

Network Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Informational  
Expires: April 18, 2007

A. Morton  
AT&T Labs  
October 15, 2006

Packet Delay Variation Applicability Statement  
draft-morton-ippm-delay-var-as-00

Status of this Memo

By submitting this Internet-Draft, each author represents that any applicable patent or other IPR claims of which he or she is aware have been or will be disclosed, and any of which he or she becomes aware will be disclosed, in accordance with [Section 6 of BCP 79](#).

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), its areas, and its working groups. Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts.

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."

The list of current Internet-Drafts can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/ietf/lid-abstracts.txt>.

The list of Internet-Draft Shadow Directories can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html>.

This Internet-Draft will expire on April 18, 2007.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2006).

Abstract

Many definitions of packet delay variation exist, and two different formulations have come into wide use in the context of active measurements. This memo examines a range of circumstances for active measurements and their uses, and recommends which of these two forms is best matched to the conditions and task.

Internet-Draft

Delay Variation AS

October 2006

## Requirements Language

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](#) [[RFC2119](#)].

## Table of Contents

<a href="#">1.</a>	Introduction . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	Purpose and Scope . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	Uses of Delay Variation Metrics . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">3.1.</a>	Determining De-jitter Buffer Size . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">3.2.</a>	Inferring Queue Occupation on a Path . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">3.3.</a>	Spatial Composition . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">3.4.</a>	Challenging Circumstances . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">3.5.</a>	<your favorite here> . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">4.</a>	Formulations of IPDV and PDV . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">4.1.</a>	IPDV: Inter-Packet Delay Variation . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">4.2.</a>	PDV: Packet Delay Variation . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">4.3.</a>	Examples and Initial Comparisons . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">5.</a>	Earlier Comparisons . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">5.1.</a>	Demichelis' Comparison . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
5.2.	Ciavattone et al. . . . .	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">5.3.</a>	IPPM List Discussion from 2001 . . . . .	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">5.4.</a>	Y.1540 <a href="#">Appendix II</a> . . . . .	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">6.</a>	Additional Properties and Comparisons . . . . .	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">6.1.</a>	Jitter in RTCP Reports . . . . .	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">6.2.</a>	Path Changes . . . . .	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">6.2.1.</a>	Lossless Path Change . . . . .	<a href="#">10</a>
<a href="#">6.2.2.</a>	Path Change with Loss . . . . .	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">6.3.</a>	Measurement Clock Issues . . . . .	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">6.4.</a>	Reporting a Single Number . . . . .	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">6.5.</a>	MAPDV2 . . . . .	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">7.</a>	Applicability of the Delay Variation Forms with Tasks . . . . .	<a href="#">13</a>
<a href="#">7.1.</a>	Challenging Circumstances . . . . .	<a href="#">13</a>
<a href="#">7.2.</a>	Spatial Composition . . . . .	<a href="#">13</a>
<a href="#">7.3.</a>	Inferring Queue Occupancy . . . . .	<a href="#">14</a>
<a href="#">7.4.</a>	Determining De-jitter Buffer Size . . . . .	<a href="#">14</a>
<a href="#">8.</a>	IANA Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">15</a>
<a href="#">9.</a>	Security Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">15</a>
<a href="#">10.</a>	Acknowledgements . . . . .	<a href="#">15</a>
<a href="#">11.</a>	References . . . . .	<a href="#">15</a>

<a href="#">11.1</a> . Normative References . . . . .	<a href="#">15</a>
<a href="#">11.2</a> . Informative References . . . . .	<a href="#">16</a>
Author's Address . . . . .	<a href="#">17</a>
Intellectual Property and Copyright Statements . . . . .	<a href="#">18</a>

## [1](#). Introduction

There are many ways to formulate delay variation metrics for packet networks. The IETF itself has several specifications for delay variation, sometimes called jitter, and these have achieved wide adoption. The International Telecommunication Union - Telecommunication Standardization Sector has also recommended several delay variation metrics (called parameters in their terminology), and some of these are widely cited and used.

Most (if not all) delay variation metrics are derived metrics, in that their definitions rely on another fundamental metric. In this case, the fundamental metric is one-way delay, and variation is assessed by computing the difference between two individual one-way delay measurements, or a pair of singletons. One of the delay singletons is taken as a reference value, and the result is the variation with respect to the reference. The variation is usually summarized for all packets in a stream (or sample) using statistics.

