

---

Subject: TCP packets lost?

Posted by [Max Deineko](#) on Mon, 07 Jan 2008 07:55:43 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hi,

I'm not really sure where to ask for help regarding my problem; I also have posted to the apache group some time ago, but have not found a solution. If you think this is the wrong group, I apologize. Also, any hint as to where ask for help would be highly appreciated.

I'm facing following problem: Apache running inside an OpenVZ VPS, serving multiple VirtualHosts. Now, it has regular availability problems, which appears to be neither load nor request pattern related.

What I don't quite understand is this: during the periods when the server isn't available (and seems to do nothing) most of TCP sessions look like the one below - apache keeps resending the handshake SYNACK packets to the client although client's response is clearly here (tcpdump done from inside the VPS).

Now I would think that even when the Apache process would hang, or be waiting for some other component, the TCP stack part of the application (or the kernel, for that matter) would still behave normally - is this wrong? I.e. is such behaviour normal? Or do the incoming packets get lost somewhere?

My first guess would have been that when the server is busy serving an expensive request, the tcp rcv buffer would get full and packets would get dropped. But wouldn't tcpdump not be able to see them then?

Any help would be highly appreciated,

thanks -

Max Deineko.

Session dump:

```
10:14:33.666935 IP CLIENT > SERVER: S 742086248:742086248(0) win 5808 <mss
1452,sackOK,timestamp 196805971 0,nop,wscale 7>
10:14:33.666965 IP SERVER > CLIENT: S 2619430727:2619430727(0) ack 742086249 win
5792 <mss 1460,sackOK,timestamp 347617915 196805971,nop,wscale 2>
10:14:33.700161 IP CLIENT > SERVER: . ack 1 win 46 <nop,nop,timestamp 196805980
347617915>
10:14:33.708406 IP CLIENT > SERVER: P 1:899(898) ack 1 win 46 <nop,nop,timestamp
```

```

196805980 347617915>
10:14:33.709279 IP CLIENT > SERVER: P 899:963(64) ack 1 win 46 <nop,nop,timestamp
196805980 347617915>
10:14:33.945483 IP CLIENT > SERVER: P 1:899(898) ack 1 win 46 <nop,nop,timestamp
196806039 347617915>
10:14:34.417635 IP CLIENT > SERVER: P 1:899(898) ack 1 win 46 <nop,nop,timestamp
196806157 347617915>
10:14:35.360801 IP CLIENT > SERVER: P 1:899(898) ack 1 win 46 <nop,nop,timestamp
196806393 347617915>
10:14:37.249017 IP CLIENT > SERVER: P 1:899(898) ack 1 win 46 <nop,nop,timestamp
196806865 347617915>
10:14:38.253998 IP SERVER > CLIENT: S 2619430727:2619430727(0) ack 742086249 win
5792 <mss 1460,sackOK,timestamp 347622503 196806865,nop,wscale 2>
10:14:38.287866 IP CLIENT > SERVER: . ack 1 win 46 <nop,nop,timestamp 196807127
347622503,nop,nop,sack 1 {0:1}>
10:14:41.023578 IP CLIENT > SERVER: P 1:899(898) ack 1 win 46 <nop,nop,timestamp
196807809 347622503>
10:14:44.253514 IP SERVER > CLIENT: S 2619430727:2619430727(0) ack 742086249 win
5792 <mss 1460,sackOK,timestamp 347628503 196807809,nop,wscale 2>
10:14:44.287392 IP CLIENT > SERVER: . ack 1 win 46 <nop,nop,timestamp 196808627
347628503,nop,nop,sack 1 {0:1}>
10:14:48.581817 IP CLIENT > SERVER: P 1:899(898) ack 1 win 46 <nop,nop,timestamp
196809697 347628503>
10:14:56.258819 IP SERVER > CLIENT: S 2619430727:2619430727(0) ack 742086249 win
5792 <mss 1460,sackOK,timestamp 347640510 196809697,nop,wscale 2>
10:14:56.292441 IP CLIENT > SERVER: . ack 1 win 46 <nop,nop,timestamp 196811629
347640510,nop,nop,sack 1 {0:1}>
10:15:03.676701 IP CLIENT > SERVER: P 1:899(898) ack 1 win 46 <nop,nop,timestamp
196813473 347640510>
10:15:20.458057 IP SERVER > CLIENT: S 2619430727:2619430727(0) ack 742086249 win
5792 <mss 1460,sackOK,timestamp 347664713 196813473,nop,wscale 2>
10:15:20.491784 IP CLIENT > SERVER: . ack 1 win 46 <nop,nop,timestamp 196817680
347664713,nop,nop,sack 1 {0:1}>
10:15:33.876920 IP CLIENT > SERVER: P 1:899(898) ack 1 win 46 <nop,nop,timestamp
196821025 347664713>
10:15:33.876953 IP SERVER > CLIENT: . ack 899 win 1897 <nop,nop,timestamp 347678134
196821025>
10:15:33.911143 IP CLIENT > SERVER: P 899:963(64) ack 1 win 46 <nop,nop,timestamp
196821035 347678134>
...(connection recovers)

