TCP and Stream Control Transmission Protocol (SCTP) RTO Restart

Abstract

This document describes a modified sender-side algorithm for managing the TCP and Stream Control Transmission Protocol (SCTP) retransmission timers that provides faster loss recovery when there is a small amount of outstanding data for a connection. The modification, RTO Restart (RTOR), allows the transport to restart its retransmission timer using a smaller timeout duration, so that the effective retransmission timeout (RTO) becomes more aggressive in situations where fast retransmit cannot be used. This enables faster loss detection and recovery for connections that are short lived or application limited.

Status of This Memo

This document is not an Internet Standards Track specification; it is published for examination, experimental implementation, and evaluation.

This document defines an Experimental Protocol for the Internet community. This document is a product of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). It represents the consensus of the IETF community. It has received public review and has been approved for publication by the Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG). Not all documents approved by the IESG are a candidate for any level of Internet Standard; see Section 2 of RFC 5741.

Information about the current status of this document, any errata, and how to provide feedback on it may be obtained at http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7765.
1. Introduction

TCP and SCTP use two almost identical mechanisms to detect and recover from data loss, specified in [RFC6298] and [RFC5681] for TCP and [RFC4960] for SCTP. First, if transmitted data is not acknowledged within a certain amount of time, a retransmission timeout (RTO) occurs and the data is retransmitted. While the RTO is based on measured round-trip times (RTTs) between the sender and receiver, it also has a conservative lower bound of 1 second to ensure that delayed data are not mistaken as lost. Second, when a sender receives duplicate acknowledgments or similar information via selective acknowledgments, the fast retransmit algorithm suspects data loss and can trigger a retransmission. Duplicate (and selective) acknowledgments are generated by a receiver when data arrives out of order. As both data loss and data reordering cause out-of-order arrival, fast retransmit waits for three out-of-order notifications before considering the corresponding data as lost. In some situations, however, the amount of outstanding data is not enough to trigger three such acknowledgments, and the sender must rely on lengthy RTOs for loss recovery.

The amount of outstanding data can be small for several reasons:

1. The connection is limited by congestion control when the path has a low total capacity (bandwidth-delay product) or the connection’s share of the capacity is small. It is also limited by congestion control in the first few RTTs of a connection or after an RTO when the available capacity is probed using slow-start.

2. The connection is limited by the receiver’s available buffer space.

3. The connection is limited by the application if the available capacity of the path is not fully utilized (e.g., interactive applications) or is at the end of a transfer.

While the reasons listed above are valid for any flow, the third reason is most common for applications that transmit short flows or use a bursty transmission pattern. A typical example of applications that produce short flows are web-based applications. [RJ10] shows that 70% of all web objects, found at the top 500 sites, are too small for fast retransmit to work. [FDT13] shows that about 77% of all retransmissions sent by a major web service are sent after RTO expiry. Applications with bursty transmission patterns often send data in response to actions or as a reaction to real life events. Typical examples of such applications are stock-trading systems, remote computer operations, online games, and web-based applications.
using persistent connections. What is special about this class of applications is that they are often time dependent, and extra latency can reduce the application service level [P09].

The RTO Restart (RTOR) mechanism described in this document makes the effective RTO slightly more aggressive when the amount of outstanding data is too small for fast retransmit to work, in an attempt to enable faster loss recovery while being robust to reordering. While RTOR still conforms to the requirement for when a segment can be retransmitted, specified in [RFC6298] for TCP and [RFC4960] for SCTP, it could increase the risk of spurious timeouts. To determine whether this modification is safe to deploy and enable by default, further experimentation is required. Section 5 discusses experiments still needed, including evaluations in environments where the risk of spurious retransmissions are increased, e.g., mobile networks with highly varying RTTs.

The remainder of this document describes RTOR and its implementation for TCP only, to make the document easier to read. However, the RTOR algorithm described in Section 4 is applicable also for SCTP. Furthermore, Section 7 details the SCTP socket API needed to control RTOR.

2. Terminology

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in RFC 2119 [RFC2119].

This document introduces the following variables:

- The number of previously unsent segments (prevunsnt): The number of segments that a sender has queued for transmission, but has not yet sent.

- RTOR Restart threshold (rrthresh): RTOR is enabled whenever the sum of the number of outstanding and previously unsent segments (prevunsnt) is below this threshold.

