Policy-Based Management providing QoS in a DiffServ Domain

Marcial Porto Fernandez[1] marcial@gta.ufrj.br
Aloysio de Castro P. Pedroza[1,2] aloysio@gta.ufrj.br
José Ferreira de Rezende[1] rezende@gta.ufrj.br

[1]Grupo de Teleinformática e Automação (GTA)
Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ)
COPPE/PEE - Programa de Engenharia Elétrica
C.P. 68504 - CEP 21945-970 - Rio de Janeiro - RJ - Brasil
Tel: +55 21 260-5010 Fax: +55 21 290-6626
[2]Departamento de Eletrônica / EE-UFRJ

Abstract

The Differentiated Services architecture has been proposed to offer quality of service in the Internet. Most works on Diffserv (DS) handles QoS guarantees in a per node basis, which assumes that assuring QoS in a single node also leads to the desired QoS in the entire DS domain. Nevertheless, this is not always true. This paper proposes a framework that offers QoS in a DS domain using Policy-based Management and fuzzy logic techniques. The QoS controller reconfigures all DS nodes according to ingress traffic and domain policies. Policy Based Management is used in this framework to provide QoS in DS domain, controlling heterogeneous equipments of different manufacturers. The performance and functionalities of a prototype are shown by simulation of a voice over IP application in different DS topologies.

Keywords: Quality of Service, DiffServ, Policy-Based Management

1 Introduction

The current Internet architecture does not offer the quality of service (QoS) required by multimedia applications. The Differentiated Services (DiffServ) is a proposal that aims at providing different service levels to flow aggregations. The DiffServ architecture, however, needs consistent resource provisioning in order to offer QoS in a whole domain or across inter-connected domains. Thus, to increase the resource utilization while avoiding violation of the service quality, traffic conditioners at the edges and mechanisms in the core of the network must be frequently reconfigured. With the equipment heterogeneity and the complex network topologies, the reconfiguration process can be a complicated task, and it can lead to severe instabilities and even more QoS violations. One possible solution is to use management action on whole domain to exert QoS control. Policy-based management has been proposed as the infrastructure to guarantee QoS in a DiffServ and IntServ architecture.

This work proposes to dynamically adjust nodes settings inside a DiffServ domain. A fuzzy controller, which configures all the domain nodes dynamically using policy-based management architecture, is introduced. The fuzzy logic is used due to the uncertainty and inaccuracy characteristics of the data flow estimate. Fuzzy logic control is an interesting approach to adjust variables of controllers. Compared to a conventional digital controller, the fuzzy controller presents advantages in handling inaccurate variables, while keeping low the complexity of the system. Our fuzzy controller is tested by simulation. The validation is achieved using a real situation, where delay, jitter and loss rate of voice flows competing with other non-sensitive delay traffics are evaluated. These QoS metrics are evaluated in three random topologies to assure the model validation.

The fuzzy controller is specified by the definition of fuzzy sets (membership function) and a set of rules according to a defined policy. The change in those configuration parameters makes possible to adjust the behavior of the controller in order to turn the action more or less aggressive. This behavior is defined by administrative decisions in a policy-based management framework. The use of a fuzzy controller to guarantee QoS in a network was introduced by Vasilakos and Anagnostakis [1]. However, it is applied to a Traffic Engineering environment, which does not consider a policy-based management framework.

This work is organized as follow: section 2 presents a summary on Policy-Based Management and existing problems to control QoS in Internet; section 3 shows the QoS fuzzy controller architecture; section 4 shows the simulation model and the proposed fuzzy controller. Section 5 shows the results of simulation and, finally, section 6 presents the conclusions and suggestion for future works.

2 QoS control in Internet

This section shows the policy-based management architecture and works related to QoS control in Internet using fuzzy approach.

Policy-based management The policy-based management was proposed by Sloman[2], which described a methodology to specify behavior parameters in an abstract way. In a heterogeneous system, built with several equipments from different manufacturers, those policies can result on different configuration settings according to the characteristics of each managed device.

One application suggested for Policy-Based Management is the QoS control on IP networks. Rajan et al.[3] give an overview of Policy-Based Management used to control QoS on DiffServ and IntServ environment. Blight and Hamada [4] study the Policy-Based framework scalability in public networks.

QoS Control in Internet and Related Works Controlling QoS parameters is a complex task, because it requests ingress traffic estimation during a given period. Due to the traffic randomness, the mesurement tend to be unreliable.

