

## **UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA**

# ENHANCEMENT OF TRANSMISSION CONTROL PROTOCOL PERFORMANCE OVER LOW EARTH ORBIT SATELLITE LINKS

### MAYADA SALIH ABDALLA MUSTAFA

FK 2003 23



# ENHANCEMENT OF TRANSMISSION CONTROL PROTOCOL PERFORMANCE OVER LOW EARTH ORBIT SATELLITE LINKS

# By MAYADA SALIH ABDALLA MUSTAFA

Thesis Submitted in Fulfilment of the Requirement for the Degree of Master of Science in the Faculty of Engineering Universiti Putra Malaysia

May 2003



To Mama, Baba, Mona, my daughters, my husband, Mazin, Maysaa & all whom I love



Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Science.

ENHANCEMENT OF TRANSMISSION CONTROL PROTOCOL PERFORMANCE OVER LOW EARTH ORBIT SATELLITE LINKS

By

MAYADA SALIH ABDALLA MUSTAFA

**May 2003** 

Chairman:

Professor Borhanuddin Mohd Ali, Ph.D.

**Faculty:** 

**Engineering** 

Recent growth of the Internet has led to the development of Internet services

everywhere and over every possible communications medium. Here, Low Earth

Orbit (LEO) Satellite has been addressed as a medium for supporting services based

on the Transmission Control Protocol (TCP).

Basically, TCP was proposed as a common transport protocol for the Internet. The

TCP mechanisms have been modified overtime and almost standardized for wired

networks. However, for wireless communications still further modifications are

needed for TCP mechanisms. Particularly, in this study an Enhanced Selective

Acknowledgement (ESACK) mechanism has been proposed to improve the

performance of TCP over LEO satellite links. The ESACK detects the network

congestion and adjusts the transmission window by considering losses in two

consecutive windows.

iii

By using the network simulator (ns) the overall performance of the TCP ESACK has been compared with that of the TCP SACK over LEO satellite links. The performance metrics include congestion window, effective throughput, end-to-end packet delay and file transmission time. Extensive simulation scenarios have been done using a number of FTP file sizes, two LEO satellite systems at different link error rates, point-to-point and multipoint-to-point connections. The results show that the ESACK provides a higher congestion window than that of the Selective Acknowledgement (SACK), which results in improving the effective throughput as well as reducing the overall file transmission time at the expense of slightly increasing end-to-end packet delay. It can be concluded that the ESACK, with possible slight changes to SACK, improves the performance of TCP over LEO satellite links.



Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk ijazah Master Sains.

PENINGKATAN PRESTASI PROTOKOL KAWALAN HANTARAN TERHADAP PENYAMBUNGAN SATELIT

Oleh

MAYADA SALIH ABDALLA MUSTAFA

Mei 2003

Pengerusi:

Profesor Borhanuddin Mohd Ali, Ph.D.

Fakulti:

Kejuruteraan

Perkembangan teknologi Internet yang terkini menjurus kepada pembangunan

perkhidmatan Internet di merata tempat menggunakan segala media komunikasi

yang boleh memuat aplikasi Internet. Pada kajian ini dibahas penggunaan sistem

komunikasi satelit buruj rendah sebagai media yang mendukung perkhidmatan

Internet berasas protokol kawalan hantaran (TCP).

Secara asas, TCP diajukan sebagai protokol umum dalam perkhidmatan Internet.

Mekanisme TCP telah diubah suai dari masa semasa dan hampir semuanya

mempunyai piawaian untuk perkhidmatan Internet yang mengunakan media

berwayar, namun untuk media komunikasi tanpa wayar, mekanisme TCP masih

perlu diubahsuai. Dalam kajian ini mekanisme "perakuan memilih tambahan

(ESACK)" dianjurkan untuk meningkatkan kecekapan protokol TCP dalam

sambungan komunikasi satelit berburuj rendah (LEO). ESACK boleh mengesan

UPM

kesesakan rangkaian komunikasi dan menyelarakan bukaan jendela penghantaran dengan mengambil kira faktor kehilangan diantara dua jendela yang berturutan.

