

Performance of Networked Applications: The Challenges in Capturing the User's Perception

Diana Joumlatt, Renata Teixeira
CNRS and UPMC Sorbonne Universites
{diana.joumlatt,renata.teixeira}@lip6.fr

Jaideep Chandrashekar, Nina Taft
Technicolor

{jaideep.chandrashekar,nina.taft}@technicolor.com

ABSTRACT

There is much interest recently in doing automated performance diagnosis on user laptops or desktops. One interesting aspect of performance diagnosis that has received little attention is the user perspective on performance. To conduct research on both end-host performance diagnosis and user perception of network and application performance, we designed an end-host data collection tool, called HostView. HostView not only collects network, application and machine level data, but also gathers feedback directly from users. User feedback is obtained via two mechanisms, a system-triggered questionnaire and a user-triggered feedback form, that for example asks users to rate the performance of their network and applications. In this paper, we describe our experience with the first deployment of HostView. Using data from 40 users, we illustrate the diversity of our users, articulate the challenges in this line of research, and report on initial findings in correlating user data to system-level data.

Categories and Subject Descriptors

C.2.3 [Network Operations]: Network monitoring

General Terms

Human Factors, Measurement, Performance

Keywords

End-host measurement, Network performance diagnosis, User experience

1. INTRODUCTION

Slow web downloads, choppy Skype calls and YouTube videos, or broken access to your email server are just few examples of how Internet disruptions can frustrate the user experience. A number of research projects aim to help users with tools that automatically diagnose performance problems. Some of this research has focused on enterprise networks [1, 13] and ISP networks supporting popular applications such as VoIP [18] or IPTV [16]. Other efforts diagnose

performance and configuration problems from an end-host upon the user request [15].

The ultimate goal of such tools is to improve the user experience, yet such efforts rarely engage the user in the process in order to understand their perception of how the network is performing. Studies of user quality of experience have been limited to a few niche applications, for instance VoIP [9], online-gaming [2], and video playback [3, 19]. We believe it is important to understand the user's perspective in assessing performance degradation. Clearly, a user's perspective of what constitutes a problem is a subjective matter. Such a perspective could potentially be used to decide whether or not to launch a diagnosis process. For example, if a user's network experiences a problem, but the application masks it and the result doesn't affect the user, it may not necessary to launch a diagnosis process.

The critical first step towards automated performance diagnosis and repair of end-hosts is to gather data directly from laptops or desktops and annotate that data with the user's perspective. Although some end-host datasets exist [6, 8, 17], none of them is annotated with the user perceived quality of the performance of the network and applications. The only exception is HomeMaestro [14], which instrumented the gateway in a small set of homes to capture all packets and asked home users to keep logs of how they perceive the network performance. Because it collects traces for a home and not per end-host and the logs are not automated, they cannot have fine-grained correlation of each user's perception of network performance.

Towards this goal we designed and built HostView¹ [11], an end-host tracing tool that runs on Mac OS and Linux PCs. HostView collects network traffic, system performance information, and the application associated with network traffic. Importantly, it also prompts the user for feedback on network performance. HostView incorporates two mechanisms for getting user feedback: a system-triggered questionnaire based upon the Experience Sampling Methodology [5], and a user-triggered mechanism called an "I'm annoyed!" button. The ESM mechanism prompts the user no more than three times per day to respond to a questionnaire about their network experience in the five minutes preceding the questionnaire. The "I'm annoyed!" button is always displayed at the edge of the screen and we ask users to click on this button when they are not happy with their network performance. Clicking the button brings up the same feedback questionnaire as in the ESM prompts. The particular questions in the questionnaire can be seen in [12]. For more details on the design of HostView, please refer to [11].

In this paper, we report on preliminary findings from our first deployment with HostView. First, we find that there is a great deal

¹<http://cmon.lip6.fr/EMD>

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. To copy otherwise, to republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee.

W-MUST'11, August 19, 2011, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
Copyright 2011 ACM 978-1-4503-0800-7/11/08 ...\$10.00.




