

Slide 1




IK1552

Internetworking/Internetteknik

prof. Gerald Q. Maguire Jr. <http://people.kth.se/~maguire/>

School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science (EECS), KTH Royal Institute of Technology
IK1552 Spring 2019, Period 4 2019.03.17 © 2019 G. Q. Maguire Jr. All rights reserved.



Slide 2



Module 8: Multicasting and RSVP

Lecture notes of G. Q. Maguire Jr.

For use in conjunction with James F. Kurose and Keith W. Ross, *Computer Networking: A Top-Down Approach*.

IK1552

SPRING 2019

SLIDE 2

Slide 3



Outline

- Multicast
- IGMP
- RSVP

Slide 4



Multicast and IGMP

IK1552

SPRING 2019

SLIDE 4

Slide 5



Broadcast and Multicast

Traditionally the Internet was designed for unicast communication (one sender and one receiver) communication.

Increasing use of multimedia (video and audio) on the Internet

- **One-to-many** and **many-to-many** communication is increasing
- In order to support these in a *scalable* fashion we use **multicasting**.
- Replicating UDP packets **where** paths **diverge** (i.e., split)

MBONE was an experimental multicast network which operated for a number of years.
(see for example <http://www-mice.cs.ucl.ac.uk/multimedia/software/> and
<http://www.ripe.net/ripe/groups/inactive-working-groups/mbone>)


Multicasting is useful for:

- **Delivery to multiple recipients**
reduces traffic, otherwise each would have to be sent its own copy ("internet radio/TV")
- **Solicitation of service (service/server discovery)**
Not doing a broadcast saves interrupting many clients

Slide 6



Filtering up the protocol stack



Filtering which takes place as you go up the TCP/IP stack
(see Stevens, Volume 1, figure 12.1, pg. 170)

We would like to filter as soon as possible to avoid load on the machine.

Slide 7



Broadcasting

- **Limited Broadcast**
 - IP address: 255.255.255.255
 - **never** forwarded by routers
 - What if you are multihomed? (i.e., attached to several networks)
 - Most BSD systems just send on first configured interface
 - routed and rwhod - determine all interfaces on host and send a copy on each (which is capable of broadcasting)
- **Net-directed Broadcast**
 - IP address: netid.255.255.255 or net.id.255.255 or net.i.d.255 (depending on the class of the network)
 - routers **must** forward
- **Subnet-Directed Broadcast**
 - IP address: netid | subnetid | hostID, where hostID = all ones
- **All-subnets-directed Broadcast**
 - IP address: netid | subnetid | hostID, where hostID = all ones and subnetID = all ones
 - generally regarded as obsolete!

To send a UDP datagram to a broadcast address set **SO_BROADCAST**

Slide 8



Other approaches to One-to-Many and Many-to-Many communication


Connection oriented approaches have problems:

- large user burden
- have to know other participants
- have to order links in advance
- poor scaling, worst case $O(N^2)$

Slide 9



Alternative centralized model



CU-SeeME uses another model - a Reflector (a centralized model)

- All sites send to one site (the reflector) overcomes the N^2 problems
- The reflector sends copies to all sites

Problems:

- Does **not** scale well
- Multiple copies sent over the same link
- Central site must know all who participate

Behavior could be changed by explicitly building a tree of reflectors - but then you are moving over to Steve Deering's model.

Slide 10



Multicast Backbone (MBONE)

Expanding multicasting across WANs

World-wide, IP-based, real-time conferencing over the Internet (via the MBONE) in daily use for several years with more than 20,000 users in more than 1,500 networks in events carrier to 30 countries.

For a nice paper examining multicast traffic see: Bruce A. Mah, “Measurements and Observations of IP Multicast Traffic”, The Tenet Group, University of California at Berkeley, and International Computer Science Institute, CSD-94-858, 1994, 12 pages:

<http://www.kitchenlab.org/www/bmah/Papers/Ipmcast-TechReport.pdf>

IK1552

SPRING 2019

SLIDE 10

Slide 11



IP Multicast scales well


End-nodes know nothing about topology

Dynamically changes of topology possible, hosts join and leave as they wish

Routers know nothing about “conversations”

- changes can be done without global coordination
- no end-to-end state to move around

Participants view of Multicast




MBONE behaves as if there were a multicast server, but this functionality is **distributed** not centralized.


Slide 12



Core Problem



N copies



1 copy

How to do efficient multipoint distribution (i.e., at most one copy of a packet crossing any particular link) without exposing topology to end-nodes

Applications

- Conference calls (without sending N copies sent for N recipients)
- Dissemination of information (stock prices, "radio stations", ...)
- Dissemination of one result for many similar requests (boot information, video)
- Unix tools:
 - nv - network video
 - vat - visual audio tool
 - wb - whiteboard
 - sd - session directory
 - ...

IK1552

SPRING 2019

SLIDE 12

Slide 13




Steve Deering's Multicast

Dynamically constructs efficient delivery trees from sender(s) to receiver(s)

Key is to compute a spanning tree of multicast routers

Simple service model:

- receivers announce interest in some multicast address
- senders just send to that address
- routers conspire to deliver sender's data to all interested receivers



Slide 14



IP WAN Multicast Requirements

- Convention for recognizing IP multicast
- Convention for mapping IP to LAN address
- Protocol for end nodes to inform their adjacent routers,
- Protocol for routers to inform neighbor routers
- Algorithm to calculate a spanning tree for message flow
- Transmit data packets along this tree

Slide 15



Multicasting IP addresses

Multicast Group Addresses - “Class D” IP address

- High 4 bits are 0x1110; which corresponds to the range 224.0.0.0 through 239.255.255.255
- **host group** = set of hosts listening to a given address
 - membership is dynamic - hosts can enter and leave at will
 - no restriction on the number of hosts in a host group
 - a host need not belong in order to send to a given host group
 - permanent host groups - assigned well known addresses by IANA
 - 224.0.0.1 - all systems on this subnet
 - 224.0.0.2 - all routers on this subnet
 - 224.0.0.4 - DVMRP routers
 - 224.0.0.9 - RIP-2 routers
 - 224.0.1.1 - Network Time Protocol (NTP) - see RFC 1305 and RFC 1769 (SNTP)
 - 224.0.1.2 - SGI's dogfight application

Slide 16



Internet Multicast Addresses

<http://www.iana.org/assignments/multicast-addresses> listed in DNS under MCAST.NET and 224.IN-ADDR.ARPA.

224.0.0.0 - 224.0.0.255 (224.0.0/24) Local Network Control Block

224.0.1.0 - 224.0.1.255 (224.0.1/24) Internetwork Control Block

224.0.2.0 - 224.0.255.0 AD-HOC Block

224.1.0.0 - 224.1.255.255 (224.1/16) ST Multicast Groups

224.2.0.0 - 224.2.255.255 (224.2/16) SDP/SAP Block

224.3.0.0 - 224.251.255.255 Reserved

239.0.0.0/8 Administratively Scoped

239.000.000.000-239.063.255.255 Reserved

239.064.000.000-239.127.255.255 Reserved

239.128.000.000-239.191.255.255 Reserved

239.192.000.000-239.251.255.255 Organization-Local Scope

239.252.0.0/16 Site-Local Scope (reserved)

239.253.0.0/16 Site-Local Scope (reserved)

239.254.0.0/16 Site-Local Scope (reserved)

239.255.0.0/16 Site-Local Scope

239.255.002.002 rasadv

Slide 17



Converting Multicast Group to Ethernet Address

Could have been a simple mapping of the 28 bits of multicast group to 28 bits of Ethernet multicast space (which is 2^{27} in size), but this would have meant that IEEE would have to allocate multiple blocks of MAC addresses to this purpose, but:

- IEEE did not want to allocate multiple blocks to one organization
- a block of 2^{24} addresses costs US\$1,000
⇒ US\$16K for 2^{27} addresses

Slide 18



Mapping Multicast (Class D) address to Ethernet MAC Address

Solution IANA has one block of Ethernet addresses 00:00:5e as the high 24 bits

- they decided to give 1/2 this address space to multicast -- thus multicast has the address range: 00:00:5e:00:00:00 to 00:00:5e:7f:ff:ff
- since the first bit of an Ethernet multicast has a low order 1 bit (which is the first bit transmitted in link layer order), the addresses are 01:00:5e:00:00:00 to 01:00:5e:7f:ff:ff
- thus there are 23 bits available for use by the 28 bits of the multicast group ID; we just use the [bottom 23 bits](#)
 - therefore 32 different multicast group addresses map to the [same](#) ethernet address
 - the IP layer will have to sort these 32 out
 - thus although the filtering is not complete, it is very significant

The multicast datagrams are delivered to [all](#) processes that belong to the same multicast group.

To extend beyond a single subnet we use IGMP.

Slide 19



Problems

Unfortunately many links do not support link layer multicasts at all!

For example:

- ATM
- Frame relay
- many cellular wireless standards (note that this is changing with the introduction of LTE's Enhanced Multimedia Broadcast Multicast Services (E-MBMS) and others)
- ...


Slide 20



IGMP: Internet Group Management Protocol

IGMP: Internet Group Management Protocol [RFC 1112]:


- Used by hosts and routers to know which hosts currently belong to which multicast groups.
- multicast routers have to know which interface to forward datagrams to
- IGMP like ICMP is part of the IP layer and is transmitted using IP datagrams (protocol = 2)



type =1 ⇒ query sent by a router, type =2 ⇒ response sent by a host

- S. E. Deering, ‘Host extensions for IP multicasting’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 988, Jul. 1986 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc988.txt>
- S. E. Deering, ‘Host extensions for IP multicasting’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 1054, May 1988 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc1054.txt>
- S. E. Deering, ‘Host extensions for IP multicasting’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 1112 (INTERNET STANDARD), Aug. 1989 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc1112.txt>

Slide 21



Slide 22



Joining a Multicast Group

- a **process** joins a multicast group on a **given** interface
- host keeps a table of all groups which have a reference count ≥ 1

IGMP Reports and Queries

- Hosts sends a report when **first** process joins a given group
- Nothing is sent when processes leave (not even when the last leaves), but the host will no longer send a report for this group
- IGMP router sends queries (to address 224.0.0.1) periodically (one out each interface), the group address in the query is 0.0.0.0

In response to a query, a host sends a IGMP report for every group with at least one process

Note that routers have to listen to all 2^{23} link layer multicast addresses!