Dengan mengunakan program simulasi rangkaian (ns) kecekapan penggunaan TCP ESACK pada sistem satelit buruj rendah dibandingkan dengan kecekapan TCP SACK pada sistem yang sama. Kajian metrik yang meliputi jendela kesesakan dilakukan untuk menunjukkan kesan keluaran, pelambatan dan transmisi yang efektif. Beberapa senario simulasi dilakukan secara intensif menggunakan fail-fail yang berbeza saiz terhadap dua buah sambungan satelit buruj rendah yang mempunyai kadar ralat yang berbeza dengan konfigurasi sambungan titik ke titik dan konfigurasi sambungan berbilang titik ke titik. Hasil kajian didapati menunjukkan ESACK menyediakan paras kesesakan jendela yang lebih tinggi berbanding dengan perakuan memilih (SACK), yang mana keluaran efektif diperbaiki dan mengurangkan keselurhan masa penghantaran fail. Dari hasil simulasi rangkain, sistem ESACK didapati mempunyai kekurangan iaitu bertambahnya kesan pelambatan pengiriman paket pada sambungan titik ke titik dan sambungan berbilang titik ke titik. Dapat disimpulkan bahawa ESACK dengan sedikit pengubahsuaian terhadap SACK dapat meningkatkan prestasi TCP dalam sistem satelit buruj rendah.



#### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I would like to thank everyone who has contributed to this success. Firstly, Prof. Dr Borhanuddin Momd Ali for, accepting me as one of his student, his strong academic's supporting by many ways, creating the association of his graduate students (Broadband-upm) having the sense of one family, and his more patience. Really it is great opportunities that I have had under his supervisory.

Secondly, Dr. Veeraraghavan Prakash and Puan Ratna Zakiah Sahbudin, for being members of the supervisory committee, for helpful suggestions and comments to make the work on the acceptable level.

Thirdly, Dr Ali M Abdelrahman for his assistances especially in equip my computer by Network Simulator (NS), much discussions on different aspects of TCP since the work was just an idea until it has become reality now.

Finally, my parents for all of the love and encouragement they have provided me throughout my life, my daughters Yousra and Ethar. Forever I proud of you.



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

|         |       |  | Page         |
|---------|-------|--|--------------|
| DEDIC   |       | N  | ii           |
| ABSTR   |       |  | 111          |
| ABSTR   |       |  | <b>v</b>     |
|         |       | EDGEMENTS  | vii          |
| APPRO   |       | 10.1   | viii         |
| DECLA   |       |  | X<br>        |
| LIST O  |       |  | XIII         |
| LIST O  |       |  | xiv          |
| LISTO   | r AB  | BREVIATIONS  | xvi          |
| Chapter | r     |  |              |
| 1       | INT   | RODUCTION  | 1.1          |
| 1       |       |  |              |
|         | 1.1   | Motivation of the Study                              | 1.2          |
|         | 1.2   | Problem Statement                                    | 1.3          |
|         | 1.3   | Aims and Contributions                               | 1.4          |
|         | 1.4   | Organization of the Thesis                           | 1.5          |
| 2       | ידו ז | ERATURE REVIEW                                       | 2.1          |
| 2       |       | Overview of Satellite Systems                        | 2.1          |
|         | 2.1   | 2.1.1 General Features of Satellites                 | 2.2          |
|         |       | 2.1.2 Advantages and Disadvantages of GEO Satellites | 2.3          |
|         |       | 2.1.3 Advantages and Disadvantages of LEO Satellites | 2.3          |
|         |       | 2.1.4 Properties of Iridium and Teledesic Systems    | 2.4          |
|         | 2.2   |  |              |
|         | 2.2   | Review of TCP Standards                              | 2.6          |
|         |       | 2.2.1 TCP Design Assumptions                         | 2.6          |
|         |       | 2.2.2 TCP Connection Establishment                   | 2.8          |
|         |       | 2.2.3 Basics of TCP                                  | 2.10         |
|         |       | 2.2.3.1 Sliding Window                               | 2.11         |
|         |       |  | 2.12         |
|         |       | 2.2.3.3 Timestamp Option                             | 2.12         |
|         |       | 2.2.4 Congestion Control Algorithms                  | 2.13<br>2.13 |
|         |       | 2.2.4.1 Slow Start                                   | 2.13         |
|         |       | 2.2.4.2 Congestion Avoidance                         | 2.14         |
|         |       | 2.2.4.4 Fast Recovery                                | 2.16         |
|         |       | 2.2.4.5 Selective Acknowledgements                   | 2.17         |
|         | 2.3   | TCP in Satellite Environment                         | 2.17         |
|         | 2.5   | 2.3.1 Satellite Link Characteristics                 | 2.20         |
|         |       | 2.3.1.1 Latency                                      | 2.20         |
|         |       | 2.3.1.2 Delay Variations                             | 2.20         |
|         |       | 2.3.1.3 Handoffs                                     | 2.21         |
|         |       | 2.3.1.4 Link Outages                                 | 2.22         |
|         |       |  | 4.44         |