```

```
# uname -a
```

```
Linux 2.6.9-023stab044.4-enterprise #1 SMP Thu May 24 17:41:23 MSD 2007
i686 i686 i386 GNU/Linux
```

```
# httpd -V
```

Server version: Apache/2.0.52  
Server built: Jul 14 2007 11:53:18  
Server's Module Magic Number: 20020903:9  
Architecture: 32-bit  
Server compiled with....  
-D APACHE\_MPM\_DIR="server/mpm/prefork"  
-D APR\_HAS\_SENDFILE  
-D APR\_HAS\_MMAP  
-D APR\_HAVE\_IPV6 (IPv4-mapped addresses enabled)  
-D APR\_USE\_SYSVSEM\_SERIALIZE  
-D APR\_USE\_PTHREAD\_SERIALIZE  
-D SINGLE\_LISTEN\_UNSERIALIZED\_ACCEPT  
-D APR\_HAS\_OTHER\_CHILD  
-D AP\_HAVE\_RELIABLE\_PIPED\_LOGS  
-D HTTPD\_ROOT="/etc/httpd"  
-D SUEXEC\_BIN="/usr/sbin/suexec"  
-D DEFAULT\_PIDLOG="logs/httpd.pid"  
-D DEFAULT\_SCOREBOARD="logs/apache\_runtime\_status"  
-D DEFAULT\_LOCKFILE="logs/accept.lock"  
-D DEFAULT\_ERRORLOG="logs/error\_log"  
-D AP\_TYPES\_CONFIG\_FILE="conf/mime.types"  
-D SERVER\_CONFIG\_FILE="conf/httpd.conf"

Some sysctl parameters:

net.ipv4.tcp\_moderate\_rcvbuf = 1  
net.ipv4.tcp\_rmem = 4096 87380 174760  
net.ipv4.tcp\_wmem = 4096 16384 131072  
net.ipv4.tcp\_dsack = 1  
net.ipv4.tcp\_fack = 1  
net.ipv4.tcp\_max\_syn\_backlog = 1024  
net.ipv4.tcp\_keepalive\_intvl = 75  
net.ipv4.tcp\_keepalive\_probes = 9  
net.ipv4.tcp\_keepalive\_time = 7200  
net.ipv4.tcp\_window\_scaling = 1

net.core.rmem\_max = 131071  
net.core.wmem\_max = 131071  
net.core.somaxconn = 128  
net.core.netdev\_max\_backlog = 300  
net.ipv4.tcp\_tw\_reuse = 0  
net.ipv4.tcp\_tw\_recycle = 0  
net.ipv4.tcp\_max\_tw\_buckets = 180000  
net.ipv4.tcp\_max\_tw\_buckets\_ve = 16536

VPS limits:

uid resource held maxheld barrier limit failcnt

tcpsndbuf	3024352	3189816	2147483647	2147483647	0
tcprcvbuf	4662588	4728124	2147483647	2147483647	0

---

---

Subject: Re: TCP packets lost?  
Posted by [porridge](#) on Mon, 07 Jan 2008 09:04:02 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Mon, Jan 07, 2008 at 07:55:43AM +0000, Max Deineko wrote:  
> My first guess would have been that when the server is busy serving an  
> expensive request, the tcp rcv buffer would get full and packets would  
> get dropped. But wouldn't tcpdump not be able to see them then?  
>  
> Any help would be highly appreciated,

<http://forum.openvz.org/index.php?t=msg&goto=21592>

My theory is that when the (receive buffer size / current connections)  
is too small for the window size, then kernel gets itself into a state  
where it's impossible to recover a connection.