Routers

Hence they listen promiscuously to all LAN multicast traffic

Slide 23



IGMP Implementation Details

In order to improve its efficiency there are several clever features:

- Since initial reports could be lost, they are resent after a random time [0, 10 sec]
- Response to queries are also delayed randomly - but if a node hears someone else report membership in a group it is interested in, its response is cancelled

Note: multicast routers do not care which host is a member of which group; only that *someone* attached to the subnet on a given interface is!

Time to Live

- TTL generally set to 1, but you can perform an [expanding ring search](#) for a server by increasing the value
- Addresses in the special range 224.0.0.0 through 224.0.0.255 - should never be forwarded by routers - regardless of the TTL value


All-Hosts Group

all-hosts group address 224.0.0.1 - consists of all multicast capable hosts and routers on a given physical network; membership is *never* reported (sometimes this is called the “all-systems multicast address”)

All-Routers Group

all-routers group address 224.0.0.2

Slide 24



Slide 25



IGMP Version 2 [RFC 2236]

Allows a host to send a message (to address 224.0.0.2) when they want to explicitly leave a group -- after this message the router sends a *group-specific* query to ask if there is anyone still interested in listening to this group.

- however, the router may have to ask multiple times because this query could be lost
- hence the leave is not immediate -- even if there had been only one member (since the router can't know this)

W. Fenner, ‘Internet Group Management Protocol, Version 2’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2236 (Proposed Standard), Nov. 1997 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2236.txt>

Slide 26



IGMP Version 3 [RFC 3376]

Joining a multicast group, but with a specified set of sender(s) -- so that a client can limit the set of senders which it is interested in hearing from (i.e., source filtering)

All IGMP replies are now set to a single layer 2 multicast address (e.g., 224.0.0.22) which all IGMPv3-capable multicast routers listen to:

- because most LANs are now *switched* rather than shared media -- it uses less bandwidth to **not** forward all IGMP replies to all ports
- most switches now support **IGMP snooping** -- i.e., the switch is IGMP aware and knows which ports are part of which multicast group (this requires the switch to know which ports other switches and routers are on -- so it can forward IGMP replies to them)
 - switches can listen to this specific layer 2 multicast address - rather than having to listen to all multicast addresses
- it is thought that rather than have end nodes figure out if all the multicast senders which it is interested in have been replied to - simply make the switch do this work.

B. Cain, S. Deering, I. Kouvelas, B. Fenner, and A. Thyagarajan, ‘Internet Group Management Protocol, Version 3’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 3376 (Proposed Standard), Oct. 2002 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3376.txt>

Slide 27



IGMP - ethereal

No.	Time	Source	Destination	Protocol	Info
1	0.000000	130.237.15.194	224.0.0.1	IGMP	V2 Membership Query
2	0.632486	130.237.15.225	239.255.255.250	IGMP	V2 Membership Report
3	0.727178	130.237.15.218	239.255.255.250	IGMP	V2 Membership Report
4	1.910951	130.237.15.227	224.0.0.252	IGMP	V2 Membership Report
5	6.953857	130.237.15.229	224.0.1.60	IGMP	V1 Membership Report
6	60.000053	130.237.15.194	224.0.0.1	IGMP	V2 Membership Query
7	61.998827	130.237.15.227	224.0.0.252	IGMP	V2 Membership Report
8	66.711434	130.237.15.225	239.255.255.250	IGMP	V2 Membership Report
9	66.953288	130.237.15.229	224.0.1.60	IGMP	V1 Membership Report
10	120.004228	130.237.15.194	224.0.0.1	IGMP	V2 Membership Query
11	120.872195	130.237.15.218	239.255.255.250	IGMP	V2 Membership Report
12	126.952839	130.237.15.229	224.0.1.60	IGMP	V1 Membership Report
13	129.597716	130.237.15.227	224.0.0.252	IGMP	V2 Membership Report
14	154.655463	211.105.145.186	224.0.0.2	IGMP	V2 Leave Group
15	154.656338	211.105.145.186	224.0.0.2	IGMP	V2 Leave Group
16	180.004408	130.237.15.194	224.0.0.1	IGMP	V2 Membership Query
17	180.942221	130.237.15.217	239.255.255.250	TCP	V2 Membership Report

Frame 1 (60 bytes on wire, 60 bytes captured)

IGMP packets as seen with Ethereal

IK1552 SPRING 2019 SLIDE 27

Slide 28



Frame 1: IGMP Membership Query

```
Ethernet II, Src: 00:02:4b:de:ea:d8, Dst: 01:00:5e:00:00:01 Destination:  
01:00:5e:00:00:01 (01:00:5e:00:00:01)  
Source: 00:02:4b:de:ea:d8 (Cisco_de:ea:d8) Type: IP (0x0800)  
Internet Protocol, Src Addr: 130.237.15.194 (130.237.15.194), Dst Addr: 224.0.0.1  
(224.0.0.1)  
Version: 4  
Header length: 20 bytes  
Differentiated Services Field: 0xc0 (DSCP 6; ECN: 0x00) 0x30: Class Selector  
Total Length: 28  
Identification: 0x6fa3 (28579) Flags: 0x00  
Fragment offset: 0 Time to live: 1  
Protocol: IGMP (0x02)  
Header checksum: 0xd6cc (correct) Source: 130.237.15.194 (130.237.15.194)  
Destination: 224.0.0.1 (224.0.0.1) Internet Group Management Protocol  
IGMP Version: 2  
Type: Membership Query (0x11)  
Max Response Time: 10.0 sec (0x64) Header checksum: 0xee9b (correct) Multicast  
Address: 0.0.0.0 (0.0.0.0)
```

Slide 29



Frame 2: IGMP v2 Membership Report

```
Ethernet II, Src: 00:06:1b:d0:98:c6, Dst: 01:00:5e:7f:ff:fa Destination:  
01:00:5e:7f:ff:fa (01:00:5e:7f:ff:fa)  
Source: 00:06:1b:d0:98:c6 (Portable_d0:98:c6) Type: IP (0x0800)  
Internet Protocol, Src Addr: 130.237.15.225 (130.237.15.225), Dst Addr: 239.255.255.250  
(239.255.255.250)  
Version: 4  
Header length: 24 bytes  
Differentiated Services Field: 0x00 (DSCP 0x00: Default; ECN: 0x00) Total Length: 32  
Identification: 0x1f9b (8075) Flags: 0x00  
Time to live: 1  
Protocol: IGMP (0x02)  
Header checksum: 0x8284 (correct) Source: 130.237.15.225  
(130.237.15.225)  
Destination: 239.255.255.250 (239.255.255.250)  
Options: (4 bytes)  
Router Alert: Every router examines packet Internet Group  
Management Protocol  
IGMP Version: 2  
Type: Membership Report (0x16) Max Response Time:  
0.0 sec (0x00) Header checksum: 0xfa04 (correct)  
Multicast Address: 239.255.255.250 (239.255.255.250)
```

Slide 30



Frame 12: IGMP v1 Membership Report

```
Ethernet II, Src: 00:01:e6:a7:d3:b9, Dst: 01:00:5e:00:01:3c Destination:  
01:00:5e:00:01:3c (01:00:5e:00:01:3c)  
Source: 00:01:e6:a7:d3:b9 (Hewlett-a7:d3:b9) Type: IP  
(0x0800)  
Internet Protocol, Src Addr: 130.237.15.229 (130.237.15.229), Dst Addr: 224.0.1.60  
(224.0.1.60)  
Version: 4  
Header length: 20 bytes  
Differentiated Services Field: 0x00 (DSCP 0x00) 0x00: Default; ECN:  
Total Length: 28  
Identification: 0x01f6 (502) Flags: 0x00  
Fragment offset: 0 Time to live: 1 Protocol: IGMP (0x02)  
Header checksum: 0x43dc (correct) Source: 130.237.15.229 (130.237.15.229)  
Destination: 224.0.1.60 (224.0.1.60)  
Internet Group Management Protocol IGMP Version: 1  
Type: Membership Report (0x12)  
Header checksum: 0x0cc3 (correct)  
Multicast Address: 224.0.1.60 (224.0.1.60)
```

Slide 31




Frame 15: IGMPv2 Leave Group

```
Ethernet II, Src: 00:02:8a:78:91:8f, Dst: 01:00:5e:00:00:02 Destination:  
01:00:5e:00:00:02 (01:00:5e:00:00:02)  
Source: 00:02:8a:78:91:8f (AmbitMic_78:91:8f) Type: IP  
(0x0800)  
Internet Protocol, Src Addr: 211.105.145.186 (211.105.145.186), Dst Addr: 224.0.0.2  
(224.0.0.2)  
Version: 4  
Header length: 24 bytes  
Differentiated Services Field: 0x00 (DSSCP 0x00: Default; ECN: 0x00) Total Length: 32  
Identification: 0x5191 (37775)  
Flags: 0x00 Fragment offset: 0 Time to live: 1  
Protocol: IGMP (0x02)  
Header checksum: 0x4c20 (correct) Source:  
211.105.145.186 (211.105.145.186)  
Destination: 224.0.0.2 (224.0.0.2)  
Options: (4 bytes)  
Router Alert: Every router examines packet Internet Group  
Management Protocol  
IGMP Version: 2  
Type: Leave Group (0x17)  
Max Response Time: 0.0 sec (0x00) Header  
checksum: 0xff71 (correct)  
Multicast Address: 239.192.249.204 (239.192.249.204)
```

Slide 32



Multicast routing



Multicast routing: **packet** replicated by the routers -- not the hosts

- **packet forwarded** one or more interfaces
router **replicates** the packet as necessary
- need to build a **delivery tree** - to decide on which paths to forward

IK1552 SPRING 2019 SLIDE 32

Slide 33



Therefore a Multicast Router

Listens to **all** multicast traffic and forwards
if necessary

Listens **promiscuously** to all LAN multicast traffic

Listens to **all** multicast addresses

For an Ethernet this means all 2^{23} link layer multicast addresses

Communicates with:

- directly connected **hosts** via **IGMP**
- other multicast routers with **multicast routing protocols**


Slide 34



Multicasting

Example: Transmitting a file from C to A, B, and D.

