstract

Many networks, such as service provider and enterprise networks, can provide different forwarding treatments for individual packets based on Differentiated Services Code Point (DSCP) values on a per-hop basis. This document provides the recommended DSCP values for web browsers to use for various classes of WebRTC traffic.

Status of This Memo

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

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

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

This Internet-Draft will expire on September 1, 2016.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2016 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to [BCP 78](#) and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must

include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	2
2.	Relation to Other Specifications	3
3.	Terminology	4
4.	Inputs	4
5.	DSCP Mappings	5
6.	Security Considerations	7
7.	IANA Considerations	7
8.	Downward References	7
9.	Acknowledgements	7
10.	Dedication	8
11.	Document History	8
12.	References	8
12.1.	Normative References	8
12.2.	Informative References	9
	Authors' Addresses	9

[1.](#) Introduction

Differentiated Services Code Point (DSCP) [[RFC2474](#)] packet marking can help provide QoS in some environments. This specification provides default packet marking for browsers that support WebRTC applications, but does not change any advice or requirements in existing IETF RFCs. The contents of this specification are intended to be a simple set of implementation recommendations based on the previous RFCs.

There are many use cases where such marking does not help, but it seldom makes things worse if packets are marked appropriately. There are some environments where DSCP markings frequently help, though. These include:

1. Private, wide-area networks.
2. Residential Networks. If the congested link is the broadband uplink in a cable or DSL scenario, often residential routers/NAT support preferential treatment based on DSCP.
3. Wireless Networks. If the congested link is a local wireless network, marking may help.

DSCP values are in principle site specific, with each site selecting its own code points for controlling per-hop-behavior to influence the

QoS for transport-layer flows. However in the WebRTC use cases, the browsers need to set them to something when there is no site specific information. In this document, "browsers" is used synonymously with "Interactive User Agent" as defined in the HTML specification, [\[W3C.REC-html5-20141028\]](#). This document describes a subset of DSCP code point values drawn from existing RFCs and common usage for use with WebRTC applications. These code points are solely defaults.

This specification defines inputs that are provided by the WebRTC application hosted in the browser that aid the browser in determining how to set the various packet markings. The specification also defines the mapping from abstract QoS policies (flow type, priority level) to those packet markings.

2. Relation to Other Specifications

This document is a complement to [\[RFC7657\]](#), which describes the interaction between DSCP and real-time communications. That RFC covers the implications of using various DSCP values, particularly focusing on Real-time Transport Protocol (RTP) [\[RFC3550\]](#) streams that are multiplexed onto a single transport-layer flow.

There are a number of guidelines specified in [\[RFC7657\]](#) that apply to marking traffic sent by WebRTC applications, as it is common for multiple RTP streams to be multiplexed on the same transport-layer flow. Generally, the RTP streams would be marked with a value as appropriate from Table 1. A WebRTC application might also multiplex data channel [\[I-D.ietf-rtcweb-data-channel\]](#) traffic over the same 5-tuple as RTP streams, which would also be marked as per that table. The guidance in [\[RFC7657\]](#) says that all data channel traffic would be marked with a single value that is typically different than the value(s) used for RTP streams multiplexed with the data channel traffic over the same 5-tuple, assuming RTP streams are marked with a value other than default forwarding (DF). This is expanded upon further in the next section.

This specification does not change or override the advice in any other standards about setting packet markings. Rather, it simply selects a subset of DSCP values that is relevant in the WebRTC context.

The DSCP value set by the endpoint is not trusted by the network. In addition, the DSCP value may be remarked at any place in the network for a variety of reasons to any other DSCP value, including default forwarding (DF) value to provide basic best effort service. Even so, there is benefit in marking traffic even if it only benefits the first few hops. The implications are discussed in Section 3.2 of [\[RFC7657\]](#). Further, a mitigation for such action is through an

authorization mechanism. Such an authorization mechanism is outside the scope of this document.

3. Terminology

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

4. Inputs

WebRTC applications send and receive two types of flows of significance to this document:

- o media flows which are RTP streams [\[I-D.ietf-rtcweb-rtp-usage\]](#)
- o data flows which are data channels [\[I-D.ietf-rtcweb-data-channel\]](#)

Each of the RTP streams and distinct data channels consists of all of the packets associated with an independent media entity, so an RTP stream or distinct data channel is not always equivalent to a transport-layer flow defined by a 5-tuple (source address, destination address, source port, destination port, and protocol). There may be multiple RTP streams and data channels multiplexed over the same 5-tuple, with each having a different level of importance to the application and, therefore, potentially marked using different DSCP values than another RTP stream or data channel within the same transport-layer flow. (Note that there are restrictions with respect to marking different data channels carried within the same SCTP association as outlined in [Section 5](#).)

