Motivation Example: Internet Radio

- Live 8 concert
  - Send ~1,000 Kb/s video streams
- Peak usage > 100,000 simultaneous users
- Consumes > 100 Gbps
- If 1000 people are in Berkeley, and if the concert were broadcast from a single location, 1000 unicast streams are sent from that location to Berkeley

This approach does not scale...

Instead build trees

- Routers keep track of groups in real-time
- Routers compute trees and forward packets along them
- LANs implement link layer multicast by broadcasting
- At most one copy of a data packet per link
- Copy data at routers
Multicast Service Model

- Receivers join a multicast group which is identified by a multicast address (e.g. G)
- Sender(s) send data to address G
- Network routes data to each of the receivers

Note: multicast vs. broadcast
- Broadcast: packets are delivered to all end-hosts in the network
- Multicast: packets are delivered only to end-hosts that are in (have joined) the multicast group

Multicast and Layering

- Multicast can be implemented at different layers
  - data link layer
    - e.g. Ethernet multicast
  - network layer
    - e.g. IP multicast
  - application layer
    - e.g. End system multicast
- Which layer is best?

Multicast Service Model (cont’d)

- Membership access control
  - Open group: anyone can join
  - Closed group: restrictions on joining

- Sender access control
  - Anyone can send to group
  - Anyone in group can send to group
  - Restrictions on which host can send to group

Multicast Implementation Issues

- How are multicast packets addressed?
- How is join implemented?
- How is send implemented?
- How much state is kept and who keeps it?
Data Link Layer Multicast

- Recall: end-hosts in the same local area network (LAN) can hear from each other at the data link layer (e.g., Ethernet)
- Reserve some data link layer addresses for multicast
- Join group at multicast address G
  - Network interface card (NIC) normally only listens for packets sent to unicast address A and broadcast address B
  - To join group G, NIC also listens for packets sent to multicast address G (NIC limits number of groups joined)
  - Implemented in hardware, thus efficient
- Send to group G
  - Packet is flooded on all LAN segments, like broadcast
  - Can waste bandwidth, but LANs should not be very large
- Only host NICs keep state about who has joined → scalable to large number of receivers, groups

Problems with Data Link Layer Multicast

- Single data link technology
- Single LAN
  - Limited to small number of hosts
  - Limited to low diameter latency
  - Essentially all the limitations of LANs compared to internetworks

Network Layer (IP) Multicast

- Overcomes limitations of data link layer multicast
- Performs inter-network multicast routing
  - Relies on data link layer multicast for intra-network routing
- Portion of IP address space defined as multicast addresses
  - $2^{28}$ addresses for entire Internet
- Open group membership
- Anyone can send to group
  - Flexible, but leads to problems

IP Multicast Routing

- Intra-domain
  - Source Specific Tree: Distance Vector Multicast Routing Protocol (DVRMP)
  - Shared Tree" Core Based Tree (CBT)
- Inter-domain
  - Protocol Independent Multicast
  - Single Source Multicast
Distance Vector Multicast Routing Protocol (DVRMP)

- An elegant extension to DV routing
- Use shortest path DV routes to determine if link is on the source-rooted spanning tree
- Three steps in developing DVRMP
  - Reverse Path Flooding
  - Reverse Path Broadcasting
  - Truncated Reverse Path Broadcasting

Reverse Path Flooding (RPF)

- Extension to DV unicast routing
- Packet forwarding
  - If incoming link is shortest path to source
  - Send on all links except incoming
  - Packets always take shortest path assuming delay is symmetric
- Issues
  - Some links (LANs) may receive multiple copies
  - Every link receives each multicast packet, even if no interested hosts

Example

- Flooding can cause a given packet to be sent multiple times over the same link
- Solution: Reverse Path Broadcasting

Reverse Path Broadcasting (RPB)

- Chose parent of each link along reverse shortest path to source
- Only parent forward to a link (child link)
- Identify Child Links
  1. Routing updates identify parent
  2. Since distances are known, each router can easily figure out if it’s the parent for a given link
  3. In case of tie, lower address wins
Don’t Really Want to Flood!

