

A Study Paper on Communication Network and overview of Packet Switching Technology

Abstract— In this paper, we highlight some of the principal paths between any two points; and second, dividing events that led up to the revolution in communications complete user messages into what he called *message blocks* then third, delivery of these messages by store and forward switching.[12]

networks experience, emphasizing the description, Baran's work was similar to the research performed functions, analysis, design and performance measurement independently by Donald Davies at the National of packet-switching networks. We also discuss some recent physical Laboratory, UK. In 1965, Davies developed the advances in radio packet switching for long-haul.

.Index Terms— ARPANET, communication networks, computer networks, networks, packet switching.

I. INTRODUCTION

It is widely assumed that, for reasons of efficiency, the various communication networks (Internet, telephone, TV, radio, ...) will merge into one ubiquitous, packet switched network that carries all forms of communications. This view of the future is particularly prevalent among the Internet community, where it is assumed that packet-switched IP is the layer over which everything else will be carried[1]. ANPL Data Communications Network entered service in 1970. Roberts and the ARPANET team took the name packet switching system uses statistical multiplexing in which communication from multiple sources competes for the use of shared media.[2] The chief difference between packet switching and other forms of statistical multiplexing arises because a packet switching system requires a sender to divide each message into blocks of data that are known as packets. The size of a packet varies; each packet switching technology defines a maximum packet size. Or in other words we can say Packet switching, which forms the basis of the Internet, is a form of statistical multiplexing that permits many- to-many communication. A sender must divide a message into a set of packets; after transmitting a packet, a sender allows other senders to transmit before transmitting a successive packet.

II. HISTORY

The concept of switching small blocks of data was first explored by Paul Baran in the early 1960s. Independently, Donald Davies at the National Physical Laboratory (NPL) in the UK had developed the same ideas a few years later (Abbate, 2000).

Baran developed the concept of message block switching during his research at the RAND Corporation for the US Air Force into survivable communications networks, first presented to the Air Force in the summer of 1961 as briefing B-26 then published as RAND Paper P-2626 in 1962 and then including and expanding somewhat within a series of eleven papers titled On Distributed Communications in 1964. Baran's P-2626 paper described a general architecture for a large-scale, distributed, survivable communications network. The paper focuses on three key ideas: first, use of a decentralized network with multiple

concept of packet-switched networks and proposed development of a

UK wide network.. A member of Davies' team met Lawrence Roberts at the 1967 ACM Symposium on Operating System Principles, bringing the two groups together.[11]

Interestingly, Davies had chosen some of the same parameters for his original network design as Baran, such as a packet size of 1024 bits. In 1966 Davies proposed that a network should be built at the laboratory to serve the needs of NPL and prove the feasibility of packet switching. The ANPL Data Communications Network entered service in 1970. Roberts and the ARPANET team took the name packet switching" itself from Davies's work.

The first computer network and packet switching network deployed for computer resource sharing was the Octopus Network at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory that began connecting four Control Data 6600 computers to several shared storage devices in 1968 and an IBM Photostore in 1970 and to several hundred Teletype Model 33 ASR terminals for time sharing use starting in 1968.(5)

In 1973 Vint Cerf and Bob Kahn wrote the specifications for Transmission Control Protocol (TCP), an Internet networking protocol for sharing resources using packet-switching among the nodes.

III. PACKET SWITCHING

Packet switching is a digital networking communications method that groups all transmitted data regardless of content, type, or structure – into suitably sized blocks, called packets. Packet switching features delivery of variable-bit-rate data streams (sequences of packets) over a shared network. When traversing network adapters, switches, routers and other network nodes, packets are buffered and queued, resulting in variable delay and throughput depending on the traffic load in the network.

Packet switching contrasts with another principal networking paradigm, circuit switching, a method which sets up a limited number of dedicated connections of constant bit rate and constant delay between nodes for exclusive use during the communication session. In case of variable fees (as opposed to flat rate), for example in cellular communication services, circuit switching is characterized

by a fee per time unit of connection time, even when

no data

is transferred, while packet switching is characterized

by a fee per unit of information. Two major packet

switching modes exist; (a) connectionless

packet switching, also known as datagram switching,

and (b) connection-oriented packet switching, also known

as **Virtual Circuit** switching.

Connection-oriented communication includes the setting up a call from one computer steps of

to another, transmitting/receiving data, and then releasing the

call. Just like a system's one call, however, the network

connecting the computers is a packet switched network, unlike the switched network. Connection-

oriented communication is done in one of two ways

over a packet switched network: with and without

virtual circuits.

