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Tng Project: Relevant Papers

Structured Stream Transport (SIGCOMM '07)
- http://bford.info/pub/net/sst-abs.html

Breaking Up the Transport Logjam (HotNets '08)
- http://bford.info/pub/net/logjam-abs.html

Efficient Cross-Layer Negotiation (HotNets '09)
- http://www.bford.info/pub/net/nego-abs

Square Pegs in Round Pipes (NSDI '12)
Evolutionary Pressures

- **Applications** need more flexible abstractions
  - semantic variations [RDP, DCCP, SCTP, SST, ...]
- **Networks** need better congestion control
  - high-speed [Floyd03], wireless links [Lochert07], ...
- **Users** need better use of available bandwidth
  - dispersion [Gustafsson97], multihoming [SCTP], logistics [Swany05], multipath [Iyengar06]...
- **Operators** need administrative control
  - Performance Enhancing Proxies [RFC3135], NATs and Firewalls [RFC3022], traffic shapers
The Transport Layer is (Still) Stuck in an Evolutionary Logjam!
[HotNets '08 – w/ Janardhan Iyengar]
Many Solutions, None Deployable

- New transports **undeployable**
  - NATs & firewalls
  - chicken & egg: app demand vs kernel support
- New congestion control schemes **undeployable**
  - impassable “TCP-friendliness” barrier
  - must work E2E, on all network types in path
- Multipath/multiflow enhancements **undeployable**
  - “You want how many flows? Not on my network!”
  - Fundamentally “TCP-unfriendly”?
Transport Abstractions

What “abstractions” do transports provide?

- Units of Data Movement (packets, streams)
- Units of Reliable Transmission (e2e principle)
- Units of Rate Control (flow, congestion)
- Units of Resource Sharing (inter-flow fairness)
- Units of Logical Endpoint Naming (ports)
- Units of Pluggability (narrow waist principle)
Analysis of Transport Functions

Current transports conflate **application-oriented** and **network-oriented** functions...

Where do security and location-independence go?
"Transport Next Generation" (Tng)

Break up the Transport into further sub-layers according to these classes of functions:
Can split E2E flow into separate CC segments
- Specialize CC scheme to network technology
- Specialize CC scheme within admin domain without interfering with E2E transport semantics
Random Annoying Questions About Transport Abstractions

- Do abstractions matter fundamentally, or only based on performance properties of their currently available implementations?
- Should we choose or design abstractions for the network or for the application?
- What is the right granularity for abstractions, or how do we handle granularity mismatches?
Data Movement Abstractions

Some data movement abstractions we've seen:

- Small Blobs (packets) [UDP, DCCP, SCTP]
- Byte-Stream [TCP]
- Packet-Stream [RDP, SCTP]
- Multi-Stream [SCTP, SST]
- Large Blobs [CDNs, DTN, DOT]
- ???
How Different Are They?

Application choices between TCP and UDP are mainly about the performance characteristics of their available implementations

- UDP datagrams: low-overhead and atomic, but only work at all when “small” (~8K max)
- TCP streams: arbitrary-size and incremental, but higher setup/shutdown/state overheads

In Structured Stream Transport [SIGCOMM '07], one abstraction serves both roles efficiently...
Example Use of TCP Abstraction

Natural approach: streams as transactions or application data units (ADUs)
[Clark/Tennenhouse]

Example: HTTP/1.0

TCP Stream Web Server

Web Client

GET 200 OK ... GET 200 OK ...

GET 200 OK ... GET 200 OK ...
Example Use of TCP Abstraction

*Practical approach: streams as sessions*
But If Streams Were Cheap...

The Structured Stream “abstraction”:

- Like TCP, but *cheap*
- Stream per object
- Stream per datagram
- Stream per AV frame

Do we really need *new abstractions* or just *better implementation*?
Network vs Application Abstractions

What's important in a transport “abstraction”: what the *application* or the *network* sees?

- Apps can get abstractions from middleware built in user space atop TCP, UDP, whatever
- Network abstractions matter for interoperability and for long-term compatibility

So should abstractions be driven by applications or by the network?
Recognizing that:

- Apps no longer need TCP for *convenience*, but as an efficient, compatible *substrate*
- But in-order delivery adds *unrecoverable delay*

Minion offers:

- Out-of-order delivery in TCP and SSL/TLS
- *No change* in network-visible TCP behavior
  - Walks, squawks like a TCP stream!
- But *application* can receive data out-of-order
1. **In-Order Arrival**
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Delivery in Minion/uTCP

2. Out-of-Order Arrival
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3. Gap-Filling Arrival

CumAck = 201

Out-of-Order Queue

read()
Is Minion a “New Abstraction”?

From “IETF philosophy” (wire format, not API)

- Same network behavior → same “abstraction”
  - Stream of bytes with seqnos, all get ACKed, …

But looks pretty different to application!

- Unordered datagrams, fancy COBS encoding
  - Or whatever application builds on top of it!

Consideration: do we need abstractions for application convenience or for interoperability?
Rate Control and Fairness

Transport connections are the traditional units of rate control and fair-sharing

- Flow, congestion control supposed to happen end-to-end between end hosts
  - Oops: Performance Enhancing Proxies (PEPs)
- Congestion control gives each competing TCP flow a “fair share” of bandwidth
  - Oops, wrong granularity for most purposes
Stream as “Fairness Abstraction”: Wrong on So Many Levels
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What Might Work (but not sure...)

Tunnels within Tunnels, Layers upon Layers...

- Aggregation at “Flow Layer” [HotNets '08]
- Recursive Internet designs [Day, Zave]

```
Endpoint Protocol
Transport Protocol
Application Protocol
Flow Protocol
Flow Middlebox
```

Shared Access Network or Wide-Area Link

```
Endpoint Protocol
Transport Protocol
Application Protocol
Flow Protocol
Flow Middlebox
```

```
Endpoint Protocol
Transport Protocol
Application Protocol
Flow Protocol
Flow Middlebox
```

```
Endpoint Protocol
Transport Protocol
Application Protocol
Flow Protocol
Flow Middlebox
```

Host A1

Host A2

Host B1

Host B2
“Fairness Enhancing Middleboxes”

Give customers **equal shares** of upstream BW independent of # connections per customer

![Diagram of network flows](image)
(Non-)Conclusion

Transports “roll many abstractions into one”

- Data Movement, Rate Control, Fair Sharing, Reliability, Endpoint Naming, Pluggability

How *should* we choose transport abstractions?

- Are abstraction choices *fundamental* or just about properties of *current* implementations?
- Are they about the *network* or the *application*?
- What are the implications of *granularity*, and how can we get the *right* granularity?