Figure 1: Median and 95th percentile of data rates.

of diversity in the installed user base – in network speeds, application usage, and the level of network use (§ 2). While expected, the extent of this diversity took us by surprise and necessitated several modifications to HostView after it was released (to support particular users). This experience leads us to believe that monitoring tools must be designed so as to adapt to particular individuals. Second, collecting feedback from users, particularly about poor network performance, is fundamentally challenging because it is hard to collect sufficient statistics about rare events. By allowing two different mechanisms to register their feedback, our tool is able to collect a reasonable number of reports (§ 3). We were able to collect 576 total reports from users in a 2 week period, 95 of which were deemed instances of poor network performance. Finally, we find that a small set (seven, to be exact) of relatively simple performance metrics are able to uncover problems in a vast majority of cases where user’s report performance problems. In 82 out of the 95 poor performance instance, at least one of the metrics also exhibits “anomalous” behavior (§ 4).

2. USER CHARACTERISTICS

Our first deployment of HostView was between November 2010 and February 2011. The data in this paper comes from 40 users (26 on Mac OS and 14 Linux users). Although many users ran HostView for over a month, this paper analyzes data from the first two weeks of each of these users for the purposes of consistency. We gathered these users both via publicity and via incentives. We publicized HostView by distributing leaflets during the ACM Internet Measurement Conference 2010 and by sending emails to a number of CS mailing lists in November 2010. We offered two types of incentives for users to install HostView. First, HostView reports “network usage” summaries, where users can see their throughput as well the fractional bandwidth of active applications. Second, we offered 50 USD Amazon gift cards to a set of 40 users randomly picked from the first 100 who run HostView for an entire month.

Given that we mainly recruited users from the networking community and that HostView runs only for Mac OS and Linux, we expect that most of our users are computer experts. Despite this bias and the small number of users, our users exhibit a great deal of diversity in many ways. First, our users come from 14 different countries in Europe, North and South America, Asia-Pacific, and Middle-East. Second, the total number of different applications employed by these users over two weeks was 385. Table 1 presents the top-ten applications in our traces in terms of the number of users and the number of bytes transferred. Application names are identified in HostView from the system process names using the *gt*




Figure 2: Trace size for the first two weeks of collection.

Ranking by users	Ranking by bytes
1. Firefox	1. uTorrent
2. Skype	2. Safari
3. Safari	3. SSH
4. Mail	4. Firefox
5. Google Chrome	5. Google Chrome
6. Dropbox	9. smb
7. iTunes	6. Skype
8. Thunderbird	7. Mail
9. Adium	8. VLC media player
10. VirtualBox	10. Chromium

Table 1: Top-ten applications.

toolkit [7], so traffic to web-based applications such as Facebook or YouTube will appear under the browser name. We see that a number of our popular applications, such as web browsers, e-mail, and Skype, are similar to popularity rankings by the broader community captured in the wakoopa ranking². It is interesting to contrast the most popular applications with the applications that transfer the most bytes. The web browsers and Skype appear in both lists. Given that BitTorrent transfers files, videos and other (often large) content, it isn’t surprising that it tops the list in terms of number of bytes. The fact that SSH appears in the top-ten reflects the working habits of computer scientists.

Third, we observe behavioral diversity, even with a bias towards computer scientists. For example, network usage varies considerably across the set of studied users. We compute data rates per user as the number of bits downloaded plus the bits uploaded every second. A user’s data rate reflects both the capacity of her access network and the amount of data exchanged by applications. If a user is connected to a 100 Mbits/s Ethernet but only reading text email, the data rate will be low. Inversely, if a user is downloading movies over a 512 Kbits/s DSL line, the download can only go as fast as the DSL link. Fig. 1 presents the cumulative distribution of the median and 95th percentile of data rates per user (computed over the two week period) in log scale. This figure shows that both statistics vary by orders of magnitude across users. There is also a significant difference between the median and the 95th percentile data rates, which indicates that individual users generate very different data rates over time.