|       |       |  | Page |
|-------|-------|--|------|
|       |       | 2.3.1.5 Transmission Errors                        | 2.23 |
|       |       | 2.3.1.6 Asymmetry                                  | 2.23 |
|       |       | 2.3.1.7 Congestion                                 | 2.23 |
|       |       | 2.3.2 TCP Extensions for Satellite Channels        | 2.24 |
|       |       | 2.3.2.1 Window Scale                               | 2.24 |
|       |       | 2.3.2.2 Selective Acknowledgments (SACK)           | 2.24 |
|       |       | 2.3.2.3 Path Message Transfer Unit Discovery       | 2.25 |
|       |       | 2.3.3 Unresolved Problems                          | 2.25 |
|       |       | 2.3.3.1 Slow Start                                 | 2.25 |
|       |       | 2.3.3.2 Link asymmetry                             | 2.26 |
|       |       | 2.3.3.3 Handling of Transmission Errors            | 2.27 |
|       | 2.4   | Summary of TCP over Satellites                     | 2.27 |
| 3     | RES   | SEARCH METHODOLOGY                                 | 3.1  |
|       | 3.1   | TCP Performance over LEO Satellite Links           | 3.1  |
|       | 3.2   | Description of Enhanced Selective Acknowledgements | 3.2  |
|       |       | 3.2.1 Basic Parameters                             | 3.3  |
|       |       | 3.2.2 Operation of ESACK Mechanism                 | 3.4  |
|       |       | 3.2.2.1 Initialisation of the Parameters           | 3.4  |
|       |       | 3.2.2.2 Actions of ESACK Mechanism                 | 3.5  |
|       |       | 3.2.3 Strengths of ESACK Mechanism                 | 3.9  |
|       |       | 3.2.4 Performance Evaluation of ESACK              | 3.11 |
|       | 3.3   | Conclusion   | 3.13 |
| 4     | RES   | SULTS AND DISCUSSION                               | 4.1  |
|       | 4.1   | Simulation Environment                             | 4.1  |
|       |       | 4.1.1 Simulation Tool                              | 4.1  |
|       |       | 4.1.2 Simulation Parameters                        | 4.2  |
|       | 4.2   | Simulation Results                                 | 4.2  |
|       |       | 4.2.1 Primary Assessment                           | 4.3  |
|       |       | 4.2.2 Different File Sizes Scenario                | 4.6  |
|       |       | 4.2.3 Various Error Rates Scenario                 | 4.16 |
|       |       | 4.2.4 Iridium System Scenario                      | 4.26 |
|       |       | 4.2.5 Network Congestion Scenario                  | 4.30 |
|       |       | 4.2.6 Multiple Connection Scenario                 | 4.34 |
|       | 4.3   |  | 4.41 |
| 5     | CON   | NCLUSION   | 5.1  |
|       | 5.1   | Environment of the Study                           | 5.1  |
|       | 5.2   | Summary of the Achievements                        | 5.3  |
|       | 5.3   | Future Work  | 5.5  |
| REFER | RENCE | ES   | R.1  |
|       |       | SS   | A.1  |
|       |       | E TUE ATTUOD                                       | D 1  |