3. RTO Overview and Rationale for RTOR

The RTO management algorithm described in [RFC6298] recommends that the retransmission timer be restarted when an acknowledgment (ACK) that acknowledges new data is received and there is still outstanding data. The restart is conducted to guarantee that unacknowledged segments will be retransmitted after approximately RTO seconds. The standardized RTO timer management is illustrated in Figure 1, where a TCP sender transmits three segments to a receiver. The arrival of
the first and second segment triggers a delayed ACK (delACK) [RFC1122], which restarts the RTO timer at the sender. The RTO is restarted approximately one RTT after the transmission of the third segment. Thus, if the third segment is lost, as indicated in Figure 1, the effective loss detection time becomes "RTO + RTT" seconds. In some situations, the effective loss detection time becomes even longer. Consider a scenario where only two segments are outstanding. If the second segment is lost, the time to expire the delACK timer will also be included in the effective loss detection time.

Sender                               Receiver
...                                  ...
DATA [SEG 1] ----------------------> (ack delayed)
DATA [SEG 2] ----------------------> (send ack)
DATA [SEG 3] ----X         /-------- ACK
(restart RTO)          <--------/
...                                  ...
(RTO expiry)
DATA [SEG 3] ---------------------->

Figure 1: RTO Restart Example

For bulk traffic, the current approach is beneficial -- it is described in [EL04] to act as a "safety margin" that compensates for some of the problems that the authors have identified with the standard RTO calculation. Notably, the authors of [EL04] also state that "this safety margin does not exist for highly interactive applications where often only a single packet is in flight." In general, however, as long as enough segments arrive at a receiver to enable fast retransmit, RTO-based loss recovery should be avoided. RTOs should only be used as a last resort, as they drastically lower the congestion window as compared to fast retransmit.

Although fast retransmit is preferable, there are situations where timeouts are appropriate or are the only choice. For example, if the network is severely congested and no segments arrive, RTO-based recovery should be used. In this situation, the time to recover from the loss(es) will not be the performance bottleneck. However, for connections that do not utilize enough capacity to enable fast retransmit, RTO-based loss detection is the only choice, and the time required for this can become a performance bottleneck.
4. RTOR Algorithm

To enable faster loss recovery for connections that are unable to use fast retransmit, RTOR can be used. This section specifies the modifications required to use RTOR. By resetting the timer to "RTO - T_earliest", where T_earliest is the time elapsed since the earliest outstanding segment was transmitted, retransmissions will always occur after exactly RTO seconds.

This document specifies an OPTIONAL sender-only modification to TCP and SCTP, which updates step 5.3 in Section 5 of [RFC6298] (and a similar update in Section 6.3.2 of [RFC4960] for SCTP). A sender that implements this method MUST follow the algorithm below:

When an ACK is received that acknowledges new data:

1. Set T_earliest = 0.

2. If the sum of the number of outstanding and previously unsent segments (prevunsnt) is less than an RTOR threshold (rrthresh), set T_earliest to the time elapsed since the earliest outstanding segment was sent.

3. Restart the retransmission timer so that it will expire after (for the current value of RTO):
   (a) RTO - T_earliest, if RTO - T_earliest > 0.
   (b) RTO, otherwise.

The RECOMMENDED value of rrthresh is four, as this value will ensure that RTOR is only used when fast retransmit cannot be triggered. With this update, TCP implementations MUST track the time elapsed since the transmission of the earliest outstanding segment (T_earliest). As RTOR is only used when the amount of outstanding and previously unsent data is less than rrthresh segments, TCP implementations also need to track whether the amount of outstanding and previously unsent data is more, equal, or less than rrthresh segments. Although some packet-based TCP implementations (e.g., Linux TCP) already track both the transmission times of all segments and also the number of outstanding segments, not all implementations do. Section 5.3 describes how to implement segment tracking for a general TCP implementation. To use RTOR, the calculated expiration time MUST be positive (step 3(a) in the list above); this is required to ensure that RTOR does not trigger retransmissions prematurely when previously retransmitted segments are acknowledged.
5. Discussion

Although RTOR conforms to the requirement in [RFC6298] that segments must not be retransmitted earlier than RTO seconds after their original transmission, RTOR makes the effective RTO more aggressive. In this section, we discuss the applicability and the issues related to RTOR.

5.1. Applicability

The currently standardized algorithm has been shown to add at least one RTT to the loss recovery process in TCP [LS00] and SCTP [HB11] [PBP09]. For applications that have strict timing requirements (e.g., interactive web) rather than throughput requirements, using RTOR could be beneficial because the RTT and the delACK timer of receivers are often large components of the effective loss recovery time. Measurements in [HB11] have shown that the total transfer time of a lost segment (including the original transmission time and the loss recovery time) can be reduced by 35% using RTOR. These results match those presented in [PGH06] and [PBP09], where RTOR is shown to significantly reduce retransmission latency.