Two main formulations of delay variation are preferred (according to [\[Krzanowski\]](#)):

1. Inter-Packet Delay Variation, IPDV, where the reference is the previous packet in the stream (according to sending sequence), and the reference changes for each packet in the stream. Properties of variation and packet sequence are captured in this formulation.
2. Packet Delay Variation, PDV, where a single reference is chosen from the stream based on specific criteria, and the reference is fixed once selected. The most common criterion for the reference is the packet with the minimum delay in the sample.

Each of these metric formulations has certain advantages and disadvantages that make them more suitable for one circumstance and less so for another. This memo examines a range of circumstances for

active measurements of delay variation and their uses, and recommends the form that is best matched to the conditions and task.

It is important to note that the authors of relevant standards for delay variation recognized there are many different users with varying needs, and allowed sufficient flexibility to formulate several metrics with different properties. Therefore, the comparison is not so much between standards bodies or their specifications as it is between specific formulations of delay variation. For instance, both Inter-Packet Delay Variation and Packet Delay Variation can be assessed using options of [[RFC3393](#)], especially the packet selection function.

The IPPM framework [[RFC2330](#)] and other RFCs describing IPPM metrics provide a background for this memo, especially for terms such as singleton, sample, and statistic.

## [2.](#) Purpose and Scope

The purpose of this memo is to compare two forms of delay variation, so that it will be evident which of the two is better suited for each of many possible uses and their related circumstances.

The scope of this memo is limited to the two forms of delay variation briefly described above (Inter-Packet Delay Variation and Packet Delay Variation), circumstances related to active measurement, and uses that are deemed relevant and worthy of inclusion here through IPPM Working Group consensus.

The scope excludes assessment of delay variation for packets with undefined delay. This is accomplished by conditioning the delay distribution on arrival within a reasonable time based on an understanding of the path under test and packet lifetimes. This is consistent with [[RFC3393](#)], where the Type-P-One-way-ipdv is undefined when the destination fails to receive one or both packets in the selected pair. Furthermore, it is consistent with application performance analysis to consider only arriving packets, because a finite waiting time-out is a feature of many protocols.

## [3.](#) Uses of Delay Variation Metrics

This section presents a set of tasks that call for delay variation measurements and their possible circumstances. It answers the question, "How will the results be used?" for the delay variation metric.

### [3.1.](#) Determining De-jitter Buffer Size

Most Isochronous applications (a.k.a. real-time applications) employ a buffer to smooth out delay variation encountered on the path from source to destination. The buffer must be big enough to accommodate (most of) the expected variation, or packet loss will result. However, if the buffer is too large, then some of the desired spontaneity of communication will be lost and conversational dynamics will be affected. Therefore, application designers need to know the extent of delay variation they must accommodate, whether they are designing fixed or adaptive buffer systems.

Network service providers also attempt to constrain delay variation

to ensure the quality of real-time applications, and monitor this metric (possibly to compare with a numerical objective or Service Level Agreement).

### [3.2.](#) Inferring Queue Occupation on a Path

As packets travel along the path from source to destination, they pass through a series of router queues. Many of the sources of delay along the path are constant, but the latency encountered in each queue varies, depending on the number of packets in the queue when a particular packet arrives. If one assumes that at least one of the packets in a test stream encounters virtually empty queues all along the path (and the path is stable), then the additional delay observed on other packets can be attributed to the time spent in one or more queues. Otherwise, the delay variation observed is the variation in queue time experienced by the test stream.

### [3.3.](#) Spatial Composition

In Spatial Composition, the tasks are similar to those described above, but with the additional complexity of a multiple network path where several sub-paths are measured separately, and no source to

destination measurements are available. In this case, the source to destination performance must be estimated, using Composed Metrics as described in [[I-D.ietf-ippm-framework-compagg](#)]

### [3.4.](#) Challenging Circumstances

Any of the tasks above are made more "interesting" when certain circumstances are present. Among these are:

1. Low cost or low complexity measurement systems. These systems may be embedded in communication devices that do not have access to high stability clocks, and time errors will almost certainly be present. These devices may not have sufficient memory to store all singletons for later processing.
2. Extremely dynamic network conditions. When there is little or no stability in the network under test, then the devices that attempt to characterize the network are equally stressed, especially if the results displayed are used to make inferences which may not be valid. Frequent path changes and prolonged congestion with substantial packet loss clearly make delay variation measurements challenging.

