

Network Working Group  
INTERNET-DRAFT  
Expiration Date: September 1998

K. Dubray  
Bay Networks  
March 1998

**Terminology for IP Multicast Benchmarking**  
**[<draft-ietf-bmwg-mcast-03.txt>](#)**

Status of this Memo

This document is an Internet-Draft. Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), its areas, and its working groups. Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as ``work in progress.''

To view the entire list of current Internet-Drafts, please check the "ltd-abstracts.txt" listing contained in the Internet-Drafts Shadow Directories on ftp.is.co.za (Africa), ftp.nordu.net (Europe), munnari.oz.au (Pacific Rim), ds.internic.net (US East Coast), or ftp.isi.edu (US West Coast).

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

Abstract

The purpose of this draft is to add terminology specific to the benchmarking of multicast IP forwarding devices. It builds upon the tenets set forth in [RFC 1242](#), [RFC 1944](#), and other IETF Benchmarking Methodology Working Group (BMWG) effort and extends them to the multicast paradigm.

**1. Introduction**

Network forwarding devices are being required to take a single frame and support delivery to a number of destinations having membership to a particular group. As such, multicast support may place a different burden on the resources of these network forwarding devices than with unicast or broadcast traffic types.

By clearly identifying benchmarks and related terminology in this document, it is hoped that detailed methodologies can be generated in subsequent documents. Taken in tandem, these two efforts endeavor to assist the clinical, empirical, and consistent characterization of certain aspects of multicast technologies and their individual implementations.

[While primarily directed towards intermediate IP multicast forwarding devices on LANs, elements of this text may or may not be applicable to other media as well.]

Dubray, K.

Expires September 1998

[Page 1]

## **2. Definition Format**

This section cites the template suggested by [RFC 1242](#) in the specification of a term to be defined.

Term to be defined.

Definition:

The specific definition for the term.

Discussion:

A brief discussion of the term, its application and any restrictions on measurement procedures.

Measurement units:

Units used to record measurements of this term, if applicable.

[Issues:]

List of issues or conditions that effect this term. This field is optional in this draft.

[See Also:]

List of other terms that are relevant to the discussion of this term. This field is optional in this draft.

### **2.1 Existing Terminology**

This document draws on existing terminology defined in other BMWG work. Examples include, but are not limited to:

Throughput	( <a href="#">RFC 1242, section 3.17</a> )
Latency	( <a href="#">RFC 1242, section 3.8</a> )
Constant Load	( <a href="#">RFC 1242, section 3.4</a> )
Frame Loss Rate	( <a href="#">RFC 1242, section 3.6</a> )
Overhead behavior	( <a href="#">RFC 1242, section 3.11</a> )
Forwarding Rates	( <a href="#">[4]</a> , section 3.6)
Loads	( <a href="#">[4]</a> , section 3.5)
Devices	( <a href="#">[4]</a> , section 3.1)

## **3. Table of Defined Terms**

### **3.1 General Nomenclature**

3.1.1 Traffic Class.

3.1.2 Group Class.

3.1.3 Service Class.

### 3.2 Forwarding and Throughput

- 3.2.1 Mixed Class Throughput (MCT).
- 3.2.2 Scaled Group Forwarding Matrix (SGFM).
- 3.2.3 Aggregated Multicast Throughput (AMT)
- 3.2.4 Encapsulation Throughput (ET)
- 3.2.5 Decapsulation Throughput (DT)
- 3.2.6 Re-encapsulation Throughput (RET)

### 3.3 Forwarding Latency

- 3.3.1 Multicast Latency
- 3.3.2 Min/Max Multicast Latency

### 3.4 Overhead

- 3.4.1 Group Join Delay.
- 3.4.2 Group Leave Delay.

### 3.5 Capacity

- 3.5.1 Multicast Group Capacity.

### 3.6 Interaction

- 3.6.1 Burdened Response
- 3.6.2 Forwarding Burdened Multicast Latency
- 3.6.3 Forwarding Burdened Join Delay
- 3.6.4 Forwarding Burdened Multicast Group Capacity.

## **3.1 General Nomenclature**

**This section will present general terminology to be used in this and other documents.**

### **3.1.1 Traffic Class.**

#### Definition:

An equivalence class of packets comprising one or more data streams.