Guérin and Orda [6] showed the effects of inaccuracy and uncertainty of the traffic on network QoS. This work shows that considering only badwidth requirements, the inaccuracy does not influence the results. However, when a data flow requires end-to-end delay guarantees, the inaccuracy will turn intractable the path selection process. Lorenz and Orda [7] also showed that the uncertainty of network state may difficult the provision of end-to-end delay in a domain. However, they showed that decomposing the delay requirements into local restrictions

and defining a probability distribution is possible to establish an exact solution. The algorithm, however, is too complex to be processed in a node, leading to the use a polynomial approximation, which is proposed.

The uncertainty and inaccuracy problem led us to propose a solution based on fuzzy logic. Several works have presented controllers based on fuzzy logic as for example Li and Nahrstedt [8, 9]. The authors, however, focus on the configuration environment and they did not deal with the control of network resources. Cheng and Chang [10] showed a fuzzy controller to configure the parameters in an ATM network. Their work, in spite of dealing with all the network parameters, supposes the use of an ATM network, which already offers QoS. Vasilakos and Anagnostakis [1] introduced a fuzzy controller to define the best path to offer QoS guarantees. This proposal, used in Traffic Engineering environment, applied a genetic algorithm to the traffic history to define the fuzzy controller parameters. A example of use of Fuzzy Logic in network management were presented by Souza et.al[11].

Our work proposes a Fuzzy controller suitable for DiffServ and Policy-Based Management framework. The results shows a improvement in end-to-end QoS metrics to a time sensitive traffic crossing a DiffServ domain.

3 QoS Controller Architecture

In this section, we show the parameters of QoS measure in a DiffServ node and the two nodes types in the architecture - the edge and the core nodes. The controller architecture, in spite of being specified for DiffServ, may be used for any class-based queue mechanism as showed in following section.

3.1 Controlling a DiffServ node

The controller in DiffServ architecture is shown in Figure 1. In DiffServ architecture, all nodes have a different queue for each class; a classifier put the packets into the respective queue and a scheduler selects packets from the queues. Besides the previous functions, the edge nodes contain a marker, that marks or remarks each packet, and a conditioner that keeps the input flow as contracted. The proposed architecture implements two controllers: one to control queues and scheduler, used in the core and edge nodes, and other to the conditioner, used to adjust the ingress traffic on edge nodes.

Scheduler Controller The variable that controls the scheduler depends on the type of mechanism used. If it is a Priority or RR (Round Robin) type, there is no control. The scheduler in our experiment should be WRR (Weighted Round Robin) or WFQ (Weighted Fair-Queuing) type, because they are controlable. The queues are served according to a configured weight that can be changed during operation. The packet delay and discard for each queue (class) can be controlled by this weight.

The first input variable is the packet delay in the queue; other delays related to packet processing would be ignored. In the same way, we could use the queue occupation, because it is directly proportional to the delay. The second input variable is the discard rate due to queue overflow.



Figure 1: DiffServ node architecture

Conditioner Controller The objective of the controller is to police the input data flows entering into the domain. The control variable depends on the conditioner type, nevertheless, most of then uses a token bucket based mechanism.

The first input variable is the bucket occupation, that is, the number of tokens stored in the bucket. If the bucket is full, it means that the incoming traffic in the node is smaller than the bucket rate; if the bucket is empty, it means that the bucket rate is similar or smaller to the incoming traffic. The second variable is the number of packets discarded in the conditioner. When a packet encounters an empty bucket, it is discarded. In this case we can conclude that the incoming traffic is larger than the bucket rate.

When there are no more resources in the domain core, we should indicate a reduction in the input rate in edge nodes, through the reduction of the bucket rate. When there are high delay into the core, the edge nodes will reduce the input rate. However we could use another policy, for instance, the conditioner could maintain the rate, refuse new connections and close some of them.

4 Simulation Model

The simulation model tested the EF (Expedited Forwarding) [12] and BE (Best Effort) classes. EF is the best class for real-time applications, like voice over IP, as it offers the smallest delay and delay variations in each node. The BE class represents an IP network (Internet) without any guarantee, used to compete with the EF class traffic. Lorenz and Orda [7] demonstrated that uncertainty offer constraints to QoS (delay and jitter). Then, this simulation scheme is a realistic model to test the proposed fuzzy controller.

4.1 Simulation Environment

The proposed model was tested on simulation. The platform used was the Network Simulator (NS), version 2.1b6a [14]. As the NS standard distribution does not include DiffServ resources, it was enclosed an additional module, proposed by Pieda and Ethridge [15]. New functions were added to this model in order to provide all the needed resources.