Without virtual circuits: This is what TCP does in the

Internet. The only two machines in the Internet that

are aware a connection is established are the two

computers at

and the presence of a

connection between the two computers. This means

that all

of the packets flowing between the two computers

can

follow different routes. One benefit of establishing the

connection is that the flow of packets from the source

to the

destination can be slowed down if the Internet is

congested

and speeded up when congestion disappears. Another

benefit is that the endpoints can anticipate traffic

between

the integrity and

continuity of the data transfers. This allows the

network to

be treated as a "stream" of data, as we will study later.

Virtual Circuit: This is not used in the Internet, but is

used in other types of networks (e.g., the X.25

protocol, still popular in Europe). The routers within

the network route all packets in one connection over

the same route. The advantage is that video and voice

traffic are easier to carry, because routers can reserve

memory space to buffer the transmission.




Fig. 1 Connection oriented network




Fig. 2 Connectionless network

Connectionless:

Connectionless communication is just packet switching where no call establishment and release occur. A message is broken into packets, and each packet is transferred separately. Moreover, the packets can travel different route connection.

Connectionless service is typically provided by the **UDP**

(User Datagram Protocol), which we will examine

later. The packets transferred using UDP are also called

datagrams.

X.25 vs. Frame Relay packet switching

Frame Relay was a best effort service that operated at layer 2 for most vendors, but there was at least one vendor that allowed Switched Virtual Circuits and Switched Permanent Virtual Circuits that operated at layer 3. Frame Relay did allow end to end flow control that almost no one utilized. Frame Relay was very popular up until about 10 years ago. to 8192 bytes.

. X.25 was an access service that operated at Layers 2 and 3 of the OSI model. X.25 was a reliable service that was supposed to route around failures, and errored links. The implementation of different vendors varied widely, from a connectionless reliable service to unreliable services. X.25 did not specify how the network operated only how the frames operated and how networks inter-operated using the X.75 protocol. There are various differences between X.25 and Frame Relay. The most significant are:

1. Call Control

X.25 connection establishment and release (call control) use in-band signaling within the same virtual channel used for user data transmission causing additional overhead. Frame Relay call control uses separate virtual channels identified by reserved DLCI using the LMI (*Local Management Interface*) protocol.

2. Routing vs. Switching

X.25 performs packet switching on OSI layer 3 (network layer); Frame Relay performs packet switching on OSI layer 2 (data-link). Frame Relay does not use any layer 3 protocol.

3. Flow Control

Frame Relay (FR) doesn't perform flow control between to acknowledge each frame; in case of frame errors frames

frame handlers (FR routers). X.25 routers have

have to be retransmitted and acknowledged. Frame

Relay

relies on flow control performed by higher layer protocols.

IV. ARCHITECTURE OF VARIOUS PACKET SWITCHING

A computer communication network is a collection of nodes at which reside the computing resources a paper is to introduce a new measurement technique. Authors should expect to be challenged by reviewers if the results are not supported by adequate data and critical details. (which themselves are connected into the network through node switches) which communicate with each other via a set of links (the data communication channels) [7], [8]. Messages in the form of commands, inquiries, file transmissions, and the like, travel through this network over the data transmission lines.

- All packets pass through a *single point* in space, at *different times*. Similar to time-sharing – multiprogramming on a single processor
- Buses are in this category (distributed multiplexor, built w. tristate drivers)
- Advantage: 1) Economize on datapaths, wires, memories
- 2) Easy to share aggregate capacity among competing flows
- Disadvantage: Non-scalable: infeasible beyond technology limit for aggregate capacity

Space switching:




Fig. 6 Basic Concepts & Terminology: Space Switching




Fig. 3. The structure of a computer-communication network

The following figures shows how the data flows over the networks and the features are explained below




Fig. 4 Basic Concepts & Terminology: Packet Switching

- Varying or unpredictable traffic – like automobiles
- Self-describing packets: header provides destination address

Time switching:




Fig. 5 Basic Concepts & Terminology: Time Switching

- Packets at a given time pass through *different paths* in space
- Similar to multiprocessing on parallel processors
- Crossbars are in this category (single-stage space switches)

- Advantage: Scalable: use when aggregate throughput > upper limit of time switching
- Disadvantage: Partitioned memories, wires \Rightarrow harder to route, schedule, load balance

Combination Example: Time-Space-Time Circuit Switch:





Fig. 7 Basic Concepts & Terminology: Time-Space-Time Circuit Switch

Time switching (TSI's) needed to resolve output and input conflicts.

