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Enterprise Quality of Service (QoS)
Part II: Enterprise Solution using Solaris™ Bandwidth Manager 1.6 Software

This article is Part II of a two-part series with a focus on Enterprise Networks detailing what corporations can do to prioritize traffic in an optimal manner to ensure that certain applications receive priority over less important applications, starting from the computing server up to the enterprise’s egress point. This article investigates the effectiveness of Solaris™ Bandwidth Manager 1.6 (Solaris BM 1.6) software in implementing a Quality of Service (QoS) solution in an enterprise network. This article also briefly looks at how policy based network and systems management takes Solaris BM 1.6 software one step further, allowing the QoS configurations to change dynamically based on certain feedback measurements. It doesn’t make sense to restrict traffic when there is no congestion, however to constantly manually perform QoS reconfigurations itself can be a daunting task, this is where policy controls play a major role.

This article details the following:
■ QoS deployment scenarios
■ Available QoS solutions

Note – Solaris Bandwidth Manager 1.6 software is supported on Solaris™ Operating Environment version 8 and older.
QoS Deployment Scenarios

There are several QoS solution approaches from a deployment perspective. Further, there are two available options from an implementation perspective, hardware and software. This article focuses on where in the enterprise QoS can be deployed and is limited to a software implementation.

The end-to-end path from a client to the server is composed of various network segments, each with different bandwidths and more important, different loads. QoS deployments are all based on one fundamental principle, restricting the amount of traffic that is injected into a slower link from a faster link. In this context, the notion of slower and faster is not necessarily about bandwidth, it is also about oversubscription of a link. To better understand this concept, let’s step out of the enterprise environment and into the access network, where a local Internet Service Provider (ISP), provides Digital Subscriber Line (DSL) service. In order to generate profits, it is often the case where many DSL lines are aggregated into a DSL Access multiplier (DSLAM). Aggregate egress traffic is forwarded to an Optical Carrier 3 (OC-3) line. Although the DSL line is much slower in terms of bandwidth, the choke point is in fact the OC-3 link at 155 mbps, since the service provider may aggregate thousands of 144 kbs lines, hoping that not all the lines will be in use at the same time. Back in the enterprise environment, where enterprise networks are usually over provisioned. Recent trends in enterprise networks have evolved where centralize web servers often provide services to all employees and partners. This is often an area of contention and an ideal situation where Solaris BM 1.6 software may be used to control traffic. There are various deployment options and the following list describes some QoS deployment possibilities:

1. Outsourcing the ISP to provide QoS Network services, providing enterprise customers with a web interface provision and their own QoS policies for their portion of bandwidth.

2. Deploying a QoS Capable Network Switch. This is usually located at a choke point at a corporate Wide Area Network (WAN) access point.

3. Deploying a Solaris BM 1.6 software server at a choke point, in front of a centralized network resource such as a consolidated server.

4. Deploying Solaris BM 1.6 software on the consolidated server themselves.

One of the main limitations of a purely network-centric approach, is that the network is not always the bottleneck. Often the server may be the source of a bottleneck. For example, web servers or application servers that are generating dynamic web pages, using JavaServer Pages™ (JSP™) technology, servlets, and Enterprise JavaBeans™ (EJB™) technology can be central processing unit (CPU) bound, due to a few relatively small-sized Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) requests. In this case, having QoS policy enforcement points (PEP) that can only
control the network bandwidth does not contribute to improving overall performance. However, if there is some feedback from the servers that provides some indication of load, the QoS device can restrict the incoming requests, aligning the requests with the server load, letting only the priority requests through. This article describes QoS from network bandwidth perspective and then describes a solution that takes server load into consideration of the QoS equation.

In order to understand the effectiveness of the Solaris BM 1.6 software, FIGURE 1 illustrates several representative configurations deployed with heavy loads. Measurements were taken on the server and the client side for verification. FIGURE 1 illustrates that with the same offered load the following is true:

1. No QoS—all clients receive poor service.
2. QoS on a dedicated server—clients receive good differential services, ensuring that priority clients receive noticeably better service than non-priority.
3. QoS located on the application server—the amount of load that QoS uses up on a server to implement differential services. This shows that there is a cost to implementing QoS, which uses CPU cycles that could be used to service client requests.