### [3.5.](#) <your favorite here>

## [4.](#) Formulations of IPDV and PDV

This section presents the formulations of IPDV and PDV, and provides some illustrative examples. We use the basic singleton definition in [[RFC3393](#)] (which itself is based on [[RFC2679](#)]):

"Type-P-One-way-ipdv is defined for two packets from Src to Dst selected by the selection function F, as the difference between the value of the Type-P-One-way-delay from Src to Dst at T2 and the value of the Type-P-One-Way-Delay from Src to Dst at T1."

### [4.1.](#) IPDV: Inter-Packet Delay Variation

An example selection function given in [RFC3393] is "Consecutive Type-P packets within the specified interval." This is exactly the function needed for IPDV. The reference packet in the pair is always the previous packet in the sending sequence.

If we have packets in a stream consecutively numbered  $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots$  falling within the test interval, then  $IPDV(i) = D(i) - D(i-1)$  where  $D(i)$  denotes the one-way-delay of the  $i$ th packet of a stream.

#### 4.2. PDV: Packet Delay Variation

The Selection Function for PDV requires two specific roles for the packets in the pair. The first packet is any Type-P packet within the specified interval. The second, or reference packet is the Type-P packet within the specified interval with the minimum one-way-delay.

Therefore,  $PDV(i) = D(i) - D(\min)$  (using the nomenclature introduced in the IPDV section).

#### 4.3. Examples and Initial Comparisons

This section will discuss the examples in slides 2 and 3 of

<http://www3.ietf.org/proceedings/06mar/slides/ippm-4.pdf>

### 5. Earlier Comparisons

This section summarizes previous work to compare these two forms of delay variation.

#### 5.1. Demichelis' Comparison

In [Demichelis], Demichelis compared the early draft versions of the two forms we consider here. Although the IPDV form would eventually be standardized under the IETF IPPM effort, the ITU-T work cited here was significantly modified based on further study and analysis. Demichelis considered the possibilities of using the delay of the first packet in the stream and the mean delay of the stream as the

PDV reference packet. Neither of these alternative references were used in practice, and they are now depreciated in favor of the minimum delay of the stream [[Y.1540](#)] .

Active measurements of a transcontinental path (Torino to Tokyo) provided the data for the comparison. The Poisson test stream had 0.764 second average inter-packet interval, with more than 58 thousand packets over 13.5 hours. Among Demichelis' observations about IPDV are the following:

1. IPDV is a measure of the network's ability to preserve the spacing between packets.
2. The distribution of IPDV is usually symmetrical about the origin, having a balance of negative and positive values (for the most part). The mean is usually zero, unless some long-term delay trend is present.
3. IPDV distinguishes quick delay variations (on the order of the interval between packets) from longer term variations.
4. IPDV places reduced demands on the stability and skew of measurement clocks.

He also notes these features of PDV:

1. PDV does not distinguish quick variation from variation over the complete test interval.
2. The location of the distribution is very sensitive to the delay of the first packet, if this packet is used as the reference.
3. The shape of the PDV distribution is identical to the delay distribution, but shifted by the reference delay.
4. Use of a common reference over long measurement intervals can indicate more PDV than would be experienced by streams that support shorter interval sessions.

5. PDV characterizes the range of queue occupancies along the



measurement path (assuming the path is fixed), but the range says nothing about how the variation took place.

The summary metrics used in this comparison were the number of values exceeding a +/-50ms range around the mean, the Inverse Percentiles, and the Inter-Quartile Range.

## 5.2. Ciavattone et al.

In [[Cia03](#)], the authors compared IPDV and PDV (referred to as delta) using a periodic packet stream conforming to [[RFC3432](#)] with inter-packet interval of 20 ms.

One of the comparisons between IPDV and PDV involves a laboratory set-up where a queue was temporarily congested by a competing packet burst. The additional queuing delay was 85ms to 95ms, much larger than the inter-packet interval. The first packet in the stream that follows the competing burst spends the longest time enqueued, and others experience less and less queuing time until the queue is drained.