The following are the inputs provided by the WebRTC application to the browser:

- o Flow Type: The browser provides this input as it knows if the flow is audio, interactive video with or without audio, non-interactive video with or without audio, or data.
- o Application Priority: Another input is the relative importance of an RTP stream or data channel. Many applications have multiple flows of the same Flow Type and often some flows are more important than others. For example, in a video conference where there are usually audio and video flows, the audio flow may be more important than the video flow. JavaScript applications can tell the browser whether a particular flow is high, medium, low or very low importance to the application.

[I-D.ietf-rtcweb-transports] defines in more detail what an individual flow is within the WebRTC context and priorities for media and data flows.

5. DSCP Mappings

The DSCP values for each flow type of interest to WebRTC based on application priority are shown in the following table. These values are based on the framework and recommended values in [RFC4594]. A web browser SHOULD use these values to mark the appropriate media packets. More information on EF can be found in [RFC3246]. More information on AF can be found in [RFC2597]. DF is default forwarding which provides the basic best effort service [RFC2474].

Flow Type	Very Low	Low	Medium	High
Audio	CS1 (8)	DF (0)	EF (46)	EF (46)
Interactive Video with or without audio	CS1 (8)	DF (0)	AF42, AF43 (36, 38)	AF41, AF42 (34, 36)
Non-Interactive Video with or without audio	CS1 (8)	DF (0)	AF32, AF33 (28, 30)	AF31, AF32 (26, 28)
Data	CS1 (8)	DF (0)	AF11	AF21

Table 1: Recommended DSCP Values for WebRTC Applications

The application priority, indicated by the columns "very low", "low", "Medium", and "high", signifies the relative importance of the flow within the application. It is an input that the browser receives to assist in selecting the DSCP value and adjusting the network transport behavior.

The above table assumes that packets marked with CS1 are treated as "less than best effort". However, the treatment of CS1 is implementation dependent. If an implementation treats CS1 as other than "less than best effort", then the actual priority (or, more precisely, the per-hop-behavior) of the packets may be changed from what is intended. It is common for CS1 to be treated the same as DF, so applications and browsers using CS1 cannot assume that CS1 will be treated differently than DF [RFC7657]. However, it is also possible

per [\[RFC2474\]](#) for CS1 traffic to be given better treatment than DF, thus caution should be exercised when electing to use CS1.

Implementers should also note that excess EF traffic is dropped. This could mean that a packet marked as EF may not get through as opposed to a packet marked with a different DSCP value. This is not a flaw, but how excess EF traffic is intended to be treated.

The browser SHOULD first select the flow type of the flow. Within the flow type, the relative importance of the flow SHOULD be used to select the appropriate DSCP value.

The combination of flow type and application priority provides specificity and helps in selecting the right DSCP value for the flow. All packets within a flow SHOULD have the same application priority. In some cases, the selected application priority cell may have multiple DSCP values, such as AF41 and AF42. These offer different drop precedences. The different drop precedence values provides additional granularity in classifying packets within a flow. For example, in a video conference, the video flow may have medium application priority. If so, either AF42 or AF43 may be selected. If the I-frames in the stream are more important than the P-frames, then the I-frames can be marked with AF42 and the P-frames marked with AF43.

It is worth noting that the application priority is utilized by the coupled congestion control mechanism for media flows per [\[I-D.ietf-rmcat-coupled-cc\]](#) and the SCTP scheduler for data channel traffic per [\[I-D.ietf-rtcweb-data-channel\]](#).

For reasons discussed in [Section 6 of \[RFC7657\]](#), if multiple flows are multiplexed using a reliable transport (e.g., TCP) then all of the packets for all flows multiplexed over that transport-layer flow MUST be marked using the same DSCP value. Likewise, all WebRTC data channel packets transmitted over an SCTP association MUST be marked using the same DSCP value, regardless of how many data channels (streams) exist or what kind of traffic is carried over the various SCTP streams. In the event that the browser wishes to change the DSCP value in use for an SCTP association, it MUST reset the SCTP congestion controller after changing values. Frequent changes in the DSCP value used for an SCTP association are discouraged, though, as this would defeat any attempts at effectively managing congestion. It should also be noted that any change in DSCP value that results in a reset of the congestion controller puts the SCTP association back into slow start, which may have undesirable effects on application performance.

For the data channel traffic multiplexed over an SCTP association, it is RECOMMENDED that the DSCP value selected be the one associated with the highest priority requested for all data channels multiplexed over the SCTP association. Likewise, when multiplexing multiple flows over a TCP connection, the DSCP value selected should be the one associated with the highest priority requested for all multiplexed flows.

If a packet enters a network that has no support for a flow type-application priority combination specified in Table 1 (above), then the network node at the edge will remark the DSCP value based on policies. This could result in the flow not getting the network treatment it expects based on the original DSCP value in the packet. Subsequently, if the packet enters a network that supports a larger number of these combinations, there may not be sufficient information in the packet to restore the original markings. Mechanisms for restoring such original DSCP is outside the scope of this document.