--  
Marcin Owsiany <[marcin@owsiany.pl](mailto:marcin@owsiany.pl)> <http://marcin.owsiany.pl/>  
GnuPG: 1024D/60F41216 FE67 DA2D 0ACA FC5E 3F75 D6F6 3A0D 8AA0 60F4 1216

"Every program in development at MIT expands until it can read mail."  
-- Unknown

---

---

Subject: Re: TCP packets lost?  
Posted by [Max Deineko](#) on Mon, 07 Jan 2008 10:00:05 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Marcin Owsiany <[marcin@owsiany.pl](mailto:marcin@owsiany.pl)> wrote:  
> On Mon, Jan 07, 2008 at 07:55:43AM +0000, Max Deineko wrote:  
>> My first guess would have been that when the server is busy serving an  
>> expensive request, the tcp rcv buffer would get full and packets would  
>> get dropped. But wouldn't tcpdump not be able to see them then?  
  
> <http://forum.openvz.org/index.php?t=msg&goto=21592>  
>  
> My theory is that when the (receive buffer size / current connections)  
> is too small for the window size, then kernel gets itself into a state  
> where it's impossible to recover a connection.

Thanks a lot. I already had found the thread and tried increasing  
tcp\_rmem size, which hung the webserver completely (maybe it was a litte

too big ;), but I'm still experimenting with the settings.

Of course there might be a problem with other server components, and I'm not really a networking expert, it's just that the tcp flow doesn't look like what I'd expect it to.

So is the behaviour I see normal or is there really something wrong at this level already? Even if one assumed that userland components were broken and went haywire sometimes?

Thanks, Max.

---

Subject: Re: Re: TCP packets lost?

Posted by [Vitaliy Gusev](#) on Mon, 07 Jan 2008 11:33:15 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 7 January 2008 13:01:24 Max Deineko wrote:

> Marcin Owsiany <[marcin@owsiany.pl](mailto:marcin@owsiany.pl)> wrote:

> > On Mon, Jan 07, 2008 at 07:55:43AM +0000, Max Deineko wrote:

> >> My first guess would have been that when the server is busy serving an

> >> expensive request, the tcp rcv buffer would get full and packets would

> >> get dropped. But wouldn't tcpdump not be able to see them then?

>

> > <http://forum.openvz.org/index.php?t=msg&goto=21592>

> >

> > My theory is that when the (receive buffer size / current connections)

> > is too small for the window size, then kernel gets itself into a state

> > where it's impossible to recover a connection.

>

> Thanks a lot. I already had found the thread and tried increasing

> tcp\_rmem size, which hung the webserver completely (maybe it was a little

> too big ;), but I'm still experimenting with the settings.

>

> Of course there might be a problem with other server components, and I'm

> not really a networking expert, it's just that the tcp flow doesn't look

> like what I'd expect it to.

Please show files: /proc/net/netstat, /proc/net/snmp ( inside VE)

Have you seen any suspicious messages in dmesg related to this issue?

>

> So is the behaviour I see normal or is there really something wrong at

> this level already? Even if one assumed that userland components were

> broken and went haywire sometimes?

>

> Thanks, Max.

>

--

Thanks,  
Vitaliy Gusev

---

---

Subject: Re: TCP packets lost?

Posted by [Max Deineko](#) on Mon, 07 Jan 2008 12:01:31 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Vitaliy Gusev <vgusev@sw.ru> wrote:

> On 7 January 2008 13:01:24 Max Deineko wrote:

>> > On Mon, Jan 07, 2008 at 07:55:43AM +0000, Max Deineko wrote:

>> >> My first guess would have been that when the server is busy

>> >> serving an expensive request, the tcp rcv buffer would get full

>> >> and packets would get dropped. But wouldn't tcpdump not be able

>> >> to see them then?

>> I already [...] tried increasing tcp\_rmem size, which hung the

>> webserver completely (maybe it was a litte too big ;), but I'm still

>> experimenting with the settings.

>>

>> Of course there might be a problem with other server components, and

>> I'm not really a networking expert, it's just that the tcp flow

>> doesn't look like what I'd expect it to.

> Please show files: /proc/net/netstat, /proc/net/snmp ( inside VE)

See below. Currently running with

```
net.ipv4.tcp_rmem = 4096      87380  184762
```

```
net.core.rmem_max = 184761
```

> Have you seen any suspicious messages in dmesg related to this issue?

