Comparison of TFRC and TCP(1,1/2) congestion control algorithms

ENSC835 and CMPT885 project demo Yi Zheng and Jian(Jason) Wen

Roadmap

Introduction
Simulation Senario
Simulation & Comparison
Windowsize effect
Throughput & lossrate comparison
Trunklink capacity effect
Queuing effects
Transmission delay effects

Simulation Scenario(1)



- Topology: Dumb-bell
- Metrics: *throughput*, *loss rate*

window size effect on Bandwidth utilization of TCP(1,1/2)



Bandwidth utilization of TCP(1,1/2)



Bandwidth utilization & lossrate comparison



Comparison of Throughput and Smoothness

- TCP(1/5,1/8) Vs TCP(1,1/2)
- TCP(3/7,1/4) Vs TCP(1,1/2)
- TCP(1/5,1/8) Vs TFRC
- TCP(1,1/2) Vs TFRC
- TCP(3/7,1/4) Vs TFRC
- TCP(3/7,1/4) Vs TFRC

TCP(1,1/2)(1/5,1/8) Vs TCP(1,1/2)(1,1/2)





TCP(1,1/2)(3/7,1/4) Vs TCP(1,1/2)(1,1/2)



TCP(1,1/2)(1/5,1/8) Vs TFRC



TCP(1, 1/2) Vs TFRC



TCP(3/7,1/4) Vs TFRC



Comparison of different bottleneck bandwidth effects

- Bottleneck bandwidth: 15Mbps
- Bottleneck bandwidth: 60Mbps

TCP(1,1/2) Vs TCP(1/5, 1/8)



Trunk link capacity:15Mbps

TCP(1,1/2) Vs TCP(1/5, 1/8)



Trunk link capacity:60Mbps

TFRC Vs TCP(1/5, 1/8)



Trunk link capacity:15Mbps

TFRC Vs TCP(1/5,1/8)



Trunk link capacity:60Mbps

Comparison of different queuing effects

- Drop-tail
- **RED** (Random Early Drop)

Drop-tail(TCP compares with TCP(1,1/2))





Drop-tail(TFRC compares with TCP(1,1/2))



Drop-tail(TFRC Vs TCP)



RED(TFRC Vs TCP(1, 1/2))



RED(TFRC Vs TCP)



RED(TCP Vs TCP(1, 1/2))



Effects of ECN in RED queuing



Comparison of transmission delay effect

- TCP(1/5,1/8) Vs TCP(1,1/2)
- TCP(3/7,1/4) Vs TCP(1,1/2)
- TCP(1/5,1/8) Vs TFRC
- TCP(1,1/2) Vs TFRC

Simulation Scenario(2)



TCP(1/5,1/8) Vs TCP(1,1/2)



TCP(3/7,1/4) Vs TCP(1,1/2)



TCP(1/5,1/8) Vs TFRC



TCP(1, 1/2) Vs TFRC





Conclusions

- Windowsize affect the throughput and lossrate of flows
- TCP(3/7, 1/4) and TCP(1,1/2)(1/5, 1/8) flows are smoother than the TCP(1,1/2) flows, but less smooth than the TFRC flows
- Throughput of TCP(1,1/2)(1/5, 1/8) is smaller than TCP(1,1/2)(3/7, 1/4) but smoother than the latter
- Comparing TCP(1,1/2)(3/7, 1/4) and TCP(1,1/2)(1/5, 1/8) with TCP(1,1/2), throughput of TCP(1,1/2) is higher
- TCP(1/5, 1/8) and TCP(3/7, 1/4) compete fairly with TCP(1,1/2) and with TFRC , while avoiding TCP(1,1/2)'s reduction of the sending rate in half in response to a single packet drop
- Different Queuing algorithms have different effects on throughput, RED better than Droptail.
- Transmission Delay affects the bandwidth utilization of flows

Main References

- Jamal Golestani, A Class of End-to-End Congestion Control Algorithms for the Internet, Proceedings of ICNP, 1998.
- S. Kunniyur and R. Srikant, "End-To-End Congestion Control: Utility Functions, Random Losses and ECN Marks", Longer version of the paper that appeared in Proceedings, INFOCOM 2000, Tel-Aviv, Israel, March 2000. Also submitted to IEEE Transactions on Networking
- S. Kunniyur and R. Srikant, "Fairness of Congestion Avoidance Schemes in Heterogeneous Networks", Proceedings, International Teletraffic Congress-16, Edinburgh, Scotland, 1999
- Yair Bartal, J. Byers and D. Raz, Global Optimization using Local Information with Applications to Flow Control, STOC, October 1997.
- TCP(1,1/2) Friendly Rate Control (TFRC): Protocol Specification, Handley, M., Pahdye, J., Floyd, S., and Widmer, J. Internet draft draftietf-tsvwg-tfrc-02.txt, work in progress, May 2001.
- R. Rejaie, M. Handley, and D. Estrin. "An End-to-end Rate-based Congestion Control Mechanism for Real-time Streams in the Internet". In *Proceedings of INFOCOMM 99*, 1999.