This section discusses a proposed integrated feedback closed loop solution, that integrates Solaris BM 1.6 software with SunTM Management Center 3.0 (Sun MC 3.0) software as illustrated in FIGURE 1. This solution takes the server load into consideration when restricting traffic and providing differentiated services.

In FIGURE 1 configuration A, shows the baseline case, where no QoS was deployed. In FIGURE 1 configuration B, shows a dedicated server deployed to control bandwidth allocation. This also illustrates how an integrated Systems and Network Approach can be used, where the policy decision point (PDP) is monitoring and controlling both the servers and the network and taking the appropriate action. In this case, if the servers become overloaded, the PDP can perform several actions to remedy the situation, depending on the Policy Decision Algorithms. The PDP can increase the priority of the process involved and can also reduce the number of requests coming into the server. This provides a closed loop solution. The PDP is located on the same server as the PEP. As previously mentioned, the PDP makes the decision about what to do with particular flows, based on console input or other input. The PDP then instructs the PEPs about what level of QoS to give specific traffic.

In FIGURE 1 configuration C, shows a deployment where the QoS function is no longer implemented on a dedicated server, but located on the server labelled Server Load. This approach describes an architecture where the PDP and policy management tool (PMT) can be shifted from a dedicated separate box, to the servers themselves (in this case, the Server Load). This would normally represent a web server. This solution may make sense for enterprise customers who do not want to
add new hardware into existing data center deployments and who want to make better use of current resources that are not fully utilized. The PEP in this case, is implemented in the network protocol stack.

**FIGURE 1** Performance Tests Configurations
Configuration A—Baseline Results with No QoS

FIGURE 2 shows the results of the client average bandwidths for the four classes; bronze, silver, gold, and platinum. Platinum is referred to the best class of service and bronze as the worst class of service. Gold and silver are the middle of line service. Clearly all classes received poor results, ranging from .6 Mbits/sec to 0.1 Mbits/sec. Response times for the platinum class range from 38 seconds to 155 seconds. The bronze class response times range from 64 seconds to 115 seconds. FIGURE 2 also shows the average load on the client, server, and QoS Solaris BM 1.6 software server. The client and end server CPU utilization is maxed out, yet the overall throughput is extremely low. The network is saturated. This clearly demonstrates that in a oversubscribed network, all traffic degrades. If this were an example of an e-commerce site, QoS would prove to be of extreme value at the time when business peaks.

FIGURE 2  Client Side Measurements of Throughput
Configuration B—QoS Policy on Dedicated Server
TCP Traffic

FIGURE 3 shows the device specific configuration file used to configure the PEP, which was implemented by Solaris BM 1.6 software. Various filters and classes are defined.
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Figure 3

Solaris Bandwidth Manager 1.6 Software Configuration File

QoS Settings allocating percentage of overall available bandwidth to the various classes of traffic.

---

version 1.5
timeout 30

filter clientplatfilterin
  remote
  type subnet
  address 14.0.0.0
  mask 255.0.0.0

filter clientgoldfilterin
  remote
  type subnet
  address 16.0.0.0
  mask 255.0.0.0

filter clientsilfilterin
  remote
  type subnet
  address 18.0.0.0
  mask 255.0.0.0

filter clientbrzfilterin
  remote
  type subnet
  address 20.0.0.0
  mask 255.0.0.0

filter clientplatfilterout
  remote
  type subnet
  address 14.0.0.0
  mask 255.0.0.0

filter clientgoldfilterout
  remote
  type subnet
  address 16.0.0.0
  mask 255.0.0.0

filter clientsilfilterout
  remote
  type subnet
  address 18.0.0.0
  mask 255.0.0.0

filter clientbrzfilterout
  remote
  type subnet
  address 20.0.0.0
  mask 255.0.0.0

interface hme2_in
  rate 100000000
  activate enabled

class bronzeclass
  interface hme2_in
  parent root
  filter clientbrzfilterin
  bandwidth 10
  priority 1
  max_bandwidth 10
  flow_events bronzeflow