V. CENTRAL ISSUES AND PROBLEMS FACED IN PACKET SWITCHING

Network sizes --the number of communicating parties, n --


vary widely among applications, ranging from small (single-digit number of nodes) to huge, like the entire Internet, with many millions to (soon) billions of nodes. The hardest and most interesting problems appear for large sizes, among these is the problem of scaling the *all-to-all* interconnection style of the local networks. It is completely unrealistic, cost-wise, for large



1 Output Contention: Packet Satellite

Output contention, the first central problem, is the attempt by multiple sources to "simultaneously" transmit information to a given output (destination) party at an aggregate rate in excess of the capacity of that output. Under these circumstances, the sources (or the streams of information that they injected into the network) *contend* (compete) for access to the desired output port of the network, hence the name "output contention".

2 Elementary Case: Single Resource Contention:



Output **contention** manifests itself even in the most elementary case: a network consisting of multiple transmitters and one receiver, as shown in the figure, where the aggregate rate of the transmitters exceeds the rate capacity of the receiver. We can study the essence of output contention using this simple case. A network like this can be built using a shared medium (e.g. traditional Ethernet), as illustrated on the left, or by running dedicated (point-to-point) links from each transmitter to the receiver, then using a multiplexor to select which piece of

information from which source will be routed to the receiver at each time, as shown in the right.

3 Short or Long Term Contention: Buffering, Dropping, Access Control, Flow Control

If the network sources want to transmit information at an aggregate rate exceeding the capacity of (a) receiver(s), then there are only three alternatives to handle this problem

a) Buffer the information in excess of the receiver capacity, in some buffer memory, and transmit it at a later time. This only applies to *short-term* contention, because if the rate mismatch persists for an unbounded period of time, an unbounded amount of memory will be needed, which is not feasible

b) Drop the information in excess of the receiver capacity. This is simpler than buffering, but leads to poor or the application. In applications where all information is needed, some protocol is put in place (usually in the end-user stations, but can also be in the network) for retransmitting the dropped information; the end result is similar to buffering, but the method, cost, and performance differ a lot.

c) Coordinate the sources so that they properly adjust their rates. By contrast to buffering, this applies mostly to *long-term* contention. Given the distributed nature of the network, such coordination inevitably involves delays. Coordination may be performed before or *after* the sources start their transmissions:

VI FUTURE

Fundamentally, a satellite provides a broadcast media which, if properly used, can provide considerable gains in the full statistical utilization of the satellite's capacity. Using ARPA's techniques, a single wideband channel (1.5 Mbit/s-60 Mbit/s) on a satellite provides an extremely economical way to interconnect high bandwidth nodes within a packet network. With the current cost of ground stations (\$150K-\$300K), it appears to be marginally economic to install separate private ground stations rather than to lease portions of commercial ground stations and trunk the data to the packet network nodes. However, either way, the cost of ground station facilities are such that the use of satellites only becomes economic compared to land lines when the aggregate data flow exceeds about 100 packets/s (100 kbit/s) to and from a node or city. Furthermore, satellite transmission has an inherent one-way delay of 270 ms; therefore, the packet traffic must logically be divided between two priority groups-interactive and batch. Only batch traffic can presently be considered for satellites, since the 270 ms delay is unacceptable for interactive applications, at least if any other options are available, even if a somewhat higher price. With current economics, the long-haul land line facilities only add about \$0.50/hr to the price of interactive data calls, which is far too little a cost to encourage the acceptance of slower service. Therefore,

interactive service will almost always require ground

line

facilities in addition to satellite facilities at all network nodes. This introduces another factor that limits the

potential

satellite traffic: land lines can easily carry 10-25

percent batch traffic at a lower priority, using a dual queue,

where satellite capability, must be compared with

any significant increase in cost. Further, if ground lines

are required and satellite facilities are optional, the full

cost for

the

incremental cost of simply expanding the land line

facilities.

All these factors considered, it is probable that satellites will be used by public data networks within the next five years

for increasing size between applying nodal points, but that ground facilities will be used exclusively for

transmissions between smaller nodes.

