Advanced Network Technologies

Application layer

Transport layer

Dr. Wei Bao| Lecturer
School of Computer Science

THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY

Peer-to-Peer

Pure peer-to-peer model architecture

- *no* always-on server
- arbitrary end systems directly communicate
- peers are intermittently connected and cha addresses

examples:

- file distribution (BitTorrent)
- Streaming (Zattoo, KanKan)
- VoIP (Skype)

File distribution: client-server vs. p2p

Question: how much time to distribute file (size *F*) from one server to *N* peers?

- peer upload/download capacity is limited resource



File distribution time: client-server

- *server transmission:* must sequentially send (upload) *N* file copies:
  - time to send one copy: F/u_s
  - time to send N copies:
    - *client:* each client download file co
      - d_{min} = min client download rate
      - (worst case) client download time: F/d_{min}



time to distribute F to N clients using client-server approach

$$D_{c\text{-}s} > max\{NF/u_s, F/d_{min}\}$$

increases linearly in N

File distribution time: p2p

› *server transmission:* must upload at least one copy

- time to send one copy: F/u_s
  - *client:* each client must download file copy
    - client download time
  - *clients:* as aggregat = upload NF bits
    - Max upload rate $u_s + \Sigma u_i$
    - $NF/(u_s + \Sigma u_i)$



time to distribute F to N clients using P2P approach

$$D_{P2P} > max\{F/u_s, F/d_{min}, NF/(u_s + \Sigma u_i)\}$$

increases linearly in N …

… but so does this, as each peer brings service capacity

Client-server vs. p2p

client upload rate = u, F/u = 1 hour, $u_s = 10u$, $d_{min} \geq u_s$



P2P file distribution: BitTorrent

BitTorrent, a file sharing application

- 20% of European internet traffic in 2012.
- Used for Linux distribution, software patches, distributing movies
- Goal: quickly replicate large files to large number of clients

- Web server hosts a .torrent file (w/ file l tracker's URL…)
- A tracker tracks downloaders/owners of
- Files are divided into chunks (256kB-1MB)
- Downloaders download chunks from themselves (and owners)
- Tit-for-tat: the more one shares (server), the faster it can download (client)

P2P file distribution: BitTorrent

› file divided into 256KB chunks

› peers in torrent send/receive file chunks



P2P file distribution: BitTorrent



- peer joining torrent:
  - has no chunks, but will accumulate them over time from other peers
  - registers with trac peers, connects t ("neighbors")

- while downloading, peer uploads chunks to other peers
- peer may change peers with whom it exchanges chunks
- *churn:* peers may come and go
- once peer has entire file, it may (selfishly) leave or (altruistically) remain in torrent

BitTorrent: requesting, sending file chunks

requesting chunks:

- at any given time, different peers have different subsets of file chunks
- periodically, Alice a peer for list of chunks that they have
- Alice requests missing chunks from peers, rarest first

sending chunks: tit-for-tat

- Alice sends chunks to those four peers currently sending her chunks *at highest rate*
  - are choked by Alice (do not nks from her)
  - 4 every 10 secs
- every 30 secs: randomly select another peer, starts sending chunks
  - "optimistically unchoke" this peer
  - newly chosen peer may join top 4

BitTorrent: tit-for-tat

(1) Alice "optimistically unchokes" Bob

(2) Alice becomes one of Bob's top-four providers; Bob reciprocates

(3) Bob becomes one of Alice's top-four providers



higher upload rate: find better trading partners, get file faster !