- ✗ Using point-to-point transfer, some links will be used more than once to send the same file



- ✓ Using Multicast

Point-to-point						
Link	A	B	E	D	Total	Multicast
1	1				1	1
2	1	1			2	1
5			1	1	2	1
6				1	1	1
Sum	2	1	1	2	6	4

Slide 35



Multicast Routing - Flooding

maintaining a list of recently seen packets (last 2 minutes), if it has been seen before, then delete it, otherwise copy to a cache/database and send a copy on all (except the incoming) interface.

✗ Disadvantages:

- Maintaining a list of “last-seen” packets. This list can be fairly long in high speed networks
- The “last-seen” lists guarantee that a router will not forward the same packet twice, but it certainly does not guarantee that the router will receive a packet only once.

✓ Advantages

- Robustness
- It does not depend on any routing tables.

Slide 36



Delivery Trees: different methods

Source-based Trees

- Notation: $(S, G) \Rightarrow$ only specific sender(s) [S= source, G=Group]
- Uses memory proportional to $O(S^*G)$, can find optimal paths \Rightarrow minimizes delay

Group Shared Trees


- Notation: $(*, G) \Rightarrow$ All senders
- Uses less memory ($O(G)$), but uses suboptimal paths \Rightarrow higher delay

Data-driven

- Build only **when data packets are sent**

Demand-driven


- Build the tree as members **join**



Slide 37



Multicast Routing - Spanning Trees



The “spanning tree” technique is used by “media-access-control (MAC) bridges”.

Simply build up an “overlay” network by marking some links as “part of the tree” and other links as “unused” (produces a loopless graph).

Drawbacks

- ✓ It does not take into account group membership
- ✓ It concentrates all traffic into a small subset of the network links.

Slide 38



Link-State Multicast: MOSPF [RFC 1584]

Just add multicast to a link-state routing protocol thus OSPF \Rightarrow MOSPF

- Use the multiprotocol facility in OSPF to carry multicast information
- Extended with a group-membership LSA
 - This LSA lists only members of a given group
- Use the resulting link-state database to build delivery trees
 - Compute least-cost **source-based** trees considering metrics using Dijkstra's algorithm
 - A tree is computed for **each (S,G) pair** with a given source (S), this is done for all S
 - Remember that as a link-state routing protocol that every router will know the topology of the complete network
- However, it is expensive to keep store all this information (and most is unnecessary)
 - Cache only the active (S,G) pairs
 - Use a **data-driven** approach, i.e., only computes a new tree when a multicast datagram arrives for this group

J. Moy, ‘Multicast Extensions to OSPF’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 1584 (Historic), Mar. 1994 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc1584.txt>

Slide 39



Reverse-Path Forwarding (RPF)

RPF algorithm takes advantage of a routing table to “orientate” the network and to compute an implicit tree per network source.


Procedure

1. When a multicast packet is received, note source (S) and interface (I)
2. If I belongs to the shortest path toward S, forward to all interfaces except I.
 - Compute shortest path **from the source** to the node rather than from the node to the source.
 - Check whether the local router is on the shortest path between a neighbor and the source before forwarding a packet to that neighbor. If this is not the case, then there is no point in forwarding a packet that will be immediately dropped by the next router.


Slide 40




RPF results in a different spanning tree for each source



RPF tree from E



RPF tree from C



RPF tree from A

These trees have two interesting properties:

- They guarantee the fastest possible delivery, as multicasting follows the shortest path from source to destination
- Better network utilization, since the packets are spread over multiple links.

Drawback

- ✗ Group membership is **not** taken into account when building the tree \Rightarrow a network can receive two or more copies of a multicast packet

Slide 41



Reverse Path Broadcast (RPB)

We define a parent router for each network

For each source, a router will forward a multicast packet **only** if it is the designated parent

⇒ each network gets only one copy of each multicast packet

Slide 42



RPB + Prunes \Rightarrow Reverse Path Multicast (RPM)

When source S starts a multicast transmission the first packet is propagated to all the network nodes (i.e., **flooding**). Therefore all leaf nodes receive the first multicast packet. However, if there is a leaf node that does **not** want to receive further packets, it will send back a “**prune**” message to the router that sent it this packet - saying effectively “don’t send further packets from source S to group G on this interface I.”

There are two obvious drawbacks in the flood and prune algorithm:

- The first packet is flooded to the whole network
- The routers must keep states per group and source

When a listener joins at a leaf that was pruned, we add this leaf back by **grafting**.

Flood and prune was acceptable in the experimental MBONE which had only a few tens of thousands of nodes, but for the Internet where both the number of sources and the number of groups becomes very large, there is a risk of exhausting the memory resources in network routers.

Slide 43



Distance-Vector Multicast Routing Protocol (DVMRP) [RFC 1075]

Start with a unicast distance-vector routing protocol (e.g., RIP), then extend (Destination, Cost, Nexthop) \Rightarrow (Group, Cost, Nexthops)

Routers only know their next hop (i.e., which neighbor)

Reverse Path Multicasting (RPM)



DVMRP is **data-driven** and uses **source-based trees**

- D. Waitzman, C. Partridge, and S. E. Deering, ‘Distance Vector Multicast Routing Protocol’, *Internet Request for Comments*, vol. RFC 1075 (Experimental), November 1988, Available at <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc1075.txt>.

Slide 44



Multicast Routing - Steiner Tree's



Assume source C and the recipients are A and D.

- Steiner tree uses less resources (links), but are *very hard* to compute (N-P complete)
- In Steiner trees the routing changes widely if a new member joins the group, this leads to instability. Thus the Steiner tree is more a mathematical construct than a practical tool.

Slide 45



Core-Based Trees (CBT)

A fixed point in the network chosen to be the center of the multicast group, i.e., “core”. Nodes desiring to be recipients send “join” commands toward this core. These commands will be processed by all intermediate routers, which will mark the interface on which they received the command as belonging to the group’s tree. The routers need to keep one piece of state information per group, listing all the interface that belong to the tree. If the router that receives a join command is already a member of the tree, it will mark only one more interface as belong to the group. If this is the first join command that the router receives, it will forward the command one step further toward the core.

Advantages

- ✓ CBT limits the expansion of multicast transmissions to precisely the set of all recipients (so it is demand-driven). This is in contrast with RPF where the first packet is sent to the whole network.
- ✓ The amount of state is less; it depends only on the number of the groups, not the number of pairs of sources and groups \Rightarrow Group-shared multicast trees $(*, G)$
- ✓ Routing is based on a spanning tree, thus CBT does **not** depend on multicast or unicast routing tables

Disadvantages

- ✗ The path between some sources and some receivers may be suboptimal.
- ✗ Senders sends multicast datagrams to the core router encapsulated in unicast datagrams

Slide 46



Protocol-Independent Multicast (PIM)

Two modes:

PIM-dense mode (PIM-DM) [RFC 3973]

- Dense mode is an implementation of RPF and prune/grant strategy
- Relies on unicast routing tables providing an optimal path
- However, it is independent of the underlying unicast protocol

PIM-sparse mode (PIM-SM) [RFC 2362, RFC 4601]

- Sparse mode is an implementation of CBT where join points are called "rendezvous points"
- A given router may know of more than one rendezvous point
- Simpler than CBT as there is no need for acknowledgement of a join message
- Can switch from group-shared tree to source-based tree if there is a dense cluster far from the nearest rendezvous point

The adjectives “dense” and “sparse” refer to the **density** of group members in the Internet. Where a group is said to be **dense** if the probability is high that the area contains at least one group member. It is said to be **sparse** if that probability is low.

- A. Adams, J. Nicholas, and W. Siadak, ‘Protocol Independent Multicast - Dense Mode (PIM-DM): Protocol Specification (Revised)’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 3973 (Experimental), Jan. 2005 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3973.txt>
- D. Estrin, D. Farinacci, A. Helmy, D. Thaler, S. Deering, M. Handley, V. Jacobson, C. Liu, P. Sharma, and L. Wei, ‘Protocol Independent Multicast-Sparse Mode (PIM-SM): Protocol Specification’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2117 (Experimental), Jun. 1997 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2117.txt>
- D. Estrin, D. Farinacci, A. Helmy, D. Thaler, S. Deering, M. Handley, V. Jacobson, C. Liu, P. Sharma, and L. Wei, ‘Protocol Independent Multicast-Sparse Mode (PIM-SM): Protocol Specification’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2362 (Experimental), Jun. 1998 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2362.txt>
- B. Fenner, M. Handley, H. Holbrook, and I. Kouvelas, ‘Protocol Independent Multicast - Sparse Mode (PIM-SM): Protocol Specification (Revised)’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 4601 (Proposed Standard), Aug. 2006 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc4601.txt>

Slide 47



Multiprotocol BGP (MBGP) [RFC 2858]

Extends BGP to enable [multicast routing policy](#), thus it connects multicast topologies within and between BGP autonomous systems

Add two new (optional and non-transitive) attributes:

- Multiprotocol Reachable NLRI (MP_REACH_NLRI)
- Multiprotocol Unreachable NLRI (MP_UNREACH_NLRI)

As these are [optional and non-transitive](#) attributes - routers which do not support these attributes ignore them and don't pass them on.

Thus MBGP allows the exchange of multicast routing information, but one must still use PIM to build the distribution tree to actually forward the traffic!


T. Bates, R. Chandra, D. Katz, and Y. Rekhter, ‘Multiprotocol Extensions for BGP-4’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2283 (Proposed Standard), Feb. 1998 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2283.txt>

T. Bates, Y. Rekhter, R. Chandra, and D. Katz, ‘Multiprotocol Extensions for BGP-4’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2858 (Proposed Standard), Jun. 2000 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2858.txt>

Slide 48



Multicast backbone (MBONE) [RFC 1112]



Multicast routing via tunnels - the basis of MBONE (see Forouzan figure 15.14 pg. 453)

Why can you do when all router's and networks don't support multicasting:
Tunnel!