The authors observed that PDV reflects the additional queuing time of the packets affected by the burst, with values of 85, 65, 45, 25, and 5ms. Also, it is easy to determine (by looking at the PDV range) that a de-jitter buffer of 90 ms would have been sufficient to accommodate the delay variation.

The distribution of IPDV values in the congested queue example are very different: 85, -20, -20, -20, -20, -5ms. Only the positive excursion of IPDV gives an indication of the de-jitter buffer size needed. Although the variation exceeds the inter-packet interval, the extent of negative IPDV values is limited by that sending interval. This preference for information from the positive IPDV values has prompted some to ignore the negative values, or to take the absolute value of each IPDV measurement (sacrificing key properties of IPDV in the process, such as its ability to distinguish delay trends).

Elsewhere, the authors considered the range as a summary statistic for IPDV, and the 99.9%-ile minus the minimum delay as a summary statistic for delay variation, or PDV.

## 5.3. IPPM List Discussion from 2001

Summary To Be Provided. But to indicate one of the key points:

IPDV values can be viewed as the adjustments that an adaptive de-

---

jitter buffer would make, IF it could make adjustments on a packet-by-packet basis. However, adaptive de-jitter buffers don't make adjustments so frequently, so in this respect IPDV provides "too much information".

#### [5.4.](#) Y.1540 [Appendix I](#)

This Appendix compares IPDV, PDV (referred to as 2-point PDV), and 1-point packet delay variation (which assume a periodic stream and assesses variation against an ideal arrival schedule constructed at the single measurement point).

### [6.](#) Additional Properties and Comparisons

This section treats some of the earlier comparison areas in more detail, and introduces new areas for comparison.

#### [6.1.](#) Jitter in RTCP Reports

[RFC3550] gives the calculation of the inter-arrival Jitter field for the RTCP report, with a sample implementation in an Appendix.

The RTCP Jitter value can be calculated using IPDV singletons. If there is packet reordering, as defined in [[I-D.ietf-ippm-reordering](#)], then estimates of Jitter based on IPDV may vary slightly, because [[RFC3550](#)] specifies the use of receive packet order.

Just as there is no simple way to convert PDV singletons to IPDV singletons without returning to the original sample of delay singletons, there is no clear relationship between PDV and [[RFC3550](#)] Jitter.

#### [6.2.](#) Path Changes

Sometimes the path characteristics change during a measurement interval. The change may be due to link or router failure, administrative changes prior to maintenance (e.g., link cost change), or re-optimization of routing using new information. All these causes are usually infrequent, and network providers take appropriate measures to ensure this. Automatic restoration to a back-up path is seen as a desirable feature of IP networks.

Path changes are usually accompanied by a persistent increase or decrease in one-way-delay. [[Cia03](#)] gives one such example. We assume that a restoration path either accepts a stream of packets, or

is not used for that particular stream (e.g., no multipath for flows).

In any case, a change in the TTL (or Hop Limit) of the received packets indicates that the path is no longer the same. Transient packet reordering may also be observed with path changes, due to use of non-optimal routing while updates propagate through the network (see [[Casner](#)] and [[Cia03](#)] )

Many, if not all, packet streams experience packet loss in conjunction with a path change. However, it is certainly possible that the active measurement stream does not experience loss. This may be due to use of a long inter-packet sending interval with respect to the restoration time, and this becomes more likely as "fast restoration" techniques see wider deployment.

Thus, there are two main cases to consider, path changes accompanied by loss, and those that are lossless from the point of view of the active measurement stream.

#### [6.2.1](#). Lossless Path Change

In the lossless case, a path change will typically affect only two IPDV singletons. However, if the change in delay is negative and larger than the inter-packet sending interval, then more than two IPDV singletons may be affected because packet reordering is also likely to occur.

The use of the new path and its delay variation can be quantified by treating the PDV distribution as bi-modal, and characterizing each mode separately. This would involve declaring a new path within the sample, and using a new local minimum delay as the PDV reference delay for the sub-sample (or time interval) where the new path is present.

The process of detecting a bi-modal delay distribution is made difficult if the typical delay variation is larger than the delay change associated with the new path. However, information on TTL (or Hop Limit) change or the presence of transient reordering can assist in an automated decision.

The effect of path changes may also be reduced by making PDV

measurements over short intervals (minutes, as opposed to hours). This way, a path change will affect one sample and its PDV values. Assuming that the mean or median one-way-delay changes appreciably on the new path, then subsequent measurements can confirm a path change, and trigger special processing on the interval containing a path change and the affected PDV result.