Packet Radio

This is the another important area where economic advantage of dynamic-allocation over pre-allocation will

soon become so fundamental and clear in all areas of communications, including voice. it is not hard to project

the same radical transition of technology will occur in voice

communications as has occurred in data communications.

Digitized voice can be compressed by a factor of three or

more by packet switching since in normal conversation each

speaker is only speaking one third of the time. Since interactive data traffic typically can be compressed by

a

factor of 15, voice clearly benefits that less from packet

switching than interactive data. This is the reason why packet switching was first applied to data communications..

Probably there will be many proposals, and even systems

built, using some form of dynamic-allocation other than

packet switching during the period of transition. The most

likely variant design would be a packetized voice

system

In short, packet switching seems ideally suited to both voice and data transmissions. The transition to packet switching for the public data network has taken a decade, and still is not complete; many PTT's and carriers have not accepted its viability. Given the huge fixed investment in voice equipment in place today, the transition to voice switching may be considerably slower and more difficult. There is no way, however, to stop it from happening.

VII CONCLUSIONS

It is fairly clear that informaton processing has come

to

depend heavily upon data communications. Rather

than

ignore the communications problem, computer

scientists are

dealing with the issues involved and have already learned to take advantage of its properties. We find a

number of major

issues which demand considerable thought and

attention.

For example, the issue of adistributed operating

system and

large distributed data bases involves problems

which are

hardly defined ,much less solved. Security issues in

the

distributed environment provided by a network are of great

concern in many communities. The current proposal is

to use an optical packet switching technology in order to:

References: Reduce the number of network layers, to simplify network management software and remove associated transport overheads

1. Baran et al., "On distributed communications, vols. I-XI. • Offer efficient traffic congestion and fine-grained service granularity compared to current wave-length switching technology, thereby improving OTN utilization."
2. D. W. Davies, K. A. Bartlett, R. A. Scantlebury, and P. T. Wilkinson, "A digital communications network for computers giving rapid response at remote terminals," ACM Symp. Operating Systems Problems, Oct. 1967.
3. R. A. Scantlebury, P. T. Wilkinson, and K. A. Bartlett, "The for a digital communication network," in Proc. IFIP Congress 1968, vol. 2-Hardware Applications," pp. 723-733.
4. R. A. Scantlebury, "A model for the local area of a data hardware design of a message switching centre organization," ACM Symp. Data Communication, Pine Mountain, Oct. 1969.
5. L. G. Roberts, "Multiple computer networks and intercomputer communication," ACM Symp. Operating System Principles, Oct. 1967.
6. L. G. Roberts and B. D. Wessler, "Computer network development to achieve resource sharing," Proc. SJCC 1970. pp. 543-549.
7. F. E. Heart, R. E. Kahn, S. M. Ornstein, W. R. Crowther, and D. C. Walden, "The interface message processor for the ARPA computer network," in AFIPS Conf. Proc. 36, pp. 551-567, June 1970.
- 8.

9. R. E. Kahn and W. R. Crowther, "Flow control in a packet-switching computer network," *Proc. ACM/IEEE Symp. Problems*, Palo Alto, CA, pp. 108-116, Oct. 1971.
10. S. M. Ornstein, F. E. Heart, W. R. Crowther, S. B. Russell, H. K. Rising, and A. Michel, "The terminal IMP for the ARPA computer network," In AFIPS Conf. Proc. 40, pp. 243-254, June 1972.
11. L. Kleinrock, —The Early History of the Internet,||*IEEE Commun. Mag.*, Aug. 2010, pp.26–36.L. G. Roberts, —The Evolution of Packet Switching,|| *Proc. IEEE*, Nov. 1978, pp. 1307–13.—A History of the ARPANET: The First Decade,|| Report to DARPA, Prepared by Bolt Beranek and Newman, Cambridge, MA, Apr.1, 1981, pp. 1–83.

12.

Sandeep panwar, born on 15 march,1986, persently working as asstt.prof, in ECE depptt at HCTM Kaithal. He has completed his b.tech and m.tech from kurukshetra university kurukshetra. He has published more than 7 research papers on antenna and wireless communication.

Dr. amit garg is a well known personality in the field of electronics and communication.He has completed his Ph.d from Thaper university patiala.He has published more tha n 70 research national and international journal paper.

Naresh kumar , born on 15 march,1985, persently working as Asstt. Prof, in ECE depptt at HCTM Kaithal. He has completed his b.tech and m.tech from kurukshetra university kurukshetra. He has published more than 9 research papers on antenna and wireless communication.