Indeed, dmesg shows

```
TCP: Treason uncloaked! Peer 91.4.192.15:52306/80 shrinks window 204385904:204399829.  
Repaired.
```

```
TCP: Treason uncloaked! Peer 91.4.192.15:52306/80 shrinks window 204385904:204399829.  
Repaired.
```

```
TCP: Treason uncloaked! Peer 91.4.192.15:52306/80 shrinks window 204385904:204399829.  
Repaired.
```

```
TCP: Treason uncloaked! Peer 62.158.79.38:1883/80 shrinks window 1835842591:1835855659.  
Repaired.
```

```
TCP: Treason uncloaked! Peer 91.12.168.104:2918/80 shrinks window  
2946649572:2946651606. Repaired.
```

```
TCP: Treason uncloaked! Peer 217.238.252.24:49584/80 shrinks window
```

3063558791:3063563147. Repaired.

TCP: Treason uncloaked! Peer 87.167.76.47:52766/80 shrinks window 867053615:867090259. Repaired.

TCP: Treason uncloaked! Peer 91.11.116.53:2475/80 shrinks window 3699395483:3699409070. Repaired.

TCP: Treason uncloaked! Peer 91.11.116.53:2476/80 shrinks window 3699833370:3699846438. Repaired.

TCP: Treason uncloaked! Peer 91.11.116.53:2475/80 shrinks window 3699403648:3699409070. Repaired.

TCP: Treason uncloaked! Peer 91.11.116.53:2476/80 shrinks window 3699841562:3699846438. Repaired.

TCP: Treason uncloaked! Peer 79.212.215.179:2859/80 shrinks window 400801346:400802798. Repaired.

TCP: Treason uncloaked! Peer 80.139.188.46:3646/80 shrinks window 156197829:156205177. Repaired.

TCP: Treason uncloaked! Peer 80.139.188.46:3646/80 shrinks window 156197829:156205177. Repaired.

TCP: Treason uncloaked! Peer 80.140.219.65:49793/80 shrinks window 4253417104:4253432263. Repaired.

TCP: Treason uncloaked! Peer 80.140.219.65:49793/80 shrinks window 4253417104:4253432263. Repaired.

TCP: Treason uncloaked! Peer 80.140.219.65:49793/80 shrinks window 4253417104:4253432263. Repaired.

That's from the hardware node after running for three days. I'm sorry I cannot relate the messages to the dropout times - the messages do not show up in the syslogs (yet - I'm new to the server).

Thanks & regards - Max.

```
# cat /proc/net/netstat
```

```
TcpExt: SyncookiesSent SyncookiesRecv SyncookiesFailed EmbryonicRsts PruneCalled
RcvPruned OfoPruned OutOfWindowIcmps LockDroppedIcmps ArpFilter TW TWRecycled
TWKilled PAWSPassive PAWSActive PAWSEstab DelayedACKs DelayedACKLocked
DelayedACKLost ListenOverflows ListenDrops TCPPrequeued TCPDirectCopyFromBacklog
TCPDirectCopyFromPrequeue TCPPrequeueDropped TCPHPHits TCPHPHitsToUser
TCPPureAcks TCPHPAcks TCPRecovery TCPSackRecovery TCPSACKReneging
TCPFACKReorder TCPSACKReorder TCPReorder TCPTSReorder TCPFullUndo
TCPPartialUndo TCPDSACKUndo TCPLossUndo TCPLoss TCPLostRetransmit
TCPRecoveryFailures TCPSackFailures TCPLossFailures TCPFastRetrans TCPForwardRetrans
TCPSlowStartRetrans TCPTimeouts TCPRecoveryFail TCPSackRecoveryFail
TCPSchedulerFailed TCPRecvCollapsed TCPDSACKOldSent TCPDSACKOfoSent
TCPDSACKRecv TCPDSACKOfoRecv TCPAbortOnSyn TCPAbortOnData TCPAbortOnClose
TCPAbortOnMemory TCPAbortOnTimeout TCPAbortOnLinger TCPAbortFailed
TCPMemoryPressures
TcpExt: 0 0 0 15666 390 7 0 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 350 518998 283 5722 6044 6044 13385260 860306
```



```
145918454 0 13263422 87351 9290224 12159160 1576 60817 31 631 240 92 198 367 2815
1284 1383 34266 20 369 13804 1501 90841 8390 24116 28574 309 7175 2 12934 5823 2 14577
291 0 751 5077 0 2285 0 0 0
```