# LIST OF TABLES

| <b>Table</b> |  | Page |
|--------------|--|------|
| 2.1          | Parameters for Iridium and Teledesic Systems                           | 2.5  |
| 2.2          | TCP Options for Satellite Paths (after RFC 2488)                       | 2.28 |
| 4.1          | Simulation Parameters  | 4.2  |
| 4.2          | Average Effective Throughputs (error rate = 0.0003)                    | 4.10 |
| 4.3          | Average Packet Delays (error rate =0.0003)                             | 4.16 |
| 4.4          | Average Effective Throughputs (file size=20MB)                         | 4.22 |
| 4.5          | Average Packet Delays (file size=20MB)                                 | 4.25 |
| 4.6          | Average Effective Throughputs using Iridium System (error rate=0.0003) | 4.27 |
| 4.7          | Average Effective Throughputs using Iridium System (file size = 20MB)  | 4.29 |
| 4.8          | Average Effective Throughputs (file size=10MB, error rate =            |      |
|              | 0.0003)  | 4.33 |



## LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure       |   | Page         |
|--------------|---|--------------|
| 2.1          | Teledesic System (288 active satellites)  | 2.5          |
| 2.2          | TCP Three-way Handshake Segment Exchange  | 2.9          |
| 2.3          | Closing a Connection  | 2.10         |
| 2.4          | Basic Operation of TCP Slow Start and Congestion Avoidance  | 2.17         |
| 2.5          | The SACK Option   | 2.19         |
| 2.6          | Example of a Polar-orbiting Satellite Constellation   | 2.22         |
| 3.1          | ESACK Mechanism in Conjunction with other TCP Mechanisms  | 3.8          |
| 3.2          | Implementation of ESACK for Congestion Readjustment   | 3.9          |
| 3.3          | A Satellite-based Host Communicates with a Server in the Internet.  | 3.13         |
| 4.1          | Average Effective Throughputs at Different Congestion Windows   | 4.4          |
| 4.2          | Average Packet Delays at Different Congestion Windows   | 4.5          |
| 4.3          | Loss Ratios at Different Congestion Windows   | 4.5          |
| 4.4          | Congestion Window (file size=2MB, error rate=0.0003)  | 4.8          |
| 4.5          | Congestion Window (file size=5MB, error rate=0.0003)  | 4.8          |
| 4.6          | Congestion Window (file size=10MB, error rate=0.0003)   | 4.9          |
| 4.7          | Congestion Window (file size=20MB, error rate=0.0003)   | 4.9          |
| 4.8          | Average Effective Throughput (file size=2MB, error rate=0.0003)   | 4.11         |
| 4.9          | Average Effective Throughput (file size=5MB, error rate=0.0003)   | 4.11         |
| 4.10         | Average Effective Throughput (file size=10MB, error rate=0.0003)  | 4.12         |
| 4.11         | Average Effective Throughput (file size=20MB, error rate=0.0003)  | 4.12         |
| 4.12         | Average Effective Throughputs for Different File Sizes (error   |              |
|              | rate=0.0003)  | 4.13         |
| 4.13         | Average Packet Delay (file size=2MB, error rate=0.0003)   | 4.14         |
| 4.14         | Average Packet Delay (file size=5MB, error rate=0.0003)   | 4.14         |
| 4.15         | Average Packet Delay (file size=10MB,error rate=0.0003)   | 4.15         |
| 4.16         | Average Packet Delay (file size=20MB, error rate=0.0003)  | 4.15         |
| 4.17         | Average packet Delays for Different File Sizes (error rate=0.0003).   | 4.16         |
| 4.18         | Congestion Window (file size=20MB, error rate=0.00001)  | 4.18         |
| 4.19         | Congestion Window (file size=20MB, error rate=0.00005)  | 4.18         |
| 4.20         | Congestion Window (file size=20MB, error rate=0.0001)   | 4.19         |
| 4.21         | Congestion Window (file size=20MB, error rate=0.0002)   | 4.19         |
| 4.22         | Average Effective Throughput (file size=20MB,error rate=0.00001)  | 4.20         |
| 4.23         | Average Effective Throughput (file size=20MB,error rate=0.00005)  | 4.20         |
| 4.24<br>4.25 | Average Effective Throughput (file size=20MB, error rate=0.0001) Average Effective Throughput (file size=20MB, error rate=0.0002) | 4.21         |
| 4.25         |   | 4.21         |
| 4.20         | Average Effective Throughputs at Different Error Rates  | 4 22         |
| 4.27         | (file size=20MB)  | 4.22<br>4.23 |
| 4.27         | Average Packet Delay (file size=20MB, error rate=0.00001)   | 4.23         |
| 4.29         | Average Packet Delay (file size=20MB, error rate=0.00003)   | 4.23         |
| 4.29         | Average Packet Delay (file size=20MB, error rate=0.0001)  | 4.24         |
| 4.50         | A VEI age Facket Delay (IIIC SIZE-ZUIVID, CITUF FALE-U.UUUZ)  | <b>+</b> .∠4 |



