

# **IAB Concerns Regarding Congestion Control for Voice Traffic in the Internet**

\*

draft-iab-congestion-00.txt

Sally Floyd, James Kempf, editors

July, 2003

AVT presentation, IETF

## Concerns about end-to-end congestion control for best-effort voice traffic in the Internet

\*

- This draft does not recommend any particular deployment path for VoIP in the Internet (e.g., best-effort, QoS, reservations, etc.).
- The draft observes that in fact, **some VoIP traffic ends up competing as best-effort traffic** with other best-effort traffic over some link in the Internet.
- The draft recommends that such flows with a minimum sending rate should terminate in the presence of sufficiently-high, persistent packet drop rates.
- The draft further observes that adaptive codecs can expand the available range for VoIP.

## The Reality:



- A VoIP flow between the Atlanta IETF and Nairobi, Kenya:
  - 64 kbps plus FEC plus framing.
  - A shared, congested 128 Kbps access link.
  - Good voice quality in the presence of 5-40% drop rates.
- The problems:
  - Congestion collapse;
  - User quality;
  - Fairness.

## Developments in the IETF:



- **RTP:**
  - RTP Profile for Audio and Video Conferences with Minimal Control
- **TFRC:**
  - TFRC-PS, still under development, would be for applications with a fixed sending rate but varying packet sizes.
  - DCCP.
- **Adaptive Rate Audio Codecs:**
  - RFC 3267: Adaptive Multi-Rate (AMR) and Adaptive Multi-Rate Wideband (AMR-WB) audio codecs.
  - iLBC: Internet Low Bit Rate Codec.
  - Ivox: Interactive VOice eXchange.

# Minimum Acceptable Sending Rates for Best-Effort Traffic

\*

- Assume (generously) a network limited in bandwidth, not CPU cycles.
- Consider fairness with TCP flows with the same RTT and 1500-byte packets.
- Take into account packet header size.
- Don't assume that  $N$  small packets dropped equals one large packet dropped.

## Minimum Acceptable Sending Rates: the details

\*

- For a VoIP flow at 4.75 kbps, 20 pps, 100 ms RTT:
  - A TCP flow sending at the same rate in bps would have a persistent packet drop rate between 35 and 40%.
- For a VoIP flow at 64 kbps, 50 pps, 100 ms RTT:
  - A TCP flow sending at the same rate in bps would have a persistent packet drop rate between 20 and 25%.

## Recommendations:

\*

- (1) In IETF standards for protocols regarding best-effort flows with a minimum sending rate, a packet drop rate must be specified, such that the best-effort flow terminates when the steady-state packet drop rate significantly exceeds the specified drop rate.
- (2) The specified drop rate for the minimum sending rate should be consistent with the use of Tables 1 and 2 as illustrated in this document.

## Extra viewgraphs:

\*



## More on minimum sending rates.

\*

- For the heavy packet drop regime, the standard TCP response function overestimates TCP's sending rate.
- **The standard TCP response function:**
  - For a packet drop rate of 50%, a sending rate of 0.1 ppr.
- **From simulations:**
  - For a packet drop rate of 50%, a sending rate of 0.018 ppr.

(For an RTO set to twice the RTT.)