### [6.2.2.](#) Path Change with Loss

If the path change is accompanied by loss, such that there are no consecutive packet pairs that span the change, then no IPDV singletons will reflect the change. This may or may not be desirable, depending on the ultimate use of the delay variation measurement.

PDV will again produce a bimodal distribution. But here, the decision process to define sub-intervals associated with each path is further assisted by the presence of loss, in addition to TTL, reordering information, and use of short measurement intervals consistent with the duration of user sessions. It is reasonable to assume that at least loss and delay will be measured simultaneously with PDV or IPDV.

### [6.3.](#) Measurement Clock Issues

As mentioned above, [[Demichelis](#)] observed that PDV places greater demands on clock synchronization than for IPDV. This observation deserves more discussion. Synchronization errors have two components: time of day errors and clock frequency errors (resulting in skew).

Both IPDV and PDV are sensitive to time-of-day errors when attempting to align measurement intervals at the source and destination. Gross mis-alignment of the measurement intervals can lead to lost packets, for example if the receiver is not ready when the first test packet arrives. However, both IPDV and PDV assess time differences, so the error present in two one-way-delay singletons will cancel as long as it is constant.

Skew is a measure of the change in clock time over an interval w.r.t. a reference clock. Both IPDV and PDV are affected by skew, but the error sensitivity in IPDV singletons is less because the intervals between consecutive packets are rather small, especially when compared to the overall measurement interval. Since PDV computes the difference between a single reference delay (the sample minimum) and all other delays in the measurement interval, the constraint on skew error is greater to attain the same accuracy as IPDV. Again, use of short PDV measurement intervals (on the order of minutes, not hours) provides some relief from the effects of skew error.

If skew is present in a sample of one-way-delays, its symptom is typically a linear growth or decline over all the one-way-delay values. As a practical matter, if the same slope appears consistently in the measurements, then it may be possible to fit the slope and compensate for the skew in the one-way-delay measurements,

thereby avoiding the issue in the PDV calculations that follow. See [\[RFC3393\]](#) for additional information on compensating for skew.

#### [6.4.](#) Reporting a Single Number

Despite the risk of over-summarization, measurements must often be displayed for easy consumption. If the right summary report is prepared, then the "dashboard" view correctly indicates whether there is something different and worth investigating further, or that the status has not changed. The dashboard model restricts every instrument display to a single number. The packet network dashboard could have different instruments for loss, delay, delay variation, reordering, etc., and each must be summarized as a single number for each measurement interval.

The simplicity of the PDV distribution lends itself to this summarization process (including use of the median or mean). [\[Y.1541\]](#) introduced the notion of a pseudo-range when setting an objective for the 99.9%-ile of PDV. The conventional range (max-min) was avoided for several reasons, including stability of the maximum delay. The 99.9%-ile of PDV is helpful to performance planners (seeking to meet some user-to-user objective for delay) and in design of de-jitter buffer sizes, even those with adaptive capabilities.

IPDV does not lend itself to summarization so easily. The mean IPDV

is typically zero. As the IPDV distribution may have two tails (positive and negative) the range or pseudo-range would not match the needed de-jitter buffer size. Additional complexity may be introduced when the variation exceeds the inter-packet sending interval, as discussed above. Should the Inter-Quartile Range be used? Should the singletons beyond some threshold be counted (e.g., mean +/- 50ms)? A strong rationale for one of these summary statistics has yet to emerge.

## [6.5.](#) MAPDV2

MAPDV2 stands for Mean Absolute Packet Delay Variation (version) 2, and is specified in [\[G.1020\]](#). The MAPDV2 algorithm computes a smoothed running estimate of the mean delay using the one-way delays of 16 previous packets. It compares the current one-way-delay to the estimated mean, separately computes the means of positive and negative deviations, and sums these deviation means to produce MAPVDV2. In effect, there is a MAPDV2 singleton for every arriving packet, so further summarization is usually warranted.

Neither IPDV or PDV assists in the computation of MAPDV2.

## [7.](#) Applicability of the Delay Variation Forms with Tasks

Based on the comparisons of IPDV and PDV presented above, this section matches the attributes of each form with the tasks described in [section 3](#). We discuss the more general circumstances first.