| Figure |  | Page |
|--------|--|------|
| 4.31   | Average Delays at Different Error Rates (file size=20MB)                                 | 4.25 |
| 4.32   | Average Effective Throughputs for Different File Sizes (error rate=0.0003, Iridium)      | 4.27 |
| 4.33   | Average Packet Delays for Different File Sizes (error rate=0.0003, Iridium)              | 4.28 |
| 4.34   | Average Effective Throughputs at Different Error Rates (file size=20MB, Iridium)         | 4.29 |
| 4.35   | Average Packet Delays at Different Error Rates (file size=20MB, Iridium)                 | 4.30 |
| 4.36   | Congestion Window under Congestion Losses (file size=10MB, error rate=0.0003)            | 4.32 |
| 4.37   | Average Effective Throughput under Congestion Losses (file size=10MB, error rate=0.0003) | 4.32 |
| 4.38   | Average Packet Delay under Congestion Losses (file size=10MB, error rate=0.0003)         | 4.33 |
| 4.39   | Congestion Windows for Multiple Sources (S0, S1, S2, S3) using SACK-B                    | 4.35 |
| 4.40   | Congestion Windows for Multiple Sources (S0, S1, S2, S3) using ESACK-B                   | 4.36 |
| 4.41   | Congestion Windows for Multiple Sources (S0, S1, S2, S3) using SACK-S                    | 4.36 |
| 4.42   | Congestion Windows for Multiple Sources (S0, S1, S2, S3) using ESACK-S                   | 4.37 |
| 4.43   | Standard Deviation for Multiple Sources Throughputs (Berkley)                            | 4.38 |
| 4.44   | Standard Deviation for Multiple Sources Throughputs (South Africa)                       | 4.38 |
| 4.45   | Standard Deviation for Multiple Sources Delays (Berkley)                                 | 4.40 |
| 4 46   | Standard Deviation for Multiple Sources Delays (South Africa)                            | 4 40 |



#### LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BER

Bit Error Rate

**CWND** 

**Congestion Window** 

**ECN** 

**Explicit Congestion Notification** 

**ESACK** 

Enhanced Selective Acknowledgements

**FEC** 

Forward Error Correction

FIN

Finish

FTP

File Transfer Protocol

**GEO** 

Geostationary Earth Orbit

**ISL** 

Inter-satellite Links

LEO

Low Earth Orbit

MTU

Message Transfer Unit

NS

Network Simulator

RF

Radio Frequency

**RTO** 

Retransmission Timeout

RTT

Round Trip Time

SACK

Selective Acknowledgements

SSTHRESH

Slow Start Threshold

SYN

Synchronization

TCP

Transmission Control Protocol

WWW

World Wide Web



#### **CHAPTER 1**

#### INTRODUCTION

Satellite systems can be considered as an integral part of the third-generation systems due to their ability to provide global coverage and immunity from terrestrial disasters. In particular low earth orbit (LEO) satellite networks have been integrated with terrestrial wired networks to provide communication services for the Internet and mobile users at remote areas. LEO satellite systems have a number of advantages over traditional geostationary earth orbit (GEO) satellite systems, because of relatively low propagation delays and power requirements, resulting from the low orbit altitude. Also LEO satellite networks have a number of advantages over mobile terrestrial networks, due to their ability to provide coverage to land, sea, and air based users [1].