#### Discussion:

In the scope of this document, Traffic Class will be considered a logical identifier used to discriminate between a set or sets of packets offered the DUT.

For example, one Traffic Class may identify a set of unicast packets offered to the DUT. Another Traffic Class may differentiate the multicast packets destined to multicast group X. Yet another Class may distinguish the set of multicast packets destined to multicast group Y.

Unless otherwise qualified, the usage of the word "Class" in this document will refer simply to a Traffic Class.

Dubray, K.

Expires September 1998

[Page 3]

Measurement units:  
Not applicable.

### **3.1.2 Group Class.**

Definition:

A specific type of Traffic Class where the packets comprising the Class are destined to a particular multicast group.

Discussion:

Measurement units:  
Not applicable.

### **3.1.3 Service Class.**

Definition:

A specific type of Traffic Class where the packets comprising the Class require particular treatment or treatments by the network forwarding devices along the path to the packets' destination(s).

Discussion:

Measurement units:  
Not applicable.

## **3.2 Forwarding and Throughput.**

This section presents terminology relating to the characterization of the packet forwarding ability of a DUT/SUT in a multicast environment. Some metrics extend the concept of throughput presented in [RFC 1242](#).

### **3.2.1 Mixed Class Throughput (MCT).**

Definition:

The maximum rate at which none of the offered frames, comprised from a unicast Class and a multicast Class, to be forwarded are dropped by the device across a fixed number of ports.

Discussion:

Often times, throughput is collected on a homogenous traffic type - though the packets' destinations may vary, the packets follow the same packet forwarding path through the DUT.

Based on the [RFC 1242](#) definition for throughput, the Mixed Class Throughput benchmark attempts to characterize the DUT's

ability to process both unicast and multicast frames in the same aggregated traffic stream.

Dubray, K.

Expires September 1998

[Page 4]

Measurement units:

Frames per second

Issues:

Related methodology may have to address the ratio of unicast packets to multicast packets.

### **3.2.2 Scaled Group Forwarding Matrix (SGFM).**

Definition:

A table that demonstrates Forwarding Rate as a function of tested multicast groups for a fixed number of tested DUT/SUT ports.

Discussion:

A desirable attribute of many Internet mechanisms is the ability to "scale." This benchmark seeks to demonstrate the ability of a SUT to forward as the number of multicast groups is scaled upwards.

Measurement units:

Packets per second, with corresponding tested multicast group and port configurations.

Issues:

The corresponding methodology (or even the definition itself) may have to reflect the impact that the pairing (source, group) has on many multicast routing protocols.

Refers to the concept of Forwarding Rate originally defined in this document. The definition of Forwarding Rate has been moved to [\[4\]](#).

### **3.2.3 Aggregated Multicast Throughput (AMT)**

Definition:

The maximum rate at which none of the offered frames to be forwarded through N destination interfaces of the same multicast group are dropped.

Discussion:

Another "scaling" type of exercise, designed to identify the DUT/SUT's ability to handle traffic as a function of the multicast destination ports it is required to support.

Measurement units:

The ordered pair (N,t) where,



N = the number of destination ports of the multicast group.  
t = the throughput, in frames per second, relative to the  
source stream.

#### **3.2.4 Encapsulation Throughput (ET)**

**Definition:**

The maximum rate at which frames offered a DUT are encapsulated and correctly forwarded by the DUT without loss.

**Discussion:**

A popular technique in presenting a frame to a device that may not support a protocol feature is to encapsulate, or tunnel, the packet containing the unsupported feature in a format that is supported by that device.

More specifically, encapsulation refers to the act of taking a frame or part of a frame and embedding it as a payload of another frame. This benchmark attempts to characterize the overhead behavior associated with that translational process.

Consideration may need to be given with respect to the impact of different frame formats on usable bandwidth.

**Measurement units:**

Frames per second.

#### **3.2.5 Decapsulation Throughput (DT)**

**Definition:**

The maximum rate at which frames offered a DUT are decapsulated and correctly forwarded by the DUT without loss.

**Discussion:**

A popular technique in presenting a frame to a device that may not support a protocol feature is to encapsulate, or tunnel, the packet containing the unsupported feature in a format that is supported by that device. At some point, the frame may be required to be returned its original format from its encapsulation wrapper for use by the frame's next destination.

