

IP Multicast in Differentiated Services (DS) Networks

Status of this Memo

This memo provides information for the Internet community. It does not specify an Internet standard of any kind. Distribution of this memo is unlimited.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2004). All Rights Reserved.

Abstract

This document discusses the problems of IP Multicast use in Differentiated Services (DS) networks, expanding on the discussion in RFC 2475 ("An Architecture of Differentiated Services"). It also suggests possible solutions to these problems, describes a potential implementation model, and presents simulation results.

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	2
1.1.	Management of Differentiated Services.	2
2.	Problems of IP Multicast in DS Domains	3
2.1.	Neglected Reservation Subtree Problem (NRS Problem).	4
2.2.	Heterogeneous Multicast Groups	12
2.3.	Dynamics of Any-Source Multicast	13
3.	Solutions for Enabling IP-Multicast in Differentiated Services Networks.	13
3.1.	Solution for the NRS Problem	13
3.2.	Solution for Supporting Heterogeneous Multicast Groups	15
3.3.	Solution for Any-Source Multicast.	16
4.	Scalability Considerations	16
5.	Deployment Considerations.	17
6.	Security Considerations.	18
7.	Implementation Model Example	18
8.	Proof of the Neglected Reservation Subtree Problem	19
8.1.	Implementation of the Proposed Solution.	20
8.2.	Test Environment and Execution	21
9.	Simulative Study of the NRS Problem and Limited Effort PHB	23

9.1. Simulation Scenario.	24
9.2. Simulation Results for Different Router Types.	26
10. Acknowledgements	31
11. References	31
11.1. Normative References	31
11.2. Informative References	31
12. Authors' Addresses	33
13. Full Copyright Statement	34

1. Introduction

This document discusses the problems of IP Multicast use in Differentiated Services (DS) networks, expanding on the discussion in RFC 2475 ("An Architecture of Differentiated Services"). It also suggests possible solutions to these problems, describes a potential implementation model, and presents simulation results.

The "Differentiated Services" (DiffServ or DS) approach [1, 2, 3] defines certain building blocks and mechanisms to offer qualitatively better services than the traditional best-effort delivery service in an IP network. In the DiffServ Architecture [2], scalability is achieved by avoiding complexity and maintenance of per-flow state information in core nodes, and by pushing unavoidable complexity to the network edges. Therefore, individual flows belonging to the same service are aggregated, thereby eliminating the need for complex classification or managing state information per flow in interior nodes.

On the other hand, the reduced complexity in DS nodes makes it more complex to use those "better" services together with IP Multicast (i.e., point-to-multipoint or multipoint-to-multipoint communication). Problems emerging from this fact are described in section 2. Although the basic DS forwarding mechanisms also work with IP Multicast, some facts have to be considered which are related to the provisioning of multicast resources. It is important to integrate IP Multicast functionality into the architecture from the beginning, and to provide simple solutions for those problems that will not defeat the already gained advantages.

1.1. Management of Differentiated Services

At least for Per-Domain Behaviors and services based on the EF PHB, admission control and resource reservation are required [14, 15]. Installation and updating of traffic profiles in boundary nodes is necessary. Most network administrators cannot accomplish this task manually, even for long term service level agreements (SLAs). Furthermore, offering services on demand requires some kind of signaling and automatic admission control procedures.

However, no standardized resource management architecture for DiffServ domains exists. The remainder of this document assumes that at least some logical resource management entity is available to perform resource-based admission control and allotment functions. This entity may also be realized in a distributed fashion, e.g., within the routers themselves. Detailed aspects of the resource management realization within a DiffServ domain, as well as the interactions between resource management and routers or end-systems (e.g., signaling for resources), are out of scope of this document.

Protocols for signaling a reservation request to a Differentiated Services Domain are required. For accomplishing end-system signaling to DS domains, RSVP [4] may be used with new DS specific reservation objects [5]. RSVP provides support for multicast scenarios and is already supported by many systems. However, application of RSVP in a DiffServ multicast context may lead to problems that are also described in the next section. The NSIS Working Group is currently defining new signaling protocols that may show a different behavior, but the WG has its current focus more on unicast flows than on multicast flows.

2. Problems of IP Multicast in DS Domains

Although potential problems and the complexity of providing multicast with Differentiated Services are considered in a separate section of [2], both aspects have to be discussed in greater detail. The simplicity of the DiffServ Architecture and its DS node types is necessary to reach high scalability, but it also causes fundamental problems in conjunction with the use of IP Multicast in DS domains. The following subsections describe these problems for which a generic solution is proposed in section 3. This solution is as scalable as IP Multicast and needs no resource separation by using different codepoint values for unicast and multicast traffic.

Because Differentiated Services are unidirectional by definition, the point-to-multipoint communication is also considered as unidirectional. In traditional IP Multicast, any node can send packets spontaneously and asynchronously to a multicast group specified by their multicast group address, i.e., traditional IP Multicast offers a multipoint-to-multipoint service, also referred to as Any-Source Multicast. Implications of this feature are discussed in section 2.3.

For subsequent considerations we assume, unless stated otherwise, at least a unidirectional point-to-multipoint communication scenario in which the sender generates packets which experience a "better" Per-Hop-Behavior than the traditional default PHB, resulting in a service of better quality than the default best-effort service. In order to

accomplish this, a traffic profile corresponding to the traffic conditioning specification has to be installed in the sender's first DS-capable boundary node. Furthermore, it must be assured that the corresponding resources are available on the path from the sender to all the receivers, possibly requiring adaptation of traffic profiles at involved domain boundaries. Moreover, on demand resource reservations may be receiver-initiated.

2.1. Neglected Reservation Subtree Problem (NRS Problem)

Typically, resources for Differentiated Services must be reserved before they are used. But in a multicast scenario, group membership is often highly dynamic, thereby limiting the use of a sender-initiated resource reservation in advance. Unfortunately, dynamic addition of new members of the multicast group using Differentiated Services can adversely affect other existing traffic if resources were not explicitly reserved before use. A practical proof of this problem is given in section 8.

IP Multicast packet replication usually takes place when the packet is handled by the forwarding core (cf. Fig. 1), i.e., when it is forwarded and replicated according to the multicast forwarding table. Thus, a DiffServ capable node would also copy the content of the DS field [1] into the IP packet header of every replicate. Consequently, replicated packets get exactly the same DS codepoint (DSCP) as the original packet, and therefore experience the same forwarding treatment as the incoming packets of this multicast group. This is also illustrated in Fig. 1, where each egress interface comprises functions for (BA-) classification, traffic conditioning (TC), and queueing.




Figure 1: Multicast packet replication in a DS node

Normally, the replicating node cannot test whether a corresponding resource reservation exists for a particular flow of replicated packets on an output link (i.e., its corresponding interface). This is because flow-specific information (e.g., traffic profiles) is usually not available in every boundary and interior node.