Distributed Hash Table

Distributed hash table (DHT)

- DHT: a *distributed P2P database*
- database has (key, value) pairs; examples:
  - key: social se human name
- distribute th over the many peers
- a peer queries DHT with key
  - DHT returns values that match the key
- peers can also insert (key, value) pairs

Distributed hash table (DHT)

- Assign the keys
- Lookup the keys

Assigning key to peer

- central issue:
  - assigning (key, value) pairs to peers.
- basic idea:
  - Key: generat
  - Assign an integer ID to eac
  - put (key,value) pair in the peer that is closest to the key

Assigning key to peer

- distance: assign integer identifier to each peer in range [0,2^n-1] for some *n*.
  - each identifier represented by *n* bits.
- Each key to be assigned integer in range [0,2^n-1]
- to get integer key, hash ori
  - A hash function is any function that can be used to map data of arbitrary size to data of fixed size (e.g., an integer in [0,2^n-1]).
  - e.g., 15 = hash("Led Zeppelin IV")
  - this is why its is referred to as a *distributed "hash" table*

Assigning key to peer

- rule: assign key to the peer that has the *closest* ID.
- Here: closest is the *immediate successor* of the key.
- e.g., $n = 4$; peers: 1, 3, 4, ..., 12, 14;
  - key = 13, then successor peer = 14
  - key = 15, then successor peer = 1

Lookup the keys

Goal: to provide a distributed lookup service returning the host that owns the key

- Given a key, find the host that owns the key



Circular DHT



› each peer *only* aware of immediate successor.

Circular DHT (con't)

O(N) messages on average to resolve query, when there are *N* peers



key 1110 is stored at node 1111

Define closest as closest successor

Circular DHT (con't)

Example: Chord is an example of a Distributed Hash Table (DHT)

As a node:

- I have a successor peer
- I have a predecessor p
- I have some shortcuts to speedup delivery of requests

- Chord: A scalable peer-to-peer lookup service for internet applications. Stoica et al. *SIGCOMM* 2001.

Circular DHT (con't)



- each peer keeps track of predecessor, successor, short cuts.
- reduced from 6 to 2 messages.
- possible to design shortcuts so *O(log N)* neighbors, *O(log N)* messages in query

Transport Layer

our goals:

- understand principles behind transport layer services:
  - multiplexing, demultiplexing
  - reliable data transfer
  - flow control
  - congestion control
- learn about Internet transport layer protocols:
  - connectionless transport
  - T r tion-oriented port
  - TCP congestion control

Outline

- Transport-layer services
- Multiplexing/demultiplexing
- Connectionless transport (UDP)
- Principles of reliable data transfer
- TCP protocol

Transport Services

Transport services and protocols

- provide *logical communication* between app processes running on different hosts
- transport protocols run in end systems
  - send side: breaks ap into *segments*, passes to network layer
  - rcv side: reassembles segments into messages, passes to app layer
- more than one transport protocol available to apps
  - Internet: TCP and UDP



Transport vs. network layer

- *network layer:* host-to-host communication
  - best-effort, unreliable
- *transport layer:* process-t communication
  - relies on, enhances, network layer services

Internet transport-layer protocols

- IP: best effort service
- reliable, in-order delivery (TCP)
  - congestion control
  - flow control
  - connection setup
- unreliable, unordered delivery: UDP
  - no-frills extension of "best-effort" IP
- services not available:
  - delay guarantees
  - bandwidth guarantees



Transport Services

Multiplexing/demultiplexing

multiplexing at sender:
handle data from multiple sockets, add transport header (later used for demultiplexing)

demultiplexing at receiver:
use header info to deliver received segments to correct socket



How demultiplexing works

- host receives IP datagrams
  - each datagram has source IP address, destination IP address
  - each datagram carries one transport-layer segment
  - each segment has source, number
- host uses *IP addresses & port numbers* to direct segment to appropriate socket



TCP/UDP segment format

Connectionless demultiplexing

› *Receiver*

› *recall:* created socket has host-local port #:

› *Sender*

❖ *recall:* when creating datagram to send into UDP socket, must specify

- destination IP address
- destination port #

o essage,(desip,

)

with *same dest.IP address, dest. port #,* but different source IP addresses and/or source port numbers will be directed to *same socket* at dest

› when host receives UDP segment:

- Checks destination port # in segment
- directs UDP segment to socket with that port #

Connectionless demux: example

```
DatagramSocket serverSocket =
  new DatagramSocket(6428);
```

```
DatagramSocket mySocket2 =
new DatagramSocket(9157);
```

```
DatagramSocket mySocket1 =
 new DatagramSocket(5775);
```