See the IETF MBONE Deployment Working Group (MBONED)
<http://antc.uoregon.edu/MBONED/> and their charter <http://datatracker.ietf.org/wg/mboned/charter/>

IK1552 SPRING 2019 SLIDE 48

- S. E. Deering, 'Host extensions for IP multicasting', Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 988, Jul. 1986 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc988.txt>
- S. E. Deering, 'Host extensions for IP multicasting', Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 1054, May 1988 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc1054.txt>
- S. E. Deering, 'Host extensions for IP multicasting', Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 1112 (INTERNET STANDARD), Aug. 1989 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc1112.txt>

Slide 49



Telesys class was multicast over MBONE

Already in Period 2, 1994/1995 "Telesys, gk" was multicast over the internet and to several sites in and near Stockholm.

Established ports for each of the data streams:

- electronic whiteboard
- video stream
- audio stream

The technology works - but it is very important to get the audio packets delivered with modest delay and loss rate. Poor audio quality is perceived a major problem.

NASA and several other organizations regularly multicast their audio and video “programs”.

Slide 50



Benefits for Conferencing

- ✓ IP Multicast is efficient, simple, robust
- ✓ Users can join a conference without enumerating (or even knowing) other participants
- ✓ User can join and leave at any time
- ✓ Dynamic membership

Slide 51



MBONE Chronology


Nov. 1988	Small group proposes testbed net to DARPA. This becomes DARTNET
Nov. 1990	Routers and T1 lines start to work
Feb. 1991	First packet audio conference (using ISI's vt)
Apr. 1991	First multicast audio conference
Sept. 1991	First audio+video conference (hardware codec)
Mar. 1992	Deering & Casner broadcast San Diego IETF to 32 sites in 4 countries
Dec. 1992	Washington DC IETF - four channels of audio and video to 195 watchers in 12 countries
Jan. 1993	MBONE events go from one every 4 months to several a day
1994/1995	Telesys gk -- multicast from KTH/IT in Stockholm
July 1995	KTH/IT uses MBONE to multicast two parallel sessions from IETF meeting in Stockholm
...	
today	lots of users and "multicasters"

IETF meetings subsequently regularly multicast - so the number of participants that can attend is not limited by physical space or travel budgets.

Slide 52



MBONE growth



MBONE Growth - Doubling time ~8 months

Slide 53



For the some statistics see: Mantra - Monitoring Multicast on a Global Scale

<http://www.caida.org/tools/measurement/mantra/>

Multicast	2003	2002	Old state 2000
	02/06/2003, 15:25:38 PST	01/21/2002, 11:30 PST (Pacific Standard Time)	
Entity	Value		
#Groups	4473	1002	330
#Participants	6059	average 4	
#Unique Participants	1446		
#ASes	137		
#RPs	197		

But we are still waiting for multicast to “take off”.

Slide 54



MBONE connections

MBONE is an “overlay” on the Internet

- multicast routers were distinct from normal, unicast routers - but increasingly routers support multicasting
- it is not trivial to get hooked up
- requires cooperation from local and regional people

MBONE is changing:

- Most router vendors now support IP multicast
- MBONE will go away as a distinct entity once ubiquitous multicast is supported throughout the Internet.
- Anyone hooked up to the Internet can participate in conferences

Slide 55



mrtouted

mrtouted UNIX deamon

tunneling to other MBONE routers

See: “Linux-Mrouted-MiniHOWTO: How to set up Linux for multicast routing” by Bart Trojanowski <bart@jukie.net>, v0.1, 30 October 1999

<http://jukie.net/~bart/multicast/Linux-Mrouted-MiniHOWTO.html>

and <http://www.linuxdoc.org/HOWTO/Multicast-HOWTO-5.html>

Slide 56



Multicast Source Discovery Protocol (MSDP) [RFC 3618]

As the routing protocols deployed in the multicast networks operating in sparse mode do not support flooding information, a mechanism was needed to propagate information about sources (i.e., hosts sourcing data to a multicast group) and the associated multicast groups to all the multicast networks.

Sends Source Active (SA) messages containing (S,G,RP):

- Source Address,
- Group Address, and
- RP Address

these are propagated by Rendezvous Points over TCP

MSDP connects multiple PIM-SM domains together. Each domain uses its own **independent** Rendezvous Point (RP) and does not depend on RPs in other domains.

- B. Fenner and D. Meyer, ‘Multicast Source Discovery Protocol (MSDP)’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 3618 (Experimental), Oct. 2003 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3618.txt>
- B. Fenner and D. Thaler, ‘Multicast Source Discovery Protocol (MSDP) MIB’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 4624 (Experimental), Oct. 2006 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc4624.txt>

Slide 57



GLOP addressing

Traditionally multicast address allocation has been dynamic and done with the help of applications like SDR that use Session Announcement Protocol (SAP).

GLOP is an example of a policy for allocating multicast addresses (it is still experimental in nature). It allocated the 233/8 range of multicast addresses amongst different ASes such that each AS is statically allocated a /24 block of multicast addresses. See [RFC 3180]

0	8	16	24
233		16 bit AS	local bits

- D. Meyer and P. Lothberg, ‘GLOP Addressing in 233/8’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2770 (Experimental), Feb. 2000 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2770.txt>
- D. Meyer and P. Lothberg, ‘GLOP Addressing in 233/8’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 3180 (Best Current Practice), Sep. 2001 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3180.txt>

Slide 58



Single Source Multicast (SSM) [RFC 3569]

A single source multicast-address space was allocated to 232/8

Each AS is allocated a unique 232/24 address block that it can use for multicasting.

S. Bhattacharyya, ‘An Overview of Source-Specific Multicast (SSM)’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 3569 (Informational), Jul. 2003 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3569.txt>

Slide 59



Other multicast efforts

PGM: Pragmatic General Multicast Protocol [RFC 3208]

Administratively Scoped IP Multicast [RFC 2365]

...

IK1552

SPRING 2019

SLIDE 59

T. Speakman, J. Crowcroft, J. Gemmell, D. Farinacci, S. Lin, D. Leshchiner, M. Luby, T. Montgomery, L. Rizzo, A. Tweedly, N. Bhaskar, R. Edmonstone, R. Sumanasekera, and L. Vicisano, ‘PGM Reliable Transport Protocol Specification’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 3208 (Experimental), Dec. 2001 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3208.txt>

D. Meyer, ‘Administratively Scoped IP Multicast’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2365 (Best Current Practice), Jul. 1998 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2365.txt>

Slide 60



Tools for managing multicast

“Managing IP Multicast Traffic” A White Paper from the IP Multicast Initiative (IPMI) and Stardust Forums for the benefit of attendees of the 3rd Annual IP Multicast Summit, February 7-9, 1999

<http://techsup.vcon.com/whtpprs/Managing%20IP%20Multicast%20Traffic.pdf>

Mrinfo	shows the multicast tunnels and routes for a router/mrouted.
Mtrace	traces the multicast path between two hosts.
RTPmon	displays receiver loss collected from RTCP messages.
Mhealth	monitors tree topology and loss statistics.
Multimon	monitors multicast traffic on a local area network.
Mlisten	captures multicast group membership information.
Dr. Watson	collects information about protocol operation.

Mantra (Monitor and Analysis of Traffic in Multicast Routers)

<http://www.caida.org/tools/measurement/mantra/>

Slide 61



SNMP-based tools and multicast related MIBs

Management Information Bases (MIBs) for multicast:

RTP MIB	designed to be used by either host running RTP applications or intermediate systems acting as RTP monitors; has tables for each type of user; collect statistical data about RTP sessions.
Basic Multicast Routing MIB	includes only general data about multicast routing. such as multicast group and source pairs; next hop routing state, forwarding state for each of a router's interfaces, and information about multicast routing boundaries.



Protocol-Specific Multicast Routing MIBs

Provide information specific to a particular routing protocol

PIM MIB	list of PIM interfaces that are configured; the router's PIM neighbors; the set of rendezvous points and an association for the multicast address prefixes; the list of groups for which this particular router should advertise itself as the candidate rendezvous point; the reverse path table for active multicast groups; and component table with an entry per domain that the router is connected to.
CBT MIB:	configuration of the router including interface configuration; router statistics for multicast groups; state about the set of group cores, either generated by automatic bootstrapping or by static mappings; and configuration information for border routers.
DVMRP MIB	interface configuration and statistics; peer router configuration states and statistics; the state of the DVMRP (Distance-Vector Multicast Routing Protocol) routing table; and information about key management for DVMRP routes.
Tunnel MIB	lists tunnels that might be supported by a router or host. The table supports tunnel types including Generic Routing Encapsulation (GRE) tunnels, IP-in-IP tunnels, minimal encapsulation tunnels, layer two tunnels (LTTP), and point-to-point tunnels (PPTP).
IGMP MIB	only deals with determining if packets should be forwarded over a particular leaf router interface; contains information about the set of router interfaces that are listening for IGMP messages, and a table with information about which interfaces currently have members listening to particular multicast groups.

Slide 63



SNMP tools for working with multicast MIBs

Merit SNMP-Based Management Project has released two freeware tools which work with multicast MIBs:

Mstat	queries a router or SNMP-capable mrouted to generate various tables of information including routing tables, interface configurations, cache contents, etc.
Mview	"application for visualizing and managing the MBone", allows user to display and interact with the topology, collect and monitor performance statistics on routers and links

HP Laboratories researchers investigating IP multicast network management are building a prototype integrated with HP OpenView -- intended for use by the network operators who are not experts in IP multicast; provides discovery, monitoring and fault detection capabilities.

Slide 64



QoS & Scheduling algorithms

Predictable delay is thought to be required for interactive real-time applications:
Alternatives:

1. use a network which guarantees fixed delays
2. use a packet scheduling algorithm
3. retime traffic at destination

Since queuing at routers, hosts, etc. has traditionally been simply FIFO; which does not provide guaranteed end-to-end delay both the 2nd and 3rd method use alternative algorithms to maintain a predictable delay.

Algorithms such as: Weighted Fair Queuing (WFQ) These algorithms normally emulate a fluid flow model.

As it is very hard to provide fixed delays in a network, hence we will examine the 2nd and 3rd methods.

IK1552

SPRING 2019

SLIDE 64

Y. Snir, Y. Ramberg, J. Strassner, R. Cohen, and B. Moore, ‘Policy Quality of Service (QoS) Information Model’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 3644 (Proposed Standard), Nov. 2003 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3644.txt>

Slide 65



RSVP: Resource Reservation Setup Protocol [RFC 2205]

RSVP is a network control protocol that will deal with resource reservations for certain Internet applications.

RSVP is a component of “Integrated services” Internet, and can provide both best-effort and QoS.

