### ENSC 427:COMMUNICATION NETWORKS FINAL PROJECT PRESENTATION SPRING 2010

### Analysis on the Performance of ATM Network Based on CBR and UBR

Group 12 Jie Gu, Li Xiang www.sfu.ca/~lxa7 jga9@sfu.ca, lxa7@sfu.ca

## Context

- Introduction
- Background Information
- OPNET Simulation Details
- Discussion of Results
- Conclusion and Ideas of Future Works

#### Reference

# Background Information

ATM – Asynchronous Transfer Mode

- Cell-based data transmission technology
- □ Cells are in fix length-53 bytes
- Diverse application transmission Voice, Ftp, Email, Video Conferencing
- Four service classes:
  - ABR Average Bit Rate
  - CBR Constant Bit Rate
  - UBR Unspecified Bit Rate
  - VBR Variable Bit Rate

## Introduction

- ATM is implemented as a network protocol and was first developed in mid 1980s
- Goal A single networking strategy to transport realtime conference and audio, as well as image, text, email
- Several organizations are involved in the creation of the standard, such as ITU, IETF



### **OPNET** Simulation Details

Objective:

Examine the effect of ATM for variable applications on the

different layers and service classes

- Two Applications: FTP and Voice
- Two Service Classes: CBR and UBR
- Two OPNET Scenarios:

CBR: CBR for FTP and VOICE application

UBR: UBR for FTP and VOICE application

# **Network Topologies**



# **Network Topologies**



### Results of FTP Application– Download Response Time



The download response time of UBR is lower than CBR

# Results of Voice Application– Packet Delay Variation



- Packet Delay of UBR fluctuates dramatically.
- Packet Delay of CBR is stable and close to zero.

# Results of Voice Application– End-to-End Delay

	LX_ATM_cbrubr-CBR-DES-1 LX_ATM_cbrubr-UBR-DES-1
0.16 -	time_average (in Voice.Packet End-to-End Delay (sec))
0.15	
0.14	
0.13	
0.12+	
0.11	
0.10	
0.09 -	
0.08-	
0.07	
0.06 -	
0.05 -	
0.04 -	
0.03 -	
0.02 -	
0.01	

The End-to-End delay of UBR is slightly lower than CBR

We only have four subnets, there are millions of clients in real life

UBR is much better than CBR

# Results of Voice Application-

### Jitter



•Lots of Jitter in UBR compared with CBR

•All Jitter are less than 0.00008 seconds

•It won't be noticeable to users

# Conclusions

#### CBR

- Strict with QoS, transfer delay, Packet Loss, Jitters
- Instant service, in specified bandwidth, such as Voice transmission

UBR

- □ No guarantee for service
- Applicable in a very tolerant of delay and cell loss environment
- □ FTP, Email

### Future Works

### Implement other service classes, such as VBR, ABR

### Test in other Applications, such as video conferencing

### Expand the file size for E-mail and FTP applications

# References

- Asynchronous Transfer Mode http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Asynchronous\_Transfer\_Mode
- http://www.panjin.net/dianxin/atm.htm
- Constant bit rate http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Constant\_bitrate
- Unspecified bit rate
- http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Traffic\_contract#Unspecified\_Bit\_ Rate\_.28UBR.29
- Kasera ,Sumit ATM networks: concepts and protocols, pp144, 2007
- Kesidis, George ATM network performance, Chapter 7.1, 2000
- McDysan, David E QoS &traffic management in IP &ATM networks, pt 2,2000

## Thank You

# Questions?