## Ethernet

$\longrightarrow$ copper, fiber

Types (some just historical):

- 10Base2 (ThinNet): coax, segment length 200 m, 30 nodes/segment
- 10Base5 (ThickNet): coax, segment length 500 m, 100 nodes/segment
- 10Base-T: twisted pair, segment length 100 m, 1024 nodes/segment
- 100Base-T (Fast Ethernet): category 5 UTP, fiber (also 100VG-AnyLAN)
- Gigabit \& 10 Gbps Ethernet: fiber, category 5 UTP
- 100 Gbps Ethernet

Connectivity example (stone age):


- single-homed vs. multi-homed
- unique 48-bit Ethernet address per NIC
- physical network: bus vs. hub vs. switch
$\rightarrow$ very old vs. old vs. not-so-old
$\rightarrow$ today: switched Ethernet

High-speed Ethernets have shorter network diameter

- 2500 m for 10 Mbps Ethernet
- 200 m for 100 Mbps Ethernet
- even shorter for 1 Gbps Ethernet
$\rightarrow$ unless fully switched (later discussion)
$\longrightarrow$ distance limitations: due to Ethernet protocol
$\longrightarrow$ creates complications for long-haul
$\longrightarrow$ e.g., tens, hundreds, or thousands of miles
$\longrightarrow 1,10,100$ Gbps: tier-1 backbone speeds
$\longrightarrow$ also multiples of 1 and 10 Gbps


## DIX Ethernet frame:



## IEEE 802.3 Ethernet frame:



LLC header
$\longrightarrow$ IEEE 802.2 LLC (Logical Link Control)
$\longrightarrow$ two Ethernet types co-exist (802.3 dominant)

Digital transmission of digital data:
$\rightarrow$ Ethernet uses baseband transmission

Using square waves to represent bits
$\rightarrow$ methods and issues

- NRZ-L (non-return to zero, level)
- NRZI (NRZ invert on ones)
- Manchester (biphase or self-clocking codes)



## Trade-offs:

- NRZ codes-long sequences of 0's (or 1's) causes synchronization problem; need extra control line (clock) or sensitive signalling equipment.
- Manchester codes - synchronization achieved through self-clocking; however, achieves only $50 \%$ efficiency vis-à-vis NRZ codes.

4B/5B code

Encode 4 bits of data using 5 bit code where the code word has at most one leading 0 and two trailing 0 's.
$0000 \leftrightarrow 11110,0001 \leftrightarrow 01001$, etc.
$\longrightarrow$ at most three consecutive 0's
$\longrightarrow$ efficiency: $80 \%$

## Encoding: Manchester

$\longrightarrow$ note: Ethernet is baseband

Addressing:

- 48 bit unique address
- point-to-point
- broadcast (all 1's)

Receiver: Ethernet NIC accepts frames with "relevant" address.

- accepts only own frame address
$\rightarrow$ default
- accepts all frames: called promiscuous mode
$\rightarrow$ can set with root privilege
$\rightarrow$ useful for traffic monitoring/sniffing


## Ethernet MAC protocol: CSMA/CD

- MA (Multiple Access): multiple nodes are allowed simultaneous access
$\rightarrow$ just send
- CS (Carrier Sense): can detect if some other node is using the link
$\rightarrow$ rule: if busy, wait until channel is not busy
$\rightarrow$ works well in small areas: why?
- CD (Collision Detection): can detect if collision due to concurrent transmission has occured
$\rightarrow$ rule: if collision, retry later
$\rightarrow$ key question: when is later?
$\rightarrow$ collision detection: more difficult in wireless environments


## Collision detection mechanism:

# Bi-directional signal propagation <br> $\rightarrow$ terminator absorbs signal: prevent bounce back <br> $\rightarrow$ can hear different signal from one transmitted 



## Collision: 2 stations

$\rightarrow$ while transmitting data frame, hears collided signal $\rightarrow$ data frame cannot be too small

$\rightarrow$ meet in the middle: best-case
$\rightarrow$ why?

Worst-case collision scenario:

$\longrightarrow \tau$ : one-way propagation delay

- sender needs to wait $2 \tau$ sec before detecting collision $\rightarrow$ time for echo to bounce back
- for 2500 m length, $51.2 \mu$ s round-trip time $(2 \tau)$
- enforce $51.2 \mu \mathrm{~s}$ slot time
- at $10 \mathrm{Mbps}, 512$ bits: minimum frame size
$\rightarrow$ assures collision detection
$\rightarrow$ wireless collision detection: why more difficult?