Applications request a specific quality of service for a data stream

RSVP delivers QoS requests to each router along the path.

- Maintains router and host state along the data stream during the requested service.
- Hosts and routers deliver these request along the path(s) of the data stream
- At each node along the path RSVP passes a new resource reservation request to an admission control routine

RSVP is a signaling protocol carrying **no** application data

- First a host sends IGMP messages to join a group
- Second a host invokes RSVP to reserve QoS

IK1552

SPRING 2019

SLIDE 65

R. Braden, L. Zhang, S. Berson, S. Herzog, and S. Jamin, ‘Resource ReSerVation Protocol (RSVP) – Version 1 Functional Specification’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2205 (Proposed Standard), Sep. 1997 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2205.txt>

J. Polk and S. Dhesikan, ‘A Resource Reservation Protocol (RSVP) Extension for the Reduction of Bandwidth of a Reservation Flow’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 4495 (Proposed Standard), May 2006 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc4495.txt>

L. Berger, F. L. Faucheur, and A. Narayanan, ‘RSVP ASSOCIATION Object Extensions’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 6780 (Proposed Standard), Oct. 2012 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6780.txt>

Slide 66



Functionality

- RSVP is receiver oriented protocol.
The receiver is responsible for requesting reservations.
- RSVP handles heterogeneous receivers.
Hosts in the same multicast tree may have different capabilities and hence need different QoS.
- RSVP adapts to changing group membership and changing routes. RSVP maintains “Soft state” in routers. The only permanent state is in the end systems. Each end system sends their RSVP control messages to refresh the router state. In the absence of refresh message, RSVP state in the routers will time-out and be deleted.
- RSVP is **not** a routing protocol.
A host sends IGMP messages to join a multicast group, but it uses RSVP to reserve resources along the delivery path(s) from that group.

Slide 67



Resource Reservation

- Inter-arrival variance reduction / jitter
- Capacity assignment / admission control
- Resource allocation (who gets the bandwidth?)

Slide 68



Jitter Control

if network has enough capacity, then:

average departure rate = receiver arrival rate

Then jitter is caused by queue waits due to competing traffic

Queue waits should be at most the amount of competing traffic in transit, while total amount of in transit data should be at most round trip propagation time

(100 ms for transcontinental path)

(64 kbit/sec => buffer = 8 kb/s * 0.1 sec = 800 bytes)

See: Jonathan Rosenberg, Lili Qiu, and Henning Schulzrinne, "Integrating Packet FEC into Adaptive Voice Playout Buffer Algorithms on the Internet", INFOCOM, (3), 2000, pp. 1705-1714.

See also <http://citeseer.nj.nec.com/rosenberg00integrating.html>

Slide 69



Capacity Assignment


- end-nodes ask network for bandwidth.
- Can get “yes” or “no” (busy signal)
- Used to control available transmission capacity

Slide 70



RSVP Protocol Mechanism

- Sender sends RSVP PATH message which records path
- Receiver sends RSVP RESV message backwards along the path indicating desired QoS
- In case of failure a RSVP error message is returned




Slide 71



RSVP Soft State

- “soft state” in hosts and routers
- create by PATH and RESV messages
- refreshed by PATH and RESV messages
- Time-outs clean up reservations
- Removed by explicit “tear-down” messages

Slide 72





RSVP operations (continued)

- At each node, RSVP applies a **local** decision procedure “admission control” to the QoS request. If the admission control succeeds, it sets the parameters to the classifiers and the packet scheduler to obtain the desired QoS. If admission control fails at any node, RSVP returns an error indication to the application.
- Each router in the path capable of resource reservation will pass incoming data packets to a packet classifier and then queue these packets in the packet scheduler. The packet classifier determines the route and the QoS class for each packet. The scheduler allocates a particular outgoing link for packet transmission.
- The packet scheduler is responsible for negotiation with the link layer to obtain the QoS requested by RSVP. The scheduler may also negotiate a given amount of “CPU time”.



RSVP Summary

- supports multicast and unicast data delivery
- adapts to changing group membership and routes
- reserves resources for simplex data streams
- is receiver oriented, i.e., the receiver is responsible for the initiation and maintenance of a flow
- maintains a “soft-state” in routers, enabling them to support gracefully dynamic memberships and automatically adapt to routing changes
- provides several reservation models
- is transparent for routers that do not provide it

Slide 75



Argument against Reservation

Given, the US has ~126 million phones:

- Each conversation uses 64 kbit/sec per phone
- Therefore the total demand is: 8×10^{12} b/s (1 Tbyte/s)

One optical fiber has a bandwidth of $\sim 25 \times 10^{12}$ b/s

There are well over 1000 transcontinental fibers!

Why should bandwidth be a problem?

Slide 76



Further reading

IETF Routing Area

<https://datatracker.ietf.org/wg/rtgwg/charter/>, especially:

Protocol Independent Multicast (pim)

<https://datatracker.ietf.org/wg/pim/charter/>

IETF Transport Area

<https://datatracker.ietf.org/wg/tsvwg/charter/> especially:

- Multicast Mobility (multimob) – concluded WG

<https://datatracker.ietf.org/wg/multimob/charter/>

- Active Queue Management and Packet Scheduling (aqm)

<https://datatracker.ietf.org/wg/aqm/charter/>

With lots of traditional broadcasters and others discovering multicast -- has been and will continue to be an exciting area (although the problems are changing).

Slide 77



Summary

This module has discussed: Multicast, IGMP, RSVP

IK1552

SPRING 2019

SLIDE 77



RFCs related to multicasting and RSVP

H. Zhai, F. Hu, R. Perlman, D. Eastlake 3rd, and O. Stokes, 'Transparent Interconnection of Lots of Links (TRILL): End Station Address Distribution Information (ESADI) Protocol', Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 7357 (Proposed Standard), Sep. 2014 <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc7357.txt>

R. Droms, 'IPv6 Multicast Address Scopes', Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 7346 (Proposed Standard), Aug. 2014 <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc7346.txt>

T. Schmidt, S. Gao, H. Zhang, and M. Waehlisch, 'Mobile Multicast Sender Support in Proxy Mobile IPv6 (PMIPv6) Domains', Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 7287 (Experimental), Jun. 2014 <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc7287.txt>

I. Wijnands, P. Hitchen, N. Leymann, W. Henderickx, A. Gulko, and J. Tantsura, 'Multipoint Label Distribution Protocol In-Band Signaling in a Virtual Routing and Forwarding (VRF) Table Context', Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 7246 (Proposed Standard), Jun. 2014 <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc7246.txt>

F. L. Faucheur, R. Maglione, and T. Taylor, 'Multicast Control Extensions for the Access Node Control Protocol (ANCP)', Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 7256 (Proposed Standard), Jul. 2014 <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc7256.txt>

L. Contreras, C. Bernardos, and I. Soto, 'Proxy Mobile IPv6 (PMIPv6) Multicast Handover Optimization by the Subscription Information Acquisition through the LMA (SIAL)', Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 7161 (Experimental), Mar. 2014 <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc7161.txt>

R. Aggarwal, Y. Kamite, L. Fang, Y. Rekhter, and C. Kodeboni, 'Multicast in Virtual Private LAN Service (VPLS)', Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 7117 (Proposed Standard), Feb. 2014 <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc7117.txt>

L. Zheng, J. Zhang, and R. Parekh, 'Survey Report on Protocol Independent Multicast - Sparse Mode (PIM-SM) Implementations and Deployments', Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 7063 (Informational), Dec. 2013 <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc7063.txt>

J. Zuniga, L. Contreras, C. Bernardos, S. Jeon, and Y. Kim, 'Multicast Mobility Routing Optimizations for Proxy Mobile IPv6', Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 7028 (Experimental), Sep. 2013 <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc7028.txt>

M. Waehlisch, T. Schmidt, and S. Venaas, 'A Common API for Transparent Hybrid Multicast', Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 7046 (Experimental), Dec. <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc7046.txt>

I. Wijnands, I. Minei, K. Komppala, and B. Thomas, 'Label Distribution Protocol Extensions for Point-to-Multipoint and Multipoint-to-Multipoint Label Switched Paths', Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 6388 (Proposed Standard), Nov. 2011 <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6388.txt>

... [many more]

H. Zhai, F. Hu, R. Perlman, D. Eastlake 3rd, and O. Stokes, 'Transparent Interconnection of Lots of Links (TRILL): End Station Address Distribution Information (ESADI) Protocol', Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 7357 (Proposed Standard), Sep. 2014 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc7357.txt>

R. Droms, 'IPv6 Multicast Address Scopes', Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 7346 (Proposed Standard), Aug. 2014 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc7346.txt>

T. Schmidt, S. Gao, H. Zhang, and M. Waehlisch, 'Mobile Multicast Sender Support in Proxy Mobile IPv6 (PMIPv6) Domains', Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 7287 (Experimental), Jun. 2014 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc7287.txt>

I. Wijnands, P. Hitchen, N. Leymann, W. Henderickx, A. Gulko, and J. Tantsura, 'Multipoint Label Distribution Protocol In-Band Signaling in a Virtual Routing and Forwarding (VRF) Table Context', Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 7246 (Proposed Standard), Jun. 2014 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc7246.txt>