In summary, DSCP marking provides neither guarantees nor promised levels of service. However, DSCP marking is expected to provide a statistical improvement in real-time service as a whole. The service provided to a packet is dependent upon the network design along the path, as well as the network conditions at every hop.

6. Security Considerations

This specification does not add any additional security implication other than the normal application use of DSCP not already addressed by the following specifications. For security implications on use of DSCP, please refer to [Section 7 of \[RFC7657\]](#) and [Section 6 of \[RFC4594\]](#). Please also see [\[I-D.ietf-rtcweb-security\]](#) as an additional reference.

7. IANA Considerations

This specification does not require any actions from IANA.

8. Downward References

This specification contains a downwards reference to [\[RFC4594\]](#). However, the parts of that RFC used by this specification are sufficiently stable for this downward reference.

9. Acknowledgements

Thanks to David Black, Magnus Westerland, Paolo Severini, Jim Hasselbrook, Joe Marcus, Erik Nordmark, Michael Tuexen, and Brian Carpenter for their invaluable input.

10. Dedication

This document is dedicated to the memory of James Polk, a long-time friend and colleague. James made important contributions to this specification, including being one of its primary authors. The IETF global community mourns his loss and he will be missed dearly.

11. Document History

Note to RFC Editor: Please remove this section.

This document was originally an individual submission in RTCWeb WG. The RTCWeb working group selected it to become a WG document. Later the transport ADs requested that this be moved to the TSVWG WG as that seemed to be a better match.

12. References

12.1. Normative References

- [I-D.ietf-rtcweb-data-channel]
Jesup, R., Loreto, S., and M. Tuexen, "WebRTC Data Channels", [draft-ietf-rtcweb-data-channel-13](#) (work in progress), January 2015.
- [I-D.ietf-rtcweb-rtp-usage]
Perkins, C., Westerlund, M., and J. Ott, "Web Real-Time Communication (WebRTC): Media Transport and Use of RTP", [draft-ietf-rtcweb-rtp-usage-25](#) (work in progress), June 2015.
- [I-D.ietf-rtcweb-security]
Rescorla, E., "Security Considerations for WebRTC", [draft-ietf-rtcweb-security-08](#) (work in progress), February 2015.
- [I-D.ietf-rtcweb-transports]
Alvestrand, H., "Transports for WebRTC", [draft-ietf-rtcweb-transports-11](#) (work in progress), January 2016.
- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), DOI 10.17487/[RFC2119](#), March 1997,
<<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.
- [RFC4594] Babiarz, J., Chan, K., and F. Baker, "Configuration Guidelines for DiffServ Service Classes", [RFC 4594](#), DOI 10.17487/[RFC4594](#), August 2006,
<<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4594>>.

- [RFC7657] Black, D., Ed. and P. Jones, "Differentiated Services (Diffserv) and Real-Time Communication", [RFC 7657](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7657, November 2015, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7657>>.

12.2. Informative References

- [I-D.ietf-rmcat-coupled-cc] Islam, S., Welzl, M., and S. Gjessing, "Coupled congestion control for RTP media", [draft-ietf-rmcat-coupled-cc-00](#) (work in progress), September 2015.
- [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, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2474>>.
- [RFC2597] Heinanen, J., Baker, F., Weiss, W., and J. Wroclawski, "Assured Forwarding PHB Group", [RFC 2597](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC2597, June 1999, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2597>>.
- [RFC3246] Davie, B., Charny, A., Bennet, J., Benson, K., Le Boudec, J., Courtney, W., Davari, S., Firoiu, V., and D. Stiliadis, "An Expedited Forwarding PHB (Per-Hop Behavior)", [RFC 3246](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC3246, March 2002, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3246>>.
- [RFC3550] Schulzrinne, H., Casner, S., Frederick, R., and V. Jacobson, "RTP: A Transport Protocol for Real-Time Applications", STD 64, [RFC 3550](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC3550, July 2003, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3550>>.
- [W3C.REC-html5-20141028] Hickson, I., Berjon, R., Faulkner, S., Leithead, T., Navara, E., O'Connor, E., and S. Pfeiffer, "HTML5", World Wide Web Consortium Recommendation REC-html5-20141028, October 2014, <<http://www.w3.org/TR/2014/REC-html5-20141028>>.

Authors' Addresses

Paul E. Jones
Cisco Systems

Email: paulej@packetizer.com

Subha Dhesikan
Cisco Systems

Email: sdhesika@cisco.com

Cullen Jennings
Cisco Systems

Email: fluffy@cisco.com

Dan Druta
AT&T

Email: dd5826@att.com