When a new receiver joins an IP Multicast group, a multicast routing protocol (e.g., DVMRP [6], PIM-DM [7] or PIM-SM [8]) grafts a new branch to an existing multicast tree in order to connect the new receiver to the tree. As a result of tree expansion, missing per-flow classification, and policing mechanisms, the new receiver will implicitly use the service of better quality, because of the "better" copied DSCP.

If the additional amount of resources which are consumed by the new part of the multicast tree are not taken into account by the domain resource management (cf. section 1.1), the currently provided quality of service of other receivers (with correct reservations) will be affected adversely or even violated. This negative effect on existing traffic contracts by a neglected resource reservation -- in the following designated as the Neglected Reservation Subtree Problem (NRS Problem) -- must be avoided under all circumstances. Strong admission control policies at the domain boundary will not help to prevent this problem either, because the new flow that inadmissibly consumes resources has its origin inside the domain.

One can distinguish two major cases of the NRS Problem. They show a different behavior depending on the location of the branching point. In order to compare their different effects, a simplistic example of a share of bandwidth is illustrated in Fig. 2 and is used in the following explanations. Neither the specific PHB types nor their assigned bandwidth share are important; however, their relative priority with respect to each other is of importance.





Figure 2: An example bandwidth share of different behavior aggregates

The bandwidth of the considered output link is shared by three types of services (i.e., by three behavior aggregates): Expedited Forwarding, Assured Forwarding, and the traditional Best-Effort service. In this example, we assume that routers perform strict priority queueing, where EF has the highest, AF the middle, and Best-Effort the lowest assigned scheduling priority. Though not mandatory for an EF implementation, a strict non-preemptive priority scheduler is one implementation option as described in section 5.1.1 of RFC 3247 [15]. Were Weighted Fair Queueing (WFQ) to be used, the described effects would essentially also occur, but with minor differences. In the following scenarios, it is illustrated that PHBs of equal or lower priority (in comparison to the multicast flow's PHB) are affected by the NRS problem.

The Neglected Reservation Subtree problem appears in two different cases:

- o Case 1: If the branching point of the new subtree (at first only a branch) and the previous multicast tree is a (egress) boundary node, as shown in Fig. 3, the additional multicast flow now increases the total amount of used resources for the corresponding behavior aggregate on the affected output link. The total amount will be greater than the originally reserved amount. Consequently, the policing component in the egress boundary node drops packets until the traffic aggregate is in accordance with the traffic contract. But while dropping packets, the router can not identify the responsible flow (because of missing flow classification functionality), and thus randomly discards packets, whether they belong to a correctly behaving flow or not. As a result, there will no longer be any service guarantee for the flows with properly reserved resources.



S: Sender

Recv.x: Receiver x

FHN: First-Hop Node

BN: Boundary Node

IN: Interior Node

```
===: Multicast branch with reserved bandwidth
```

```
###: Multicast branch without reservation
```

*) Bandwidth of EF aggregated on the output link is higher than actual reservation, EF aggregate will be limited in bandwidth without considering the responsible flow.

Figure 3: The NRS Problem (case 1) occurs when Receiver B joins

In figure 3, it is assumed that receiver A is already attached to the egress boundary node (BN) of the first domain. Furthermore, resources are properly reserved along the path to receiver A and used by correspondingly marked packets. When receiver B joins the same group as receiver A, packets are replicated and forwarded along the new branch towards the second domain with the same PHB as for receiver A. If this PHB is EF, the new branch possibly exhausts allotted resources for the EF PHB, adversely affecting other EF users that receive their packets over the link that is marked with the *). The BN usually ensures that outgoing traffic aggregates to the next domain are conforming to the agreed traffic conditioning specification. The egress BN will, therefore, drop packets of the PHB type that are used for the multicast flow.

Other PHBs of lower or higher priority are not affected adversely in this case. The following example in Fig. 4. illustrates this for two PHBs.

Expedited Forw. with reservation	Expedited Forw. excess flow without reservation	Assured Forw. with reserv.	BE
EF with and without reservation share 40% of reserved EF aggregate. -> EF packets with reservation and without reservation will be discarded!		40 %	20%

(a) Excess flow has EF codepoint

Expedited Forw. with reservation	Assured Forwarding excess flow without reservation	Assured Forw. with reserv.	BE
40%	AF with & without reservation share 40% of reserved EF aggregate. -> EF packets with reservation and without reservation will be discarded!		20 %

(b) Excess flow has AF codepoint


Figure 4: Resulting share of bandwidth in a egress boundary node with a neglected reservation of (a) an Expedited Forwarding flow or (b) an Assured Forwarding flow.

Fig. 4 shows the resulting share of bandwidth in cases when (a) Expedited Forwarding and (b) Assured Forwarding is used by the additional multicast branch causing the NRS Problem. Assuming that the additional traffic would use another 30% of the link bandwidth, Fig. 4 (a) illustrates that the resulting aggregate of Expedited Forwarding (70% of the outgoing link bandwidth) is throttled down to its originally reserved 40%. In this case, the amount of dropped EF bandwidth is equal to the amount of excess bandwidth. Consequently, the original Expedited Forwarding

aggregate (which had 40% of the link bandwidth reserved) is also affected by packet losses. The other services, e.g., Assured Forwarding or Best-Effort, are not disadvantaged.

Fig. 4 (b) shows the same situation for Assured Forwarding. The only difference is that now Assured Forwarding is solely affected by discards, as the other services will still get their guarantees. In either case, packet losses are restricted to the misbehaving service class by the traffic meter and policing mechanisms in boundary nodes. Moreover, the latter problem (case 1) occurs only in egress boundary nodes because they are responsible for ensuring that the traffic leaving the Differentiated Services domain is not more than the following ingress boundary node will accept. Therefore, those violations of SLAs will already be detected and processed in egress boundary nodes.

- o Case 2: The Neglected Reservation Subtree problem can also occur if the branching point between the previous multicast tree and the new subtree is located in an interior node (as shown in Fig. 5). In Fig. 5, it is assumed that receivers A and B have already joined the multicast group and have reserved resources accordingly. The interior node in the second domain starts replication of multicast packets as soon as receiver C joins. Because the router is not equipped with metering or policing functions, it will not recognize any amount of excess traffic and will forward the new multicast flow. If the latter belongs to a higher priority service, such as Expedited Forwarding, bandwidth of the aggregate is higher than the aggregate's reservation at the new branch and will use bandwidth from lower priority services.