class silverclass
  interface hme2_in
  parent root
  filter clientsilfilterin
  bandwidth 15
  priority 1
  max_bandwidth 15
  flow_events silverflow

class goldclass
  interface hme2_in
  parent root
  filter clientgoldfilterin
  bandwidth 25
  priority 1
  max_bandwidth 25
  flow_events goldflow

class platclass
  interface hme2_in
  parent root
  filter clientplatfilterin
  bandwidth 50
  priority 1
  max_bandwidth 50
  flow_events platflow

interface hme2_out
  rate 100000000
  activate enabled

class brzclassout
  interface hme2_out
  parent root
  filter clientbrzfilterout
  bandwidth 10
  priority 1
  max_bandwidth 10
  flow_events brzclassout

class silclassout
  interface hme2_out
  parent root
  filter clientsilfilterout
  bandwidth 15
  priority 1
  max_bandwidth 15
  flow_events silclassout

class goldclassout
  interface hme2_out
  parent root
  filter clientgoldfilterout
  bandwidth 25
  priority 1
  max_bandwidth 25
  flow_events goldout

class platclassout
  interface hme2_out
  parent root
  filter clientplatfilterout
  bandwidth 50
  priority 1
  max_bandwidth 50
  flow_events platflowout
FIGURE 4 shows the measurements taken on the client side, clearly showing that the four classes of traffic are first experiencing throughput ranging from 40 Mbits/sec to 5 Mbits/sec, much better than the results of no QoS.

As a cross check, FIGURE 5 and FIGURE 6 illustrate the measurements taken on the policy server, showing the bandwidth proportions of all classes of traffic. The measurements show that for the transmission control protocol (TCP) traffic, all classes are in fact receiving the proportions of bandwidth of the specified configuration. Clearly, there is a tremendous improvement in all classes except the lowest bronze class whose response times have worsened to 352 seconds during congestion. Platinum class on the other hand is consistently receiving 1.5 seconds response times and an average bandwidth of 44 Mbits/sec. Gold class is also not consistently receiving response times of 2.7 seconds with an average bandwidth of 24 Mbits/sec. Silver class is not consistently receiving 4.7 seconds response times with an average bandwidth of 14.2 Mbits/sec. Bronze class is not as important, its traffic is dramatically sacrificed for the others, starving out the lowest class queue, disproportionately. As illustrated, the bandwidth manager proved effective in allocating TCP traffic.
FIGURE 5  TCP Traffic Flow Statistics of QoS and Policy on Dedicated Server
FIGURE 6  TCP Traffic Statistics of QoS and Policy on Dedicated Server

The load statistics in FIGURE 7 show that the client and server are under a full load, and the policy server under approximately 2/3 capacity. The server is completely overloaded, because the server feedback was not used. By including feedback and restricting overall bandwidth, across all classes, it is not expected to dramatically improve response times by all clients. Better allocation of overall resources is achieved by keeping the server from reaching its saturation point.
Two sets of tests were ran, the TCP traffic and the user datagram protocol (UDP) traffic, using the dedicated server to enforce policies as shown in FIGURE 1, configuration B. The results show the usefulness of the bandwidth manager product. Premium customers are getting a larger share of the overall pipe. The TCP traffic is flow-controlled and the client slows in sending data if the server advertises a small receive window. This allows packets to be dropped or the ACK Packet returned after various time-outs. An ACK Packet is a TCP packet that the receiver sends to the sender acknowledging receipt of certain sequence of bytes of the stream. Using UDP traffic allows the client to blindly pump data.
Configuration B—QoS Policy on Dedicated Server UDP Traffic