This difference in network usage also reflects on the volume of trace data collected for each user. Fig. 2 shows the cumulative distribution of the HostView trace size (in bytes) collected during the first two weeks for each of the 40 users (x-axis is in log scale). This figure shows that trace sizes vary from tens of megabytes to over

²Wakoopa is a social networking site that tracks the applications used by its members: <http://social.wakoopa.com/software>

ten gigabytes. The trace size depends not only on the data rates, but also on other factors such as the amount of time a user spends online, the applications used, and a person’s use of HostView’s *pause* feature. The offered pause function allows users to temporarily halt data collection. Our analysis of HostView logs shows that 26 users never paused the data collection, other users paused it only few times (at most 4 times during the two week period), except for one user who paused it 13 times. The users with the smallest traces never used the pause button; they simply spent little time online. In summary, we observe user diversity over orders of magnitude in terms of data rates and volume of network data generated; and we observe some outlier user behavior in terms of their use of the pause feature.

3. CHALLENGE: USER DIVERSITY

Although the diversity in user behavior is attractive for gathering a broad set of data, and for subsequent analysis, this same diversity leads to challenges in this line of research, as discussed in this section.

3.1 Monitoring tool design

There are often many ways to carry out the software design of a particular component in the monitoring tool itself. The “best” design may in fact depend upon the configuration and usage patterns of a user’s computer. We illustrate this point with one example and discuss the implications for monitoring tool design.

A core component of an end-host monitoring tool is the ability to upload the collected data from an individual machine to a back-end server for later processing. This should be done in a way that does not impact the PC performance nor annoy the user. One approach is to upload the most recent trace all at once, per each data transfer attempt (we try every 4 hours). This way the task completes quickly and removes potentially large trace files off a user’s machine in one step. We tried this approach initially and found that although it worked for the majority of users, there were a few who reported problems because uploading traces was consuming too much bandwidth and impacting machine performance. We learned that these users in fact suffered (with some regularity) from very low bandwidth rates, illustrating that one cannot make assumptions even about minimal upload quality.

We redesigned this mechanism following a second approach that also attempts to upload every four hours, but that introduces two features to avoid consuming too much bandwidth. First, it caps the upload bandwidth at 100 Kbits/s. Second, it sends traces split in 2 Mbytes chunks. After sending each chunk, if the chunk is larger than 150 Kbytes and the achieved throughput is less than 10 Kbits/s, then HostView aborts uploading the trace and tries again after four hours. This check ensures that if a user is at a place with bad network connectivity, HostView will not exacerbate the problem. Four of our users are running the new upload algorithm and no uploading problems have since been reported.

We conclude that the diversity in trace sizes and network connectivity of an individual’s machine implies that a “one-size-fits-all” approach isn’t necessarily the best design paradigm for end-host tracing tools. Moreover it seems a shame to have to design a tool for the worst case scenario, i.e. the few users with problems. We have come to believe that developing monitoring software whose configurations are *adaptive* is the right design paradigm for the future development of end-host tracing tools. For example, a tool could be adaptive in that it first observes the user’s behavior or the machine performance and then selects among a few options for uploading the trace data.

Completed	ESM		I’m annoyed!
	Deferred	Not Answered	
541	311	448	35



Table 2: User feedback (1335 questionnaires)

3.2 Sampling users for feedback

The study of network disruptions as perceived by end-users presents fundamental challenges in getting sufficient data for the task at hand. The challenge is in figuring out *at what time* and *under what conditions* to sample a user. By “sample a user” we mean the act of popping up a questionnaire and getting the user to complete it. We identify five issues in gathering both machine and user data during the very moment of a performance problem. First, poor performance events are by definition supposed to not be the norm, and thus depending upon the user’s machine and network, such events could be far and few between. Second, in order to avoid user annoyance, the questionnaire should pop up a limited number of times per day. We selected to use 3 based upon the results of our 400-person survey [10]. Third, the questionnaires need to be spaced somewhat far apart - again to minimize user annoyance. This is complicated by the fact that predicting user uptime is hard [11] which makes the task of deciding when to next pop up a questionnaire difficult. On days when the user doesn’t use her PC much, fewer than 3 samples could be collected. Fourth, promising the user that they will be asked to fill out the questionnaire less than a small finite number (e.g. 3 times a day), means that once they are all filled out, another questionnaire cannot be issued even if a poor performance epoch occurs. Fifth, there is a large diversity of user willingness [10] and we suspect that there will also be a wide range in the consistency within users fill-in the questionnaires.