There are also traffic types that do not benefit from RTOR. One example of such traffic is bulk transmission. The reason why bulk traffic does not benefit from RTOR is that such traffic flows mostly have four or more segments outstanding, allowing loss recovery by fast retransmit. However, there is no harm in using RTOR for such traffic as the algorithm is only active when the amount of outstanding and unsent segments are less than rrthresh (default 4).

Given that RTOR is a mostly conservative algorithm, it is suitable for experimentation as a system-wide default for TCP traffic.

5.2. Spurious Timeouts

RTOR can in some situations reduce the loss detection time and thereby increase the risk of spurious timeouts. In theory, the retransmission timer has a lower bound of 1 second [RFC6298], which limits the risk of having spurious timeouts. However, in practice, most implementations use a significantly lower value. Initial measurements show slight increases in the number of spurious timeouts when such lower values are used [RHB15]. However, further experiments, in different environments and with different types of traffic, are encouraged to quantify such increases more reliably.

Does a slightly increased risk matter? Generally, spurious timeouts have a negative effect on the network as segments are transmitted needlessly. However, recent experiments do not show a significant
Another problem with spurious retransmissions is related to the performance of TCP/SCTP, as the congestion window is reduced to one segment when timeouts occur [RFC5681]. This could be a potential problem for applications transmitting multiple bursts of data within a single flow, e.g., web-based HTTP/1.1 and HTTP/2.0 applications. However, results from recent experiments involving persistent web traffic [RHB15] revealed a net gain using RTOR. Other types of flows, e.g., long-lived bulk flows, are not affected as the algorithm is only applied when the amount of outstanding and unsent segments is less than rrthresh. Furthermore, short-lived and application-limited flows are typically not affected as they are too short to experience the effect of congestion control or have a transmission rate that is quickly attainable.

While a slight increase in spurious timeouts has been observed using RTOR, it is not clear whether or not the effects of this increase mandate any future algorithmic changes -- especially since most modern operating systems already include mechanisms to detect [RFC3522] [RFC3708] [RFC5682] and resolve [RFC4015] possible problems with spurious retransmissions. Further experimentation is needed to determine this and thereby move this specificaion from Experimental to the Standards Track. For instance, RTOR has not been evaluated in the context of mobile networks. Mobile networks often incur highly variable RTTs (delay spikes), due to e.g., handovers, and would therefore be a useful scenario for further experimentation.

5.3. Tracking Outstanding and Previously Unsent Segments

The method of tracking outstanding and previously unsent segments will probably differ depending on the actual TCP implementation. For packet-based TCP implementations, tracking outstanding segments is often straightforward and can be implemented using a simple counter. For byte-based TCP stacks, it is a more complex task. Section 3.2 of [RFC5827] outlines a general method of tracking the number of outstanding segments. The same method can be used for RTOR. The implementation will have to track segment boundaries to form an understanding as to how many actual segments have been transmitted but not acknowledged. This can be done by the sender tracking the boundaries of the rrthresh segments on the right side of the current window (which involves tracking rrthresh + 1 sequence numbers in TCP). This could be done by keeping a circular list of the segment boundaries, for instance. Cumulative ACKs that do not fall within this region indicate that at least rrthresh segments are outstanding, and therefore RTOR is not enabled. When the outstanding window becomes small enough that RTOR can be invoked, a full understanding of the number of outstanding segments will be available from the rrthresh + 1 sequence numbers retained. (Note: the implicit sequence
number consumed by the TCP FIN bit can also be included in the
tracking of segment boundaries.)

Tracking the number of previously unsent segments depends on the
segmentation strategy used by the TCP implementation, not whether it
is packet based or byte based. In the case where segments are formed
directly on socket writes, the process of determining the number of
previously unsent segments should be trivial. In the case that
unsent data can be segmented (or resegmented) as long as it is still
unsent, a straightforward strategy could be to divide the amount of
unsent data (in bytes) with the Sender Maximum Segment Size (SMSS) to
obtain an estimate. In some cases, such an estimation could be too
simplistic, depending on the segmentation strategy of the TCP
implementation. However, this estimation is not critical to RTOR.
The tracking of prevunsnt is only made to optimize a corner case in
which RTOR was unnecessarily disabled. Implementations can use a
simplified method by setting prevunsnt to rrthresh whenever
previously unsent data is available, and set prevunsnt to zero when
no new data is available. This will disable RTOR in the presence of
unsent data and only use the number of outstanding segments to
enable/disable RTOR.