If you use the same architecture as shown in FIGURE 1, configuration C, but change the traffic from TCP to UDP, some interesting results are revealed. FIGURE 8 and FIGURE 9 graphically illustrate the measurements captured on the QoS policy server. The results show a dramatic degradation in performance, for all classes. The graphical results taken on the bandwidth manager server are consistent with the class settings. As FIGURE 3 previously illustrated, the configuration file, out of a total pipe of 100 Mbits/sec, platinum class is 50% of the pipe, gold is 25%, silver is 15%, and bronze is 10%. Referring to FIGURE 8, you can see that platinum, in general, is experiencing better bandwidth and response times than gold. In the same matter, gold is better than silver, and silver is still better than bronze. You can clearly see that it is much more difficult to implement QoS on UDP traffic than on TCP traffic. The reason for this is that TCP traffic is flow-controlled. When packets are dropped, the sender reduces the amount of traffic it injects into the network, thus reducing congestion. In comparison, UDP traffic is not well-behaved. If packets are dropped, the sender continues to interject the same amount of traffic, so the congestion on the client side is not improved.
FIGURE 8  QoS and Policy on Dedicated Server UDP Traffic Statistics
FIGURE 9  QoS and Policy on Dedicated Server UDP Traffic Flow Statistics

FIGURE 10 shows the performance measurements taken on the client side. By looking at the client throughput, you can see that the UDP traffic can be controlled by QoS. It is not controlled as well as the TCP traffic but much better than without using QoS at all.
Configuration C—QoS Policy Software Only Solution

FIGURE 11 shows the results of deploying the architecture that is illustrated in FIGURE 1, where the PDP function is deployed on the server running the network application. The results show that the CPU availability is required to process all the packets, classify, queue, and schedule. This is all processed in the kernel mode. The one issue realized after the experimental results are reviewed, is that the configuration of the interfaces in creating classes made a big difference. The CPU performance was much better when only one side of the network was filtered and classified, either on the ingress or egress, but not both sides.
Experimental Setup

This section describes an experimental setup. The client and server hosts were deployed on dual CPU Sun Enterprise 250 servers and in-between the Sun Enterprise 250 servers is a 4 CPU Ultra 80 workstation running Solaris BM 1.6 software. The client side runs an equal number of New Test TCP—TCP Performance Test Program (NTTCP) sessions per class. Care is taken to ensure a calibrated load among the classes, in order to achieve correct results. Equal number of platinum, gold, silver, and bronze NTTCP requests are generated from client to server.

As FIGURE 12 illustrates, the client and server are attached via an 100 Mbyte/sec FDX Netgear switch. The client side continuously runs NTTCP in a loop, ensuring that each class runs the same number of NTTCP requests, thus calibrating the load equally across all the four classes of traffic (platinum, gold, silver, and bronze). Each class is mapped directly to one logical interface, thus simplifying the filters and class configurations on the Solaris BM 1.6 software.
Products

There are several QoS Solutions available in the market place that can be applied to different Network Segments and Systems. Network QoS capable switches, such as those offered by Extreme Networks, Foundry, Cisco, and others provide multiple services, switching, and routing along with QoS and QoS rules capability. These are vendor-specific solutions that require significant knowledge of Network Management and specific understanding of the switch vendor’s Command Line Interface or Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP) Management Information Base (MIB) definition for QoS provisioning, but provides a better solution in the long run. If however, a fast and simple solution is required, the software based QoS solution can be a worthwhile alternative. If existing routers are not QoS capable, upgrading routers in existing infrastructures requires a significant investment of time and effort. Products that can be installed next to routers, such as Allot and Packeteer, provide hardware solutions that provide QoS and limited policy capabilities on a few devices. Load balancers simply make an estimate of the response times of servers among a server farm but does not incorporate QoS in concise manner.
The main limitation of these products are that the server load is sometimes the bottleneck, with the network being uncongested and impacting the effectiveness of differentiated services. Solaris BM 1.6 software and the Sun MC 3.0 software solution exposes a set of API’s where the server load can be monitored and dynamic reconfiguration is possible on both the Server and Network Resource. Section, “Appendix A” provides some code skeletons that show how such a solution can be implemented using Sun MC 3.0 software and the Solaris BM 1.6 software API’s.

Summary

The results showed that the Solaris BM 1.6 software performed well, providing users true differentiated services. TCP traffic is much more predictable and controlled than UDP traffic, but the Solaris BM 1.6 software still proved to do a fairly reasonable job in segregating traffic classes proportionately. Deploying the PDP and PEP on a dedicated server offered the best results. Deploying the PDP and PEP on the application server, as a software-only solution, was the least intrusive solution. However, sufficient CPU resources must be available for best results. Finally, an architecture was proposed, with some code skeletons in Section, “Appendix A” that offer an integrated QoS Policy Based System and Network Management System. This is where the server is also monitored and reconfigured based on policies. This solution is a closed loop feedback architecture that offers promising performance results.
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Appendix A

This appendix presents some code skeletons that show how you could possibly implement a QoS solution with Sun MC 3.0 and Solaris Bandwidth Manager 1.6 software.