Connection-oriented demux

- TCP socket identified by 4-tuple:
  - source IP address
  - source port numb
  - dest IP address
  - dest port number
- demux: receiver uses all four values to direct segment to appropriate socket
- server host may support many simultaneous TCP sockets:
  et identified by its
  le
  have different
  sockets for each connecting client
  - non-persistent HTTP will have different socket for each request

Connection-oriented demux: example



three segments, all destined to IP address: B, dest port: 80 are demultiplexed to *different* sockets

Connection-oriented demux: example



Connectionless Transport UDP

UDP: User Datagram Protocol [RFC 768]

- "no frills," Internet transport protocol
- "best effort" service, UDP segments may be:
  - lost
  - delivered out-of-o
- *connectionless:*
  - no handshaking between UDP sender, receiver
  - each UDP segment handled independently of others

- UDP use:
  - streaming multimedia apps (loss tolerant, rate sensitive)
  - DNS
- ansfer ov
  - lity at application layer application-specific error recovery!

UDP: segment header



UDP segment format

length, in bytes of UDP segment, including header

why is there a UDP?

- ction establishment
- n add d
- connection state at sender, receiver
- small header size
- no congestion control: UDP can blast away as fast as desired

UDP checksum

Goal: detect "errors" (e.g., flipped bits) in transmitted segment

sender:

- treat segment con
  including header fi
  sequence of 16-bi
- sum: addition (one's complement sum) of segment contents
- checksum: complement of sum
- sender puts checksum value into UDP checksum field

receiver:

hecksum of received

- uted checksum
  um field value:
  - NO - error detected
  - YES - no error detected.

Internet checksum: example

example: add two 16-bit integers



Note: when adding numbers, a carryout from the most significant bit needs to be added to the result

Principles of Reliable Data Transfer

Principles of reliable data transfer

- important in application, transport, link layers
  - top-10 list of important networking topics!

- characteristics of unreliable channel will determine complexity of reliable data transfer protocol (rdt)

Principles of reliable data transfer

- important in application, transport, link layers
  - top-10 list of important networking topics!

- characteristics of unreliable channel will determine complexity of reliable data transfer protocol (rdt)

Principles of reliable data transfer

- important in application, transport, link layers
  - top-10 list of important networking topics!

Network layer

- characteristics of unreliable channel will determine complexity of reliable data transfer protocol (rdt)

Principles of reliable data transfer

`rdt_send()`: called from above, (e.g., by app.). Passed data to deliver to receiver upper layer

`deliver_data()`: called by **rdt** to deliver data to upper

send side

 receive side

`udt_send()`: called by rdt, to transfer packet over unreliable channel to receiver

`rdt_rcv()`: called when packet arrives on rcv-side of channel

Principles of reliable data transfer

We will:

- incrementally develop sender, receiver sides of reliable data transfer protocol (rdt)
- consider only u er
  - but control info !
- use finite state machines (FSM) y sender, receiver

state: when in this "state", next state and action uniquely determined by next event



Principles of reliable data transfer

- underlying channel perfectly reliable
  - no bit errors
  - no loss of packets
- separate FSMs f
  - sender sends dat
  - receiver reads data from underly



sender receiver

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:

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 acknowle* xplicitly tell that pkt had errors
  - sender retransmits pkt on receipt of NAK
- new mechanisms in `rdt2.0` (beyond `rdt1.0`):
  - error detection
  - feedback: control msgs (ACK,NAK) from receiver to sender

rdt2.0: FSM specification



rdt2.0: operation with no errors



rdt2.0: error scenario



rdt2.0 has a fatal flaw!

what happens if ACK/NAK corrupted?