Note: the conclusions of this section should be regarded as preliminary, pending discussion and further development by the IPPM WG.

### [7.1.](#) Challenging Circumstances

When appreciable skew is present between measurement system clocks, then IPDV has a clear advantage, since that PDV would require processing over the entire sample to remove the skew error. Neither form of delay variation is more suited than the other to on-the-fly summarization without memory, and this is one of the reasons that [\[RFC3550\]](#) RTCP Jitter and MAPDV2 in [\[G.1020\]](#) have attained deployment

in low-cost systems.

If the network under test exhibits frequent path changes, on the order of several new routes per minute, then IPDV appears to isolate the delay variation on each path from the transient effect of path change (especially if there is packet loss at the time of path change). It is possible to make meaningful PDV measurements when paths are unstable, but great importance would be placed on the algorithms that infer path change and attempt to divide the sample on path change boundaries.

If the network under test exhibits frequent loss, then PDV may produce a larger set of singletons for the sample than IPDV. This is due to IPDV requiring consecutive packet arrivals to assess delay variation, compared to PDV where any packet arrival is useful. The worst case is when no consecutive packets arrive, and the entire IPDV sample would be undefined. PDV would successfully produce a sample based on the arriving packets.

Note that delay variation may not be the top concern under these unstable and un-reliable circumstances, as this author has pointed-out many times in discussion.

## [7.2.](#) Spatial Composition

ITU-T Recommendation [[Y.1541](#)] gives a provisional method to compose a PDV metric using PDV measurement results from two or more sub-paths.

PDV has a clear advantage at this time, since there is no known method to compose an IPDV metric. In addition, IPDV results depend

greatly on the exact sequence of packets and may not lend themselves easily to the composition problem.

## [7.3.](#) Inferring Queue Occupancy

The PDV distribution is anchored at the minimum delay observed in the measurement interval. When the sample minimum coincides with the true minimum delay of the path, then the PDV distribution is equivalent to the queuing time distribution experienced by the test stream. If the minimum delay is not the true minimum, then the PDV distribution captures the variation in queuing time and some

additional amount of queuing time is experienced, but unknown. One can summarize the PDV distribution with the mean, median, and other statistics.

IPDV can capture the difference in queuing time from one packet to the next, but this is a different distribution from the queue occupancy revealed by PDV.

#### [7.4.](#) Determining De-jitter Buffer Size

This task is complimentary to the problem of inferring queue occupancy through measurement. Again, use of the sample minimum as the reference delay for PDV yields a distribution that is very relevant to de-jitter buffer size. This is because the minimum delay is an alignment point for the smoothing operation of de-jitter buffers. A de-jitter buffer that is ideally aligned with the delay variation adds zero buffer time to packets with the longest accommodated network delay (any packets with longer delays are discarded). Thus, a packet experiencing minimum network delay should be aligned to wait the maximum length of the de-jitter buffer. With this alignment, the stream is smoothed with no unnecessary delay added. [[G.1020](#)] illustrates the ideal relationship between network delay variation and buffer time.

The PDV distribution is also useful for this task, but different statistics are preferred. The range (max-min) or the 99.9%-ile of PDV (pseudo-range) are closely related to the buffer size needed to accommodate the observed network delay variation.

In some cases, the positive excursions of IPDV may help to approximate the de-jitter buffer size, but there is no guarantee that a good buffer estimate will emerge, especially when the delay varies as a positive trend over several test packets.

#### [8.](#) IANA Considerations

This document makes no request of IANA.



Note to RFC Editor: this section may be removed on publication as an RFC.

## 9. Security Considerations

The security considerations that apply to any active measurement of live networks are relevant here as well. See [[RFC4656](#)]

## 10. Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Phil Chimento for his suggestion to employ the convention of conditional distributions for Delay to deal with packet loss, and his encouragement to "write the memo" after hearing the talk.

## 11. References

### 11.1. Normative References

[I-D.ietf-ippm-reordering]

Morton, A., "Packet Reordering Metric for IPPM",  
[draft-ietf-ippm-reordering-13](#) (work in progress),  
May 2006.

[RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.

[RFC2330] Paxson, V., Almes, G., Mahdavi, J., and M. Mathis, "Framework for IP Performance Metrics", [RFC 2330](#), May 1998.