The fuzzy library used in this work was developed with the Unfuzzy tool of Duarte[16]. This tool offers a graphic interface for prototype development (specification of the membership

functions, inference rules and the defuzzificator), besides allowing initial verification of the model. The C or C++ code generated is compiled and linked to our model.

4.2 Membership functions and Fuzzification

In our example, we defined a policy that gives maximum priority to the EF class, the priority of BE class will be reduced whenever there is reduction of EF class quality. In spite of that rule, the bandwidth for BE class should never be less than 10% of total bandwidth. Many other policies could be defined only changing membership functions and rule base.

The proposed controller uses triangular and trapezoid fuzzy sets because they are implemented with more efficient code. We also made experiences with a Gaussian function, but the results did not justify the complexity added.

4.2.1 Scheduler Controller



(a) Input: Queue Weight

(b) Input: EF Delay

(c) Input: BE Discard

(d) Output: Queue Weight

Figure 2: Scheduler Membership functions

The first input membership function, EF/BE relative weight, is shown in Figure 2(a). It represents the WRR scheduler weight of the EF queue in regard to the total weight (EF+BE). The fuzzy sets are: "VLP", very low priority; "LP", low priority; "MP", medium priority; "HP", high priority and "VHP", very high priority. As the relative weight is always a number between zero and one, normalization is not needed.

The second input membership function, delay in EF queue, is shown in Figure 2(b). This sensor reads the delay of a packet through the node. The fuzzy sets are: "LD", low delay; "MD",

medium delay and "HD", high delay. The variable must be normalized before entering in the controller.

The third input membership function, discard in BE queue, is shown in Figure 2(c). This sensor reads the number of discarded packets in BE class during a time interval. The value is normalized in regard to the maximum loss rate. The fuzzy sets are: "LD", low discard; "MD", medium discard and "HD", high discard.

4.2.2 Conditioner Controller

The membership function of the conditioner is similar to the scheduler function. The first input variable is the token bucket rate, that reads the current token bucket rate from the conditioner. The second input is the bucket occupation, that reads the level of bucket of EF class which is a component to the measure of the real rate of incoming traffic. When the bucket level is high, it means that the rate of incoming packets is smaller than the bucket rate. The third input is the discard rate in EF queue, that measures the number of discarded packets from EF class in the conditioner. When a packet is discarded, the token bucket rate is smaller than the data input rate.

4.2.3 Output Membership functions and Defuzzificator

The output membership functions were also defined as trapezoid functions, by the same previous reasons. We used the center of gravity defuzzification method, because it offers a result suitable for our application and it demands less floating point calculations than other methods [17]. The first output membership function, queue weight EF/BE, is shown in the Figure 2(d). It gives the weight of the WRR scheduler. The fuzzy sets are: "VLP", very low priority; "LP", low priority; "MP", medium priority; "HP", high priority and "VHP", very high priority.

The second output membership function, token bucket rate, gives the value of EF bucket rate considering the reduction of trafic.

4.3 Rule base and Inference

Rule base is an IF-THEN rule group with fuzzy sets that represent the desired behavior of a fuzzy system. It can be defined in agreement with the administrative policy. For our example, we used a rule that gave priority to EF class in any situation, but leaving for the BE class at least 10% of the bandwidth.

The fuzzy operators were selected experimentally. We chose the maximum operator for union and intersection. Implication used the product operator and the OR and AND used the minimum operator. We have tested several other operators, however this combination offered the best result, that is, the reaction to the variations was fast and the oscillation was not excessive.

4.3.1 Scheduler Controller

The scheduler controller was defined with 45 rules, whose synthesis is presented as follows:

1. If the delay in EF queue is medium (MD), then the queue weight priority is increased by 1; for instance, if the priority was low (LP) it goes to medium priority (MP). And if EF delay is high (HD) the queue weight priority is increased by 2.

2. If the delay in EF queue is low (LD) and the discard rate in BE queue is medium (MD), then queue priority is reduced by 1; for instance, if the priority was medium (MP) it goes to low priority (LP). And if BE discard is high (HD) the queue priority is reduced by 2.

4.3.2 Conditioner Controller

The scheduler controller was defined with 27 rules, whose synthesis is presented as follows:

1. If EF delay in core nodes is low, the conditioner bucket level is low and EF queue discard is medium, then the conditioner rate is increased by 1 and if EF queue discard is high the conditioner rate is increased by 2.