- sender does not know what happened at receiver!
- cannot just retran possible duplicate

handling duplicates:

- sender retransmits current pkt if ACK/NAK corrupted
- *quence number* to
- re (does not deliver up

stop and wait

sender sends one packet, then waits for receiver response

rdt2.1: sender, handles garbled ACK/NAKs



rdt2.1: receiver, handles garbled ACK/NAKs



rdt2.1: discussion

sender:

- seq # added to pkt
- two seq. #'s (0,1 suffice.
- 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

  ates whether 0 or ed pkt seq

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 *ex* being ACKed
- "unexpected" A n same action as NAK: *retransmit current pkt*

rdt2.2: sender, receiver fragments



rdt3.0: channels with errors and loss

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

- checksum, seq. # retransmissions help … but not e

approach: sender waits "reasonable" amount of time for ACK

› if no ACK received in K) just delayed (not lo
- n will be duplicate, but seq. #'s already handles this
- receiver must specify seq # of pkt being ACKed

› requires countdown timer

rdt3.0 sender



rdt3.0 in action



rdt3.0 in action



Performance of rdt3.0

- rdt3.0 is correct, but performance stinks
- e.g.: 1 Gbps link, 15 ms prop. delay, 8000 bit packet:

$$D_{trans} = \frac{L}{R} = \frac{8000 \text{ bits}}{} = 8 \text{ microsecs}$$

- U_{sender}: *utilization* – fraction of r busy sending

$$U_{sender} = \frac{L/R}{RTT + L/R} = \frac{}{30.008} = 0.00027$$

  - if RTT=30 msec, 1KB pkt every 30 msec: 33kB/sec thruput over 1 Gbps link

❖ network protocol limits use of physical resources!

rdt3.0: stop-and-wait operation



$$U_{sender} = \frac{L/R}{RTT + L/R} = \frac{.008}{30.008} = 0.00027$$

Pipelined protocols

pipelining: sender allows multiple, "in-flight", yet-to-be-acknowledged pkts

- range of sequence numbers must be increased
- buffering at send

› two generic forms of pipelined protocols: *go-Back-N, selective repeat*

Pipelining: increased utilization



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

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

Pipelined protocols: overview

Go-back-N:

- sender can have up to N unacked packets in pipeline
- receiver only se *cumulative ack*
  - does not ack packet if there is a gap
- sender has timer for oldest unacked packet
  - when timer expires, retransmit *all* unacked packets

Selective Repeat:

- sender can have up to N unacked packets in pipeline
- receiver sends *individual ack* packet
- intains timer for ked packet
  - when timer expires, retransmit only that unacked packet

Go-Back-N: sender

› "window" of up to N, consecutive unacked pkts allowed

- ACK(n): ACKs all pkts up to, including seq # n - *"cumulative ACK"*
  - may receive duplicate ACKs (see receiver)
- timer for oldest in-flight pkt
- *timeout(n):* retransmit packet n and all higher seq # pkts in window

Go-Back-N: sender

› "window" of up to N, consecutive unacked pkts allowed

- ACK(n): ACKs all pkts up to, including seq # n - *"cumulative ACK"*
  - may receive duplicate ACKs (see receiver)
- timer for oldest in-flight pkt
- *timeout(n):* retransmit packet n and all higher seq # pkts in window

GBN: sender extended FSM



GBN: receiver extended FSM



ACK-only: always send ACK ly-received pkt with highest *in-order* seq #

- may generate duplicate ACKs
- need only remember **`expectedseqnum`**

› out-of-order pkt:

- discard (don't buffer): *no receiver buffering!*
- re-ACK pkt with highest in-order seq #

GBN in action



Selective repeat

- receiver *individually* acknowledges all correctly received pkts
  - buffers pkts as needed for eventual in-order delivery to upper layer
- sender only re CK not received
  - sender timer for each unACKe
- sender window
- receiver window

Selective repeat: sender, receiver windows



Selective repeat

sender

data from above:

› if next available seq # in window, send pkt

timeout(n):

› resend pkt n, res

ACK(n) in [sendbase,sendbase+N-1]:

› mark pkt n as received

› if n is smallest unACKed pkt, advance window base to next unACKed seq #

receiver

pkt n in [rcvbase, rcvbase+N-1]

- send ACK(n)
- out-of-order: buffer
- der: deliver (also
  er buffered, in-order
  indow to
  t-yet-received pkt

[rcvbase-N,rcvbase-1]

- ACK(n)

otherwise:

- ignore

Selective repeat in action