FHN: First-Hop Node, BN: Boundary Node, Recv.x: Receiver x

S: Sender, IN: Interior Node

===: Multicast branch with reserved bandwidth

###: Multicast branch without reservation

*) Bandwidth of EF aggregated on the output link is higher than actual reservation, EF aggregate will be limited in bandwidth without considering the responsible flow

Figure 5: Neglected Reservation Subtree problem case 2
after join of receiver C

The additional amount of EF without a corresponding reservation is forwarded together with the aggregate which has a reservation. This results in no packet losses for Expedited Forwarding as long as the resulting aggregate is not higher than the output link bandwidth. Because of its higher priority, Expedited Forwarding gets as much bandwidth as needed and as is available. The effects on other PHBs are illustrated by the following example in Fig. 6.

Expedited Forw. with reservation	Expedited Forw. excess flow without reservation	Assured Forw. with reserv.	BE
40%	30%	30%	0%

EF with reservation and the excess flow use together 70% of the link bandwidth because EF, with or without reservation, has the highest priority.

(a) Excess flow has EF codepoint

Expedited Forw. with reservation	Assured Forw. excess flow without reservation	Assured Forw. with reserv.	BE
40%	60% (10% loss)		0%

AF with reservation and the excess flow use together 60% of the link bandwidth because EF has the highest priority (-> 40%). 10% of AF packets will be lost.

(b) Excess flow has AF codepoint

Figure 6: Resulting share of bandwidth in an interior node with a neglected reservation of (a) an Expedited Forwarding flow or (b) an Assured Forwarding flow

The result of case 2 is that there is no restriction for Expedited Forwarding, but as Fig. 6 (a) shows, other services will be extremely disadvantaged by this use of non-reserved resources. Their bandwidth is used by the new additional flow. In this case, the additional 30% Expedited Forwarding traffic preempts resources from the Assured Forwarding traffic, which in turn preempts

resources from the best-effort traffic, resulting in 10% packet losses for the Assured Forwarding aggregate, and a complete loss of best-effort traffic. The example in Fig. 6 (b) shows that this can also happen with lower priority services like Assured Forwarding. When a reservation for a service flow with lower priority is neglected, other services (with even lower priority) can be reduced in their quality (in this case the best-effort service). As shown in the example, the service's aggregate causing the NRS problem can itself be affected by packet losses (10% of the Assured Forwarding aggregate is discarded). Besides the described problems of case 2, case 1 will occur in the DS boundary node of the next DS domain that performs traffic metering and policing for the service aggregate.

Directly applying RSVP to Differentiated Services would also result in temporary occurrence of the NRS Problem. A receiver has to join the IP multicast group to receive the sender's PATH messages, before being able to send a resource reservation request (RESV message). Thus, the join message on the link for receiving PATH messages can cause the NRS Problem, if this situation is not handled in a special way (e.g., by marking all PATH messages with codepoint 0 and dropping or re-marking all other data packets of the multicast flow).

2.2. Heterogeneous Multicast Groups

Heterogeneous multicast groups contain one or more receivers, which would like to get another service or quality of service as the sender provides or other receiver subsets currently use. A very important characteristic which should be supported by Differentiated Services is that participants requesting a best-effort quality only should also be able to participate in a group communication which otherwise utilizes a better service class. The next better support for heterogeneity provides concurrent use of more than two different service classes within a group. Things tend to get even more complex when not only different service classes are required, but also different values for quality parameters within a certain service class.

A further problem is to support heterogeneous groups with different service classes in a consistent way. It is possible that some services will not be comparable to each other so that one service cannot be replaced by the other, and both services have to be provided over the same link within this group.

Because an arbitrary new receiver that wants to get the different service can be grafted to any point of the current multicast delivery tree, even interior nodes may have to replicate packets using the different service. At a first glance, this seems to be a

contradiction with respect to simplicity of the interior nodes, because they do not even have a profile available and should now convert the service of quality of individual receivers. Consequently, in order to accomplish this, interior nodes have to change the codepoint value during packet replication.

2.3. Dynamics of Any-Source Multicast

Basically, within an IP multicast group, any participant (actually, it can be any host not even receiving packets of this multicast group) can act as a sender. This is an important feature which should also be available in case a specific service other than best-effort is used within the group. Differentiated Services possess, conceptually, a unidirectional character. Therefore, for every multicast tree implied by a sender, resources must be reserved separately if simultaneous sending should be possible with a better service. This is even true if shared multicast delivery trees are used (e.g., with PIM-SM or Core Based Trees). If not enough resources are reserved for a service within a multicast tree allowing simultaneous sending of more than one participant, the NRS problem will occur again. The same argument applies to half-duplex reservations which would share the reserved resources by several senders, because it cannot be ensured by the network that exactly one sender sends packets to the group. Accordingly, the corresponding RSVP reservation styles "Wildcard Filter" and "Shared-Explicit Filter" [4] cannot be supported within Differentiated Services. The Integrated Services approach is able to ensure the half-duplex nature of the traffic, because every router can check each packet for its conformance with the installed reservation state.

3. Solutions for Enabling IP-Multicast in Differentiated Services Networks

The problems described in the previous section are mainly caused by the simplicity of the Differentiated Services architecture. Solutions that do not introduce additional complexity need to be introduced so as to not diminish the scalability of the DiffServ approach. This document suggests a straightforward solution for most of the problems.

3.1. Solution for the NRS Problem

The proposed solution consists conceptually of the following three steps that are described in more detail later.

1. A new receiver joins a multicast group that is using a DiffServ service. Multicast routing protocols accomplish the connection of the new branch to the (possibly already existing) multicast delivery tree as usual.
2. The unauthorized use of resources is avoided by re-marking at branching nodes all additional packets departing down the new branch. At first, the new receiver will get all packets of the multicast group without quality of service. The management entity of the correspondent DiffServ domain may get informed about the extension of the multicast tree.
3. If a pre-issued reservation is available for the new branch or somebody (receiver, sender or a third party) issues one, the management entity instructs the branching router to set the corresponding codepoint for the demanded service.

Usage of resources which were not previously reserved must be prevented. In the following example, we consider a case where the join of a new receiver to a DS multicast group requires grafting of a new branch to an already existing multicast delivering tree. The connecting node that joins both trees converts the codepoint (and therefore the Per-Hop Behavior) to a codepoint of a PHB which is similar to the default PHB in order to provide a best-effort-like service for the new branch. More specifically, this particular PHB can provide a service that is even worse than the best-effort service of the default PHB. See RFC 3662 [16] for a corresponding Lower Effort Per-Domain Behavior.

The conversion to this specific PHB could be necessary in order to avoid unfairness being introduced within the best-effort service aggregate, and, which results from the higher amount of resource usage of the incoming traffic belonging to the multicast group. If the rate at which re-marked packets are injected into the outgoing aggregate is not reduced, those re-marked packets will probably cause discarding of other flow's packets in the outgoing aggregate if resources are scarce.

