Tools for the Evaluation of Simulation and Testbed Scenarios

Status of this Memo

Abstract

    This document describes tools for the evaluation of simulation and
    testbed scenarios used in research on Internet congestion control
    mechanisms. We believe that research in congestion control
    mechanisms has been seriously hampered by the lack of good models
    underpinning analysis, simulation, and testbed experiments, and that
    tools for the evaluation of simulation and testbed scenarios can
    help in the construction of better scenarios, based on better

underlying models. One use of the tools described in this document
is in comparing key characteristics of test scenarios with known
characteristics from the diverse and ever-changing real world.
Tools characterizing the aggregate traffic on a link include the
distribution of per-packet round-trip times, the distribution of
packet sequence numbers, and the like. Tools characterizing end-to-
end paths include drop rates as a function of packet size and of
burst size, the synchronization ratio between two end-to-end TCP
flows, and the like. For each characteristic, we describe what
aspects of the scenario determine this characteristic, how the
characteristic can affect the results of simulations and experiments
for the evaluation of congestion control mechanisms, and what is
known about this characteristic in the real world. We also explain
why the use of such tools can add considerable power to our
understanding and evaluation of simulation and testbed scenarios.

Table of Contents

TO BE DELETED BY THE RFC EDITOR UPON PUBLICATION:

 Changes from draft-irtf-tmrg-tools-01.txt:
 * Added section on "Drop Rates as a Function of Sending Rate."

 * Added a number of new references.

1. Introduction

This document discusses tools for the evaluation of simulation and
testbed scenarios used in research on Internet congestion control
mechanisms. These tools include but are not limited to measurement
tools; the tools discussed in this document are largely ways of
characterizing aggregate traffic on a link, or characterizing the
end-to-end path. One use of these tools is for understanding key
characteristics of test scenarios; many characteristics, such as the
distribution of per-packet round-trip times on the link, don't come
from a single input parameter but are determined by a range of
inputs. A second use of the tools is to compare key characteristics
of test scenarios with what is known of the same characteristics of
the past and current Internet, and with what can be conjectured
about these characteristics of future networks. This paper follows
the general approach from "Internet Research Needs Better Models"
[FK02].

As an example of the power of tools for characterizing scenarios, a
great deal is known about the distribution of connection sizes on a
link, or equivalently, the distribution of per-packet sequence
numbers. It has been conjectured that a heavy-tailed distribution
of connection sizes is an invariant feature of Internet traffic. A
test scenario with mostly long-lived traffic, or with a mix with
only long-lived and very short flows, does not have a realistic
distribution of connection sizes, and can give unrealistic results
in simulations or experiments evaluating congestion control
mechanisms. For instance, the distribution of packet sequence
numbers makes clear the fraction of traffic on a link from medium-
sized connections, e.g., with packet sequence numbers from 100 to
1000. These medium-sized connections can slow-start up to a large
congestion window, possibly coming to an abrupt stop soon
afterwards, contributing significantly to the burstiness of the
aggregate traffic, and to the problems facing congestion control.

In the sections below we will discuss a number of tools for
describing and evaluating scenarios, show how these characteristics
can affect the results of research on congestion control mechanisms,
and summarize what is known about these characteristics in real-
world networks.

2. Conventions

   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 [RFC 2119].

3. Tools

   The tools or characteristics that we discuss are the following.

3.1. Characterizing Aggregate Traffic on a Link

   o Distribution of per-packet round-trip times.

   o Distribution of packet sequence numbers.

   o Distribution of packet sizes.

   o Ratio between forward-path and reverse-path traffic.

   o Distribution of peak flow rates.

   o Distribution of transport protocols.

3.2. Characterizing an End-to-End Path

   o Synchronization ratio.

   o Drop rates as a function of packet size.

   o Drop rates as a function of burst size.

   o Drop rates as a function of sending rate.

   o Degree of packet drops.

   o Range of queueing delay.

