


Chapter 3

Transport Layer



Computer Networking: A Top-Down Approach

8th edition

Jim Kurose, Keith Ross
Pearson, 2020



Chapter 3: roadmap

- Transport-layer services
- Multiplexing and demultiplexing
- Connectionless transport: UDP
- **Principles of reliable data transfer**
- Connection-oriented transport: TCP
- Principles of congestion control
- TCP congestion control
- Evolution of transport-layer functionality



rdt1.0: reliable transfer over a reliable channel

- underlying channel perfectly reliable
 - no bit errors
 - no loss of packets
- *separate* FSMs for sender, receiver:
 - sender sends data into underlying channel
 - receiver reads data from underlying channel



rdt2.0: channel with bit errors

- underlying channel may flip bits in packet
 - checksum (e.g., Internet checksum) to detect bit errors
- *the* question: how to recover from errors?

How do humans recover from “errors” during conversation?


rdt2.0: channel with bit errors

- underlying channel may flip bits in packet
 - checksum to detect bit errors
- *the question*: how to recover from errors?
 - *acknowledgements (ACKs)*: receiver explicitly tells sender that pkt received OK
 - *negative acknowledgements (NAKs)*: receiver explicitly tells sender that pkt had errors
 - sender *retransmits* pkt on receipt of NAK


stop and wait

sender sends one packet, then waits for receiver response

rdt2.0: FSM specifications




rdt2.0: FSM specification




- Note:** “state” of receiver (did the receiver get my message correctly?) isn’t known to sender unless somehow communicated from receiver to sender
- that’s why we need a protocol!

rdt2.0: operation with no errors



rdt2.0: corrupted packet scenario



rdt2.0 has a fatal flaw!

what happens if ACK/NAK corrupted?

- sender doesn't know what happened at receiver!
- can't just retransmit: possible duplicate


handling duplicates:

- sender retransmits current pkt if ACK/NAK corrupted
- sender adds *sequence number* to each pkt
- receiver discards (doesn't deliver up) duplicate pkt


stop and wait

sender sends one packet, then waits for receiver response

rdt2.1: sender, handling garbled ACK/NAKs



rdt2.1: receiver, handling garbled ACK/NAKs



rdt2.1: discussion

sender:

- seq # added to pkt
- two seq. #s (0,1) will suffice.
Why?
- must check if received ACK/NAK corrupted
- twice as many states
 - state must “remember” whether “expected” pkt should have seq # of 0 or 1

receiver:


- must check if received packet is duplicate
 - state indicates whether 0 or 1 is expected pkt seq #
- note: receiver can *not* know if its last ACK/NAK received OK at sender

rdt2.2: a NAK-free protocol

- same functionality as rdt2.1, using ACKs only
- instead of NAK, receiver sends ACK for last pkt received OK
 - receiver must *explicitly* include seq # of pkt being ACKed
- duplicate ACK at sender results in same action as NAK:
retransmit current pkt

As we will see, TCP uses this approach to be NAK-free

rdt2.2: sender, receiver fragments



rdt3.0: channels with errors *and* loss

New channel assumption: underlying channel can also *lose* packets (data, ACKs)

- checksum, sequence #s, ACKs, retransmissions will be of help ... but not quite enough

Q: How do *humans* handle lost sender-to-receiver words in conversation?

rdt3.0: channels with errors *and* loss


Approach: sender waits “reasonable” amount of time for ACK

- retransmits if no ACK received in this time
- if pkt (or ACK) just delayed (not lost):
 - retransmission will be duplicate, but seq #s already handles this!
 - receiver must specify seq # of packet being ACKed
- use countdown timer to interrupt after “reasonable” amount of time




timeout


rdt3.0 sender




rdt3.0 sender



rdt3.0 in action




(a) no loss




(b) packet loss

rdt3.0 in action



(c) ACK loss




(d) premature timeout/ delayed ACK

Performance of rdt3.0 (stop-and-wait)

- U_{sender} : *utilization* – fraction of time sender busy sending
- example: 1 Gbps link, 15 ms prop. delay, 8000 bit packet
 - time to transmit packet into channel:


$$D_{trans} = \frac{L}{R} = \frac{8000 \text{ bits}}{10^9 \text{ bits/sec}} = 8 \text{ microsecs}$$

rdt3.0: stop-and-wait operation



rdt3.0: stop-and-wait operation

$$\begin{aligned}U_{\text{sender}} &= \frac{L / R}{RTT + L / R} \\&= \frac{.008}{30.008} \\&= 0.00027\end{aligned}$$




- rdt 3.0 protocol performance stinks!
- Protocol limits performance of underlying infrastructure (channel)

rdt3.0: pipelined protocols operation


pipelining: sender allows multiple, “in-flight”, yet-to-be-acknowledged packets

- range of sequence numbers must be increased
- buffering at sender and/or receiver



(a) a stop-and-wait protocol in operation

Pipelining: increased utilization



3-packet pipelining increases utilization by a factor of 3!

$$U_{\text{sender}} = \frac{3L / R}{RTT + L / R} = \frac{.0024}{30.008} = 0.00081$$

QUESTIONS