Therefore, the re-marked packets from this multicast group should be discarded more aggressively than other packets in this outgoing aggregate. This could be accomplished by using an appropriately configured PHB (and a related DSCP) for those packets. In order to distinguish this kind of PHB from the default PHB, it is referred to as the Limited Effort (LE) PHB (which can be realized by an appropriately configured AF PHB [9] or Class Selector Compliant PHB [1]) throughout this document. Merely dropping packets more aggressively at the re-marking node is not sufficient, because there may be enough resources in the outgoing behavior aggregate (BA) to

transmit every re-marked packet without having to discard any other packets within the same BA. However, resources in the next node may be short for this particular BA. Those "excess" packets, therefore, must be identifiable at this node.

Re-marking packets is only required at branching nodes, whereas all other nodes of the multicast tree (such with outdegree 1) replicate packets as usual. Because a branching node may also be an interior node of a domain, re-marking of packets requires conceptually per-flow classification. Though this seems to be in contradiction to the DiffServ philosophy of a core that avoids per-flow states, IP multicast flows are different from unicast flows: traditional IP multicast forwarding and multicast routing are required to install states per multicast group for every outgoing link anyway. Therefore, re-marking in interior nodes is scalable to the same extent as IP multicast (cf. section 4).

Re-marking with standard DiffServ mechanisms [10] for every new branch requires activation of a default traffic profile. The latter accomplishes re-marking by using a combination of an MF-classifier and a marker at an outgoing link that constitutes a new branch. The classifier will direct all replicated packets to a marker that sets the new codepoint. An alternative implementation is described in section 7.

The better service will only be provided if a reservation request was processed and approved by the resource management function. That means an admission control test must be performed before resources are actually used by the new branch. In case the admission test is successful, the re-marking node will be instructed by the resource management to stop re-marking and to use the original codepoint again (conceptually by removing the profile).

In summary, only those receivers will obtain a better service within a DiffServ multicast group, which previously reserved the corresponding resources in the new branch with assistance of the resource management. Otherwise, they get a quality which might be even lower than best-effort.

3.2. Solution for Supporting Heterogeneous Multicast Groups

In this document, considerations are limited to provisioning different service classes, but not different quality parameters within a certain service class.

The proposed concept from section 3.1 provides a limited solution of the heterogeneity problem. Receivers are allowed to obtain a Limited Effort service without a reservation, so that at least two different

service classes within a multicast group are possible. Therefore, it is possible for any receiver to participate in the multicast session without getting any quality of service. This is useful if a receiver just wants to see whether the content of the multicast group is interesting enough, before requesting a better service which must be paid for (like snooping into a group without prior reservation).

Alternatively, a receiver might not be able to receive this better quality of service (e.g., because it is mobile and uses a wireless link of limited capacity), but it may be satisfied with the reduced quality, instead of getting no content at all.

Additionally, applying the RSVP concept of listening for PATH messages before sending any RESV message is feasible again. Without using the proposed solution, this would have caused the NRS Problem.

Theoretically, the proposed approach in section 7 also supports more than two different services within one multicast group, because the additional field in the multicast routing table can store any DSCP value. However, this would work only if PHBs can be ordered, so that the "best" PHB among different required PHBs downstream is chosen to be forwarded on a specific link. This is mainly a management issue and is out of the scope of this document.

More advanced concepts may also support conditional re-marking in dependence on the group address and DSCP value. This is useful if the group uses different PHBs (e.g., for flows to different transport protocol ports) and the re-marking should thus additionally depend on the DSCP value of an incoming packet.

3.3. Solution for Any-Source Multicast

Every participant would have to initiate an explicit reservation to ensure the possibility of sending to the group with a better service quality, regardless of whether other senders within the group already use the same service class simultaneously. This would require a separate reservation for each sender-rooted multicast tree.

However, in the specific case of best-effort service (the default PHB), it is nevertheless possible for participants to send packets to the group anytime without requiring any additional mechanisms. The reason for this is that the first DS-capable boundary node will mark those packets with the DSCP of the default PHB because of a missing traffic profile for this particular sender. The first DS capable boundary nodes should therefore always classify multicast packets based on both the sender's address and the multicast group address.

4. Scalability Considerations

The proposed solution does not add complexity to the DS architecture or to a DS node, nor does it change the scalability properties of DiffServ. With current IP multicast routing protocols, a multicast router has to manage and hold state information per traversing multicast flow. The suggested solution scales to the same extent as IP multicast itself, because the proposed re-marking may occur per branch of a multicast flow. This re-marking is logically associated with an addition to the multicast routing state that is required anyway. In this respect, re-marking of packets for multicast flows in interior nodes is not considered as a scalability problem or to be in contradiction to the DiffServ approach itself. It is important to distinguish the multicast case from existing justifiable scalability concerns relating to re-marking packets of unicast flows within interior routers. Moreover, the decision of when to change a re-marking policy is not performed by the router, but by some management entity at a time scale which is different from the time scale at the packet forwarding level.

5. Deployment Considerations

The solution proposed in section 3.1 can be deployed on most router platforms available today. Architectures that perform routing and forwarding functions in software could be updated by a new software release.

However, there may be some specialized hardware platforms that are currently not able to deploy the proposed solution from section 7. This may be the case when a multicast packet is directly duplicated on the backplane of the router, so that all outgoing interfaces read the packet in parallel. Consequently, the codepoint cannot be changed for a subset of these outgoing interfaces and the NRS problem can not be solved directly in the branching point.

In this case, there exist several alternative solutions:

1. As mentioned in section 3.1, if traffic conditioning mechanisms can be applied on the outgoing packets at the individual output interfaces, a combination of classifier and marker may be used for each branch.
2. The change of the codepoint for subtrees without properly allocated resources could take place in the following downstream router. There, for every incoming packet of the considered multicast group, the codepoint would be changed to the value that the previous router should have set. If a LAN (e.g., a high-speed switching LAN) is attached to the considered outgoing interface, then on every router connected to the LAN, packets of the considered group should be changed

on the incoming interface by standard DiffServ mechanisms.

Future releases of router architectures may support the change of the codepoint directly in the replication process as proposed in section 7.

6. Security Considerations

Basically, the security considerations in [1] apply. The proposed solution does not imply new security aspects. If a join of arbitrary end-systems to a multicast group is not desired (thereby receiving a lower than best-effort quality) the application usually has to exclude these participants. This can be accomplished by using authentication, authorization, or ciphering techniques at the application level -- like in traditional IP multicast scenarios.

Moreover, it is important to consider the security of corresponding management mechanisms, because they are used to activate re-marking of multicast flows. On the one hand, functions for instructing the router to mark or re-mark packets of multicast flows are attractive targets to perform theft of service attacks. On the other hand, their security depends on the router management mechanisms which are used to realize this functionality. Router management should generally be protected against unauthorized use, therefore preventing those attacks as well.