3.3. Other Characteristics

   o Congestion control mechanisms for traffic, along with sender and
      receiver buffer sizes.

   o Characterization of congested links in terms of bandwidth and
      typical levels of congestion (in terms of packet drop rates).

   o Characterization of congested links in terms of buffer size.

    o Characterization of challenging lower layers in terms of
       reordering, delay variation, packet corruption, and the like.

    o Characterization of network changes affecting congestion, such as
       routing changes or link outages.

    Below we will discuss each characteristic in turn, giving the
    definition, the factors determining that characteristic, the effect
    on congestion control metrics, and what is known so far from
    measurement studies in the Internet.

[4](#). **Distribution of per-packet round-trip times**

    Definition: The distribution of per-packet round-trip times on a
    link is defined formally by assigning to each packet the most recent
    round trip time measured for that end-to-end connection. In
    practice, coarse-grained information is generally sufficient, even
    though it has been shown that there is significant variability in
    round-trip times within a TCP connection [[AKSJ03](#)], and it is
    sufficient to assign to each packet the first round-trip time
    measurement for that connection, or to assign the current round-trip
    time estimate maintained by the TCP connection.

    Determining factors: The distribution of per-packet round-trip times
    on a link is determined by end-to-end propagation delays, by
    queueing delays along end-to-end paths, and by the congestion
    control mechanisms used by the traffic. For example, for a scenario
    using TCP, TCP connections with smaller round-trip times will
    receive a proportionally larger fraction of traffic than competing
    TCP connections with larger round-trip times, all else being equal,
    due to the dynamics of TCP favoring flows with smaller round-trip
    times. This will generally shift the distribution of per-packet
    RTTs lower relative to the distribution of per-connection RTTs,
    since short-RTT connections will have more packets.

    Effect on congestion control metrics: The distribution of per-packet
    round-trip times on a link affects the burstiness of the aggregate
    traffic, and therefore can affect congestion control performance in
    a range of areas such as delay/throughput tradeoffs. The
    distribution of per-packet round-trip times can also affect metrics
    of fairness, degree of oscillations, and the like. For example,
    long-term oscillations of queueing delay are more likely to occur in
    scenarios with a narrow range of round-trip times [[FK02](#)].

    Measurements: The distribution of per-packet round-trip times for
    TCP traffic on a link can be measured from a packet trace with the
    passive TCP round-trip time estimator from Jiang and Dovrolis

[JD02]. [Add pointers to other estimators, such as ones mentioned
in JD02. Add a pointer to Mark Allman's loss detection tool.]
Their paper shows the distribution of per-packet round-trip times
for TCP packets for a number of different links. For the links
measured, the percent of packets with round-trip times at most
100 ms ranged from 30% to 80%, and the percent of packets with
round-trip times at most 200 ms ranged from 55% to 90%, depending on
the link.

In the NS simulator, the distribution of per-packet round-trip times
for TCP packets on a link can be reported by the queue monitor,
using TCP's estimated round-trip time added to packet headers. This
is illustrated in the validation test "./test-all-simple stats3" in
the directory tcl/test.

Scenarios: [FK02] shows a relatively simple scenario, with a
dumbbell topology with four access links on each end, that gives a
fairly realistic range of round-trip times. [Look for the other
citations to add.]

5. Distribution of packet sequence numbers

Definition: The distribution of packet sequence numbers on a link is
defined by giving each packet a sequence number, where the first
packet in a connection has sequence number 1, the second packet has
sequence number 2, and so on. The distribution of packet sequence
numbers can be derived in a straightforward manner from the
distribution of connection sizes, and vice versa; however, the
distribution of connection sizes is more suited for traffic
generators, and the distribution of packet sequence numbers is more
suited for measuring and illustrating the packets actually seen on a
link over a fixed interval of time. There has been a considerably
body of research over the last ten years on the heavy-tailed
distribution of connection sizes for traffic on the Internet.
[CBC95] [Add citations.]

Determining factors: The distribution of connection sizes is largely
determined by the traffic generators used in a scenario. For
example, is there a single traffic generator characterized by a
distribution of connection sizes? A mix of long-lived and web
traffic, with the web traffic characterized by a distribution of
connection sizes? Or something else?

