

# A Congestion Control Mechanism for Supporting Differentiated Service in Mobile Ad hoc Networks

Jin-Nyun Kim, Nam-Koo Ha, Dong-Hoon Cho, Hyun-Sook Kim, Ki-Jun Han  
Dept of Computer Engineering, Kyungpook National University, Daegu, 702-701, Korea  
Tel : +82-53-940-8697 Fax : +82-53-957-4846 E-mail: duritz@netopia.knu.ac.kr

## Abstract

Differentiated services (DiffServ) has been widely accepted as the service model to adopt for providing quality-of-service (QoS) over the next-generation IP networks. There is a growing need to support QoS in mobile ad hoc networks. Supporting DiffServ in mobile ad hoc networks, however, is very difficult because of the dynamic nature of mobile ad hoc networks, which causes network congestion. The network congestion induces long transfer packet delay and low throughput which make it very difficult to support QoS in mobile ad hoc networks. We propose DiffServ module to support differentiated service in mobile ad hoc networks through congestion control. Our DiffServ module uses the periodical rate control for real time traffic and also uses the best effort bandwidth concession when network congestion occurs. Network congestion is detected by measuring the packet transfer delay or bandwidth threshold of real time traffic. We evaluate our mechanism via a simulation study. Simulation results show our mechanism may offer a low and stable delay and a stable throughput for real time traffic in mobile ad hoc networks.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Differentiated services (DiffServ) [1] has been widely accepted as the service model to adopt for providing quality-of-service (QoS) over the next-generation IP networks. DiffServ uses the concept of Per Hop Behaviors (PHBs), which provide different levels of QoS to aggregated flows. This is done by classifying individual traffic flows into various service levels desired before entering the DiffServ network domain. Within the DiffServ domain, flows of the same class are aggregated and treated as one flow. Each aggregated flow is given a different treatment, in terms of network resources assigned, as described by the PHB for that class. There are three PHBs such as Expedited Forwarding (EF) [2], [3] service, Assured Forwarding (AF) service and Best Effort service. Service level agreements (SLAs) contain delay and throughput requirements among others like reliability requirements [4]. The EF PHBs provide low loss, low delay, and low jitter services for real time traffic that represents traffic like video or voice. We will use EF traffic as the same term with real time traffic within this paper.

A mobile ad hoc network is formed by a group of wireless stations without infrastructure. There is a growing need to support real time traffic in mobile ad hoc networks. This, However, is very challenging because mobile ad hoc networks represent dynamic nature, which causes unexpected network congestion as illustrated in Fig. 1 [6]. In this figure, we can see that network congestion is induced when a mobile station moves, which may consequently cause high delay and low throughput. Consequently, the QoS guarantee of real time flows is violated.




Fig. 1. Congestion in mobile ad hoc networks

In this paper, we propose a DiffServ module to support differentiated service in mobile ad hoc networks through congestion control. Our DiffServ module uses the periodical rate control for real time traffic and the best effort bandwidth concession when network congestion occurs. The organization of this paper is as follows. In Section 2, we describe congestion detection and congestion control mechanism performed at our DiffServ module. In Section 3, we present simulation model and some results. Finally, conclusions are offered in Section 4.

## 2. PROPOSED DIFFSERV MODULE FOR MOBILE AD HOC NETWORKS

The most dominant factor of packet transfer delay in networks is queuing delay. So, delay and jitter are minimized when queuing delays are minimized. The intent of the EF PHB is to provide a PHB in which EF marked packets usually encounter short or empty queues. EF Service should provide minimum delay and jitter [2].

According to RFC 3246 [2] which discusses the departure time of EF traffic, a node that supports EF on an interface I at some configured rate R must satisfy the following condition for the j-th packet:

$$d(j) \leq F(j) + E \quad (1)$$

where  $d(j)$  is an actual departure time,  $F(j)$  is a target departure time, and  $E$  is a tolerance that depends on the particular node characteristics.  $E$  provides an upper bound on  $(d(j)-F(j))$  for all  $j$ .

$F(j)$  is defined iteratively by

$$F(0) = 0, \quad d(0) = 0 \quad \text{for all } j > 0: \quad (2)$$

$$F(j) = \max[a(j), \min(d(j-1), F(j-1))] + \frac{L(j)}{R} \quad (3)$$

where  $a(j)$  is an arrival time, and  $R$  is the EF configured rate.