All of this means that popping up questionnaires randomly, when limited to 3 a day and multiple hours in between questionnaires, isn’t going to generate many surveys at poor performance epochs. To improve the chances we designed HostView (described in [11]) to pop up the questionnaires using a scheme that weighs bad performance moments more heavily when deciding when to pop-up the questionnaire. Remember, that our “I’m annoyed!” button also increases the chances of getting feedback since the user can elect to engage it at any time.

How did our users respond to the two mechanisms for gathering data? Table 2 presents a summary of the responses we gathered. The numbers in the first 3 columns, under the ESM heading, refer to system-triggered questionnaires. We received 541 completed surveys that came from 35 users, indicating that most of our users (88%) used the ESM mechanism regularly. This also implies that 5 of our users never responded to the system-triggered questionnaire. Unfortunately we found that 448 questionnaires were never answered; this count refers to questionnaires that popped up and either were closed by the user or timed out after 6 minutes because the user ignored it. The 311 *Deferred* questionnaires refers to the number of times a user hit the “Ask Me Later” button when the survey popped up. Of the deferred questionnaires, we found that roughly 23% were completed the following time the questionnaire popped up. We found that 80% of the deferred questionnaires were answered within a 12 hour period. This illustrates that the deferral option is a good feature to have in ESM system. Overall we found that the majority of our users did use the ESM mechanism and complete the questionnaires, however this same set of users also left plenty of questionnaires empty and made regular use of the deferral option. We obtained 28 reports from 8 users that were generated from the “I’m annoyed!” button. Only 11 of our users used both the ESM and “I’m annoyed!” button mechanisms. This



(a) ‘I am annoyed : Speed rate: Slow; Application: iTerm; Problems: “Can’t connect to some sites or services”

(b) I am annoyed: Speed rate: Super slow; Problems: “Slow down-load or upload”

Figure 3: Correlation of poor performance reports with system and network performance indicators

indicates that many users prefer one mechanism over the other and thus having both definitely improves the chances of obtaining the target user feedback data.

In the following, we focus on the poor performance reports out of the 569 completed questionnaires (541 from ESM and 28 from the “I’m annoyed!” button). We say a completed questionnaire constitutes a **poor performance report** if the user rated their connection quality as either a 1 or a 2, out of a 5-point scale (with 5 being the fastest) or if the user explicitly named an application they believe to be performing poorly or provided a description of the problem. Among the 541 ESM questionnaires, 67 of them were poor performance reports, and these were generated by 23 users. So in total, over our 2 week period, we received 95 poor performance reports from 24 users.

All of this points to the fact that in order to get sufficient data, a large number of users are needed, or the measurement experiment needs to be run for a very long time. Simply scaling up the number of users is at odds with well known practices in the HCI community. There, most surveys are done with a small set of users (say 20) [4] and the users agree to respond to the questionnaires. This well accepted methodology has the advantage that the users participating will use the tool properly, thus enabling a qualitative study. However the disadvantage of this approach is that the number of users that participate is very limited (i.e. rarely in the hundreds). In the Internet measurement community, we are used to data gathering activities that assembles thousands or millions of data points from an ongoing stream of events. Further exploration is needed in approaches that target a large user base, even if they are only partially trained or aren’t guaranteed to be diligent in responding to feedback questionnaires. (Although we only present data from 40 users here, our next deployment will target a much larger user base.)