Effect on congestion control metrics: The distribution of packet
sequence numbers affects the burstiness of aggregate traffic on a
link, thereby affecting all congestion control metrics for which
this is a factor. As an example, [FK02] illustrates that the
traffic mix can affect the queue dynamics on a congested link.

[Find more to cite, about the effect of the distribution of packet sequence numbers on congestion control metrics.]

[Add a paragraph about the impact of medium-size flows.]

[Add a paragraph about the impact of flows starting and stopping.]

[Add a warning about scenarios that use only long-lived flows, or a mix of long-lived and very short flows.]

Measurements: [Cite some of the literature.]

Traffic generators: Some of the available traffic generators are listed on the web site for "Traffic Generators for Internet Traffic" [TG]. This includes pointers to traffic generators for peer-to-peer traffic, traffic from online games, and traffic from Distributed Denial of Service (DDoS) attacks.

In the NS simulator, the distribution of packet sequence numbers for TCP packets on a link can be reported by the queue monitor at a router. This is illustrated in the validation test "./test-all-simple stats3" in the directory tcl/test.

6. The Distribution of Packet Sizes

Definition: The distribution of packet sizes is defined in a straightforward way, using packet sizes in bytes.

Determining factors: The distribution of packet sizes is determined by the traffic mix, the path MTUs, and by the packet sizes used by the transport-level senders.

The distribution of packet sizes on a link is also determined by the mix of forward-path TCP traffic and reverse-path TCP traffic in that scenario, for a scenario characterized by a `forward path' (e.g., left to right on a particular link) and a `reverse path' (e.g., right to left on the same link). For such a scenario, the forward-path TCP traffic contributes data packets to the forward link and acknowledgment packets to the reverse link, while the reverse-path TCP traffic contributes small acknowledgment packets to the forward link. The ratio between TCP data and TCP ACK packets on a link can be used as some indication of the ratio between forward-path and reverse-path TCP traffic.

Effect on congestion control metrics: The distribution of packet sizes on a link is an indicator of the ratio of forward-path and reverse-path TCP traffic in that network. The amount of reverse-path traffic determines the loss and queueing delay experienced by

acknowledgement packets on the reverse path, significantly affecting
the burstiness of the aggregate traffic on the forward path. [In
what other ways does the distribution of packet sizes affect
congestion control metrics?]

Measurements: There has been a wealth of measurements over time on
the packet size distribution of traffic [A00], [HMTG01]. These
measurements are generally consistent with a model of roughly 10% of
the TCP connections using an MSS of roughly 500 bytes, and with the
other 90% of TCP connections using an MSS of 1460 bytes.

7. The Ratio Between Forward-path and Reverse-path Traffic

Definition: For a scenario characterized by a `forward path' (e.g.,
left to right on a particular link) and a `reverse path' (e.g.,
right to left on the same link), the ratio between forward-path and
reverse-path traffic can be defined as the ratio between the
forward-path traffic in bps, and the reverse-path traffic in bps.

Determining factors: The ratio between forward-path and reverse-path
traffic is defined largely by the traffic mix.

Effect on congestion control metrics: Zhang, Shenker and Clark have
shown in 1991 that for TCP, the amount of reverse-path traffic
affects the ACK compression and packet drop rate for TCP
acknowledgement packets, significantly affecting the burstiness of
TCP traffic on the forward path [ZSC91]. The queueing delay on the
reverse path also affects the performance of delay-based congestion
control mechanisms, if the delay is computed based on round-trip
times. This has been shown by Grieco and Mascolo in [GM04] and by
Prasad, Jain, and Dovrolis in [PJD04].

Measurements: There is a need for measurements on the range of
ratios between forward-path and reverse-path traffic for congested
links. In particular, for TCP traffic traversing congested link X,
what is the likelihood that the acknowledgement traffic will
encounter congestion (i.e., queueing delay, packet drops) somewhere
on the reverse path as well?