6. Related Work

There are several proposals that address the problem of not having
enough ACKs for loss recovery. In what follows, we explain why the
mechanism described here is complementary to these approaches:

The limited transmit mechanism [RFC3042] allows a TCP sender to
transmit a previously unsent segment for each of the first two
duplicate acknowledgements (dupACKs). By transmitting new segments,
the sender attempts to generate additional dupACKs to enable fast
retransmit. However, limited transmit does not help if no previously
unsent data is ready for transmission. [RFC5827] specifies an early
retransmit algorithm to enable fast loss recovery in such situations.
By dynamically lowering the number of dupACKs needed for fast
retransmit (dupthresh), based on the number of outstanding segments,
a smaller number of dupACKs is needed to trigger a retransmission.
In some situations, however, the algorithm is of no use or might not
work properly. First, if a single segment is outstanding and lost,
it is impossible to use early retransmit. Second, if ACKs are lost,
early retransmit cannot help. Third, if the network path reorders
segments, the algorithm might cause more spurious retransmissions
than fast retransmit. The recommended value of RTOR’s rrthresh
variable is based on the dupthresh, but it is possible to adapt to
allow tighter integration with other experimental algorithms such as
early retransmit.
Tail Loss Probe [TLP] is a proposal to send up to two "probe segments" when a timer fires that is set to a value smaller than the RTO. A "probe segment" is a new segment if new data is available, else it is a retransmission. The intention is to compensate for sluggish RTO behavior in situations where the RTO greatly exceeds the RTT, which, according to measurements reported in [TLP], is not uncommon. Furthermore, TLP also tries to circumvent the congestion window reset to one segment by instead enabling fast recovery. The probe timeout (PTO) is normally two RTTs, and a spurious PTO is less risky than a spurious RTO because it would not have the same negative effects (clearing the scoreboard and restarting with slow-start). TLP is a more advanced mechanism than RTOR, requiring e.g., SACK to work, and is often able to further reduce loss recovery times. However, it also noticeably increases the amount of spurious retransmissions, as compared to RTOR [RHB15].

TLP is applicable in situations where RTOR does not apply, and it could overrule (yielding a similar general behavior, but with a lower timeout) RTOR in cases where the number of outstanding segments is smaller than four and no new segments are available for transmission. The PTO has the same inherent problem of restarting the timer on an incoming ACK and could be combined with a strategy similar to RTOR’s to offer more consistent timeouts.

7. SCTP Socket API Considerations

This section describes how the socket API for SCTP defined in [RFC6458] is extended to control the usage of RTO restart for SCTP.

Please note that this section is informational only.

7.1. Data Types

This section uses data types from [IEEE.9945]: uintN_t means an unsigned integer of exactly N bits (e.g., uint16_t). This is the same as in [RFC6458].

7.2. Socket Option for Controlling the RTO Restart Support

(SCTP_RTO_RESTART)

This socket option allows the enabling or disabling of RTO Restart for SCTP associations.

Whether or not RTO restart is enabled per default is implementation specific.
This socket option uses IPPROTO_SCTP as its level and SCTP_RTO_RESTART as its name. It can be used with getsockopt() and setsockopt(). The socket option value uses the following structure defined in [RFC6458]:

```c
struct sctp_assoc_value {
    sctp_assoc_t assoc_id;
    uint32_t assoc_value;
};
```

 assoc_id: This parameter is ignored for one-to-one style sockets. For one-to-many style sockets, this parameter indicates upon which association the user is performing an action. The special sctp_assoc_t SCTP_{FUTURE|CURRENT|ALL}_ASSOC can also be used in assoc_id for setsockopt(). For getsockopt(), the special value SCTP_FUTURE_ASSOC can be used in assoc_id, but it is an error to use SCTP_{CURRENT|ALL}_ASSOC in assoc_id.

 assoc_value: A non-zero value encodes the enabling of RTO restart whereas a value of 0 encodes the disabling of RTO restart.

sctp_opt_info() needs to be extended to support SCTP_RTO_RESTART.

8. Security Considerations

This document specifies an experimental sender-only modification to TCP and SCTP. The modification introduces a change in how to set the retransmission timer’s value when restarted. Therefore, the security considerations found in [RFC6298] apply to this document. No additional security problems have been identified with RTO Restart at this time.
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