Pseudo Code

The following code boxes illustrate a pseudo code for a QoS solution.

```c
/*
QoSSBM : Quality Of Service Policy Based Network and Systems Management
Policy Decision Point - PDP

DESC: This Skeleton Prototype, polls for agent stats from the Sun Server
which is running a Java Agent using the Sun MCI 3.0 API Libraries.
The user is expected to enter a policy, which is composed of
a Condition, the condition for this skeleton code, is that
cpu utilization exceeds 90%. Once this condition evaluates to
TRUE, this Policy Decision Point, creates a class object for
each of the following classes:
    Platinum - 50%
    Gold - 25%
    Silver - 15%
    Bronze -10%

and replaces this with lower bandwidth percentages. An alternative
simply retrieves the QInterface object and lowers the entire
interface bandwidth, thereby controlling the PEP’s input rate,
thereby controlling the amount of traffic sent to the servers.
*/
```
continued
import java.util.*;
import java.net.*;
import java.lang.reflect.*;
import java.io.*;
import com.sun.jaw.reference.query.*;
import com.sun.jaw.reference.client.mo.*;
import com.sun.jaw.reference.client.adaptor.*;
import com.sun.jaw.impl.adaptor.security.*;
import com.sun.jaw.impl.adaptor.http.*;

import java.util.Vector;
import java.io.PrintWriter;
import com.sun.jaw.reference.common.*;
import com.sun.ba.common.*;
import com.sun.ba.mo.*;
import com.sun.ba.events.*;
import com.sun.ba.config.*;

public class QoSSBM implements QConstants {

    private static void usage() {
        System.err.println("Usage: Java QoSSBM [PEP] ");
    }

    public void reconfigurePEP( QDynamicConfMO runningConf)
        throws InstanceAlreadyExistException, InstanceNotFoundException {

    try{
        ServerSocket PEPsock = new ServerSocket(3001);

        Loop: while (true) {

            Socket pepsocket=PEPsock.accept();
            BufferedReader pepin = new BufferedReader(new InputStreamReader(pepsocket.getInputStream() ));
            System.out.println("--------------------- data from agent -----------------");
            System.out.println(pepin.readLine());
            if Agent cpu utilization data < threshold{
                continue Loop;
            }
            /*/
            continued
Create the new lower b/w classes that will replace existing classes definitions  
Note these class names must match the class definitions in  
file:deepak.ba.conf-2.27.5pm  
*/  
System.out.println("creating modified classes for PEP reconfiguration...");  
try {  
  /* Platinum Class reconfiguration */  
  QIfName hmein = new QIfName("hme2_in");  
  System.out.println("QIfName hmein = " + hmein);  
  QClassName pn = new QClassName(hmein, "platclass");  
  System.out.println("QClassName pn = " + pn);  
  QClass platcl = runningConf.performGetClass(pn);  
  System.out.println("QClass platcl=" + platcl);  
  platcl.setName("platclass");  
  platcl.setBandwidth(40);  
  platcl.setPriority((byte) 1);  
  System.out.println(" Downloading Reprovisioned Class information to  
  PEP");  
  pn = runningConf.performModifyClass(pn,platcl);  
  System.out.println(" Modified pn=" + pn);  
  }  
  /* Gold Class reconfiguration */  
  QClassName gn = new QClassName(hmein, "goldclass");  
  QClass goldcl = new QClass();
PEP Agent Pseudo Code