7. Implementation Model Example

One possibility of implementing the proposed solution from section 3.1 is described in the following. It has to be emphasized that other realizations are also possible, and this description should not be understood as a restriction on potential implementations. The benefit of the following described implementation is that it does not require any additional classification of multicast groups within an aggregate. It serves as a proof of concept that no additional complexity is necessary to implement the proposed general solution described in section 3.

Because every multicast flow has to be considered by the multicast routing process (in this context, this notion signifies the multicast forwarding part and not the multicast route calculation and maintenance part, cf. Fig. 1), the addition of an extra byte in each multicast routing table entry containing the DS field, and thus its DS codepoint value per output link (resp. virtual interface, see Fig. 8), results in nearly no additional cost. Packets will be replicated by the multicast forwarding process, so this is also the right place for setting the correct DSCP values of the replicated packets. Their DSCP values are not copied from the incoming original packet, but

from the additional DS field in the multicasting routing table entry for the corresponding output link (only the DSCP value must be copied, while the two remaining bits are ignored and are present for simplification reasons only). This field initially contains the codepoint of the LE PHB if incoming packets for this specific group do not carry the codepoint of the default PHB.

When a packet arrives with the default PHB, the outgoing replicates should also get the same codepoint in order to retain the behavior of current common multicast groups using the default PHB. A router configuration message changes the DSCP values in the multicast routing table and may also carry the new DSCP value which should be set in the replicated packets. It should be noted that although re-marking may also be performed by interior nodes, the forwarding performance will not be decreased, because the decision of when and what to re-mark is made by the management (control plane).

Multicast Destination Address	Other Fields	List of virtual interfaces	Inter- face ID	DS Field
X	*-----	C	(DSCP,CU)
Y	*-----	D	(DSCP,CU)
...		
...	B	(DSCP,CU)
...	D	(DSCP,CU)
		
			.	.
			.	.

Figure 8: Multicast routing table with additional fields for DSCP values

8. Proof of the Neglected Reservation Subtree Problem

In the following, it is shown that the NRS problem actually exists and occurs in reality. Hence, the problem and its solution was investigated using a standard Linux Kernel (v2.4.18) and the Linux-based implementation KIDS [11].

Furthermore, the proposed solution for the NRS problem has been implemented by enhancing the multicast routing table, as well as the

multicast routing behavior in the Linux kernel. In the following section, the modifications are briefly described.

Additional measurements with the simulation model simulatedKIDS [12] will be presented in section 9. They show the effects of the NRS problem in more detail and also the behavior of the BAs using or not using the Limited Effort PHB for re-marking.

8.1. Implementation of the Proposed Solution

As described in section 3.1, the proposed solution for avoiding the NRS Problem is an extension of each routing table entry in every Multicast router by one byte. In the Linux OS, the multicast routing table is implemented by the "Multicast Forwarding Cache (MFC)". The MFC is a hash table consisting of an "mfc-cache"-entry for each combination of the following three parameters: sender's IP address, multicast group address, and incoming interface.

The routing information in a "mfc-cache"-entry is kept in an array of TTLs for each virtual interface. When the TTL is zero, a packet matching to this "mfc-cache"-entry will not be forwarded on this virtual interface. Otherwise, if the TTL is less than the packet's TTL, the latter will be forwarded on the interface with a decreased TTL.

In order to set an appropriate codepoint if bandwidth is allocated on an outgoing link, we added a second array of bytes -- similar to the TTL array -- for specifying the codepoint that should be used on a particular virtual interface. The first six bits of the byte contain the DSCP that should be used, and the seventh bit indicates whether the original codepoint in the packet has to be changed to the specified one (=0) or has to be left unchanged (=1). The default entry of the codepoint byte is zero; so initially, all packets will be re-marked to the default DSCP.

Furthermore, we modified the multicast forwarding code for considering this information while replicating multicast packets. To change an "mfc-cache"-entry we implemented a daemon for exchanging the control information with a management entity (e.g., a bandwidth broker). Currently, the daemon uses a proprietary protocol, but migration to the COPS protocol (RFC 2748) is planned.

8.2. Test Environment and Execution




Figure 8.1: Evaluation of NRS-Problem described in
Figure 3

In order to prove case 1 of the NRS problem, as described in section 2.1, the testbed shown in Figure 8.1 was built. It is a reduced version of the network shown in Figure 5 and consists of two DS-capable nodes, an ingress boundary node and an egress boundary node. The absence of interior nodes does not have any effect on to the proof of the described problem.

The testbed is comprised of two Personal Computers (Pentium III at 450 Mhz, 128 MB Ram, 3 network cards Intel eepro100) used as DiffServ nodes, as well as one sender and three receiver systems (also PCs). On the routers, KIDS has been installed and an mrouted (Multicast Routing Daemon) was used to perform multicast routing. The network was completely built of separate 10BaseT Ethernet segments in full-duplex mode. In [11], we evaluated the performance of the software routers and found out that even a PC at 200Mhz had no problem handling up to 10Mbps DS traffic on each link. Therefore, the presented measurements are not a result of performance bottlenecks caused by these software routers.

The sender generated two shaped UDP traffic flows of 500kbps (packets of 1.000 byte constant size) each and sent them to multicast group 1 (233.1.1.1) and 2 (233.2.2.2). In both measurements, receiver A had a reservation along the path to the sender for each flow, receiver B had reserved for flow 1, and C for flow 2. Therefore, two static profiles are installed in the ingress boundary node with 500kbps EF bandwidth and a token bucket size of 10.000 bytes for each flow.

In the egress boundary node, one profile has been installed for the output link to host B and one related for the output link to host C. Each of them permits up to 500kbps Expedited Forwarding, but only the aggregate of Expedited Forwarding traffic carried on the outgoing link is considered.

In measurement 1, the hosts A and B joined to group 1, while A, B, and C joined to group 2. Those joins are using a reservation for the group towards the sender. Only the join of host B to group 2 has no admitted reservation. As described in section 2.1, this will cause the NRS problem (case 1). Metering and policing mechanisms in the egress boundary node throttle down the EF aggregate to the reserved 500kbps, and do not depend on whether or not individual flows have been reserved.

	Host A	Host B	Host C
Group 1	500kbps	250kbps	500kbps
Group 2	500kbps	250kbps	

Figure 8.2: Results of measurement 1 (without the proposed solution): Average bandwidth of each flow.
--> Flows of group 1 and 2 on the link to host B share the reserved aggregate of group 1.

Figure 8.2 shows the obtained results. Host A and C received their flows without any interference. But host B received data from group 1 with only half of the reserved bandwidth, so one half of the packets have been discarded. Figure 8.2 also shows that receiver B got the total amount of bandwidth for group 1 and 2, that is exactly the reserved 500kbps. Flow 2 got Expedited Forwarding without actually having reserved any bandwidth and additionally violated the guarantee of group 1 on that link.