# cat /proc/net/snmp

```
Ip: Forwarding DefaultTTL InReceives InHdrErrors InAddrErrors ForwDatagrams
InUnknownProtos InDiscards InDelivers OutRequests OutDiscards OutNoRoutes ReasmTimeout
ReasmReqds ReasmOKs ReasmFails FragOKs FragFails FragCreates
Ip: 2 64 55086729 0 0 0 0 55079918 59160345 0 0 22 64 0 22 0 0 0
Icmp: InMsgs InErrors InDestUnreachs InTimeExcds InParmProbs InSrcQuenches InRedirects
InEchos InEchoReps InTimestamps InTimestampReps InAddrMasks InAddrMaskReps OutMsgs
OutErrors OutDestUnreachs OutTimeExcds OutParmProbs OutSrcQuenches OutRedirects
OutEchos OutEchoReps OutTimestamps OutTimestampReps OutAddrMasks OutAddrMaskReps
Icmp: 10852 99 2358 0 0 2 0 8401 0 0 0 0 0 8472 0 71 0 0 0 0 8401 0 0 0 0
Tcp: RtoAlgorithm RtoMin RtoMax MaxConn ActiveOpens PassiveOpens AttemptFails
EstabResets CurrEstab InSegs OutSegs RetransSegs InErrs OutRsts
Tcp: 0 0 0 0 487897 1752675 1326 25489 45 55038781 59121501 195520 397 7118
Udp: InDatagrams NoPorts InErrors OutDatagrams
Udp: 30214 71 0 30372
```

---

---

Subject: Re: TCP packets lost?

Posted by [Max Deineko](#) on Mon, 07 Jan 2008 12:19:15 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Max Deineko <max@bitchesgroove.at> wrote:

> Vitaliy Gusev <vgusev@sw.ru> wrote:

>> On 7 January 2008 13:01:24 Max Deineko wrote:

>> Please show files: /proc/net/netstat, /proc/net/snmp ( inside VE)

Prettier:

/proc/net/snmp:

```
Forwarding      2
DefaultTTL     64
InReceives     55086729
InHdrErrors     0
InAddrErrors    0
ForwDatagrams   0
InUnknownProtos 0
InDiscards      0
InDelivers     55079918
OutRequests     59160345
OutDiscards     0
OutNoRoutes     0
```



ReasmTimeout	22
ReasmReqds	64
ReasmOKs	0
ReasmFails	22
FragOKs	0
FragFails	0
FragCreates	0

/proc/net/netstat:

SyncookiesSent	0
SyncookiesRecv	0
SyncookiesFailed	0
EmbryonicRsts	15666
PruneCalled	390
RcvPruned	7
OfoPruned	0
OutOfWindowIcmps	3
LockDroppedIcmps	0
ArpFilter	0
TW	0
TWRecycled	0
TWKilled	0
PAWSPassive	0
PAWSActive	0
PAWSEstab	350
DelayedACKs	518998
DelayedACKLocked	283
DelayedACKLost	5722
ListenOverflows	6044
ListenDrops	6044
TCPPrequeued	13385260
TCPDirectCopyFromBacklog	860306
TCPDirectCopyFromPrequeue	145918454
TCPPrequeueDropped	0
TCPHPHits	13263422
TCPHPHitsToUser	87351
TCPPureAcks	9290224
TCPHPAcks	12159160
TCPRenoRecovery	1576
TCPsackRecovery	60817
TCPsACKReneging	31
TCPFACKReorder	631
TCPsACKReorder	240
TCPRenoReorder	92
TCPTSReorder	198
TCPFullUndo	367
TCPPartialUndo	2815

TCPDSACKUndo	1284
TCPLossUndo	1383
TCPLoss	34266
TCPLostRetransmit	20
TCPRenoFailures	369
TCPsackFailures	13804
TCPLossFailures	1501
TCPFastRetrans	90841
TCPForwardRetrans	8390
TCPSlowStartRetrans	24116
TCPTimeouts	28574
TCPRenoRecoveryFail	309
TCPsackRecoveryFail	7175
TCPSchedulerFailed	2
TCPRcvCollapsed	12934
TCPDSACKOldSent	5823
TCPDSACKOfoSent	2
TCPDSACKRecv	14577
TCPDSACKOfoRecv	291
TCPAbortOnSyn	0
TCPAbortOnData	751
TCPAbortOnClose	5077
TCPAbortOnMemory	0
TCPAbortOnTimeout	2285
TCPAbortOnLinger	0
TCPAbortFailed	0
TCPMemoryPressures	0

---



---

Subject: Re: Re: TCP packets lost?