More specifically, decapsulation refers to the act of taking a frame or part of a frame embedded as a payload of another frame and returning it to the payload's appropriate format. This benchmark attempts to characterize the overhead behavior associated with that translational process.

Consideration may need to be given with respect to the impact of different frame formats on usable bandwidth.

**Measurement units:**

Frames per second.

Dubray, K.

Expires September 1998

[Page 6]

### **3.2.6 Re-encapsulation Throughput (RET)**

**Definition:**

The maximum rate at which frames of one encapsulated format offered a DUT are converted to another encapsulated format and correctly forwarded by the DUT without loss.

**Discussion:**

A popular technique in presenting a frame to a device that may not support a protocol feature is to encapsulate, or tunnel, the packet containing the unsupported feature in a format that is supported by that device. At some point, the frame may be required to be converted from one encapsulation format to another encapsulation format.

More specifically, re-encapsulation refers to the act of taking an encapsulated payload of one format and replacing it with another encapsulated format - all the while preserving the original payload's contents. This benchmark attempts to characterize the overhead behavior associated with that translational process.

Consideration may need to be given with respect to the impact of different frame formats on usable bandwidth.

**Measurement units:**

Frames per second.

## **3.3 Forwarding Latency.**

This section presents terminology relating to the characterization of the forwarding latency of a DUT/SUT in a multicast environment. It extends the concept of latency presented in [RFC 1242](#).

### **3.3.1 Multicast Latency.**

**Definition:**

The set of individual latencies from a single input port on the DUT or SUT to all tested ports belonging to the destination multicast group.

**Discussion:**

This benchmark is based on the [RFC 1242](#) definition of latency. While it is useful to collect latency between a pair of source and destination multicast ports, it may be insightful to collect the same type of measurements across a range of ports supporting that Group Class.

A variety of statistical exercises can be applied to the set of latencies measurements.

Dubray, K.

Expires September 1998

[Page 7]^L

INTERNET-DRAFT

Multicast Benchmarking Terminology

March 1998

Measurement units:

Time units with enough precision to reflect measurement.

### **3.3.2 Min/Max Multicast Latency.**

Definition:

The difference between the maximum latency measurement and the minimum latency measurement from the set of latencies produced by the Multicast Latency benchmark.

Discussion:

This statistic may yield some insight into how a particular implementation handles its multicast traffic. This may be useful to users of multicast synchronization types of applications.

Measurement units:

Time units with enough precision to reflect measurement.

## **3.4 Overhead**

This section presents terminology relating to the characterization of the overhead delays associated with explicit operations found in multicast environments.

### **3.4.1 Group Join Delay.**

Definition:

The time duration it takes a DUT/SUT to start forwarding multicast packets from the time a successful IGMP group membership report has been issued to the DUT/SUT.

Discussion:

Many factors can contribute to different results, such as the number or type of multicast-related protocols configured on the system under test. Other factors are physical topology and "tree" configuration.

Because of the number of variables that could impact this metric, the metric may be a better characterization tool for a device or

system rather than a basis for comparisons with other devices.

A consideration for the related methodology: possible need to differentiate a specifically-forwarded multicast frame from those sprayed by protocols implementing a flooding tactic to solicit prune feedback.

Measurement units:  
Microseconds.

Dubray, K.

Expires September 1998

[Page 8]

### **3.4.2 Group Leave Delay.**

**Definition:**

The time duration it takes a DUT/SUT to cease forwarding multicast packets after a corresponding IGMP "Leave Group" message has been successfully offered to the DUT/SUT.

**Discussion:**

While it is important to understand how quickly a system can process multicast frames; it may be beneficial to understand how quickly that same system can stop the process as well.

**Measurement units:**

Microseconds.

**Issues:** Methodology may need to consider protocol-specific timeout values.

## **3.5 Capacity**

This section offers terms relating to the identification of multicast group limits of a DUT/SUT.

### **3.5.1 Multicast Group Capacity.**

**Definition:**

The maximum number of multicast groups a SUT/DUT can support while maintaining the ability to forward multicast frames to all multicast groups registered to that SUT/DUT.