[RFC2679] Almes, G., Kalidindi, S., and M. Zekauskas, "A One-way Delay Metric for IPPM", [RFC 2679](#), September 1999.

[RFC2680] Almes, G., Kalidindi, S., and M. Zekauskas, "A One-way Packet Loss Metric for IPPM", [RFC 2680](#), September 1999.

[RFC3393] Demichelis, C. and P. Chimento, "IP Packet Delay Variation Metric for IP Performance Metrics (IPPM)", [RFC 3393](#), November 2002.

- [RFC3432] Raisanen, V., Grotefeld, G., and A. Morton, "Network performance measurement with periodic streams", [RFC 3432](#), November 2002.
- [RFC4656] Shalunov, S., Teitelbaum, B., Karp, A., Boote, J., and M. Zekauskas, "A One-way Active Measurement Protocol (OWAMP)", [RFC 4656](#), September 2006.

## 11.2. Informative References

- [Casner] "A Fine-Grained View of High Performance Networking, NANOG 22 Conf.; <http://www.nanog.org/mtg-0105/agenda.html>", May 20-22 2001.
- [Cia03] "Standardized Active Measurements on a Tier 1 IP Backbone, IEEE Communications Mag., pp 90-97.", June 2003.
- [Demichelis]  
<http://www.advanced.org/ippm/archive.3/att-0075/01-pap02.doc>, "Packet Delay Variation Comparison between ITU-T and IETF Draft Definitions", November 2000.
- [G.1020] ITU-T Recommendation G.1020, "'Performance parameter definitions for the quality of speech and other voiceband applications utilizing IP networks'", 2006.
- [I-D.ietf-ippm-framework-compagg]  
Morton, A. and S. Berghe, "Framework for Metric Composition", [draft-ietf-ippm-framework-compagg-01](#) (work in progress), June 2006.
- [Krzanowski]  
Presentation at IPPM, IETF-64, "Jitter Definitions: What is What?", November 2005.
- [RFC3550] Schulzrinne, H., Casner, S., Frederick, R., and V. Jacobson, "RTP: A Transport Protocol for Real-Time Applications", STD 64, [RFC 3550](#), July 2003.
- [Y.1540] ITU-T Recommendation Y.1540, "Internet protocol data communication service - IP packet transfer and availability performance parameters", December 2002.
- [Y.1541] ITU-T Recommendation Y.1540, "Network Performance Objectives for IP-Based Services", February 2006.

Internet-Draft

Delay Variation AS

October 2006

Author's Address

Al Morton  
AT&T Labs  
200 Laurel Avenue South  
Middletown,, NJ 07748  
USA

Phone: +1 732 420 1571

Fax: +1 732 368 1192

Email: [acmorton@att.com](mailto:acmorton@att.com)

URI: <http://home.comcast.net/~acmacm/>

---

Internet-Draft

Delay Variation AS

October 2006

### Full Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2006).

This document is subject to the rights, licenses and restrictions contained in [BCP 78](#), and except as set forth therein, the authors retain all their rights.

This document and the information contained herein are provided on an "AS IS" basis and THE CONTRIBUTOR, THE ORGANIZATION HE/SHE REPRESENTS OR IS SPONSORED BY (IF ANY), THE INTERNET SOCIETY AND THE INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE DISCLAIM ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION HEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

### Intellectual Property

The IETF takes no position regarding the validity or scope of any Intellectual Property Rights or other rights that might be claimed to pertain to the implementation or use of the technology described in this document or the extent to which any license under such rights might or might not be available; nor does it represent that it has made any independent effort to identify any such rights. Information on the procedures with respect to rights in RFC documents can be found in [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

Copies of IPR disclosures made to the IETF Secretariat and any assurances of licenses to be made available, or the result of an attempt made to obtain a general license or permission for the use of such proprietary rights by implementers or users of this specification can be obtained from the IETF on-line IPR repository at

<http://www.ietf.org/ipr>.

The IETF invites any interested party to bring to its attention any copyrights, patents or patent applications, or other proprietary rights that may cover technology that may be required to implement this standard. Please address the information to the IETF at [ietf-ipr@ietf.org](mailto:ietf-ipr@ietf.org).

#### Acknowledgment

Funding for the RFC Editor function is provided by the IETF Administrative Support Activity (IASA).