For measurement 2, the previously presented solution (cf. section 3.1) has been installed in the boundary node. Now, while duplicating the packets, whether the codepoint has to be changed to Best-Effort (or Limited Effort) or whether it can be just duplicated is checked. In this measurement, it changed the codepoint for group 2 on the link to Host B to Best-Effort.

	Host A	Host B	Host C
Group 1	500kbps	500kbps	500kbps
Group 2	500kbps	500kbps	

Figure 8.3: Results of measurement 1 (with the proposed solution): Average bandwidth of each flow.

--> Flow of group 1 on the link to host B gets the reserved bandwidth of group 1. The flow of group 2 has been re-marked to Best-Effort.

Results of this measurement are presented in Figure 8.3. Each host received its flows with the reserved bandwidth and without any packet loss. Packets from group 2 are re-marked in the boundary node so that they have been treated as best-effort traffic. In this case, they got the same bandwidth as the Expedited Forwarding flow, and because there was not enough other traffic on the link present, there was no need to discard packets.

The above measurements confirm that the Neglected Reservation Subtree problem is to be taken seriously and that the presented solution will solve it.

9. Simulative Study of the NRS Problem and Limited Effort PHB

This section shows some results from a simulative study which shows the correctness of the proposed solution and the effect of re-marking the responsible flow to Limited Effort. A proof of the NRS problem has also been given in section 8 and in [13]. This section shows the benefit for the default Best Effort traffic when Limited Effort is used for re-marking instead of Best Effort. The results strongly motivate the use of Limited Effort.

Flow	Source	Dest.	Case I	Case II	Case III	Case IV
EF0	S0	D0	4 Mbps	4 Mbps	4 Mbps	4 Mbps
EF1	S1	D1	2 Mbps	2 Mbps	2 Mbps	2 Mbps
EF2	S2	D2	5 Mbps	5 Mbps	5 Mbps	5 Mbps
BE0	S3	D3	1 Mbps	2.25 Mbps	0.75 Mbps	3.75 Mbps
BE1	S4	D4	4 Mbps	2.25 Mbps	0.75 Mbps	3.75 Mbps

Table 9.1: Direction, amount and Codepoint of flows in the four simulation cases (case I to IV)

The four cases (I to IV) used in the simulation runs had the following characteristics:

Case I: In this scenario, the BE sources sent together exactly 5 Mbps, so there is no congestion in the BE queue.

Case II: BE is sending less than 5 Mbps, so there is space available in the BE queue for re-marked traffic. BE0 and BE1 are sending together 4.5 Mbps, which is exactly the share of BE when LE is used. So, when multicast packets are re-marked to LE because of the NRS problem, the LE should get 0.5 Mbps and BE 4.5 Mbps, which is still enough for BE0 and BE1. LE should not show a greedy behavior and should not use resources from BE.

Case III: In this case, BE is very low. BE0 and BE1 use together only 1.5 Mbps. So when LE is used, it should be able to use the unused bandwidth resources from BE.

Case IV: BE0 and BE1 send together 7.5 Mbps so there is congestion in the BE queue. In this case, LE should get 0.5 Mbps (not more and not less).

In each scenario, loss rate and throughput of the considered flows and aggregates have been metered.

9.2. Simulation Results for Different Router Types

9.2.1. Interior Node

When the branching point of a newly added multicast subtree is located in an interior node, the NRS problem can occur as described in section 2.1 (Case 2).

In the simulation runs presented in the following four subsections, D3 joins to the multicast group of sender S0 without making any reservation or resource allocation. Consequently, a new branch is added to the existing multicast tree. The branching point issued by the join of D3 is located in IR2. On the link to BR3, no bandwidth was allocated for the new flow (EF0).

The metered throughput of flows on the link between IR2 and BR3 in the four different cases is shown in the following four subsections. The situation before the new receiver joins is shown in the second column. The situation after the join without the proposed solution is shown in column three. The fourth column presents the results when the proposed solution of section 3.1 is used and the responsible flow is re-marked to LE.

9.2.1.1. Case I:

	before join	after join (no re-marking)	after join, (re-marking to LE)
achieved through- put	EF0: --- EF1: 2.001 Mbps EF2: 5.002 Mbps BE0: 1.000 Mbps BE1: 4.000 Mbps	EF0: 4.007 Mbps EF1: 2.003 Mbps EF2: 5.009 Mbps BE0: 0.601 Mbps BE1: 0.399 Mbps	LE0: 0.504 Mbps EF1: 2.000 Mbps EF2: 5.000 Mbps BE0: 1.000 Mbps BE1: 3.499 Mbps
BA through- put	EF: 7.003 Mbps BE: 5.000 Mbps LE: ---	EF: 11.019 Mbps BE: 1.000 Mbps LE: ---	EF: 7.000 Mbps BE: 4.499 Mbps LE: 0.504 Mbps
packet loss rate	EF0: --- EF1: 0 % EF2: 0 % BE0: 0 % BE1: 0 %	EF0: 0 % EF1: 0 % EF2: 0 % BE0: 34.8 % BE1: 59.1 %	LE0: 87.4 % EF1: 0 % EF2: 0 % BE0: 0 % BE1: 0 %

(*) EF0 is re-marked to LE and signed as LE0

9.2.1.2. Case II:

	before join	after join (no re-marking)	after join, (re-marking to LE)
achieved through- put	EF0: --- EF1: 2.000 Mbps EF2: 5.002 Mbps BE0: 2.248 Mbps BE1: 2.252 Mbps	EF0: 4.003 Mbps EF1: 2.001 Mbps EF2: 5.005 Mbps BE0: 0.941 Mbps BE1: 0.069 Mbps	LE0: 0.500 Mbps EF1: 2.001 Mbps EF2: 5.002 Mbps BE0: 2.253 Mbps BE1: 2.247 Mbps
BA through- put	EF: 7.002 Mbps BE: 4.500 Mbps LE: ---	EF: 11.009 Mbps BE: 1.010 Mbps LE: ---	EF: 7.003 Mbps. BE: 4.500 Mbps LE: 0.500 Mbps
packet loss rate	EF0: --- EF1: 0 % EF2: 0 % BE0: 0 % BE1: 0 %	EF0: 0 % EF1: 0 % EF2: 0 % BE0: 58.0 % BE1: 57.1 %	LE0: 87.4 % EF1: 0 % EF2: 0 % BE0: 0 % BE1: 0 %