The rate at which EF traffic is served at a given output interface should be at least the arrival rate, independent of the offered load of non-EF traffic to that interface [2]. The relationships between EF traffic's input rate and output rate in each node are represented in the following three cases:

- (I) input rate > output rate
- (II) input rate < output rate
- (III) input rate = output rate

In case (I), it is difficult to support EF service because of the higher queuing delay. In case (II), the queuing delay is minimal so that high quality is provided to EF traffic. Non-EF traffic, however, is starved. Also, the delay and throughput of EF traffic can fluctuate because the output rate of EF traffic is disturbed. Finally, case (III) is considered as an ideal case for EF traffic. We assert that the input and output rate of EF traffic should be the same.

A path of real time traffic is established by the QoS extensions [7] of routing protocols such as AODV and OLSR. QoS routing protocols find an optimal path in meeting the delay and bandwidth requirements of real time traffic.

The proposed DiffServ module exists in the IP layer together with routing protocol as illustrated in Fig. 2. There is an interface between the DiffServ module and MAC for their interoperation. The DiffServ module controls the output rate of traffic using a MAC delay or bandwidth usage provided through the interface. The objective of our DiffServ module is guaranteeing the QoS requirement of already established real time traffic. The DiffServ module has two main roles:

- 1) It periodically regulates the output rate of real time traffic to meet bandwidth requirements. In other words, the output rate is maintained the same as the input rate. This rate maintenance provides not only the ideal EF service as previously described but also a stable throughput and delay of real time traffic.
- 2) When congestion occurs, the bandwidth of best effort traffic is conceded to real time traffic in order to prevent the QoS requirement penalty. Fig. 3 illustrates the conceding of best effort bandwidth to real time traffic.




Fig. 2. DiffServ module




Fig. 3. The concession of best effort bandwidth

If queues remain short and empty relative to the buffer space available, packet loss and queuing delay is kept to a minimum. Since EF traffic usually encounters short or empty queues, and node mobility induces obscurity of queue utilization, the conventional congestion detection method using a queue threshold value or queue overflow is not appropriate for mobile ad hoc networks. For this reason, in our scheme, congestions are detected by monitoring when the delay and bandwidth utilization of real time packets exceed a given threshold.




Fig. 4. Congestion control in mobile ad hoc networks

When a node detects congestion, it sends out congestion notification messages in the direction of the source node of the real time flow as illustrated in Fig. 4. The notification messages are broadcast because of wireless medium characteristics. First, one-hop upstream nodes receiving the notification messages concede the bandwidth allocated for their best effort flows to their real time flows to relieve a congested situation. At this time, if the congestion is resolved, all congestion control processes end and congestion notification messages are no longer relayed in the direction of source nodes. If the congestion is not relieved, however, the congestion notification messages are continuously relayed in the direction of source nodes. So, two-hop, three-hop, ..., upstream nodes receiving the notification messages reduce their output rates of their best effort flows. Through this process, if the congestion is solved all processes successfully end, and if the congestion is not solved the notification messages are continuously relayed in direction of source nodes until congestion is solved. So, light congestion is simply relieved at one-hop upstream nodes, but the heavy congestion is relieved after many upstream nodes reduce their best effort output rates.

### 3. SIMULATION

We evaluated our mechanism via simulation. Fig. 5 illustrates the network model used in the simulation. In this figure, three nodes simultaneously access a channel in order to communicate with a congested node. It is assumed that a contention-based service by the IEEE 802.11 Distributed Coordination Function (DCF) channel access mode is used to contend for the medium for each packet transmission. Each node is modeled as a perfect output buffered device, that is, one which delivers packets immediately to the appropriate output queue as illustrated in Fig. 6.




Fig. 5. Network model




Fig. 5. Model of node with prioritized queues

The focus of the experiments is whether our DiffServ module guarantees the QoS requirements of real time traffics as the best effort traffic load is increased.

Fig. 7 and Fig. 8 show throughput and delay, respectively, when the output rate of real time traffic is maintained the same as the input rate. The input rate of real time traffic is 1Mbps that represents a bandwidth requirement. In the experiment, the best effort traffic load continuously increased while the rate of real time traffic is maintained at 1 Mbps. As a result of experiment, the throughput of the best effort traffic increases up to some point and after that point, is saturated to almost 5 Mbps. Furthermore, the delay of the best effort traffic suddenly increases after the saturation point. We can see that the throughput of real time traffic is maintained successfully meeting the bandwidth requirement. The delay performance of real time traffic also shows a relatively stable pattern. Assuming that the bandwidth requirement is 1 Mbps and the node-to-node delay requirement is 10 ms, then the network is not congested. A congestion control mechanism for real time traffic is not needed.