- F. L. Faucheur, R. Maglione, and T. Taylor, ‘Multicast Control Extensions for the Access Node Control Protocol (ANCP)’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 7256 (Proposed Standard), Jul. 2014 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc7256.txt>
- L. Contreras, C. Bernardos, and I. Soto, ‘Proxy Mobile IPv6 (PMIPv6) Multicast Handover Optimization by the Subscription Information Acquisition through the LMA (SIAL)’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 7161 (Experimental), Mar. 2014 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc7161.txt>
- R. Aggarwal, Y. Kamite, L. Fang, Y. Rekhter, and C. Kodeboniya, ‘Multicast in Virtual Private LAN Service (VPLS)’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 7117 (Proposed Standard), Feb. 2014 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc7117.txt>
- L. Zheng, J. Zhang, and R. Parekh, ‘Survey Report on Protocol Independent Multicast - Sparse Mode (PIM-SM) Implementations and Deployments’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 7063 (Informational), Dec. 2013 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc7063.txt>
- J. Zuniga, L. Contreras, C. Bernardos, S. Jeon, and Y. Kim, ‘Multicast Mobility Routing Optimizations for Proxy Mobile IPv6’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 7028 (Experimental), Sep. 2013 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc7028.txt>
- M. Waehlisch, T. Schmidt, and S. Venaas, ‘A Common API for Transparent Hybrid Multicast’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 7046 (Experimental), Dec. 2013 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc7046.txt>
- I. Wijnands, I. Minei, K. Kompella, and B. Thomas, ‘Label Distribution Protocol Extensions for Point-to-Multipoint and Multipoint-to-Multipoint Label Switched Paths’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 6388 (Proposed Standard), Nov. 2011 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6388.txt>
- I. Wijnands, T. Eckert, N. Leymann, and M. Napierala, ‘Multipoint LDP In-Band Signaling for Point-to-Multipoint and Multipoint-to-Multipoint Label Switched Paths’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 6826 (Proposed Standard), Jan. 2013 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6826.txt>
- M. Westerlund and P. Frojdh, ‘SDP and RTSP Extensions Defined for 3GPP Packet-Switched Streaming Service and Multimedia Broadcast/Multicast Service’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 6064 (Informational), Jan. 2011 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6064.txt>
- S. Venaas, ‘Multicast Ping Protocol’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 6450 (Proposed Standard), Dec. 2011 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6450.txt>

- S. Venaas, R. Parekh, G. V. de Velde, T. Chown, and M. Eubanks, ‘Multicast Addresses for Documentation’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 6676 (Informational), Aug. 2012 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6676.txt>
- D. Thaler, ‘Unicast-Prefix-Based IPv4 Multicast Addresses’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 6034 (Proposed Standard), Oct. 2010 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6034.txt>
- B. V. Steeg, A. Begen, T. V. Caenegem, and Z. Vax, ‘Unicast-Based Rapid Acquisition of Multicast RTP Sessions’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 6285 (Proposed Standard), Jun. 2011 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6285.txt>
- T. Schmidt, M. Wahlsch, and S. Krishnan, ‘Base Deployment for Multicast Listener Support in Proxy Mobile IPv6 (PMIPv6) Domains’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 6224 (Informational), Apr. 2011 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6224.txt>
- P. Savola, ‘Overview of the Internet Multicast Addressing Architecture’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 6308 (Informational), Jun. 2011 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6308.txt>
- E. Rosen, Y. Rekhter, W. Hendrickx, and R. Qiu, ‘Wildcards in Multicast VPN Auto-Discovery Routes’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 6625 (Proposed Standard), May 2012 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6625.txt>
- E. Rosen, Y. Cai, and I. Wijnands, ‘Cisco Systems’ Solution for Multicast in BGP/MPLS IP VPNs’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 6037 (Historic), Oct. 2010 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6037.txt>
- E. Rosen and R. Aggarwal, ‘Multicast in MPLS/BGP IP VPNs’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 6513 (Proposed Standard), Feb. 2012 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6513.txt>
- V. Roca, ‘Simple Authentication Schemes for the Asynchronous Layered Coding (ALC) and NACK-Oriented Reliable Multicast (NORM) Protocols’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 6584 (Proposed Standard), Apr. 2012 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6584.txt>
- T. Paila, R. Walsh, M. Luby, V. Roca, and R. Lehtonen, ‘FLUTE - File Delivery over Unidirectional Transport’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 6726 (Proposed Standard), Nov. 2012 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6726.txt>
- T. Morin, B. Niven-Jenkins, Y. Kamite, R. Zhang, N. Leymann, and N. Bitar, ‘Mandatory Features in a Layer 3 Multicast BGP/MPLS VPN Solution’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 6517 (Informational), Feb. 2012 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6517.txt>

- B. Manning, ‘DISCOVER: Supporting Multicast DNS Queries’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 6804 (Historic), Nov. 2012 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6804.txt>
- J. Macker, ‘Simplified Multicast Forwarding’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 6621 (Experimental), May 2012 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6621.txt>
- B. Joshi, A. Kessler, and D. McWalter, ‘PIM Group-to-Rendezvous-Point Mapping’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 6226 (Proposed Standard), May 2011 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6226.txt>
- S. Gundavelli, M. Townsley, O. Troan, and W. Dec, ‘Address Mapping of IPv6 Multicast Packets on Ethernet’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 6085 (Proposed Standard), Jan. 2011 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6085.txt>
- D. Farinacci, G. Shepherd, S. Venaas, and Y. Cai, ‘Population Count Extensions to Protocol Independent Multicast (PIM)’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 6807 (Experimental), Dec. 2012 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6807.txt>
- D. Farinacci, D. Meyer, J. Zwiebel, and S. Venaas, ‘The Locator/ID Separation Protocol (LISP) for Multicast Environments’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 6831 (Experimental), Jan. 2013 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6831.txt>
- S. Cheshire and M. Krochmal, ‘Multicast DNS’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 6762 (Proposed Standard), Feb. 2013 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6762.txt>
- Y. Cai, L. Wei, H. Ou, V. Arya, and S. Jethwani, ‘Protocol Independent Multicast Equal-Cost Multipath (ECMP) Redirect’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 6754 (Proposed Standard), Oct. 2012 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6754.txt>
- Y. Cai, E. Rosen, and I. Wijnands, ‘IPv6 Multicast VPN (MVPN) Support Using PIM Control Plane and Selective Provider Multicast Service Interface (S-PMSI) Join Messages’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 6516 (Proposed Standard), Feb. 2012 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6516.txt>
- Y. Cai and H. Ou, ‘PIM Multi-Topology ID (MT-ID) Join Attribute’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 6420 (Proposed Standard), Nov. 2011 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6420.txt>
- A. Begen, ‘Considerations for Deploying the Rapid Acquisition of Multicast RTP Sessions (RAMS) Method’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 6659 (Informational), Jul. 2012 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6659.txt>
- A. Begen, ‘RTP Control Protocol (RTCP) Port for Source-Specific Multicast (SSM) Sessions’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 6128 (Proposed Standard), Feb. 2011 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6128.txt>

- A. Begen, D. Wing, and T. V. Caenegem, ‘Port Mapping between Unicast and Multicast RTP Sessions’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 6284 (Proposed Standard), Jun. 2011 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6284.txt>
- A. Begen and E. Friedrich, ‘Multicast Acquisition Report Block Type for RTP Control Protocol (RTCP) Extended Reports (XRs)’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 6332 (Proposed Standard), Jul. 2011 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6332.txt>
- H. Asaeda, H. Liu, and Q. Wu, ‘Tuning the Behavior of the Internet Group Management Protocol (IGMP) and Multicast Listener Discovery (MLD) for Routers in Mobile and Wireless Networks’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 6636 (Informational), May 2012 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6636.txt>
- R. Aggarwal and E. Rosen, ‘IPv4 and IPv6 Infrastructure Addresses in BGP Updates for Multicast VPN’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 6515 (Proposed Standard), Feb. 2012 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6515.txt>
- R. Aggarwal, E. Rosen, T. Morin, and Y. Rekhter, ‘BGP Encodings and Procedures for Multicast in MPLS/BGP IP VPNs’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 6514 (Proposed Standard), Feb. 2012 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc6514.txt>
- D. Wing and T. Eckert, ‘IP Multicast Requirements for a Network Address Translator (NAT) and a Network Address Port Translator (NAPT)’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 5135 (Best Current Practice), Feb. 2008 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc5135.txt>
- I. Wijnands, A. Boers, and E. Rosen, ‘The Reverse Path Forwarding (RPF) Vector TLV’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 5496 (Proposed Standard), Mar. 2009 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc5496.txt>
- B. Weis, G. Gross, and D. Ignjatic, ‘Multicast Extensions to the Security Architecture for the Internet Protocol’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 5374 (Proposed Standard), Nov. 2008 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc5374.txt>
- E. Stephan, L. Liang, and A. Morton, ‘IP Performance Metrics (IPPM): Spatial and Multicast’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 5644 (Proposed Standard), Oct. 2009 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc5644.txt>
- R. Sivaramu, J. Lingard, D. McWalter, B. Joshi, and A. Kessler, ‘Protocol Independent Multicast MIB’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 5060 (Proposed Standard), Jan. 2008 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc5060.txt>
- T. Schmidt, M. Waehlisch, and G. Fairhurst, ‘Multicast Mobility in Mobile IP Version 6 (MIPv6): Problem Statement and Brief Survey’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC

- 5757 (Informational), Feb. 2010 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc5757.txt>
- P. Savola, ‘Overview of the Internet Multicast Routing Architecture’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 5110 (Informational), Jan. 2008 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc5110.txt>
- P. Savola and J. Lingard, ‘Host Threats to Protocol Independent Multicast (PIM)’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 5294 (Informational), Aug. 2008 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc5294.txt>
- J. Ott, J. Chesterfield, and E. Schooler, ‘RTP Control Protocol (RTCP) Extensions for Single-Source Multicast Sessions with Unicast Feedback’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 5760 (Proposed Standard), Feb. 2010 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc5760.txt>
- D. McWalter, D. Thaler, and A. Kessler, ‘IP Multicast MIB’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 5132 (Proposed Standard), Dec. 2007 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc5132.txt>
- H. Liu, W. Cao, and H. Asaeda, ‘Lightweight Internet Group Management Protocol Version 3 (IGMPv3) and Multicast Listener Discovery Version 2 (MLDv2) Protocols’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 5790 (Proposed Standard), Feb. 2010 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc5790.txt>
- Y. Kamite, Y. Wada, Y. Serbest, T. Morin, and L. Fang, ‘Requirements for Multicast Support in Virtual Private LAN Services’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 5501 (Informational), Mar. 2009 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc5501.txt>
- B. Joshi and R. Bijlani, ‘Protocol Independent Multicast (PIM) Bootstrap Router MIB’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 5240 (Proposed Standard), Jun. 2008 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc5240.txt>
- M. Handley, I. Kouvelas, T. Speakman, and L. Vicisano, ‘Bidirectional Protocol Independent Multicast (BIDIR-PIM)’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 5015 (Proposed Standard), Oct. 2007 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc5015.txt>
- B. Haberman and J. Martin, ‘Internet Group Management Protocol Version 3 (IGMPv3) / Multicast Listener Discovery Version 2 (MLDv2) and Multicast Routing Protocol Interaction’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 5186 (Informational), May 2008 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc5186.txt>
- T. Eckert, E. Rosen, R. Aggarwal, and Y. Rekhter, ‘MPLS Multicast Encapsulations’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 5332 (Proposed Standard), Aug. 2008 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc5332.txt>