2. If EF delay in core nodes is high, the conditioner bucket level is medium and EF queue discard is low, then the conditioner rate is reduced by 1 and if bucket level is high the conditioner rate is reduced by 2.

4.4 Conventional controller

A conventional digital controller that executes an intuitive control was defined to validate our proposal. The results of the fuzzy controller compared to a situation without controller were clearly better. We used the same sample period as the fuzzy controler. This controller presents the following characteristics:

1. If the delay average of the last three samples surpasses a certain value, it calculates the slope of the adjusted line for those three points. This slope is applied to queue weight in the scheduler, increasing the EF class rate.

2. If the delay average of the last three samples is below a certain value, and the BE queue drop rate is high, it calculates the slope of the adjusted line for those three points (that should be negative). This slope is applied to the output queue weight in the scheduler.

4.5 Simulation Topology

The application voice over IP was implemented with CBR and exponential On-Off traffic over UDP protocol. The CBR traffic is the worst case for network QoS; on the other hand, the On-Off traffic is closer to a normal conversation. The voice traffic was classified into EF class and the competitive traffic CBR/UDP was classified into BE class. The topology evaluated was outlined on Figure 3 which shows a DS domain composed of 40 nodes, 30 core nodes and 10 edge nodes. There are five input edge nodes and 5 output edge nodes. The topologies was created with gt-itm package (bundled in NS)[14]. We used three diferents topologies whose metrics are shown in Table 1.

Topology	Type	Avg Deg	Diameter(hh, ll, hl)	Avg Depth(hh, ll, hl)	Bicomp
Topology 1	Waxman 1	4.333	5, 71, 113	3.87, 54.40, 80.33	3
Topology 2	Waxman 2	4.133	5, 105, 147	4.10, 71.73, 110.10	3
Topology 3	Exponential	4.133	6, 95, 102	4.27, 71.00, 80.56	3

Table 1: Topology Metrics



Figure 3: Simulation Topology

To simulate the voice conection, the number of voice traffic sources (EF class) changes during the simulation time of 200 seconds. The changes in traffic yields the controller operation in a real situation. The number of voice source varies according to an exponential distribution with the following time paterns (traffic on, traffic off): (5.0,2.0), (10.0,10.0), (6.0,3.0), (20.0,20.0), (15.0,5.0). Each CBR voice source was defined with a 64 Kbps rate PCM channel. In On-off source, we used 64 Kbps rate with burst time of 600 ms and idle time of 400 ms, giving an average rate of 25,6 Kbps. The size of the packet is 576 bytes for both cases. While the CBR traffic varied from 0 to 150 sources, giving an average of 93 active sources, the On-Off traffic varied from 0 to 300 sources giving an average of 186 active sources. We used 150 and 300 competitive BE CBR sources with rate of 64 Kbps. The delay of each link of 2 Mbps is 10 ms. All queues have a maximum size of 100 packets giving a maximum delay of 225 ms in each node. The simulation model used a WRR scheduler, Drop Tail queues in both classes and Token Bucket conditioner for EF class (the BE class was not conditioned).

5 Results

The evaluated measures were the percentil of end-to-end delay and jitter of the EF class. For each evaluation, we used CBR and exponential On-off traffic. We show the graphs and tables of a DiffServ domain without controller, with a conventional controller and with the proposed fuzzy controller. All simulations began with initial scheduler configuration with 50% of the bandwidth for each class. To eliminate measures with an empty network, the measures always started 5 seconds after the beginning of the simulation.

The sampling period influences the controller stability. When the period is too long, it may have oscillations. The period used in this work was 1.0 s, but if we reduce the period there will be an improvement on the controller performance.

5.1 End-to-end delay on EF class

The graph on Figure 4 shows the end-to-end delay of a voice traffic classified in EF class from source to sink node without any controller. These graphs were taken from Topology 1. All graphs show only total queue delay because links delay were excluded. Figure 4(a) shows the result with CBR traffic and Figure 4(b) exponential On-Off traffic.



(a) CBR Traffic (b) On-Off traffic

Figure 4: End-to-end delay of one EF flow in topology 1 without Controller



(a) CBR Traffic (b) On-Off Traffic

Figure 5: End-to-end delay of one EF flow in topology 1 with Conventional Controller



(a) CBR Traffic (b) On-Off Traffic

Figure 6: End-to-end delay of one EF flow in topology 1 with Fuzzy Controller

The graph on Figure 5 shows the end-to-end delay with a conventional controller. We noticed in Figure 5(a) an improvement of the delay comparing to the case without controller. In On-off traffic, in Figure 5(b), the delay presents a little improvement.