As discussed in Section 6, the distribution of packet sizes on a
link can be used as an indicator of the ratio of forward-path and
reverse-path TCP traffic in that network.

8. The Distribution of Per-Packet Peak Flow Rates

Definition: The distribution of peak flow rates is defined by
assigning to each packet the peak sending rate in bytes per second
of that connection, where the peak sending rate is defined over

0.1-second intervals. The distribution of peak flow rates gives
some indication of the ratio of "alpha" and "beta" traffic on a
link, where alpha traffic on a congested link is defined as traffic
with that link at the main bottleneck, while the beta traffic on the
link has a primary bottleneck elsewhere along its path [RSB01].

Determining factors: The distribution of peak flow rates is
determined by flows with bottlenecks elsewhere along their end-to-
end path, e.g., flows with low-bandwidth access links. The
distribution of peak flow rates is also affected by applications
with limited sending rates.

Effect on congestion control metrics: The distribution of peak flow
rates affects the burstiness of aggregate traffic, with low-peak-
rate traffic decreasing the aggregate burstiness, and adding to the
traffic's tractability.

Measurements: [RSB01]. The distribution of peak rates can be
expected to change over time, as there is an increasing number of
high-bandwidth access links to the home, and of high-bandwidth
Ethernet links at work and at other institutions.

Simulators: [For NS, add a pointer to the DelayBox,
"http://dirt.cs.unc.edu/delaybox/", for more easily simulating low-
bandwidth access links for flows.]

Testbeds: In testbeds, Dummynet [Dummynet] and NISTNet [NISTNet]
provide convenient ways to emulate paths with different limited peak
rates.

9. **The Distribution of Transport Protocols.**

Definition: The distribution of transport protocols on a congested
link is straightforward, with each packet given its associated
transport protocol (e.g., TCP, UDP). The distribution is often
given both in terms of packets and in terms of bytes.

For UDP packets, it might be more helpful to classify them in terms
of the port number, or the assumed application (e.g., DNS, RIP,
games, Windows Media, RealAudio, RealVideo, etc.) [MAWI]). Other
traffic includes ICMP, IPSEC, and the like. In the future there
could be traffic from SCTP, DCCP, or from other transport protocols.

Effect on congestion control metrics: The distribution of transport
protocols affects metrics relating to the effectiveness of AQM
mechanisms on a link.

Measurements: In the past, TCP traffic has typically consisted of
90% to 95% of the bytes on a link [UW02], [UA01]. [Get updated
citations for this.] Measurement studies show that TCP traffic from
web servers almost always uses conformant TCP congestion control
procedures [MAF05].

10. The Synchronization Ratio

Definition: The synchronization ratio is defined as the degree of
synchronization of loss events between two TCP flows on the same
path. Thus, the synchronization ratio is defined as a
characteristic of an end-to-end path. When one TCP flow of a pair
has a loss event, the synchronization ratio is given by the fraction
of those loss events for which the second flow has a loss event
within one round-trip time. Each connection in a flow pair has a
separate synchronization ratio, and the overall synchronization
ratio of the pair of flows is the higher of the two ratios. When
measuring the synchronization ratio, it is preferable to start the
two TCP flows at slightly different times, with large receive
windows.

Determining factors: The synchronization ratio is determined largely
by the traffic mix on the congested link, and by the AQM mechanism
(or lack of AQM mechanism).

Different types of TCP flows are also likely to have different
synchronization measures. E.g., Two HighSpeed TCP flows might have
higher synchronization measures that two Standard TCP flows on the
same path, because of their more aggressive window increase rates.
Raina, Towsley, and Wischik [RTW05] have discussed the relationships
between synchronization and TCP's increase and decrease parameters.

Effect on congestion control metrics: The synchronization ratio
affects convergence times for high-bandwidth TCPs. Convergence
times are known to be poor for some high-bandwidth protocols in
environments with high levels of synchronization. [Cite the papers
by Leith and Shorten.] However, it is not clear if these
environments with high levels of synchronization are realistic.