- M. Cotton, L. Vegoda, and D. Meyer, 'IANA Guidelines for IPv4 Multicast Address Assignments', Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 5771 (Best Current Practice), Mar. 2010 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc5771.txt>
- J. Chesterfield and B. Haberman, 'Multicast Group Membership Discovery MIB', Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 5519 (Proposed Standard), Apr. 2009 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc5519.txt>
- R. Boivie, N. Feldman, Y. Imai, W. Livens, and D. Ooms, 'Explicit Multicast (Xcast) Concepts and Options', Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 5058 (Experimental), Nov. 2007 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc5058.txt>
- A. Boers, I. Wijnands, and E. Rosen, 'The Protocol Independent Multicast (PIM) Join Attribute Format', Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 5384 (Proposed Standard), Nov. 2008 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc5384.txt>
- N. Bhaskar, A. Gall, J. Lingard, and S. Venaas, 'Bootstrap Router (BSR) Mechanism for Protocol Independent Multicast (PIM)', Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 5059 (Proposed Standard), Jan. 2008 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc5059.txt>
- W. Atwood, S. Islam, and M. Siami, 'Authentication and Confidentiality in Protocol Independent Multicast Sparse Mode (PIM-SM) Link-Local Messages', Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 5796 (Proposed Standard), Mar. 2010 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc5796.txt>
- B. Adamson, C. Bormann, M. Handley, and J. Macker, 'NACK-Oriented Reliable Multicast (NORM) Transport Protocol', Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 5740 (Proposed Standard), Nov. 2009 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc5740.txt>
- B. Adamson, C. Bormann, M. Handley, and J. Macker, 'Multicast Negative-Acknowledgment (NACK) Building Blocks', Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 5401 (Proposed Standard), Nov. 2008 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc5401.txt>
- S. Yasukawa, A. Farrel, D. King, and T. Nadeau, 'Operations and Management (OAM) Requirements for Point-to-Multipoint MPLS Networks', Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 4687 (Informational), Sep. 2006 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc4687.txt>
- J. Widmer and M. Handley, 'TCP-Friendly Multicast Congestion Control (TFMCC): Protocol Specification', Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 4654 (Experimental), Aug. 2006 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc4654.txt>
- P. Savola, R. Lehtonen, and D. Meyer, 'Protocol Independent Multicast - Sparse Mode (PIM-SM) Multicast Routing Security Issues and Enhancements', Internet Request for

- Comments, vol. RFC 4609 (Informational), Oct. 2006 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc4609.txt>
- T. Pusateri, ‘Protocol Independent Multicast - Sparse Mode (PIM-SM) IETF Proposed Standard Requirements Analysis’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 4602 (Informational), Aug. 2006 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc4602.txt>
- M. Pullen, F. Zhao, and D. Cohen, ‘Selectively Reliable Multicast Protocol (SRMP)’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 4410 (Experimental), Feb. 2006 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc4410.txt>
- J.-S. Park, M.-K. Shin, and H.-J. Kim, ‘A Method for Generating Link-Spaced IPv6 Multicast Addresses’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 4489 (Proposed Standard), Apr. 2006 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc4489.txt>
- Y. Nomura, R. Walsh, J.-P. Luoma, J. Ott, and H. Schulzrinne, ‘Requirements for Internet Media Guides (IMGs)’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 4473 (Informational), May 2006 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc4473.txt>
- T. Morin, ‘Requirements for Multicast in Layer 3 Provider-Provisioned Virtual Private Networks (PPVPNs)’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 4834 (Informational), Apr. 2007 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc4834.txt>
- D. Meyer, R. Rockell, and G. Shepherd, ‘Source-Specific Protocol Independent Multicast in 232/8’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 4608 (Best Current Practice), Aug. 2006 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc4608.txt>
- M. McBride, J. Meylor, and D. Meyer, ‘Multicast Source Discovery Protocol (MSDP) Deployment Scenarios’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 4611 (Best Current Practice), Aug. 2006 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc4611.txt>
- D. Levi and D. Harrington, ‘Definitions of Managed Objects for Bridges with Traffic Classes, Multicast Filtering, and Virtual LAN Extensions’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 4363 (Proposed Standard), Jan. 2006 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc4363.txt>
- H. Holbrook and B. Cain, ‘Source-Specific Multicast for IP’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 4607 (Proposed Standard), Aug. 2006 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc4607.txt>
- H. Holbrook, B. Cain, and B. Haberman, ‘Using Internet Group Management Protocol Version 3 (IGMPv3) and Multicast Listener Discovery Protocol Version 2 (MLDv2) for Source-Specific Multicast’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 4604 (Proposed Standard), Aug. 2006 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc4604.txt>
- R. Hinden and S. Deering, ‘IP Version 6 Addressing Architecture’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 4291 (Draft Standard), Feb. 2006 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc4291.txt>

- B. Haberman and J. Martin, ‘Multicast Router Discovery’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 4286 (Proposed Standard), Dec. 2005 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc4286.txt>
- B. Fenner and D. Thaler, ‘Multicast Source Discovery Protocol (MSDP) MIB’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 4624 (Experimental), Oct. 2006 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc4624.txt>
- B. Fenner, H. He, B. Haberman, and H. Sandick, ‘Internet Group Management Protocol (IGMP) / Multicast Listener Discovery (MLD)-Based Multicast Forwarding (“IGMP/MLD Proxying”), Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 4605 (Proposed Standard), Aug. 2006 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc4605.txt>
- B. Fenner, M. Handley, H. Holbrook, and I. Kouvelas, ‘Protocol Independent Multicast - Sparse Mode (PIM-SM): Protocol Specification (Revised)’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 4601 (Proposed Standard), Aug. 2006 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc4601.txt>
- D. Farinacci and Y. Cai, ‘Anycast-RP Using Protocol Independent Multicast (PIM)’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 4610 (Proposed Standard), Aug. 2006 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc4610.txt>
- M. Christensen, K. Kimball, and F. Solensky, ‘Considerations for Internet Group Management Protocol (IGMP) and Multicast Listener Discovery (MLD) Snooping Switches’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 4541 (Informational), May 2006 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc4541.txt>
- K. Chowdhury, P. Yegani, and L. Madour, ‘Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol (DHCP) Options for Broadcast and Multicast Control Servers’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 4280 (Proposed Standard), Nov. 2005 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc4280.txt>
- G. Bourdon, ‘Extensions to Support Efficient Carrying of Multicast Traffic in Layer-2 Tunneling Protocol (L2TP)’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 4045 (Experimental), Apr. 2005 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc4045.txt>
- M. Baugher, R. Canetti, L. Dondeti, and F. Lindholm, ‘Multicast Security (MSEC) Group Key Management Architecture’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 4046 (Informational), Apr. 2005 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc4046.txt>
- R. Aggarwal, D. Papadimitriou, and S. Yasukawa, ‘Extensions to Resource Reservation Protocol - Traffic Engineering (RSVP-TE) for Point-to-Multipoint TE Label Switched Paths (LSPs)’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 4875 (Proposed Standard), May 2007 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc4875.txt>

- B. Aboba, D. Thaler, and L. Esibov, ‘Link-local Multicast Name Resolution (LLMNR)’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 4795 (Informational), Jan. 2007 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc4795.txt>
- S. Yadav, R. Yavatkar, R. Pabbati, P. Ford, T. Moore, S. Herzog, and R. Hess, ‘Identity Representation for RSVP’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 3182 (Proposed Standard), Oct. 2001 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3182.txt>
- B. Whetten, L. Vicisano, R. Kermode, M. Handley, S. Floyd, and M. Luby, ‘Reliable Multicast Transport Building Blocks for One-to-Many Bulk-Data Transfer’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 3048 (Informational), Jan. 2001 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3048.txt>
- R. Vida and L. Costa, ‘Multicast Listener Discovery Version 2 (MLDv2) for IPv6’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 3810 (Proposed Standard), Jun. 2004 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3810.txt>
- D. Thaler, ‘Multicast Address Allocation MIB’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 3559 (Proposed Standard), Jun. 2003 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3559.txt>
- D. Thaler, B. Fenner, and B. Quinn, ‘Socket Interface Extensions for Multicast Source Filters’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 3678 (Informational), Jan. 2004 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3678.txt>
- D. Stopp and B. Hickman, ‘Methodology for IP Multicast Benchmarking’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 3918 (Informational), Oct. 2004 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3918.txt>
- P. Savola and B. Haberman, ‘Embedding the Rendezvous Point (RP) Address in an IPv6 Multicast Address’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 3956 (Proposed Standard), Nov. 2004 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3956.txt>
- B. Quinn and K. Almeroth, ‘IP Multicast Applications: Challenges and Solutions’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 3170 (Informational), Sep. 2001 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3170.txt>
- D. Ooms, B. Sales, W. Livens, A. Acharya, F. Griffoul, and F. Ansari, ‘Overview of IP Multicast in a Multi-Protocol Label Switching (MPLS) Environment’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 3353 (Informational), Aug. 2002 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3353.txt>
- D. Meyer and P. Lothberg, ‘GLOP Addressing in 233/8’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 3180 (Best Current Practice), Sep. 2001 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3180.txt>
- M. Luby, L. Vicisano, J. Gemmell, L. Rizzo, M. Handley, and J. Crowcroft, ‘The Use of Forward Error Correction (FEC) in Reliable Multicast’, Internet Request for Comments,