The graph on Figure 6 shows the end-to-end delay with fuzzy controller. We noticed in Figure 6(a) an improvement of the delay comparing to the case without controller and with a conventional controller. The fuzzy controller corrects all traffic variation, keeping delay values low. In On-off traffic, Figure 6(b), the average delay is smaller than previous cases.

Table 2 shows the delay and jitter of CBR and On-Off traffic for topology 1. The percentil 50 means that 50% of all packets have a delay and jitter smaller than this value. The same is valid to percentil 90 and 95. Table 3 and 2 shows the delay and jitter of CBR and On-Off traffic for topology 2 and 3.

	Average		Percentil 50		Percentil 90		Percentil 95	
Traffic	Delay	Jitter	Delay	Jitter	Delay	Jitter	Delay	Jitter
CBR Without	152.88	59.45	173.95	69.70	219.46	145.15	229.25	146.30
CBR Conven.	102.98	72.27	57.60	69.70	211.39	144.58	223.49	194.11
CBR Fuzzy	41.21	1.58	40.32	0.00	63.36	2.30	68.54	2.30
OO Without	139.48	16.23	145.09	19.13	161.97	100.64	164.54	117.36
OO Conven.	129.56	9.40	143.03	10.70	161.63	91.48	164.43	115.96
OO Fuzzy	39.62	8.89	30.11	8.02	79.65	62.04	93.09	76.83

Table 2: Delay and Jitter of EF class in Topology 1

	Average		Percentil 50		Percentil 90		Percentil 95	
Traffic	Delay	Jitter	Delay	Jitter	Delay	Jitter	Delay	Jitter
CBR Without	151.00	60.00	172.22	69.70	217.15	145.15	226.94	146.30
CBR Conven.	101.30	71.37	50.18	69.70	207.94	144.58	220.03	145.73
CBR Fuzzy	39.30	1.58	38.59	0.00	61.06	2.30	66.24	2.30
OO Without	137.69	35.31	143.18	97.87	159.88	105.25	162.07	126.88
OO Conven.	127.85	24.26	140.87	88.94	159.31	87.37	161.70	111.05
OO Fuzzy	37.70	15.74	28.11	17.77	77.58	61.76	91.07	76.90

Table 3: Delay and Jitter of EF class in Topology 2

	Average		Percentil 50		Percentil 90		Percentil 95	
Traffic	Delay	Jitter	Delay	Jitter	Delay	Jitter	Delay	Jitter
CBR Without	173.37	93.36	205.06	69.70	300.10	218.30	353.09	288.58
CBR Conven.	139.18	70.58	167.04	2.30	263.81	216.00	274.18	217.73
CBR Fuzzy	79.60	42.06	63.94	2.30	157.25	143.42	169.34	144.00
OO Without	176.77	56.67	167.83	39.02	273.39	144.76	289.85	168.90
OO Conven.	118.20	52.04	143.12	23.25	205.88	147.68	243.71	170.10
OO Fuzzy	59.44	30.98	51.81	19.49	113.43	80.39	132.27	100.31

Table 4: Delay and Jitter of EF class in Topology 3

5.2 Discard on DiffServ Domain

The Table 5 shows the loss rate of the voice traffic on EF class and default traffic on BE class in topology 1. The Table 6 shows the loss rate for topology 2 and Table 7 for topology 3.

We noticed a decrease of EF discard rate with Fuzzy controller for both traffics comparing to case without and with conventional controller.

Controller	EF Drops (CBR)	BE Drops (CBR)	EF Drops (On-Off)	BE Drops (On-Off)
Without	53010	50917	254879	207484
Conventional	37611	66400	241029	212534
Fuzzy	14	103951	25809	428051

Table 5: Drops in Topology 1

Controller	EF Drops (CBR)	BE Drops (CBR)	EF Drops (On-Off)	BE Drops (On-Off)
Without	53010	50917	192405	153402
Conventional	37611	66400	184548	156298
Fuzzy	14	103951	8094	336720

Table 6: Drops in Topology 2

Controller	EF Drops (CBR)	BE Drops (CBR)	EF Drops (On-Off)	BE Drops (On-Off)
Without	49859	49136	189435	154098
Conventional	46823	52164	172764	160148
Fuzzy	4579	94433	32087	300419

Table 7: Drops in Topology 3

6 Conclusion and Future Works

We showed, in this paper, a fuzzy controller that reconfigures router parameters to offer better quality of service inside a DiffServ domain. The use of fuzzy logic improves the handling of inaccuracy and uncertainties of the ingress traffic in a domain. The controller kept low complexity, maintaining DiffServ scalability characteristic. The controller's computing was not verified, but we believe that it is not high because the simulation time of fuzzy and conventional controllers were similar.

