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The Problem - The Wizard Gap

(ratio has gone from 3:1 to 300:1 in last decade)
Why? TCP "tuning" requires experts

- TCP/IP hides the net and upper layers for each other

- This is good for the growth of the ’net
  - but it hides all problems

- All bugs have the same symptom: less than expected performance!
TCP tuning is really debugging

- Six classes of bugs limit performance
  - TCP sender or receiver buffer space
  - Packet losses, corruption, congestion, lame HW
  - IP Routing, long round trip times
  - Inefficient applications
  - IP Packet reordering
  - Improper MSS negotiations or MTU discovery
TCP tuning is painful debugging

- Any one problem can mask all other problems
- Confounding all but the best experts
- Akin to finding the weakest link of an invisible chain
- We need better diagnostic visibility
The Web100 Project

- When there is a problem, just ask TCP
  - TCP has an ideal vantage point
  - TCP can identify the bottleneck subsystem
  - TCP already measures the network
  - TCP can measure the application
  - TCP can adjust itself

- This is the whole point of Web100
Status Overview

- Two years into three years of funding

- Open source in the field
  - 5000 lines of kernel code (Matt)
  - 40000 lines of user code (John E)

- About 130 defined instruments (R Reddy)

- Dissemination
  - Standard TCP-MIB via the IETF (Matt)
  - Vendor adoption (Peter)
  - Web pages and user support (Tanya)

- Evaluator/Collaborator feedback (Jim & 9 teams)
My Goal for this meeting

- Help us maximize our impact beyond the project
  - Set priorities for year 3 and beyond

- Web100 has to grow beyond this team

How?
Part 2
The ultimate goal is a widely implemented standard

I-D introduced prior to each of the last 3 IETFs
  • draft-ietf-tsvwg-tcp-mib-extension-01.txt

Transport AD’s very supportive
  • Scott Bradner and Allison Mankin

Only 2 comments from other people
  • IPv6 MIB management has noticed
  • Plan to start dialog next month

Gradual transition to "Kernel follows I-D"
Kernel Development: The big picture

- New autotuning loosely follows Feng’s DRS
  - To be presented by John Heffner

- Net100 contribution: the WAD
  - the Work Around Daemon

- Version 2.0 plans
  - Backward compatibility issues

- Kernel mainline strategy
The WAD (See DoE Net100 project)

- Framework for non-standard features & tuning
  - See Dunigan et al SC2002 paper

- Most require out-of-band parameters or policy
  - No globally suitable default configuration
  - MUST be disabled by default

- Safe controls are/will be in Web100 releases
  - Limits on cwnd, rwnd, MSS, etc.
  - Disable dupacks, cwnd validation, etc.
  - Hooks for diagnostics

- Unsafe controls are excluded from Web100 release
  - Alter AIMD parameters
Kernel Plans for version 2.0

- IPv6 support (mostly done)
  - Requires a userland "compatibility patch"
- New autotuning (mostly done)
- Bring into alignment with the newest MIB
  - Changes to about 30 instruments
- Move beyond 2.4.16
- Basic CPU profiling (done)
- Document NETLINK event notification (from Net100)
- Various minor fixes and extensions (done)
Mainline source strategy

- **Linux**
  - Recent harsh language is frightening
  - Planned to start dialog last month but slipped
  - We need to do something Real Soon Now

- **netBSD, freeBSD, *BSD**
  - Consider a consortia to re-implement the kernel
  - Solve GPL problems
  - "Second interoperable implementation" for IETF
  - Foster "classic" workstation adoption
  - Put pressure on Linux community