- vol. RFC 3453 (Informational), Dec. 2002 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3453.txt>
- D. Kim, D. Meyer, H. Kilmer, and D. Farinacci, ‘Anycast Rendevous Point (RP) mechanism using Protocol Independent Multicast (PIM) and Multicast Source Discovery Protocol (MSDP)’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 3446 (Informational), Jan. 2003 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3446.txt>
- R. Kermode and L. Vicisano, ‘Author Guidelines for Reliable Multicast Transport (RMT) Building Blocks and Protocol Instantiation documents’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 3269 (Informational), Apr. 2002 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3269.txt>
- T. Hardjono and B. Weis, ‘The Multicast Group Security Architecture’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 3740 (Informational), Mar. 2004 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3740.txt>
- B. Haberman, ‘Source Address Selection for the Multicast Listener Discovery (MLD) Protocol’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 3590 (Proposed Standard), Sep. 2003 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3590.txt>
- B. Haberman, ‘Allocation Guidelines for IPv6 Multicast Addresses’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 3307 (Proposed Standard), Aug. 2002 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3307.txt>
- B. Haberman and R. Worzella, ‘IP Version 6 Management Information Base for The Multicast Listener Discovery Protocol’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 3019 (Proposed Standard), Jan. 2001 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3019.txt>
- B. Haberman and D. Thaler, ‘Unicast-Prefix-based IPv6 Multicast Addresses’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 3306 (Proposed Standard), Aug. 2002 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3306.txt>
- B. Fenner and D. Meyer, ‘Multicast Source Discovery Protocol (MSDP)’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 3618 (Experimental), Oct. 2003 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3618.txt>
- R. Bless and K. Wehrle, ‘IP Multicast in Differentiated Services (DS) Networks’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 3754 (Informational), Apr. 2004 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3754.txt>
- S. Bhattacharyya, ‘An Overview of Source-Specific Multicast (SSM)’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 3569 (Informational), Jul. 2003 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3569.txt>

- Z. Albanna, K. Almeroth, D. Meyer, and M. Schipper, ‘IANA Guidelines for IPv4 Multicast Address Assignments’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 3171 (Best Current Practice), Aug. 2001 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3171.txt>
- B. Adamson, C. Bormann, M. Handley, and J. Macker, ‘Negative-acknowledgment (NACK)-Oriented Reliable Multicast (NORM) Protocol’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 3940 (Experimental), Nov. 2004 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3940.txt>
- B. Adamson, C. Bormann, M. Handley, and J. Macker, ‘Negative-Acknowledgment (NACK)-Oriented Reliable Multicast (NORM) Building Blocks’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 3941 (Experimental), Nov. 2004 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3941.txt>
- A. Adams, J. Nicholas, and W. Siadak, ‘Protocol Independent Multicast - Dense Mode (PIM-DM): Protocol Specification (Revised)’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 3973 (Experimental), Jan. 2005 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc3973.txt>
- D. Wallner, E. Harder, and R. Agee, ‘Key Management for Multicast: Issues and Architectures’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2627 (Informational), Jun. 1999 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2627.txt>
- D. Thaler, ‘Interoperability Rules for Multicast Routing Protocols’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2715 (Informational), Oct. 1999 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2715.txt>
- D. Thaler and C. Hopps, ‘Multipath Issues in Unicast and Multicast Next-Hop Selection’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2991 (Informational), Nov. 2000 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2991.txt>
- D. Thaler, M. Handley, and D. Estrin, ‘The Internet Multicast Address Allocation Architecture’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2908 (Historic), Sep. 2000 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2908.txt>
- R. Talpade and M. Ammar, ‘Multicast Server Architectures for MARS-based ATM multicasting’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2149 (Informational), May 1997 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2149.txt>
- R. Ramanathan, ‘Multicast Support for Nimrod : Requirements and Solution Approaches’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2102 (Informational), Feb. 1997 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2102.txt>
- P. Radoslavov, D. Estrin, R. Govindan, M. Handley, S. Kumar, and D. Thaler, ‘The Multicast Address-Set Claim (MASC) Protocol’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2909 (Historic), Sep. 2000 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2909.txt>
- M. Pullen, M. Myjak, and C. Bouwens, ‘Limitations of Internet Protocol Suite for Distributed Simulation the Large Multicast Environment’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC

- 2502 (Informational), Feb. 1999 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2502.txt>
- M. Pullen, R. Malghan, L. Lavu, G. Duan, J. Ma, and H. Nah, ‘A Simulation Model for IP Multicast with RSVP’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2490 (Informational), Jan. 1999 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2490.txt>
- D. Meyer, ‘Administratively Scoped IP Multicast’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2365 (Best Current Practice), Jul. 1998 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2365.txt>
- K. McCloghrie, D. Farinacci, and D. Thaler, ‘IPv4 Multicast Routing MIB’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2932 (Proposed Standard), Oct. 2000 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2932.txt>
- K. McCloghrie, D. Farinacci, D. Thaler, and B. Fenner, ‘Protocol Independent Multicast MIB for IPv4’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2934 (Experimental), Oct. 2000 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2934.txt>
- A. Mankin, A. Romanow, S. Bradner, and V. Paxson, ‘IETF Criteria for Evaluating Reliable Multicast Transport and Application Protocols’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2357 (Informational), Jun. 1998 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2357.txt>
- R. Kermode, ‘MADCAP Multicast Scope Nesting State Option’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2907 (Proposed Standard), Sep. 2000 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2907.txt>
- R. Hinden and S. Deering, ‘IPv6 Multicast Address Assignments’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2375 (Informational), Jul. 1998 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2375.txt>
- S. Hanna, B. Patel, and M. Shah, ‘Multicast Address Dynamic Client Allocation Protocol (MADCAP)’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2730 (Proposed Standard), Dec. 1999 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2730.txt>
- M. Handley, D. Thaler, and R. Kermode, ‘Multicast-Scope Zone Announcement Protocol (MZAP)’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2776 (Historic), Feb. 2000 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2776.txt>
- M. Handley, S. Floyd, B. Whetten, R. Kermode, L. Vicisano, and M. Luby, ‘The Reliable Multicast Design Space for Bulk Data Transfer’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2887 (Informational), Aug. 2000 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2887.txt>
- R. Finlayson, ‘An Abstract API for Multicast Address Allocation’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2771 (Informational), Feb. 2000 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2771.txt>

- R. Finlayson, ‘IP Multicast and Firewalls’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2588 (Informational), May 1999 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2588.txt>
- W. Fenner, ‘Internet Group Management Protocol, Version 2’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2236 (Proposed Standard), Nov. 1997 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2236.txt>
- D. Farinacci, D. Meyer, and Y. Rekhter, ‘Intra-LIS IP multicast among routers over ATM using Sparse Mode PIM’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2337 (Experimental), Apr. 1998 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2337.txt>
- D. Estrin, D. Farinacci, A. Helmy, D. Thaler, S. Deering, M. Handley, V. Jacobson, C. Liu, P. Sharma, and L. Wei, ‘Protocol Independent Multicast-Sparse Mode (PIM-SM): Protocol Specification’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2362 (Experimental), Jun. 1998 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2362.txt>
- D. Estrin, D. Farinacci, A. Helmy, D. Thaler, S. Deering, M. Handley, V. Jacobson, C. Liu, P. Sharma, and L. Wei, ‘Protocol Independent Multicast-Sparse Mode (PIM-SM): Protocol Specification’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2117 (Experimental), Jun. 1997 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2117.txt>
- A. Emberson, ‘TFTP Multicast Option’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2090 (Experimental), Feb. 1997 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2090.txt>
- K. Dubray, ‘Terminology for IP Multicast Benchmarking’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2432 (Informational), Oct. 1998 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2432.txt>
- S. Deering, W. Fenner, and B. Haberman, ‘Multicast Listener Discovery (MLD) for IPv6’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2710 (Proposed Standard), Oct. 1999 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2710.txt>
- C. Chung and M. Greene, ‘Definitions of Managed Objects for Multicast over UNI 3.0/3.1 based ATM Networks’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2417 (Proposed Standard), Sep. 1998 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2417.txt>
- C. Chung and M. Greene, ‘Definitions of Managed Objects for Multicast over UNI 3.0/3.1 based ATM Networks’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2366 (Proposed Standard), Jul. 1998 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2366.txt>
- E. Bell, A. Smith, P. Langille, A. Rijhsinghani, and K. McCloghrie, ‘Definitions of Managed Objects for Bridges with Traffic Classes, Multicast Filtering and Virtual LAN Extensions’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2674 (Proposed Standard), Aug. 1999 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2674.txt>
- A. Ballardie, ‘Core Based Trees (CBT version 2) Multicast Routing – Protocol Specification –’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2189 (Historic), Sep. 1997 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2189.txt>

- A. Ballardie, ‘Core Based Trees (CBT) Multicast Routing Architecture’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2201 (Historic), Sep. 1997 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2201.txt>
- P. Bagnall, R. Briscoe, and A. Poppitt, ‘Taxonomy of Communication Requirements for Large-scale Multicast Applications’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2729 (Informational), Dec. 1999 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2729.txt>
- G. Armitage, ‘Support for Multicast over UNI 3.0/3.1 based ATM Networks’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 2022 (Proposed Standard), Nov. 1996 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2022.txt>
- D. Waitzman, C. Partridge, and S. E. Deering, ‘Distance Vector Multicast Routing Protocol’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 1075 (Experimental), Nov. 1988 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc1075.txt>
- T. Pusateri, ‘IP Multicast over Token-Ring Local Area Networks’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 1469 (Historic), Jun. 1993 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc1469.txt>
- J. Moy, ‘Multicast Extensions to OSPF’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 1584 (Historic), Mar. 1994 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc1584.txt>
- D. Marlow, ‘Host Group Extensions for CLNP Multicasting’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 1768 (Experimental), Mar. 1995 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc1768.txt>
- S. E. Deering, ‘Host extensions for IP multicasting’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 1112 (INTERNET STANDARD), Aug. 1989 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc1112.txt>
- S. E. Deering, ‘Host extensions for IP multicasting’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 1054, May 1988 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc1054.txt>
- R. Braudes and S. Zabele, ‘Requirements for Multicast Protocols’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 1458 (Informational), May 1993 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc1458.txt>
- A. Ballardie, ‘Scalable Multicast Key Distribution’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 1949 (Experimental), May 1996 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc1949.txt>
- S. Armstrong, A. Freier, and K. Marzullo, ‘Multicast Transport Protocol’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 1301 (Informational), Feb. 1992 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc1301.txt>
- S. E. Deering, ‘Host extensions for IP multicasting’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 988, Jul. 1986 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc988.txt>

S. E. Deering and D. R. Cheriton, ‘Host groups: A multicast extension to the Internet Protocol’, Internet Request for Comments, vol. RFC 966, Dec. 1985 [Online]. Available: <http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc966.txt>

Slide 79



¿Questions?

IK1552

SPRING 2019

SLIDE 79