Recent advances in satellite technologies together with fast growth of the Internet have motivated the development of LEO satellite networks such as Iridium and Teledesic systems which perform onboard switching and signal processing, and being interconnected by inter-satellite links (ISL). Iridium provides a low bandwidth service, capable of supporting voice telephony and simple message forwarding services [2]. Teledesic uses fast inter-satellite links and onboard packet switching to provide a high bandwidth and good quality of services similar to that provided by the terrestrial fixed network [3]. On the other hand, the Internet has faced further



challenges over satellite providers, since the standard Internet protocols like transmission control protocol (TCP) have been designed primarily for wired networks. Thus several problems may arise when the TCP traffic transport over long link satellite networks [4]. The reasons for that; wireless environments have very different characteristics in terms of latency, jitter, and error rates.

This study introduces the types of satellite constellation networks, and investigates how overall performance of TCP communications carried across such a network can be affected by standard TCP congestion control mechanisms. These mechanisms include slow start with congestion avoidance, fast retransmit with fast recovery and selective acknowledgements (SACK) [5]. Then an enhanced SACK (ESACK) is proposed in this thesis to improve the overall performance of TCP in LEO satellite environment. Finally, the TCP ESACK mechanism is compared with TCP SACK mechanism via extensive simulations, whereby the results obtained showed that the proposed ESACK mechanism improves the performance over the standard SACK mechanism.

#### 1.1 Motivation of the Study

Recently, there has been increasing interest in extending transmission control protocol (TCP) to operate over LEO satellite networks. Building broadband networks based on satellite and wireless Internet technologies is a method of reaching remote and mobile users. For broadband Internet access to continue its fast



growth over satellite networks satellite service, providers must overcome the inefficiencies of traditional Internet protocols that degrade the quality of service and inhibit the overall network performance. This motivates researchers to develop a number of proposals for optimising Internet performance over satellite networks.

#### 1.2 Problem Statement

Despite the progress on improving TCP mechanisms there remain some features of the protocol that impair the performance over satellite links. The main problem comes from the fact that the TCP operates on the incorrect assumption by relating any loss to the network congestion. Consequently the TCP responses to the loss by reducing the congestion window which in turn reduces the performance. In satellite communications, packet errors can occur due to atmospheric and environmental conditions, noisy channel disruptions, link outages, signal degradation and interferences. Thus when a loss is actually due to the stress of space rather than the network congestion the TCP unnecessarily reduces the throughput by under-utilizing the link, while the network appears to be slow or inefficient to the Internet over satellite user.

In this thesis the loss indication is addressed as the main factor that affects the TCP performance in LEO satellite environment. The loss may be indicated by large delay variations or handoff due to the relative motion of the LEO satellites, packet transmission errors of satellite links, and/or network congestion. Therefore an



enhanced SACK (ESACK) mechanism has been proposed to improve the TCP performance over LEO satellite links by considering loss indications in two consecutive windows before assuming there is network congestion.

#### 1.3 Aims and Contributions

The main objective of this research is to enhance the performance of TCP over LEO satellite networks. This is achieved by proposing an enhanced selective acknowledgements (ESACK) mechanism, which is a slight modification over the standard selective acknowledgements (SACK) mechanism. The contributions of the study could be summarized as follows:

- Identification of the problems that may arise due to the characteristics of LEO satellites, such as those caused by delay variations and handoffs.
- Analysis of the negative impacts of the standard TCP mechanisms on the performance of TCP over LEO satellite networks.
- Proposing of the TCP ESACK mechanism that improves the performance of TCP data over LEO satellite links.
- Modelling and simulating the proposed ESACK and standard SACK mechanisms using a wide range of file transfer protocol (FTP) data files at different error rates. These mechanisms are compared for the TCP performance over LEO satellite links, Teledesic and Iridium systems, where the ESACK mechanism always shows better effective throughput than that of SACK mechanism.