Wischik and MeKweon [WM05] have shown that the level of
synchronization affects the buffer requirements at congested
routers. Baccelli and Hong [BH02] have a model showing the effect
of the synchronization ratio on aggregate throughput.

Measurements: Grenville Armitage and Qiang Fu have performed initial
experiments of synchronization in the Internet, using Standard TCP
flows, and have found very low levels of synchronization.

In a discussion of the relationship between stability and
desynchronization, Raina, Towsley, and Wischik [RTW05] report that
"synchronization has been reported again and again in simulations".
In contrast, synchronization has not been reported again and again
in the real-world Internet.

Appenzeller, Keslassy, and McKeown in [AKM04] report the following:
"Flows are not synchronized in a backbone router carrying thousands
of flows with varying RTTs. Small variations in RTT or processing
time are sufficient to prevent synchronization [QZK01]; and the
absence of synchronization has been demonstrated in real networks
[F02,IMD01]."

[Appenzeller et al, Sizing Router Buffers, reports that
synchronization is rare as the number of competing flows increases.
Kevin Jeffay has some results on synchronization also.]

Needed: We need measurements of the synchronization ratio for flows
that use high-bandwidth protocols over high-bandwidth paths, given
typical levels of competing traffic and with typical queuing
mechanisms at routers (whatever these are), to see if there are
higher levels of synchronization with high-bandwidth protocols such
as HighSpeed TCP, Fast TCP, and the like, which are more aggressive
than Standard TCP. The assumption would be that in many
environments, high-bandwidth protocols have higher levels of
synchronization than flows using Standard TCP.

11. Drop or Mark Rates as a Function of Packet Size

Definition: Drop rates as a function of packet size are defined by
the actual drop rates for different packets on an end-to-end path or
on a congested link over a particular time interval. In some cases,
e.g., Drop-Tail queues in units of packets, general statements can
be made; e.g., that large and small packets will experience the same
packet drop rates. However, in other cases, e.g., Drop-Tail queues
in units of bytes, no such general statement can be made, and the
drop rate as a function of packet size will be determined in part by
the traffic mix at the congested link at that point of time.

Determining factors: The drop rate as a function of packet size is
determined in part by the queue architecture. E.g., is the Drop-
Tail queue in units of packets, of bytes, of 60-byte buffers, or of
a mix of buffer sizes? Is the AQM mechanism in packet mode,
dropping each packet with the same probability, or in byte mode,
with the probability of dropping or marking a packet being
proportional to the packet size in bytes.

The effect of packet size on drop rate would also be affected by the presence of preferential scheduling for small packets, or by differential scheduling for packets from different flows (e.g., per-flow scheduling, or differential scheduling for UDP and TCP traffic).

In many environments, the drop rate as a function of packet size will be heavily affected by the traffic mix at a particular time. For example, is the traffic mix dominated by large packets, or by smaller ones? In some cases, the overall packet drop rate could also affect the relative drop rates for different packet sizes.

In wireless networks, the drop rate as a function of packet size is also determined by the packet corruption rate as a function of packet size. [Cite Deborah Pinck's papers on Satellite-Enhanced Personal Communications Experiments and on Experimental Results from Internetworking Data Applications Over Various Wireless Networks Using a Single Flexible Error Control Protocol.] [Cite the general literature.]

Effect on congestion control metrics: The drop rate as a function of packet size has a significant effect on the performance of congestion control for VoIP and other small-packet flows. [Citation: "TFRC for Voice: the VoIP Variant", draft-ietf-dccp-tfrc-voip-02.txt, and earlier papers.] The drop rate as a function of packet size also has an effect on TCP performance, as it affects the drop rates for TCP's SYN and ACK packets. [Citation: Jeffay and others.]

Measurements: We need measurements of the drop rate as a function of packet size over a wide range of paths, or for a wide range of congested links. For tests of relative drop rates on end-to-end packets, one possibility would be to run successive TCP connections with 200-byte, 512-byte, and 1460-byte packets, and to compare the packet drop rates. The ideal test would include running TCP connections on the reverse path, to measure the drop rates for the small ACK packets on the forward path. It would also be useful to characterize the difference in drop rates for 200-byte TCP packets and 200-byte UDP packets, even though some of this difference could be due to the relative burstiness of the different connections.