(*) EF0 is re-marked to LE and signed as LE0

9.2.1.3. Case III:

	before join	after join (no re-marking)	after join, (re-marking to LE)
achieved through- put	EF0: --- EF1: 2.000 Mbps EF2: 5.000 Mbps BE0: 0.749 Mbps BE1: 0.749 Mbps	EF0: 3.998 Mbps EF1: 2.001 Mbps EF2: 5.002 Mbps BE0: 0.572 Mbps BE1: 0.429 Mbps	LE0: 3.502 Mbps EF1: 2.001 Mbps EF2: 5.003 Mbps BE0: 0.748 Mbps BE1: 0.748 Mbps
BA through- put	EF: 7.000 Mbps BE: 1.498 Mbps LE: ---	EF: 11.001 Mbps BE: 1.001 Mbps LE: ---	EF: 7.004 Mbps BE: 1.496 Mbps LE: 3.502 Mbps
packet loss rate	EF0: --- EF1: 0 % EF2: 0 % BE0: 0 % BE1: 0 %	EF0: 0 % EF1: 0 % EF2: 0 % BE0: 19.7 % BE1: 32.6 %	LE0: 12.5 % EF1: 0 % EF2: 0 % BE0: 0 % BE1: 0 %

(*) EF0 is re-marked to LE and signed as LE0

9.2.1.4. Case IV:

	before join	after join (no re-marking)	after join, (re-marking to LE)
achieved through- put	EF0: --- EF1: 2.018 Mbps EF2: 5.005 Mbps BE0: 2.825 Mbps BE1: 2.232 Mbps	EF0: 4.001 Mbps EF1: 2.000 Mbps EF2: 5.001 Mbps BE0: 1.000 Mbps BE1: ---	LE0: 0.500 Mbps EF1: 2.003 Mbps EF2: 5.007 Mbps BE0: 3.425 Mbps BE1: 1.074 Mbps
BA through- put	EF: 7.023 Mbps BE: 5.057 Mbps LE: ---	EF: 11.002 Mbps BE: 1.000 Mbps LE: ---	EF: 7.010 Mbps BE: 4.499 Mbps LE: 0.500 Mbps
packet loss rate	EF0: --- EF1: 0 % EF2: 0 % BE0: 23.9 % BE1: 41.5 %	EF0: 0 % EF1: 0 % EF2: 0 % BE0: 73.3 % BE1: ---	LE0: 75.0 % EF1: 0 % EF2: 0 % BE0: 0 % BE1: 0 %

(*) EF0 is re-marked to LE and signed as LE0

NOTE: BE1 has undefined throughput and loss in situation "after join (no re-marking)", because TCP is going into retransmission back-off timer phase and closes the connection after 512 seconds.

9.2.2. Boundary Node

When the branching point of a newly added multicast subtree is located in a boundary node, the NRS problem can occur as described in section 2.1 (Case 1).

In the simulation runs presented in the following four subsections, D3 joins to the multicast group of sender S1 without making any reservation or resource allocation. Consequently, a new branch is added to the existing multicast tree. The branching point issued by the join of D3 is located in BR3. On the link to BR4, no bandwidth was allocated for the new flow (EF1).

The metered throughput of the flows on the link between BR3 and BR4 in the four different cases is shown in the following four subsections. The situation before the new receiver joins is shown in the second column. The situation after the join but without the proposed solution is shown in column three. The fourth column presents results when the proposed solution of section 3.1 is used and the responsible flow is re-marked to LE.

9.2.2.1. Case I:

	before join	after join (no re-marking)	after join, (re-marking to LE)
achieved through- put	EF0: --- EF1: --- EF2: 5.002 Mbps BE0: 1.000 Mbps BE1: 4.000 Mbps	EF0: --- EF1: 1.489 Mbps EF2: 3.512 Mbps BE0: 1.000 Mbps BE1: 4.002 Mbps	EF0: --- LE1: 0.504 Mbps EF2: 5.002 Mbps BE0: 1.004 Mbps BE1: 3.493 Mbps
BA through- put	EF: 5.002 Mbps BE: 5.000 Mbps LE: ---	EF: 5.001 Mbps BE: 5.002 Mbps LE: ---	EF: 5.002 Mbps BE: 4.497 Mbps LE: 0.504 Mbps
packet loss rate	EF0: --- EF1: --- EF2: 0 % BE0: 0 % BE1: 0 %	EF0: --- EF1: 25.6 % EF2: 29.7 % BE0: 0 % BE1: 0 %	EF0: --- LE1: 73.4 % EF2: 0 % BE0: 0 % BE1: 0 %

(*) EF1 is re-marked to LE and signed as LE1

9.2.2.2. Case II:

	before join	after join (no re-marking)	after join, (re-marking to LE)
achieved through- put	EF0: --- EF1: --- EF2: 5.003 Mbps BE0: 2.249 Mbps BE1: 2.252 Mbps	EF0: --- EF1: 1.520 Mbps EF2: 3.482 Mbps BE0: 2.249 Mbps BE1: 2.252 Mbps	EF0: --- LE1: 0.504 Mbps EF2: 5.002 Mbps BE0: 2.245 Mbps BE1: 2.252 Mbps
BA through- put	EF: 5.003 Mbps BE: 4.501 Mbps LE: ---	EF: 5.002 Mbps BE: 4.501 Mbps LE: ---	EF: 5.002 Mbps BE: 4.497 Mbps LE: 0.504 Mbps
packet loss rate	EF0: --- EF1: --- EF2: 0 % BE0: 0 % BE1: 0 %	EF0: --- EF1: 24.0 % EF2: 30.4 % BE0: 0 % BE1: 0 %	EF0: --- LE1: 74.8 % EF2: 0 % BE0: 0 % BE1: 0 %

(*) EF1 is re-marked to LE and signed as LE1

9.2.2.3. Case III:

	before join	after join (no re-marking)	after join, (re-marking to LE)
achieved through- put	EF0: --- EF1: --- EF2: 5.001 Mbps BE0: 0.749 Mbps BE1: 0.749 Mbps	EF0: --- EF1: 1.084 Mbps EF2: 3.919 Mbps BE0: 0.752 Mbps BE1: 0.748 Mbps	EF0: --- LE1: 2.000 Mbps EF2: 5.000 Mbps BE0: 0.750 Mbps BE1: 0.750 Mbps
BA through- put	EF: 5.001 Mbps BE: 1.498 Mbps LE: ---	EF: 5.003 Mbps BE: 1.500 Mbps LE: ---	EF: 5.000 Mbps BE: 1.500 Mbps LE: 2.000 Mbps
packet loss rate	EF0: --- EF1: --- EF2: 0 % BE0: 0 % BE1: 0 %	EF0: --- EF1: 45.7 % EF2: 21.7 % BE0: 0 % BE1: 0 %	EF0: --- LE1: 0 % EF2: 0 % BE0: 0 % BE1: 0 %

