

RMCAT requirements

draft-jesup-rmcat-01

Randell Jesup

IETF 86 Orlando

Changes since Atlanta

- Incorporated feedback
- Removed assumptions that imply a particular solution
- General cleanup

Areas of interest

- What is “Fair”?
 - We can change the term, but that doesn't change the requirement
- No definition is “correct”
- Not necessarily the same as 1xTCP flow
- Matters more when measured against longer flows
- Matters most when measured against other low-delay flows
 - Being mildly unfair to long-term, non-realtime flows is probably ok, but...
- Avoid pushing competing flows into collapse
- Avoid new flows taking too long to get a “usable” share

Where do we go with “fairness”?

- Try to define it
 - We won't succeed, but we may be able to bound it, and describe pieces of it
 - Needs to be defined for both “local” fairness and “aggregate” at nodes deeper in the network

What goes into fairness?

- Startup vs. steady-state
- Long-lived vs short competition
- Bursty competition (browsing)
- Low-delay/self competition vs TCP-like
- Affect on newcomer flows – time until “usable” (another vague term!)
- “Local” vs “aggregate” - where are we measuring?
- Others?

What goes into fairness?

- Startup vs. steady-state
- Long-lived vs short competition
- Bursty competition (browsing)
- Low-delay/self competition vs TCP-like
- Affect on newcomer flows – time until “usable” (another vague term!)
- “Local” vs “aggregate” - where are we measuring?
- Others?

Other issues

- Minimum bandwidth
 - Application-defined (or application input)
 - Don't assume minimum is a static number
 - Implies requirement that applications can change parameters dynamically
 - Other parameters?
 - Oscillation importance?
 - Mode-switch point (nice kitty to nasty kitty)
 - Implies switch to longer delays/loss-based

Questions/Discussion