This is the feedback of a server load to the Policy server via socket connection.

```java
/*
   PEP: Policy Enforcement Point Server Agent

   DESC: This Java client code, runs on the server as a PEP agent. This agent continually sends feedback
   performance data to the Policy Server, which then decides what action to take. This is a skeleton code,
   that still needs to have code written to open another socket that accepts reconfiguration commands
   from the PDP. Some of this code was borrowed from the Sun MC 3.0 examples.
   Reconfiguration of this pep is currently via rsh system calls.

   AUTHOR: Deepak Kakadia, Staff Engineer, Enterprise Services, Sun Microsystems
   DATE: March 2 2001

*/
import java.net.*;
import java.io.*;
import com.sun.symon.base.client.*;
import java.util.Vector;

public class PEP extends SMRawDataResponseAdapter {
    Socket pdpsock = null;
    InputStream pdpin =null;
    PrintStream pdpout =null;

    public PEP( String server_name, int server_port,
               int agent_port, String user, String password ) throws Exception
    {
      try {
        String publicKey =  "687a8398ad4a85077d33b7a94e1f50de0c4ba023e" +
          "9c9ba772b247cc253bd3cd0115bc24b74239916751e68" +
          "1fd02e5ad6eb5345eb7c75b39a1c304e0f000846aa" +
          "470b755b640af974e7f7c70daa6191df6efa9a99" +
          "e31bb5e984f7b7db4f4b97eldcba1792d2860ca9e" +
          "5990dfb369e1bcf296274a4e4984c80893296799d3" +
          "04cd";

        System.out.println(" Connecting to local Sun MC 3.0 Agent....");
        SMLogin obj = new SMLogin();
        obj.connect(server_name, server_port, user, password, publicKey);
        System.out.println("Successfully Connected and Authenticated");
        continued
```
System.out.println(" connecting to pdp server - angeli ...");
pdpsock = new Socket("angeli",3001);
pdpin = pdpsock.getInputStream(); /* future to process reconfiguration commands from PDP */
pdpout = new PrintStream(pdpsock.getOutputStream()); /* polling server resource utilization data to PDP */

SMRawDataRequest req = obj.getRawDataRequest();
while(true) {
    String[] urlarr = new String[2];
    urlarr[0] = "snmp://" + server_name + ":" + agent_port + "/mod/kernel-reader/cpu-detail/cpu-util/cpuUtilTable" + "/cpuUtilEntry/cpu_idle";
    urlarr[1] = "snmp://" + server_name + ":" + agent_port + "/mod/kernel-reader/cpu-detail/cpu-util/cpuUtilTable/" + "/cpuUtilEntry/cpu_user";
    Vector urlvect = new Vector();
    urlvect.addElement(urlarr[0]);
    urlvect.addElement(urlarr[1]);
    req.getURLValue(urlvect, "2", this, this);
    System.out.println("sleeping...");
    Thread.sleep(2000);
}

} catch {Exception e} {
    System.out.println(e.getMessage());
}

public void getURLResponse(SMRequestStatus status, Vector dat, Object identifier) {
    int error = status.getReturnCode();
    if (error == SMErrorCode.SUCCESS) {
        if (dat.size() != 2) {
            System.out.println("Incorrect data returned. size =" + "+" + dat.size());
        } else {
            for (int i = 0; i < dat.size(); i++) {

continued
Vector row = (Vector) dat.elementAt(i);
pdpout.println(row.elementAt(0));
for (int j = 0; j < row.size(); j++)
{
    if (i == 0) {
        System.out.println("Sending Feedback to PDP -% CPU Idle time for cpu(s): "+ row.elementAt(j));
pdpout.println(row.elementAt(j));
    }
    else {
        System.out.println("% CPU User time for cpu(s): "+ row.elementAt(j));
        }
    }
}
else {  // Failure
    // The various error codes as in SMErrorCode may be reported here
    System.out.println("Error code = " + error + " " + "Msg Text = " + status.getMessageText() + " " + "Exception = " + (status.getException()).getMessage());
}
}
private static void usage()
{
    System.out.println(
        "usage: Java PEP " +
        "server_name server_port agent_port user password");
}
public static void main(String[] args) throws Exception {
    if ( args.length != 5) {
        usage();
        System.exit(1);
    }
    else {
        try{
            new PEP (args[0], new Integer(args[1]).intValue(),
                    new Integer(args[2]).intValue(), args[3], args[4]);
            System.exit(0);
        } catch(Exception e){
            e.printStackTrace();
        }
    }
    
}