Posted by [gblond](#) on Mon, 07 Jan 2008 14:43:48 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 7 January 2008 15:02:14 Max Deineko wrote:

> Vitaliy Gusev <[vgusev@sw.ru](mailto:vgusev@sw.ru)> wrote:

> > On 7 January 2008 13:01:24 Max Deineko wrote:

> > > On Mon, Jan 07, 2008 at 07:55:43AM +0000, Max Deineko wrote:

> > > > My first guess would have been that when the server is busy

> > > > serving an expensive request, the tcp rcv buffer would get full

> > > > and packets would get dropped. But wouldn't tcpdump not be able

> > > > to see them then?

>

> > I already [...] tried increasing tcp\_rmem size, which hung the

> > webserver completely (maybe it was a litte too big ;), but I'm still

> > experimenting with the settings.

> >

> > Of course there might be a problem with other server components, and

> > I'm not really a networking expert, it's just that the tcp flow

> >> doesn't look like what I'd expect it to.  
>  
> > Please show files: /proc/net/netstat, /proc/net/snmp ( inside VE)  
>  
> See below. Currently running with  
>  
> net.ipv4.tcp\_rmem = 4096 87380 184762  
> net.core.rmem\_max = 184761

1) You didn't describe value of the net.core.rmem\_default parameter.  
Try to increase one.

2) Can you check patch from thread  
<http://forum.openvz.org/index.php?t=msg&goto=9018> ?