Fig. 7. The throughput when the real time bandwidth requirement is 1 Mbps




Fig. 8. The delay when the real time bandwidth requirement is 1 Mbps

If the bandwidth requirement of real time traffic is changed to 3.027Mbps, however, we can observe congestion as shown in Fig. 9 and Fig. 10. In this case, the bandwidth requirement of real time is satisfied when the offered loads of best effort are relatively low. As the best effort traffic load increases, however, the throughput of real time traffic decreases and the delay also terribly increases, which induces the QoS violation of real time traffic.




Fig. 9. The throughput with no congestion control when the real time bandwidth requirement is 3.027 Mbps




Fig. 10. The delay with no congestion control when the real time bandwidth requirement is 3.027 Mbps




Fig. 11. The throughput with congestion control when the real time bandwidth requirement is 3.027 Mbps




Fig. 12. The delay with congestion control when the real time bandwidth requirement is 3.027 Mbps

Fig. 11 and 12 show the throughput and delay performances with our congestion control mechanism. When the bandwidth requirement of real time traffic is 3.027Mbps, the throughput of real time traffic is stably maintained at 3.027Mbps and the delay is also maintained at stably low values as a result of the best effort bandwidth concession. In Fig. 11, the crooked points represent that congestion control is performed. Whenever congestion is detected, the bandwidth of best effort traffic is conceded to real time traffic through its rate reduction. As previously described, congestion is detected by a delay threshold value of real time packet.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we proposed DiffServ module, supporting service differentiation in mobile ad hoc networks through rate regulation and congestion control. In our scheme, for real time traffic, we regulated its output rate the same as the input rate. This regulation produced stable throughput and delays. The congestion was detected by measuring the delay or bandwidth utilization of real time traffic and comparing it with some threshold values. The congestion was controlled by conceding the best effort bandwidth to real time traffic. We verified our DiffServ mechanism through simulation. The experiment results showed that our mechanism could offer stable throughput and stably low delays for real time traffic.

#### References

- [1] S. Blake, D. Black, M. Carlson, E. Davies, Z. Wang, and W. Weiss, "An architecture for differentiated services," IETF, RFC 2475, Dec. 1998.
- [2] B. Davie, A. Charny, J.C.R. Bennett, K. Benson, J.Y. Le Boudec, W. Courtney, S. Davari, V. Firoiu, and D. Stiliadis, "An expedited forwarding PHB," IETF, RFC 3246, March 2002.
- [3] A. Charny, J.D.R. Bennett, K. Benson, J.Y. Le Boudec, A. Chiu, W. Courtney, S. Davari, V. Firoiu, C. Kalmanek, and K.K. Ramakrishnan, "Supplemental information for the new definition of the EF PHB," IETF, RFC 3247, March 2002.
- [4] T. C-K. Hui and C.-K. Tham, "Adaptive provisioning of differentiated services networks based on reinforcement learning," *IEEE Trans. Syst. Man. Cybern. C*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 492-501, Nov. 2003.
- [5] Wireless LAN medium access control (MAC) and physical layer (PHY) specifications, IEEE standard 802.11, June 1999.
- [6] Gahng-Seop Ahn, Andrew T. Campbell, Andras Veres, and Li-Hsiang Sun, "Supporting service differentiation for real-time and best-effort traffic in stateless wireless ad hoc networks," *IEEE Trans. Mobile computing*, vol. 1, July-Sept. 2002.
- [7] S. Chen and K. Nahrstedt, "Distributed quality-of-service routing in ad hoc networks," *IEEE JSAC*, vol. 17, no. 8, Aug. 1999.
- [8] Satyabrata Chakrabarti and Amitabh Mishra, "QoS issues in ad hoc wireless networks," *IEEE communications magazine*, Feb. 2001.
- [9] Y. Dong, D. Makrakis, T. Sullivan, "Network congestion control in ad hoc IEEE 802.11 wireless LAN," *CCECE 2003-CCGEI 2003*, May 2003.
- [10] Prasant Mohapatra, Jian Li, and Chao Gui, "QoS in mobile ad hoc networks," *IEEE Wireless Communication*, June 2003.