Ping experiments could also be used to get measurements of drop rates as a function size, but it would be necessary to make sure that the ping sending rates were adjusted to be TCP-friendly.

[Cite the known literature on drop rates as a function of packet size.]

Our conjecture is that there is a wide range of behaviors for this
characteristic in the real world. Routers include Drop-Tail queues
in packets, bytes, and buffer sizes in between; these will have
quite different drop rates as a function of packet size. Some
routers include RED in byte mode (the default for RED in Linux) and
some have RED in packet mode (Cisco, I believe). This also affects
drop rates as a function of packet size.

Some routers on congested access links use per-flow scheduling. In
this case, does the per-flow scheduling have the goal of fairness in
bytes per second or in *packets* per second? What effect does the
per-flow scheduling have on the drop rate as a function of packet
size, for packets in different flows (e.g., a small-packet VoIP flow
competing against a large-packet TCP flow) or for packets within the
same flow (small ACK packets and large data packets on a two-way TCP
connection).

12. Drop Rates as a Function of Burst Size.

Definition: Burst-tolerance, or drop rates as a function of burst
size, can be defined in terms of an end-to-end path, or in terms of
aggregate traffic on a congested link.

The burst-tolerance of an end-to-end path is defined in terms of
connections with different degrees of burstiness within a round-trip
time. When packets are sent in bursts of N packets, does the drop
rate vary as a function of N? For example, if the TCP sender sends
small bursts of K packets, for K less than the congestion window,
how does the size of K affect the loss rate? Similarly, for a ping
tool sending pings at a certain rate in packets per second, one
could see how the clustering of the ping packets in clusters of size
K affects the packet drop rate. As always with such ping
experiments, it would be important to adjust the sending rate to
maintain a longer-term sending rate that was TCP-friendly.

Determining factors: The burst-tolerance is determined largely by
the AQM mechanisms for the congested routers on a path, and by the
traffic mix. For a Drop-Tail queue with only a small number of
competing flows, the burst-tolerance is likely to be low, and for
AQM mechanisms where the packet drop rate is a function of the
average queue size rather than the instantaneous queue size, the
burst tolerance should be quite high.

Effect on congestion control metrics: The burst-tolerance of the
path or congested link can affect fairness between competing flows
with different round-trip times; for example, Standard TCP flows
with longer round-trip times are likely to have a more bursty
arrival pattern at the congested link that that of Standard TCP

flows with shorter round-trip times. As a result, in environment
with low burst tolerance (e.g., scenarios with Drop-Tail queues),
longer-round-trip-time TCP connections can see higher packet drop
rates than other TCP connections, and receive an even smaller
fraction of the link bandwidth than they would otherwise. [FJ92]
(Section 3.2). We note that some TCP traffic is inherently bursty,
e.g., Standard TCP without rate-based pacing, particularly in the
presence of dropped ACK packets or of ACK compression. The burst-
tolerance of a router can also affect the delay-throughput tradeoffs
and packet drop rates of the path or of the congested link.

Measurements: One could measure the burst-tolerance of an end-to-end
path by running successive TCP connections, forcing bursts of size
at least K by dropping an appropriate fraction of the ACK packets to
the TCP receiver. Alternately, if one had control of the TCP
sender, one could modify the TCP sender to send bursts of K packets
when the congestion window was K or more segments.

[Look at Crovella's paper on loss pairs.]

[Look at: M. Allman and E. Blanton, "Notes on Burst Mitigation for
Transport Protocols", ACM Computer Communication Review, vol. 35(2),
(2005).]