Transmit at least 512 bits

$$
\longrightarrow 6+6+2+46+4=64 \mathrm{~B}=512 \text { bits }
$$

When to retry upon collision: use exponential backoff

1. Wait for random $0 \leq X \leq 51.2 \mu$ s before 1st retry
2. Two consecutive collisions: wait for random $0 \leq X \leq$ $102.4 \mu$ s before 2 nd retry
3. Three consecutive collisions: wait for random $0 \leq$ $X \leq 204.8 \mu$ s before 3rd retry
4. $i$ consecutive collisions: wait for $0 \leq X \leq 2^{i-1} 51.2 \mu \mathrm{~s}$ before next attempt
5. Give up if $i>16$
$\rightarrow$ a form of stop-and-wait
$\rightarrow$ what's the ACK?
$\rightarrow$ guaranteed reliability?
$\rightarrow$ why exponential backoff?

## CSMA/CD Throughput

$\longrightarrow$ approximate analysis in simplified setting

Assumptions:

- time is slotted
$\rightarrow$ slot duration: $2 \tau$
- $k$ hosts; each host transmits with probability $p$ at every slot
$\rightarrow$ transmission behavior among hosts independent
$\rightarrow$ transmission behavior across slots independent

New performance metric: utilization ( $\varrho$ )
$\longrightarrow$ fraction of total bandwidth utilized
$\longrightarrow \quad 0 \leq \varrho \leq 1$
$\longrightarrow$ small $\varrho$ : large wastage

In slotted CSMA/CD:
$\longrightarrow$ fraction of usefully used slots
$\longrightarrow$ what are "uselessly used" slots?

Ex.: snapshot of baseband channel over 10 time slots
$\rightarrow$ blue: successfully transmitted frames
$\rightarrow$ brown: collided frames
$\rightarrow$ utilization $\varrho$ ?


One more viewpoint:
$\longrightarrow$ note: useful and useless "periods" alternate


In the long run,

$$
\varrho=\frac{E[\operatorname{good}]}{E[\mathrm{good}]+E[\mathrm{bad}]}
$$

$\rightarrow$ avrg. length of adjacent "good" and "bad" periods
$\rightarrow$ formula holds under mild conditions

Next: estimate $E[$ good $]$ and $E[$ bad $]$

Not difficult to show:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varrho & =\frac{E[\text { good }]}{E[\text { good }]+E[\mathrm{bad}]} \\
& \approx \frac{1}{1+B L / F}
\end{aligned}
$$

where
$B$ : bandwidth (bps)
$L$ : length of wire (meters)
$F$ : frame size (bits)

What does the formula say?

For example, if $B$ is increased, what must be done to maintain high utilization?

## Today: switched Ethernet

- not bus anymore but switch
$\rightarrow$ contention moved from bus to "single point"
$\rightarrow$ switch: a computer
- Ethernet frames are logically scheduled
$\rightarrow$ buffering, who goes first (FIFO, priority)
- no more physical collision
$\rightarrow$ instead: buffer overflow

Diagram of 4-port switch:

$\rightarrow$ output buffered switch
$\rightarrow$ switches: both input and output buffers
$\rightarrow$ switching fabric: hardware
$\rightarrow$ functions: pure hardware, firmware, processes in OS
$\rightarrow$ e.g., Cisco's router OS: IOS (Internet OS)

Note: a switch has nothing to do with CSMA/CD
$\rightarrow$ it's not a shared bus medium with physical collisions
$\rightarrow$ what does "switched" Ethernet mean?

Issue of backward compatibility:

- Ethernet switch emulates CSMA/CD
$\rightarrow$ interoperate with legacy systems
$\rightarrow$ host's CSMA/CD NIC card cannot tell difference
$\rightarrow$ as if connected to a bus
- upon buffer overflow: send collision signal
$\rightarrow$ switch emulates collision
$\rightarrow$ transparent to legacy NIC
$\rightarrow$ facilitates incremental deployment

Internet: new technology must respect legacy
$\rightarrow$ otherwise deployment is difficult
$\rightarrow$ key requirement of any practical solution

Long distance Ethernet: e.g., 1000Base-LX
$\longrightarrow$ what about length limit of CSMA/CD?
Medium-haul GigE/10GigE (802.3ae): 500m, 5km, 40km

- solution: disable CSMA/CD
$\rightarrow$ switch-to-switch: disable at both ends
$\rightarrow$ purely point-to-point link
$\rightarrow$ backward compatibility: not an issue anymore
- flow control
$\rightarrow$ send pause frame to prevent buffer overflow


## QoS: IEEE 802.3p

$\longrightarrow$ frame tagging conveys priority
$\longrightarrow$ priority classes supported at switches
$\longrightarrow$ useful for VoIP (voice-over-IP)

Note: today's Ethernet is a hybrid mix of switch, CSMA/CD, short- and long-distance LAN
$\longrightarrow$ would not have been designed this way
$\longrightarrow$ result of legacy-respecting incremental changes