The policy-based management allow the controller to be generic, defining the domain behavior in agreement with administrative decisions. Furthermore, the behavior can be easily changed in whole domain, during normal system operation.

The simulations used to validate the model considered an example with EF and BE classes. Delay and jitter measurements are affected by inaccuracy and uncertainty of ingress traffic into the domain [7]. The results obtained through simulation demonstrated the functionality of the proposal showing an improvement in QoS metrics.

The results obtained using Drop Tail queues, WRR scheduler and Token Bucket conditioner, already reached improvement in QoS metrics. If more sophisticated mechanisms are used, for instance, WRED queues and WFQ scheduler, the results will be certainly better.

As future work a new controller will be defined including support to other DiffServ classes, like AF (Assured Forwarding). This class has a different philosophy, forcing the controller to deal with variables different from those considered in this paper. Thus we will have a complete controller, able to adjust all DiffServ parameters dynamically, according to the traffic changes and a given policy.

References

[1] VASILAKOS, A., ANAGNOSTAKIS, K., “Evolutionary-Fuzzy Prediction for Strategic Inter-Domain Routing: Architecture and Mechanisms”, WCCI 98. Anchorage, USA, May 4-9 1998.

[2] SLOMAN, M., “Policy Driven Management for Distributed Systems”, Journal of Network and Systems Management, Vol. 2, No. 4, pp. 333-360, 1994.

[3] RAJAN, R., VERMA, D., KAMAT, S., at al. “A Policy Framework for Integrated and Differentiated Services in the Internet”, IEEE Network Magazine. USA, September/October 1999.

[4] BLIGHT, D., HAMADA, T., “Policy-Based Networking Architecture for QoS Interworking in IP Management - Scalable Architecture for Large-Scale Enterprise Public Interoperation”,

[5] STEVENS,M., WEISS, W., MAHON, H., at al., "Policy Framework", Internet Draft draft-ietf-policy-framework-00.txt, September 1999.

[6] GUÉRIN, R., ORDA, A., “QoS-based Routing in Networks with Inacurate Information: Theory and Algorithms”, IEEE Infocom 97. Kobe, Japan, 1997

[7] LORENZ, D., ORDA, A., “QoS Routing in Networks with Uncertain Parameters”, IEEE Infocom 98

[8] LI, B., NAHRSTEDT, K., “A Control-Based Middleware Framework for Quality of Service Adaptions”, IEEE Journal on Select Areas in Communication, September 1997.

[9] LI, B., NAHRSTEDT, K., “Dinamic Reconfiguration for Complex Multimidia Application”, IEEE International Conference on Multimedia Computing and Systems 99, Vol 1, pp 165-170, July 1999.

[10] CHENG, R., CHANG, C., “Design of a Fuzzy Traffic Controler for ATM Networks”, IEEE/ACM Transaction on Networking, v.4 n^o 3, pp 460-469, June 1996.

[11] SOUZA, J.N., CARVALHO, E.V., BELCHIOR, A.D., ”Distributed Proactive Network Management based on Fuzzy Logic”, International Conference on Telecommunication - ICT’ 99. Korea, 1999.

[12] JACOBSON, V., NICHOLS, K., PODURI, K., ”An Expedited Forwarding PHB”, Request for Comments 2598, June 1999.

[13] BLAKE,S., BLACK, D., ,CARLSON, M., et al, ”An Architecture for Differentiated Services”, Request for Comments 2475, December 1998.

[14] Network Simulator - NS Version 2, http://www.isi.edu/nsnam/ns/.

[15] PIEDA, P., ETHRIDGE, J., BAINES, M., et al.,”A Network Simulator Differentiated Services Implementation - Open IP”, Nortel Networks, http://www7.nortel.com:8080/CTL/.

[16] DUARTE, O., Unfuzzy, http://ohm.ingsala.unal.edu.co/ogduarte/

[17] ROSS, T., “Fuzzy Logic with Engineering Applications”, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1995.