Making inferences about the AQM mechanism for the congested router
on an end-to-end path: One potential use of measurement tools for
determining the burst-tolerance of an end-to-end path would be to
make inferences about the presence or absence of an AQM mechanism at
the congested link or links. As a simple test, one could run a TCP
connection until the connection comes out of slow-start. If the
receive window of the TCP connection was sufficiently high that the
connection exited slow-start with packet drops or marks instead of
because of the limitation of the receive window, one could record
the congestion window at the end of slow-start, and the number of
packets dropped from this window. A high packet drop rate might be
more typical of a Drop-Tail queue with small-scale statistical
multiplexing on the congested link, and a single packet drop coming
out of slow-start would suggest an AQM mechanism at the congested
link.

The synchronization measure could also add information about the
likely presence or absence of AQM on the congested link(s) of an
end-to-end path, with paths with higher levels of synchronization
being more likely to have Drop-Tail queues with small-scale
statistical multiplexing on the congested link(s).

[Cite the relevant literature about tools for determining the AQM
mechanism on an end-to-end path.]

13. **Drop Rates as a Function of Sending Rate.**

   Definition: Drop rates as a function of sending rate is defined in
   terms of the drop behavior of a flow in the end-to-end path. That
   is, does the sending rate of an individual flow affect its own
   packet drop rate, or its packet drop rate largely independent of the
   sending rate of the flow?

   Determining factors: The sending rate of the flow affects its own
   packet drop rate in an environment with small-scale statistical
   multiplexing on the congested link. The packet drop rate is largely
   independent of the sending rate in an environment with large-scale
   statistical multiplexing, with many competing small flows at the
   congested link. Thus, the behavior of drop rates as a function of
   sending rate is a rough measure of the level of statistical
   multiplexing on the congested links of an end-to-end path.

   Effect on congestion control metrics: The level of statistical
   multiplexing at the congested link can affect the performance of
   congestion control mechanisms in transport protocols. For example,
   delay-based congestion control is often better suited to
   environments small-scale statistical multiplexing at the congested
   link, where the transport protocol responds to the delay caused by
   its own sending rate.

   Measurements: In a simulation or testbed, the level of statistical
   multiplexing on the congested link can be observed directly. In the
   Internet, the level of statistical multiplexing on the congested
   links of an end-to-end path can be inferred indirectly through per-
   flow measurements, by observing whether the packet drop rate varies
   as a function of the sending rate of the flow.

14. **Congestion Control Mechanisms for Traffic, along with Sender and
   Receiver Buffer Sizes."**

   Effect on congestion control metrics: Please don't evaluate AQM
   mechanisms by using Reno TCP, or evaluate new transport protocols by
   comparing them with the performance of Reno TCP! For an
   explanation, see [FK02] (Section 3.4).

   Measurements: See [MAF05].

15. **Characterization of Congested Links in Terms of Bandwidth and**
Typical Levels of Congestion

   [Pointers to the current state of our knowledge.]

16. **Characterization of Challenging Lower Layers.**

   [This will just be a short set of pointers to the relevant
   literature, which is quite extensive.]

17. **Characterization of Network Changes Affecting Congestion**

   [Pointers to the current state of our knowledge.]

18. **Using the Tools Presented in this Document**

   [To be done.]

19. **Related Work**

   [Cite "On the Effective Evaluation of TCP" by Allman and Falk.]

20. **Conclusions**

   [To be done.]

21. **Security Considerations**

   There are no security considerations in this document.

22. **IANA Considerations**

   There are no IANA considerations in this document.

23. **Acknowledgements**

   Thanks to Xiaoliang (David) Wei for feedback and contributions to
   this document.

Informative References

   [RFC 2119] S. Bradner. Key Words For Use in RFCs to Indicate
       Requirement Levels. RFC 2119.

   [MAWI] M.W. Group, Mawi working group traffic archive, URL
       "http://tracer.csl.sony.jp/mawi/".

   [AKM04] B. Appenzeller, I. Keslassy, and N. McKeown, Sizing Router
       Buffers, SIGCOMM 2004.

   [AKSJ03] J. Aikat, J. Kaur, F.D. Smith, and K. Jeffay, Variability
       in TCP Roundtrip Times, ACM SIGCOMM Internet Measurement
       Conference, Maimi, FL, October 2003, pp. 279-284.