(*) EF1 is re-marked to LE and signed as LE1

9.2.2.4. Case IV:

	before join	after join (no re-marking)	after join, (re-marking to LE)
achieved through- put	EF0: --- EF1: --- EF2: 5.048 Mbps BE0: 2.638 Mbps BE1: 2.379 Mbps	EF0: --- EF1: 1.201 Mbps EF2: 3.803 Mbps BE0: 2.535 Mbps BE1: 2.536 Mbps	EF0: --- LE1: 0.500 Mbps EF2: 5.004 Mbps BE0: 3.473 Mbps BE1: 1.031 Mbps
BA through- put	EF: 5.048 Mbps BE: 5.017 Mbps LE: ---	EF: 5.004 Mbps BE: 5.071 Mbps LE: ---	EF: 5.004 Mbps BE: 4.504 Mbps LE: 0.500 Mbps
packet loss rate	EF0: --- EF1: --- EF2: 0 % BE0: 30.3 % BE1: 33.3 %	EF0: --- EF1: 40.0 % EF2: 23.0 % BE0: 32.1 % BE1: 32.7 %	EF0: --- LE1: 68.6 % EF2: 0 % BE0: 0 % BE1: 0 %

(*) EF1 is re-marked to LE and signed as LE1

10. Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank Mark Handley and Bill Fenner for their valuable comments on this document. Special thanks go to Milena Neumann for her extensive efforts in performing the simulations. We would also like to thank the KIDS simulation team [12].

11. References

11.1. Normative References

- [1] Nichols, K., Blake, S., Baker, F. and D. Black, "Definition of the Differentiated Services Field (DS Field) in the IPv4 and IPv6 Headers", RFC 2474, December 1998.
- [2] Blake, S., Black, D., Carlson, M., Davies, E., Wang, Z. and W. Weiss, "An Architecture for Differentiated Services", RFC 2475, December 1998.

11.2. Informative References

- [3] Nichols, K. and B. Carpenter, "Definition of Differentiated Services Per Domain Behaviors and Rules for their Specification", RFC 3086, April 2001.
- [4] Braden, R., Ed., Zhang, L., Berson, S., Herzog, S. and S. Jamin, "Resource ReSerVation Protocol (RSVP) -- Version 1", RFC 2205, September 1997.
- [5] Bernet, Y., "Format of the RSVP DCLASS Object", RFC 2996, November 2000.
- [6] Waitzman, D., Partridge, C. and S. Deering, "Distance Vector Multicast Routing Protocol", RFC 1075, November 1988.
- [7] Estrin, D., Farinacci, D., Helmy, A., Thaler, D., Deering, S., Handley, M., Jacobson, V., Liu, L., Sharma, P. and L. Wei, "Protocol Independent Multicast-Sparse Mode (PIM-SM): Protocol Specification", RFC 2362, June 1998.
- [8] Adams, A., Nicholas, J. and W. Siadak, "Protocol Independent Multicast - Dense Mode (PIM-DM) Protocol Specification (Revised)", Work in Progress.
- [9] Heinanen, J., Baker, F., Weiss, W. and J. Wroclawski, "Assured Forwarding PHB Group" RFC 2597, June 1999.

- [10] Bernet, Y., Blake, S., Grossman, D. and A. Smith, "An Informal Management Model for DiffServ Routers", RFC 3290, May 2002.
- [11] R. Bless, K. Wehrle. Evaluation of Differentiated Services using an Implementation under Linux, Proceedings of the Intern. Workshop on Quality of Service (IWQOS'99), London, 1999.
- [12] K. Wehrle, J. Reber, V. Kahmann. A simulation suite for Internet nodes with the ability to integrate arbitrary Quality of Service behavior, Proceedings of Communication Networks And Distributed Systems Modeling And Simulation Conference (CNDS 2001), Phoenix (AZ), January 2001.
- [13] R. Bless, K. Wehrle. Group Communication in Differentiated Services Networks, Internet QoS for the Global Computing 2001 (IQ 2001), IEEE International Symposium on Cluster Computing and the Grid, May 2001, Brisbane, Australia, IEEE Press.
- [14] Davie, B., Charny, A., Bennett, J.C.R., Benson, K., Le Boudec, J.Y., Courtney, W., Davari, S., Firoiu, V. and D. Stiliadis, "An Expedited Forwarding PHB (Per-Hop Behavior)", RFC 3246, March 2002.
- [15] Charny, A., Bennett, J.C.R., Benson, K., Le Boudec, J.Y., Chiu, A., Courtney, W., Davari, S., Firoiu, V., Kalmanek, C. and K.K. Ramakrishnan, "Supplemental Information for the New Definition of the EF PHB (Expedited Forwarding Per-Hop Behavior)", RFC 3247, March 2002.
- [16] Bless, R., Nichols, K. and K. Wehrle, "A Lower Effort Per-Domain Behavior (PDB) for Differentiated Services", RFC 3662, December 2003.

12. Authors' Addresses

Comments and questions related to this document can be addressed to one of the authors listed below.

Roland Bless
Institute of Telematics
Universitaet Karlsruhe (TH)
Zirkel 2
76128 Karlsruhe, Germany

Phone: +49 721 608 6413
EMail: bless@tm.uka.de
URI: <http://www.tm.uka.de/~bless>

Klaus Wehrle
University of Tuebingen
WSI - Computer Networks and Internet /
Protocol Engineering & Distributed Systems
Morgenstelle 10c
72076 Tuebingen, Germany

EMail: Klaus.Wehrle@uni-tuebingen.de
URI: <http://net.informatik.uni-tuebingen.de/~wehrle/>

13. Full Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2004). This document is subject to the rights, licenses and restrictions contained in BCP 78 and except as set forth therein, the authors retain all their rights.

This document and the information contained herein are provided on an "AS IS" basis and THE CONTRIBUTOR, THE ORGANIZATION HE/SHE REPRESENTS OR IS SPONSORED BY (IF ANY), THE INTERNET SOCIETY AND THE INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE DISCLAIM ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION HEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

Intellectual Property

The IETF takes no position regarding the validity or scope of any Intellectual Property Rights or other rights that might be claimed to pertain to the implementation or use of the technology described in this document or the extent to which any license under such rights might or might not be available; nor does it represent that it has made any independent effort to identify any such rights. Information on the procedures with respect to rights in RFC documents can be found in BCP 78 and BCP 79.

Copies of IPR disclosures made to the IETF Secretariat and any assurances of licenses to be made available, or the result of an attempt made to obtain a general license or permission for the use of such proprietary rights by implementers or users of this specification can be obtained from the IETF on-line IPR repository at <http://www.ietf.org/ipr>.

The IETF invites any interested party to bring to its attention any copyrights, patents or patent applications, or other proprietary rights that may cover technology that may be required to implement this standard. Please address the information to the IETF at ietf-ipr@ietf.org.

Acknowledgement

Funding for the RFC Editor function is currently provided by the Internet Society.