#### 1.4 Organization of the Thesis

This thesis is organized as follows: the introductory chapter justifies the study by stating the problems and identifying the objectives of the research; Chapter 2 surveys standard TCP mechanisms with their impacts on TCP over LEO satellite networks; Chapter 3 describes the research methodology by proposing the TCP ESACK mechanism; Chapter 4 introduces the simulation environment and evaluates the performance of the TCP ESACK over LEO satellite links; and finally Chapter 5 concludes the thesis by highlighting the main features of the TCP ESACK with its performance achievements.



#### **CHAPTER 2**

#### LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter surveys the advances in satellite technologies, the development in the Internet with the primary focus on the transmission control protocol (TCP) mechanisms and their impacts on the performance of TCP over LEO satellite networks.

#### 2.1 Overview of Satellite Systems

Originally there are two basic types of satellite systems being applicable for TCP; geostationary earth orbit (GEO) satellites and low earth orbit (LEO) satellites. GEOs orbit is approximately 35,000 km above the equator, in which a satellite can stay over the same area of the earth for an indefinite period of time. Each GEO satellite serves one geographical area, and can theoretically cover about 41% of the earth's surface. Companies proposing GEO systems are planning on using between three and fifteen satellites to deliver worldwide services [1].

LEO satellite orbit is between 700 km and 1350 km above the surface of the earth.

Each LEO is moving constantly, covering a particular area for around 10 minutes.

Because of this, a network of many satellites is required to cover the entire world.



Teledesic and Iridium systems are examples of LEO satellites which have been implemented in this study [2, 3].

#### 2.1.1 General Features of Satellites

Advances in satellite technologies indicate that both satellites (LEO and GEO) will be an essential part of the next-generation Internet (NGI). There are several reasons why satellites will play a key role in the NGI [6, 7]:

- Satellite services can be provided over wide geographical areas including urban, rural, remote, and inaccessible areas (Appendix A).
- Satellite communication systems have very flexible bandwidth-on-demand capabilities.
- Alternative channels can be provided for connections that have unpredictable bandwidth demands and traffic characteristics, which may result in maximum resource utilization.
- Users can easily be added to the system by simply installing the Internet interfaces at customer premises. As a result, network expansions will be a simple task.
- Satellites can act as a safety valve for NGI. Fiber failure or network congestion problems can be recovered easily by routing traffic through a satellite channel.
- Applications such as tele-education, telemedicine, entertainment, etc., can be realized through satellites.



#### 2.1.2 Advantages and Disadvantages of GEO Satellites

Advantages: three GEO satellites are enough for a complete coverage of the earth. Senders and receivers can use fixed antenna positions. Therefore, GEOs are ideal for TV and radio broadcasting. Lifetime expectations for GEOs are about 15 years. GEOs do not require handover [8].

Disadvantages: northern or southern regions of the earth have more problems on receiving these satellites due to the low elevation above the latitude of 60 degrees, i.e., larger antennas are needed. The biggest problem for voice and data communications is the high latency of over 0.25 sec one-way [8]. Because of this latency factor, broadband GEO systems are not as attractive for interactive uses as terrestrial or LEO systems. Also the transmission control protocol/internet protocol (TCP/IP) does not work well with such latency problem. Another potential problem with GEOs is their relatively inefficient reuse of valuable radio spectrum, because of the great distances at which they orbit the earth.

#### 2.1.3 Advantages and Disadvantages of LEO Satellites

Advantages: the great merit of LEO systems is the elimination of GEO's latency problem, because of their relatively close positions to the earth. This is the reason why LEOs were proposed as an alternative to GEOs. Thus, videoconferences can be conducted in true real time, and transmission protocols like TCP/IP may need slight

