Adding Explicit Congestion Notification (ECN) Capability to TCP's SYN/ACK Packets

A. Kuzmanovic, A. Mondal, S. Floyd, and K.K. Ramakrishnan draft-ietf-tcpm-ecnsyn-03.txt TCPM December 2007

## Purpose:

- Specifies a modification to RFC 3168 to allow TCP SYN/ACK packets to be ECN-Capable.
- Based on the SIGCOMM 2005 paper by A. Kuzmanovic.
- Avoids the retransmit timeout when a SYN/ACK packet would have been dropped.
- If the SYN/ACK packet is ECN-marked, the sender of that packet responds by reducing the initial window to one segment, instead of two to four segments.

## More:

- The SYN/ACK packet can be sent as ECN-Capable only in response to an ECN-setup SYN packet.
- The SYN packet still MUST NOT be sent as ECN-Capable.
- The benefit of adding ECN-capability to SYN/ACK packets can be high, particularly for small web transfers.

## Changes from draft-ietf-tcpm-ecnsyn-02:

- Added to the discussion in the Security section of whether ECN-Capable TCP SYN packets have problems with firewalls, over and above the known problems of TCP data packets (e.g., as in the Microsoft report). From a question raised at the TCPM meeting at the July 2007 IETF.
- Added a sentence to the discussion of routers or middleboxes that \*might\* drop TCP SYN packets on the basis of IP header fields. Feedback from Remi Denis-Courmont.
- General editing. Feedback from Alfred Hoenes.

# Changes from draft-ietf-tcpm-ecnsyn-03 (not yet submitted):

- General editing. This includes using the terms "initiator" and "responder" for the two ends of the TCP connection. Feedback from Alfred Hoenes.
  - URL:

http://www.icir.org/floyd/papers/draft-ietf-tcpm-ecnsyn-04a.txt, "http://www.icir.org/floyd/papers/draft-ietf-tcpm-ecnsyn-04a.ps".

## Backwards compatibility issues:

- (1) Accept problems with old ECN TCP implementations that don't respond to ECN-marked SYN/ACK packets?
- (2) Use an ECN-SYN flag in TCP header of SYN packet?
  "I want to use ECN, and I understand ECN-marked SYN/ACK packets"
- (3) Use an ECN-SYN TCP option?
  - "I understand ECN-marked SYN/ACK packets."

Slides from last time:

### The TODO List from March 2006:

- Converge on the response to a marked SYN/ACK packet.
- Look at the costs of adding ECN-Capability in a worstcase scenario. (From feedback from Mark Allman and Janardhan Iyengar.)
- Find out how current TCP implementations respond when receiving a SYN/ACK packet that has been ECN-marked?

# Response to an ECN-Marked SYN/ACK Packet?

- Set initial cwnd to one packet:
  - Instead of setting cwnd to 2-4 packets.
  - Continue in congestion avoidance instead of slow-start.
- OR
- Wait an RTT before sending a data packet:
  Proposed by Mark Allman.
- Simulations reported in Appendix A.

#### **Results from Simulations:**

Simulations with RED in Packet Mode, 3 KB Average Flow Size



#### **Results from Simulations:**

Simulations with RED in Packet Mode, 3 KB Average Flow Size, #2



#### **Results from Simulations:**

Simulations with RED in Packet Mode, 3 KB Average Flow Size, #3



# Simulation Overview:

- Heavy-tailed distribution of file sizes
  - With a range of average file sizes.
- Topology:
  - Target delay 1 ms, 5 ms, 10 ms.
  - 100 Mbps congested link.
  - Minimum RTT of 12 ms.
  - RED in gentle mode.
- Simulations with RED in packet and byte mode.
  - For the simulations with RED in byte mode, SYN packets aren't dropped or marked very often. So it doesn't make much difference if SYN/ACK packets are ECN-Capable.

## Lessons from Simulations:

- Dangers with high congestion?
  - When congestion is high, packets are dropped rather than ECN-marked, with or without ECN+.
- Comparing ECN+ with ECN/Wait:
  - The overall congestion level with ECN+ (without waiting) is similar to that with ECN/Wait (waiting after an ECN/SYN packet is marked).

## Current TCP Implementations:

- Fedora Linux TCP:
  - Shouldn't crash after an ECN-marked SYN/ACK packet.
  - Shouldn't respond to the CE codepoint in a SYN/ACK packet either.
- FreeBSD?
- Microsoft Vista?