The Goal

- Transport protocol for multicast
  - Reliability
    - Apps: file distribution, non-interactive streaming
  - Low delay
    - Apps: conferencing, distributed gaming
  - Congestion control for multicast flows
    - Critical for all applications

Reliability: The Problems

- Assume reliability through retransmission
  - Even with FEC, may still have to deal with retransmission (why?)
- Sender can not keep state about each receiver
  - E.g., what receivers have received, RTT
  - 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.

Scalable Reliable Multicast (SRM) [Floyd et al ’95]

- Receivers use timers to send NACKS and retransmissions
  - Randomized
    - Prevent implosion
    - Uses latency estimates
      - Short timer → cause duplicates when there is reordering
      - Long timer → causes excess delay
  - Any node retransmits
    - Sender can use its bandwidth more efficiently
    - Overall group throughput is higher
  - Duplicate NACK/retransmission suppression

Inter-node Latency Estimation

- Every node estimates latency to every other node
  - Uses session reports (< 5% of bandwidth)
    - Assume symmetric latency
    - What happens when group becomes very large?

Algorithm

- Detect loss → set timer
- Receive request for same data → cancel timer, set new timer, possibly with new iteration
- Timer expires → send repair request

Repair Request Timer Randomization

- Chosen from the uniform distribution on $2[Cd_{S,A}(C_1 + C_2)d_{i} + 1]$
  - $A$ = node that lost the packet
  - $S$ = source
  - $C_1$, $C_2$ = algorithm parameters
  - $d_{S,A}$ = latency between S and A
  - $i$ = iteration of repair request tries seen

- Algorithm
  - $d_{S,A} = d_{S,B} - d_{B,A} = C_{A,B}d_{i} + d$
Timer Randomization

- Repair timer similar
  - Every node that receives repair request sets repair timer
  - Latency estimate is between node and node requesting repair
- Timer properties – minimize probability of duplicate packets
  - Reduce likelihood of implosion (duplicates still possible)
    - Poor timer, randomized granularity
    - High latency between nodes
  - Reduce delay to repair
    - Nodes with low latency to sender will send repair request more quickly
    - Nodes with low latency to requester will send repair more quickly
  - When is this sub-optimal?

Chain Topology

- \( C_1 = D_1 \neq 1, C_2 = D_2 = 0 \)
- All link distances are 1

Star Topology

- \( C_1 = D_1 = 0, \)
- Tradeoff between (1) number of requests and (2) time to receive the repair
- \( C_2 < 1 \)
  - \( E(\# \text{ of requests}) = g - 1 \)
- \( C_2 > 1 \)
  - \( E(\# \text{ of requests}) = 1 + (g-2)/C_2 \)
  - \( E(\text{time until first timer expires}) = 2C_2/g \)
- \( C_1 = \sqrt{g} \)
  - \( E(\# \text{ of requests}) = \sqrt{g} \)
  - \( E(\text{time until first timer expires}) = 2\sqrt{g} \)

Bounded Degree Tree

- Use both
  - Deterministic suppression (chain topology)
  - Probabilistic suppression (star topology)
- Large \( C_2/C_1 \) fewer duplicate requests, but larger repair time
- Large \( C_1 \) fewer duplicate requests
- Small \( C_1 \) smaller repair time
Adaptive Timers

- C and D parameters depend on topology and congestion → choose adaptively
- After sending a request:
  - Decrease start of request timer interval
- Before each new request timer is set:
  - If requests sent in previous rounds, and any dup requests were from further away:
    - Decrease request timer interval
  - Else if average dup requests high:
    - Increase request timer interval
  - Else if average dup requests low and average request delay too high:
    - Decrease request timer interval

Local Recovery

- Some groups are very large with low loss correlation between nodes
  - Multicasting requests and repairs to entire group wastes bandwidth
- Separate recovery multicast groups
  - e.g. hash sequence number to multicast group address
  - only nodes experiencing loss join group
  - recovery delay sensitive to join latency
- TTL-based scoping
  - send request/repair with a limited TTL
  - how to set TTL to get to a host that can retransmit
  - how to make sure retransmission reaches every host that heard request

Application Layer Framing (ALF)

- [Clark and Tennenhouse 90]
- Application should define Application Data Unit (ADU) to lower layers
  - ADU is unit of error recovery
  - App can recover from whole ADU loss
  - App treats partial ADU loss/corruption as whole loss
  - App names ADUs
  - App can process ADUs out of order
  - Small ADUs (e.g., a packet): low delay, keep app busy
  - Large ADUs (e.g., a file): more efficient use of bw and cycles
  - Lower layers can minimize delay by passing ADUs to apps out of order

Multicast Congestion Control

- Unicast congestion control:
  - send at rate not exceeding smallest fair share of all links along a path
- Multicast congestion control:
  - send at minimum of unicast fair shares across all receivers
  - Problem: what if receivers have very different bandwidths?
  - segregate receivers into multicast groups according to current available bandwidth
**Issues**

- What rate for each group?
- How many groups?
- How to join and leave groups?