[A00] M. Allman, A Web Server's View of the Transport Layer,
    Computer Communication Review, 30(5), October 200.

[BH02] F. Baccelli and D. Hong, AIMD, Fairness and Fractal Scaling
    of TCP Traffic, Infocom 2002.

[CBC95] C. Cunha, A. Bestavros, and M. Crovella, "Characteristics of
    WWW Client-based Traces", BU Technical Report BUCS-95-010, 1995.

[Dummynet] L. Rizzo, Dummynet, URL
    "http://info.iet.unipi.it/~luigi/ip_dummynet/".

BIBREF F02 "F02" C. J. Fraleigh, Provisioning Internet Backbone
    Networks to Support Latency Sensitive Applications. PhD thesis,
    Stanford University, Department of Electrical Engineering, June
    2002.

[FJ92] S. Floyd and V. Jacobson, On Traffic Phase Effects in Packet-
    Switched Gateways, Internetworking: Research and Experience, V.3
    N.3, September 1992, p.115-156.

[FK02] S. Floyd and E. Kohler, Internet Research Needs Better
    Models, Hotnets-I, October 2002.

[GM04] L. Grieco and S. Mascolo, Performance Evaluation and
    Comparison of Westwood+, New Reno, and Vegas TCP Congestion
    Control, CCR, April 2004.

[HMTG01] C. Hollot, V. Misra, D. Towsley, and W. Gong, On Designing
    Improved Controllers for AQM Routers Supporting TCP Flows, IEEE
    Infocom, 2001.

[IMD01] G. Iannaccone, M. May, and C. Diot, Aggregate Traffic
    Performance with Active Queue Management and Drop From Tail.
    SIGCOMM Comput. Commun. Rev., 31(3):4-13, 2001.

[JD02] H. Jiang and C. Dovrolis, Passive Estimation of TCP Round-
    trip Times, Computer Communication Review, 32(3), July 2002.

[MAF05] A. Medina, M. Allman, and A. Floyd. Measuring the Evolution
    of Transport Protocols in the Internet. Computer Communication
    Review, April 2005.

[NISTNet] NIST Net, URL "http://snad.ncsl.nist.gov/itg/nistnet/".

[PJD04] R. Prasad, M. Jain, and C. Dovrolis, On the Effectiveness of
    Delay-Based Congestion Avoidance, PFLDnet 2004, February 2004.

   [QZK01] L. Qiu, Y. Zhang, and S. Keshav, Understanding the
       Performance of Many TCP Flows, Comput. Networks,
       37(3-4):277-306, 2001.

   [RSB01] R. Riedi, S. Sarvotham, and R. Varaniuk, Connection-level
       Analysis and Modeling of Network Traffic, SIGCOMM Internet
       Measurement Workshop, 2001.

   [RTW05] G. Raina, D. Towsley, and D. Wischik, Control Theory for
       Buffer Sizing, CCR, July 2005.

   [TG] Traffic Generators for Internet Traffic Web Page, URL
       "http://www.icir.org/models/trafficgenerators.html".

   [UA01] U. of Auckland, Auckland-vi trace data, June 2001. URL
       "http://wans.cs.waikato.ac.nz/wand/wits/auck/6/".

   [UW02] UW-Madison, Network Performance Statistics, October 2002.
       URL "http://wwwstats.net.wisc.edu/".

   [WM05] D. Wischik and N. McKeown, Buffer sizes for Core Routers,
       CCR, July 2005.

   [ZSC91] L. Zhang, S. Shenker, and D.D. Clark, Observations and
       Dynamics of a Congestion Control Algorithm: the Effects of Two-
       way Traffic, SIGCOMM 1991.

Editors' Addresses

   Sally Floyd <floyd@icir.org>
   ICSI Center for Internet Research
   1947 Center Street, Suite 600
   Berkeley, CA 94704
   USA

   Eddie Kohler <kohler@cs.ucla.edu>
   4531C Boelter Hall
   UCLA Computer Science Department
   Los Angeles, CA 90095
   USA

Intellectual Property