# QoS and NGN



Professor Washington University St. Louis, MO 63130 Co-Founder and CTO Nayna Networks, Inc. Santa Clara, CA 95054

International Technology Forum Palo Alto, CA, October 20-21, 2005

These Slides are available at

http:/www.cse.wustl.edu/~jain/talks/itf05qs.htm



ITF 2005 QoS Panel

## QoS - Past

- □ **IEEE 802.1D**: Strict priority, Massive bandwidth
- ATM: Classes of Service: CBR, VBR, ABR, UBR
   Difficult to specify cell delay variation
   Difficult to accrete VDD
  - Difficult to aggregate VBR
- □ **Integrated Services:** ATM like services
  - □ Best effort, controlled load, guaranteed service.
  - □ RSVP for signaling. Soft state.
  - □ Per-flow considered too complex for routers
- **Differentiated Services:** Marking in packets
  - Per hop behavior Mechanisms and not services.
    DiffServ is a misnomer.
- □ **MPLS:** End-to-end path setup.



ITF 2005 QoS Panel



# **QoS Debate**

- Massive Bandwidth vs Managed Bandwidth
- Per-Flow vs Aggregate
- Quantitative vs Qualitative
- □ Absolute vs Relative
- □ End-to-end vs Per-hop
- □ Soft State vs Hard State
- Path based vs Access based
- Source-Controlled vs Receiver Controlled



ITF 2005 QoS Panel



# **Comparison of QoS Approaches**

Issue	ATM	IntServ	DiffServ	MPLS	IEEE
					802.1D
Massive Bandwidth vs Managed Bandwidth	Managed	Managed	Massive	Managed	Massive
Per-Flow vs Aggregate	Both	Per-flow	Aggregate	Both	Aggregate
Quantitative vs Qualitative	Quantitativ e	Quantitativ e+Qualitat ive	Mostly qualitative	Both	Qualitative
Absolute vs Relative	Absolute	Absolute	Mostly Relative	Absolute plus relative	Relative
End-to-end vs Per- hop	e-e	e-e	Per-hop	e-e	Per-hop
Soft State vs Hard State	Hard	Soft	None	Hard	Hard
Path based vs Access based	Path	Path	Access	Path	Access
Source-Controlled vs Receiver Controlled	Unicast Source, Multicast both	Receiver	Ingress	Both	Source
Washington University IN-ST-LOUIS	ITF 2005 OoS Pan	el	©2005 Raj Jain		NAYNA

#### **State of the Network: 2005**

- Security is most important: All packets go through deep inspections ⇒ Throughput limited by packet inspection, Firewalls, Spam filters
- 2. Wireless (WiFi) is spreading (Intel Centrino) Limited bandwidth ⇒Triple play over wireless needs QoS
- 3. More Cell phones than POTS. Smart Cell phones w PDA, email, video, images ⇒ Mobility
- 4. Voice over Internet Protocol (VOIP) is in the Mainstream  $\Rightarrow$  IP QoS vs Application specific QoS
- 5. Terabyte/Petabyte storage (Not VoD)  $\Rightarrow$  High-Speed Networking
- 6. Internet is less about communication and more for information retrieval
   Weakington



ITF 2005 QoS Panel



## **Upcoming Challenges of Networking**

- **1.** Size: 4 nodes  $\Rightarrow$  100 M nodes  $\Rightarrow$  4B people  $\Rightarrow$  4T appliances
- 2. Distance: USA  $\Rightarrow$  Worldwide  $\Rightarrow$  Interplanetary  $\Rightarrow$  WAN  $\Rightarrow$  LAN  $\Rightarrow$  PAN
- **3.** Speed: 128 kbps  $\Rightarrow$  10Mbps  $\Rightarrow$  10Gbps  $\Rightarrow$  1.6 Tbps
- 4. Criteria: Least cost  $\Rightarrow$  Policy based (Traffic Mgmt), Power
- **5. Traffic**: Delay-tolerant Data, real-time voice and video, storage and computing
- **6.** Trusted nodes  $\Rightarrow$  Secure, virus proof, spam proof, ...
- 7. Stationary Nodes  $\Rightarrow$  Mobile Nodes  $\Rightarrow$  Mobile Networks
- 8. Stable Links ⇒ Continuous disruption, long outages, Varying quality
- 9. Single ownership ⇒ Multiple Domains ⇒ Hierarchies of ownership
- **10. Heterogeneity**: Single technology  $\Rightarrow$  Multiple L1/L2/L3



ITF 2005 QoS Panel





- 1. QoS requirements different for Enterprise and carriers
- 2. Need to design services and not mechanisms
- Application specific QoS mechanisms in addition to TCP/IP
- 4. Significant future challenges in QoS due to scale, mobility, ...



ITF 2005 QoS Panel