**Discussion:**

**Measurement units:**

Multicast groups.

**Issues:**

The related methodology may have to consider the impact of multicast sources per group on the ability of a SUT/DUT to "scale up" the number of supportable multicast groups.

## **3.6 Interaction**

Network forwarding devices are generally required to provide more functionality than than the forwarding of traffic. Moreover, network forwarding devices may be asked to provide those functions in a variety of environments. This section offers terms to assist in the characterization

of DUT/SUT behavior in consideration of potentially interacting factors.

Dubray, K.

Expires September 1998

[Page 9]



### **3.6.1 Burdened Response.**

**Definition:**

A measured response collected from a DUT/SUT in light of interacting, or potentially interacting, distinct stimuli.

**Discussion:**

Many metrics provide a one dimensional view into an operating characteristic of a tested system. For example, the forwarding rate metric may yield information about the packet processing ability of a device. Collecting that same metric in view of another control variable can oftentimes be very insightful. Taking that same forwarding rate measurement, for instance, while the device's address table is injected with an additional 50,000 entries may yield a different perspective.

**Measurement units:**

While burdened response is not a specific metric, metrics of this type must follow guidelines when reporting results.

The metric's principal result **MUST** be reported in conjunction with the contributing factors.

For example, in reporting a Forwarding Burdened Latency, the latency measurement should be reported with respect to corresponding Offered Load and Forwarding Rates.

**Issues:**

A Burdened response may be very illuminating when trying to characterize a single device or system. Extreme care must be exercised when attempting to use that characterization as a basis of comparison with other devices or systems. Test agents must ensure that the measured response is a function of the controlled stimuli, and not secondary factors. An example of such an interfering factor would be configuration mismatch of a timer impacting a response process.

### **3.6.2 Forwarding Burdened Multicast Latency.**

**Definition:**

A multicast latency taken from a DUT/SUT in the presence of a traffic forwarding requirement.

**Discussion:**

This burdened response metric builds on the Multicast Latency definition offered in [section 3.3.1](#). It mandates that the DUT be subjected to an additional measure of traffic not required by the non-burdened metric.



It attempts to provide a means to evaluate how traffic load may or may not impact a device's or system's packet processing delay.

Measurement units:

Time units with enough precision to reflect the latencies measurements.

Latency measurements MUST be reported with the corresponding sustained Forwarding Rate and associated Offered Load.

### **3.6.3 Forwarding Burdened Group Join Delay.**

Definition:

A multicast Group Join Delay taken from a DUT/SUT in the presence of a traffic forwarding requirement.

Discussion:

This burdened response metric builds on the Group Join Delay definition offered in [section 3.4.1](#). It mandates that the DUT be subjected to an additional measure of traffic not required by the non-burdened metric.

Many factors can contribute to different results, such as the number or type of multicast-related protocols configured on the system under test. Other factors are physical topology and "tree" configuration.

Because of the number of variables that could impact this metric, the metric may be a better characterization tool for a device or system rather than a basis for comparisons with other devices.

Measurement units:

Time units with enough precision to reflect the delay measurements.

Delay measurements MUST be reported with the corresponding sustained Forwarding Rate and associated Offered Load.

## **4. Security Considerations**

Security issues are not addressed in this memo.

## **5. References**

- [1] Bradner, S. Benchmarking Terminology for Network Interconnection Devices. [RFC 1242](#). July, 1991.
- [2] Bradner, S., McQuaid, J. Benchmarking Methodology for Network

Interconnect Devices. [RFC 1944](#). May, 1996.

Dubray, K.

Expires September 1998

[Page 11]

- [3] Craig, R. Terminology for Cell/Call Benchmarking. <[draft-ietf-bmwg-call-01.txt](#)> March, 1997.
- [4] Mandeville, R. Benchmarking Terminology for LAN Switching Devices. [RFC 2285](#). February, 1998.

## **5. Author's Address**

Kevin Dubray  
Bay Networks, Inc.  
600 Technology Park Drive  
M/S BL60-301  
Billerica, MA 01981  
(978) 916-3862  
kdubray@baynetworks.com

or direct discussion to the Benchmarking Methodology Working Group:  
bmwg@harvard.edu