4. USER REPORTS ON PERFORMANCE

We now compare user reports of poor performance with system and network performance metrics that are easily measured automatically. We start with a simple analysis in which we consider seven basic metrics, and seek to understand if the poor performance epochs (as flagged by the user) co-occur with any of our automated metrics experiencing atypical, or “anomalous” behavior.

The specific performance indicators, seven in all, that we extracted from the traces are as follows: *Round-trip times (RTTs)*, computed as the elapsed time between sending a TCP packet and receiving the corresponding acknowledgment; *Data rate*, the aggregate bandwidth (in both directions) measured in bits/second;




Figure 4: ESM: Everything Good

TCP retransmissions, which counts the number of segments retransmitted (per second); *TCP resets*, measured as the number of packets containing a RST flag (TCP reset); *CPU load*, the CPU utilization measured at 30 second intervals. Finally, when the end-host had an active and operational wireless interface, we also logged *wireless signal strength* and *wireless noise*, as reported by the *airport* or *iwconfig* utilities (on Mac OS and Linux, respectively).

For each of these seven performance indicators, we define an anomaly as follows: we build a distribution of the values using two weeks of data and identify the 5th and 95th percentile values of the distribution. We consider an instance of a metric that falls inside this range (5th to 95th percentile values) to be normal. We consider the following cases to be anomalous: i) if the *RTT*, *CPU load*, *TCP retransmissions* or *wireless noise* exceed the 95th percentile value; ii) if the *data rate* or *wireless signal strength* fall below the 5th percentile value; or iii) any instance of a *any* TCP reset.

We now look at some detailed examples that illustrate the sequence of events in time that occur just before and after a user completes a poor performance report. Figures 3(a), 3(b) and 4 all follow the same format; the time the user submitted the report is marked 0 on the x-axis (indicated by the vertical line) and we assume the poor performance epoch occurred close to this time. The brief time series on the x-axis indicates what occurred for 2 minutes before and after the report was filed. Because the performance metrics all have different ranges, we rescaled them so as to be able to view them (y-axis) on the same plot. The normal range is mapped to values between [0, 1] with the 5th (95th) percentile value mapped to 0 (1), respectively. Values in the range [*min*, 5th percentile] (and that in [95th percentile, *max*])

Problem (number of reports)	Data rate	Wireless signal strength	Wireless noise	CPU load	RTT	TCP reset	TCP retransmissions
Slow browser (27)	14	2	0	10	18	23	14
Slow download or upload (24)	12	2	1	7	17	22	14
Poor voice or audio quality (14)	7	0	0	2	8	9	2
Poor video quality (11)	5	2	0	2	7	9	6
Can't connect to some sites or services (10)	3	1	1	3	8	8	6
Total (95 reports)	38	8	2	24	56	74	38

Table 3: Breakdown of anomalies across bad performance problems picked by users

are mapped to $[-0.1, 0]$ (and $[1, 1.1]$ respectively). Thus anomalies are those falling below 0 or above 1 (depending upon the metric). TCP RSTs are treated differently, and we simply mark the time that the RST was observed.

In Figure 3(a) the user reported a bad performance epoch by using the ‘‘I’m annoyed!’’ mechanism and provided the additional context: ‘‘Speed rate: Slow’’; ‘‘Application: iTerm’’; ‘‘Problems: Can’t connect to some sites or services’’. Here we see that the RTTs appear to rise and fall, and occasionally cross the $y = 1$ line (i.e., exceed the 95th percentile of the distribution), and we posit that the performance problem experienced by the user was due to the very large round trip times observed. This variation (pattern) in RTTs is typical behavior when the user is behind a large buffer. The stream of packets exchanged with the end-host gradually fills up the buffer introducing additional latency. When the buffer fills up, it starts dropping packets causing TCP connections to reduce their rate; this buffer bloat issue is becoming a major problem for ISPs (see <http://www.bufferbloat.net/>). To keep the plot readable, we only indicate the performance metrics relevant to this instance being anomalous.