**Assumptions**

- a video application
  - can easily make size/quality tradeoff in encoding of application data (i.e., a 10Kb video frame has less quality than a 20Kb frame)
  - separate encodings can be combined to provide better quality
    - e.g., combine 5Kb + 10Kb + 20Kb frames to provide greater quality than just 20Kb frames
- 6 layers
- 32x2^i kb/s for the i-th layer

**Example of Size/Quality Tradeoff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>798 bytes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1208 bytes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1900 bytes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3457 bytes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5372 bytes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10274 bytes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Basic Algorithm**

- join a new layer when there is no congestion
  - joining may cause congestion
  - join infrequently when the join is likely to fail
- drop largest layer when there is congestion
  - congestion detected through drops
  - could use explicit feedback, delay
- how frequently to attempt join?
- how to scale up to large groups?
Join Timer

- Set 2 timers for each layer
  - use randomization to prevent synchronization
  - join timer expires → join next larger layer
  - detect congestion → drop layer, increase join timer, update detection timer with time since last layer add
  - detection timer expires → decrease join timer for this layer
- Layers have exponentially increasing size → multiplicative increase/decrease (?)
- All parameters adapt to network conditions

Scaling Problems

- Independent joins do not scale
  - frequency of joins increase with group size → congestion collapse (why?)
  - joins interfere with each other → unfairness
- Could reduce join rate
  - convergence for large groups will be slow

Scaling Solution

- Multicast join announcement
- node initiates join iff current join is for higher layer
- congestion → backs off its own timer to join that layer
- shares bottleneck with joiner
- no congestion → joins new layer iff it was original joiner
- does not share bottleneck with joiner
- convergence could still be slow (why?)

Simulation Results

- Higher network latency → less stability
  - congestion control is control problem
  - control theory predicts that higher latency causes less stability
- No cross traffic
- Scales up to 100 nodes
Priority-drop and Uniform-drop

- Uniform drop
  - drop packets randomly from all layers
- Priority drop
  - drop packets from higher layers first
- Sending rate <= bottleneck
  - no loss, no difference in performance
- Sending rate > bottleneck
  - important, low layer packets may be dropped \( \rightarrow \) uniform drop performance decreases
- Convex utility curve \( \rightarrow \) users encouraged to remain at maximum

Later Work Contradicts

- Burstiness of traffic results in better performance for priority drop
  - 50-100% better performance
  - measured in throughput, not delay
- Neither has good incentive properties
  - \( n \) flows, \( P(\text{drop own packet}) = \frac{1}{n}, P(\text{drop other packet}) = \frac{(n-1)}{n} \)
  - need Fair Queueing for good incentive properties

Discussion

- Could this lead to congestion collapse?
- Do SRM/RLM actually scale to millions of nodes?
  - Session announcements of SRM
- Does RLM generalize to reliable data transfer?
  - What if layers are independent?
  - What about sending the file multiple times?
- Is end-to-end reliability the way to go?
  - What about hop-by-hop reliability?

Summary

- Multicast transport is a difficult problem
- One can significantly improve performance by targeting a specific application
  - e.g., bulk data transfer or video
- Depend on Multicast routing working
Resilient Multicast: STORM [Rex et al '97]

- Targeted applications: continuous-media applications
  - E.g., video and audio distribution
- Resilience
  - Receivers don’t need 100% of data
  - Packets must arrive in time for repairs
  - Data is continuous, large volume
  - Old data is discarded

Design Implications

- Recovery must be fast
  - SRM not appropriate (why?)
- Protocol overhead should be small
- No ACK collection or group management

Solution

- Build an application recovery structure
  - Directed acyclic graph that span the set of receiver
    - Does not include routers!
  - Typically, a receiver has multiple parents
  - Structure is built and maintained distributedly
- Properties
  - Responsive to changing conditions
  - Achieve faster recovery
  - Reduced overhead

Details

- Use multicast (expanding ring search) to find parents
- When there is a gap in sequence number send a NACK
  - Note: unlike SRM in which requests and repairs are multicast, with STORM NACKs and repairs are unicast
- Each node maintain
  - List of parent nodes
  - A quality estimator for each parent node
  - A delay histogram for all packets received
  - A list of timers for NACKs sent to the parent
  - A list of NACKs note served yet
  - Note: excepting the list of NACKs shared by parent-child all other info is local
Choosing a Parent

- What is a good parent?
  - Can send repairs in time
  - Has a low loss correlation with the receiver

Source stamps each packet to local time
- \( t_a \) – adjusted arrival time, where
  \[ t_a = \text{packet stamp} - \text{packet arrival time} \]

Each node compute loss rate as a function of \( t_a \):
  \[ L(t) = 1 - \frac{\text{number of packets such that } t_a \leq t}{\text{total number of packets expected}} \]

Choose parent that maximizes the number of received packets by time \( t_a + B \)

Loop Prevention

- Each receiver is assigned a level
- Parent’s level < child’s level
- Level proportional to the distance from source
  - Use RTT + a random number to avoid to many nodes on the same level

Adaptation

- Receivers evaluate parents continually
- Choose a new parent when one of current parents doesn’t perform well
- Observations:
  - Changing parents is easy, as parents don’t keep track of children
  - Preventing loops is easy, because the way the levels are assigned
  - Thus, no need to maintain consistent state such as child-parent relationship