>  
> > Have you seen any suspicious messages in dmesg related to this issue?  
>  
> Indeed, dmesg shows  
>  
> TCP: Treason uncloaked! Peer 91.4.192.15:52306/80 shrinks window 204385904:204399829.  
Repaired.  
> TCP: Treason uncloaked! Peer 91.4.192.15:52306/80 shrinks window 204385904:204399829.  
Repaired.  
> TCP: Treason uncloaked! Peer 91.4.192.15:52306/80 shrinks window 204385904:204399829.  
Repaired.  
> TCP: Treason uncloaked! Peer 62.158.79.38:1883/80 shrinks window  
1835842591:1835855659. Repaired.  
> TCP: Treason uncloaked! Peer 91.12.168.104:2918/80 shrinks window  
2946649572:2946651606. Repaired.  
> TCP: Treason uncloaked! Peer 217.238.252.24:49584/80 shrinks window  
3063558791:3063563147. Repaired.  
> TCP: Treason uncloaked! Peer 87.167.76.47:52766/80 shrinks window  
867053615:867090259. Repaired.  
> TCP: Treason uncloaked! Peer 91.11.116.53:2475/80 shrinks window  
3699395483:3699409070. Repaired.  
> TCP: Treason uncloaked! Peer 91.11.116.53:2476/80 shrinks window  
3699833370:3699846438. Repaired.  
> TCP: Treason uncloaked! Peer 91.11.116.53:2475/80 shrinks window  
3699403648:3699409070. Repaired.  
> TCP: Treason uncloaked! Peer 91.11.116.53:2476/80 shrinks window  
3699841562:3699846438. Repaired.  
> TCP: Treason uncloaked! Peer 79.212.215.179:2859/80 shrinks window  
400801346:400802798. Repaired.  
> TCP: Treason uncloaked! Peer 80.139.188.46:3646/80 shrinks window  
156197829:156205177. Repaired.

```

> TCP: Treason uncloaked! Peer 80.139.188.46:3646/80 shrinks window
156197829:156205177. Repaired.
> TCP: Treason uncloaked! Peer 80.140.219.65:49793/80 shrinks window
4253417104:4253432263. Repaired.
> TCP: Treason uncloaked! Peer 80.140.219.65:49793/80 shrinks window
4253417104:4253432263. Repaired.
> TCP: Treason uncloaked! Peer 80.140.219.65:49793/80 shrinks window
4253417104:4253432263. Repaired.
>
> That's from the hardware node after running for three days. I'm sorry I
> cannot relate the messages to the dropout times - the messages do not
> show up in the syslogs (yet - I'm new to the server).
>
> Thanks & regards - Max.
>
>
> # cat /proc/net/netstat
>
> TcpExt: SyncookiesSent SyncookiesRecv SyncookiesFailed EmbryonicRsts PruneCalled
RcvPruned OfoPruned OutOfWindowlcmpts LockDroppedlcmpts ArpFilter TW TWRecycled
TWKilled PAWSPassive PAWSActive PAWSEstab DelayedACKs DelayedACKLocked
DelayedACKLost ListenOverflows ListenDrops TCPPrequeued TCPDirectCopyFromBacklog
TCPDirectCopyFromPrequeue TCPPrequeueDropped TCPHPHits TCPHPHitsToUser
TCPPureAcks TCPHPacks TCPRenoRecovery TCPSackRecovery TCPSACKReneging
TCPFACKReorder TCPSACKReorder TCPRenoReorder TCPTSReorder TCPFullUndo
TCPPartialUndo TCPDSACKUndo TCPLossUndo TCPLoss TCPLostRetransmit
TCPRenoFailures TCPSackFailures TCPLossFailures TCPFastRetrans TCPForwardRetrans
TCPSlowStartRetrans TCPTimeouts TCPRenoRecoveryFail TCPSackRecoveryFail
TCPSchedulerFailed TCPRcvCollapsed TCPDSACKOldSent TCPDSACKOfoSent
TCPDSACKRecv TCPDSACKOfoRecv TCPAbortOnSyn TCPAbortOnData TCPAbortOnClose
TCPAbortOnMemory TCPAbortOnTimeout TCPAbortOnLinger TCPAbortFailed
TCPMemoryPressures
> TcpExt: 0 0 0 15666 390 7 0 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 350 518998 283 5722 6044 6044 13385260
860306 145918454 0 13263422 87351 9290224 12159160 1576 60817 31 631 240 92 198 367
2815 1284 1383 34266 20 369 13804 1501 90841 8390 24116 28574 309 7175 2 12934 5823 2
14577 291 0 751 5077 0 2285 0 0 0
>
> # cat /proc/net/snmp
>
> Ip: Forwarding DefaultTTL InReceives InHdrErrors InAddrErrors ForwDatagrams
InUnknownProtos InDiscards InDelivers OutRequests OutDiscards OutNoRoutes ReasmTimeout
ReasmReqds ReasmOKs ReasmFails FragOKs FragFails FragCreates
> Ip: 2 64 55086729 0 0 0 0 55079918 59160345 0 0 22 64 0 22 0 0 0
> Icmp: InMsgs InErrors InDestUnreachs InTimeExcds InParmProbs InSrcQuenches InRedirects
InEchos InEchoReps InTimestamps InTimestampReps InAddrMasks InAddrMaskReps OutMsgs
OutErrors OutDestUnreachs OutTimeExcds OutParmProbs OutSrcQuenches OutRedirects
OutEchos OutEchoReps OutTimestamps OutTimestampReps OutAddrMasks OutAddrMaskReps
> Icmp: 10852 99 2358 0 0 2 0 8401 0 0 0 0 0 8472 0 71 0 0 0 0 0 8401 0 0 0 0

```

> Tcp: RtoAlgorithm RtoMin RtoMax MaxConn ActiveOpens PassiveOpens AttemptFails  
EstabResets CurrEstab InSegs OutSegs RetransSegs InErrs OutRsts  
> Tcp: 0 0 0 0 487897 1752675 1326 25489 45 55038781 59121501 195520 397 7118  
> Udp: InDatagrams NoPorts InErrors OutDatagrams  
> Udp: 30214 71 0 30372

>

>

--

Thank,  
Vitaliy Gusev

---

Subject: Re: TCP packets lost?

Posted by [Max Deineko](#) on Mon, 07 Jan 2008 20:17:45 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Vitaliy Gusev <vgusev@openvz.org> wrote:

> 1) You didn't describe value of the net.core.rmem\_default parameter.  
> Try to increase one.

Was set to 113664. I've increased it a little so now it's

```
net.ipv4.tcp_rmem = 4096 87380 284762
net.core.rmem_max = 284761
net.core.rmem_default = 284762
```

> 2) Can you check patch from thread  
> <http://forum.openvz.org/index.php?t=msg&goto=9018> ?

I am going to, though it's not easy, has to wait right now.

Thanks for your help - Max.

---

Subject: Re: TCP packets lost?

Posted by [Max Deineko](#) on Fri, 18 Jan 2008 12:14:23 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Turns out the host is running Virtuozzo. We contacted SWSoft support -  
I'll post here in case we have any news.

Thanks - Max.