Figure 3(b) is another instance where the user complained about bad performance. Here, the metrics plotted are *data rate*, *wireless signal strength*, and *wireless noise*. We see that the *wireless signal strength* is consistently below the 5th percentile value (below the $y = 0$ line) around the time the user complained. In this case, the user annoyance with their performance may have been due to poor wireless quality that adversely affected the available bandwidth.

In the above two cases we found anomalous events co-occurring with the user’s poor performance report and thus could postulate that when network performance was at the fringe of its normal behavior, this particular user unhappy with it. Two other scenarios are possible in terms of the consistency between system metrics and user reporting. If the performance metrics are anomalous, but the user files a report indicating there is no problem, then this is an indication that the user can tolerate such performance levels. On the other hand, if a user files a report indicating poor performance and none of our metrics exhibit anomalous behavior, then it means that more metrics are needed to understand what annoyed the user. (Clearly, our seven metrics considered here are merely a starting point, and we plan to examine others, especially application level metrics, shortly.)

Figure 4 shows an example of a completed ESM performance report. The user said there was no problem when completing the report, yet it is very clear from the figure that the RTT values consistently exceed the 95th percentile values, and this is also reflected in the low data rates. We looked into this case in more detail and found that at the time the report was completed, the user had 3 processes running: a large file transfer to a foreign country, mail and HostView. HostView was engaged in a data upload to a central server but this activity was capped at 100 Kbps and the RTTs to the server were between 0.7 and 0.8 in Figure 4; the mail activity generated minimal traffic, however the RTTs for the file transfer traffic were above 95th percentile. In this mix of applications, it is possible that the user was happily reading emails and not bothered if the file transfer occurred slowly.

We performed this type of analysis over all of the 95 poor performance reports we received. Overall, we found that in 82 out of these 95 instances, at least one of our seven performance metrics exhibited anomalous behavior. The anomalies that we could associate with each of these 82 poor performance reports are summarized in Table 3. The first column indicates the type of problem the user selected (among a list of choices that included ‘Other’ and ‘None’). The number next to the problem indicates the number of reports received of that problem type; for example, we received 27 reports about slow browsers. The count in the data rate column indicates that in 14 of those 27 reports (row 1), the data rate metric crossed its threshold line for our simple definition of anomalous. Note that the values in a single row can exceed the total number of reports because sometimes in a single report, multiple metrics can be anomalous. In order to explain the 13 reports for which we found no anomalous event across our performance indicators, we need to examine additional performance metrics.

We see in the table that all of our metrics, except wireless noise, were implicated in some problem. We are not claiming that the poor performance epoch a user experienced was caused by the anomaly we observe; in fact our metrics often themselves indicate some other underlying performance problem. We are merely claiming that there can often be simple indicators that track user annoyance, and the fact that our seven metrics are helpful in explaining 82 of the 95 poor performance reports we received is promising; one may not need to look at hundreds of features to understand the majority of incidents. Pinpointing the exact root causes for poor network performance problems is a challenging task and much more work needs to be done. Our work here is an initial foray toward the eventual goal of detecting performance degradations on the fly and performing proactive mitigation where possible.

5. CONCLUSION

We learned some interesting lessons in our first deployment of HostView. First, we believe that designing for diversity is an important paradigm in the design of end-host tracing tools. Designing for diversity implies that both the monitoring tool and the user-feedback mechanism should be adaptive. Second, due to the multiple challenges in getting user feedback data at poor performance epochs, we believe that the sampling mechanism should be weighted to prompt users when anomalous events occur. Third, we found that despite all of the challenges in collecting feedback for performance diagnosis, the two sampling methods we used together generated a fair amount of feedback. Fourth, we found that most users reporting poor performance episodes did so consistently and that reports often correlate with some performance metrics exhibiting outlier behaviors. This is promising for research in the area of automated diagnosis at end-hosts.

Acknowledgements

This project is supported by the European Community’s Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) no. 258378 (FIGARO) and the ANR project C’MON.