- This is still a broadcast algorithm – the traffic goes everywhere
- Need to “Prune” the tree when there are subtrees with no group members
- Solution: Truncated Reverse Path Broadcasting

Truncated Reverse Path Broadcasting (TRPB)

- Extend DV/RPB to eliminate unneeded forwarding
- Identify leaves
  - Routers announce that a link is their next link to source S
  - Parent router can determine that it is not a leaf
- Explicit group joining on LAN
  - Members periodically (with random offset) multicast report locally
  - Hear and report, then suppress own
- Packet forwarding
  - If not a leaf router or have members
  - Out all links except incoming

Pruning Details

- Prune (Source,Group) at leaf if no members
  - Send Non-Membership Report (NMR) up tree
- If all children of router R send NRM, prune (S,G)
  - Propagate prune for (S,G) to parent R
- On timeout:
  - Prune dropped
  - Flow is reinstated
  - Downstream routers re-prune
- Note: a soft-state approach

Pruning Details

- How to pick prune timers?
  - Too long → large join time
  - Too short → high control overhead
- What do you do when a member of a group (re) joins?
  - Issue prune-cancellation message (grafts)
Distance Vector Multicast Scaling

- State requirements:
  - $O(Sources \times Groups)$ active state
- How to get better scaling?
  - Hierarchical Multicast
  - Core-based Trees

Core Based Trees (CBT)

- Pick a "rendezvous point" for the group called the core.
  - Shared tree
- Unicast packet to core and bounce it back to multicast group
- Tree construction is receiver-based
  - Joins can be tunneled if required
  - Only nodes on One tree per group tree involved
- Reduce routing table state from $O(S \times G)$ to $O(G)$

Example

- Group members: M1, M2, M3
- M1 sends data

Disadvantages

- Sub-optimal delay
  - Need good core selection
  - Optimal choice (computing topological center) is NP hard
Problems with Network Layer Multicast (NLM)

- Scales poorly with number of groups
  - A router must maintain state for every group that traverses it
  - Many groups traverse core routers
- Supporting higher level functionality is difficult
  - NLM: best-effort multi-point delivery service
  - Reliability and congestion control for NLM complicated
- Deployment is difficult and slow
  - ISP’s reluctant to turn on NLM

NLM Reliability

- Assume reliability through retransmission
- Sender can not keep state about each receiver
  - E.g., what receivers have received
  - Number of receivers unknown and possibly very large
- Sender can not retransmit every lost packet
  - Even if only one receiver misses packet, sender must retransmit, lowering throughput
- N(ACK) implosion
  - Described next

(N)ACK Implosion

- (Positive) acknowledgements
  - Ack every n received packets
  - What happens for multicast?
- Negative acknowledgements
  - Only ack when data is lost
  - Assume packet 2 is lost

NACK Implosion

- When a packet is lost all receivers in the sub-tree originated at the link where the packet is lost send NACKs
Barriers to Multicast

- Hard to change IP
  - Multicast means changes to IP
  - Details of multicast were very hard to get right

- Not always consistent with ISP economic model
  - Charging done at edge, but single packet from edge can explode into millions of packets within network

- Troublesome security model
  - Anyone can send to a group
  - Denial-of-service attacks on known groups

Application Layer Multicast (ALM)

- Let the hosts do all the “special” work
  - Only require unicast from infrastructure

- Basic idea:
  - Hosts do the copying of packets
  - Set up tree between hosts

- Example: Narada [Yang-hua et al, 2000]
  - Small group sizes <= hundreds of nodes
  - Typical application: chat

Narada: End System Multicast

“Overlay” Tree

Algorithmic Challenge

- Choosing replication/forwarding points among hosts
  - how do the hosts know about each other
  - and know which hosts should forward to other hosts
Advantages of ALM

- No need for changes to IP or routers
- No need for ISP cooperation
- End hosts can prevent other hosts from sending
- Easy to implement reliability
  - use hop-by-hop retransmissions

Performance Concerns

- Stretch
  - Ratio of latency in the overlay to latency in the underlying network
- Stress
  - Number of duplicate packets sent over the same physical link

What Do You Need to Know?

- DVRMP
- CBT
- ALM (e.g., Narada)
- How they compare