6. REFERENCES

- [1] P. Bahl, R. Chandra, A. Greenberg, S. Kandula, D. Maltz, and M. Zhang. Towards Highly Reliable Enterprise Network Services via Inference of Multi-level Dependencies. In *ACM SIGCOMM*, 2007.
- [2] K.-T. Chen, P. Huang, and C.-L. Lei. How sensitive are online gamers to network quality? *Commun. ACM*, 49(11):34–38, 2006.
- [3] K.-T. Chen, C. C. Tu, and W.-C. Xiao. Oneclick: A framework for measuring network quality of experience. In *Proceedings of IEEE INFOCOM 2009*, 2009.
- [4] S. Consolvo, J. Jung, D. Avrahami, P. Powledge, B. Greenstein, and G. Maganis. The Wi-Fi Privacy Ticker: Improving Awareness and Control of Personal Information Exposure on Wi-Fi. In *Proc. of Ubicomp*, October 2010.
- [5] S. Consolvo and M. Walker. Using the Experience Sampling Method to Evaluate UbiComp Applications. *IEEE Pervasive Computing Magazine*, 2(2), 2003.
- [6] E. Cooke, R. Mortier, A. Donnelly, P. Barham, and R. Isaacs. Reclaiming Network-wide Visibility Using Ubiquitous Endsystem Monitors. In *Usenix Technical Conference*, 2006.
- [7] F. Gringoli, L. Salgarelli, M. Dusi, N. Cascarano, F. Rizzo, and K. Claffy. Gt: picking up the truth from the ground for internet traffic. In *ACM SIGCOMM CCR*, 2009.
- [8] S. Guha, J. Chandrashekar, N. Taft, and D. Papagiannaki. How Healthy are Today's Enterprise Networks? In *Proc. of the Internet Measurement Conference*, October 2008.
- [9] W. Jiang and H. Schulzrinne. Modeling of packet loss and delay and their effect on real-time multimedia service quality. In *Proc. NOSSDAV*, 2000.
- [10] D. Joumblatt, R. Teixeira, J. Chandrashekar, and N. Taft. Perspectives on Tracing End-Hosts: A Survey Summary. In *SIGCOMM CCR*, April 2009.
- [11] D. Joumblatt, R. Teixeira, J. Chandrashekar, and N. Taft. HostView: Annotating End-Host Performance Measurements with User Feedback. In *HotMetrics, ACM SIGMETRICS Workshop*, 2010.
- [12] D. Joumblatt, R. Teixeira, J. Chandrashekar, and N. Taft. HostView User Manual. http://cmon.lip6.fr/EMD/Download_files/user-manual_Linux.pdf, 2010. Pages 4,6.
- [13] S. Kandula, R. Mahajan, P. Verkaik, S. Agarwal, J. Padhye, and P. Bahl. Detailed diagnosis in enterprise networks. In *ACM SIGCOMM*, 2009.
- [14] T. Karagiannis, C. Gkantsidis, P. Key, E. Athanasopoulos, and E. Raftopoulos. Homemaestro: Distributed monitoring and diagnosis of performance anomalies in home networks. Technical Report MSR-TR-2008-161, Microsoft Research, 2008.
- [15] C. Kreibich, N. Weaver, B. Nechaev, and V. Paxson. Netalyzer: illuminating the edge network. In *IMC*, 2010.
- [16] A. Mahimkar, Z. Ge, A. Shaikh, J. Wang, J. Yates, Y. Zhang, and Q. Zhao. Towards Automated Performance Diagnosis in a Large IPTV Network. In *ACM SIGCOMM*, 2009.
- [17] C. R. Simpson, Jr. and G. F. Riley. NETI@home: A distributed approach to collecting end-to-end network performance measurements. In *PAM2004*, April 2004.
- [18] V. Singh, H. Schulzrinne, and K. Miao. DYSWIS: An architecture for automated diagnosis of networks. In *IEEE Network Operations and Management Symposium*, 2008.
- [19] S. Tao, J. Apostolopoulos, and R. Guérin. Real-time monitoring of video quality in IP networks. *IEEE/ACM Trans. Netw.*, 16(5):1052–1065, October 2008.