

IPv6 Multicast Deployment Issues
draft-ietf-mboned-ipv6-multicast-issues-02.txt

Status of this Memo

This document is an Internet-Draft and is subject to all provisions of [Section 3 of RFC 3667](#). By submitting this Internet-Draft, each author represents that any applicable patent or other IPR claims of which he or she is aware have been or will be disclosed, and any of which he or she become aware will be disclosed, in accordance with [RFC 3668](#).

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."

The list of current Internet-Drafts can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/ietf/1id-abstracts.txt>.

The list of Internet-Draft Shadow Directories can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html>.

This Internet-Draft will expire on August 19, 2005.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2005).

Abstract

This memo describes known issues with IPv6 multicast, and provides historical reference of how some earlier problems have been resolved.

Table of Contents

- [1. Introduction](#) [3](#)
- [1.1 Multicast-related Abbreviations](#) [3](#)
- [2. Justification for IPv6 Inter-domain ASM](#) [3](#)
- [2.1 Groups of Different Non-global Scopes](#) [3](#)
- [3. Different Solutions to Inter-domain Multicast](#) [4](#)
- [3.1 Changing the Multicast Usage Model](#) [4](#)
- [3.2 Implementing MSDP for IPv6](#) [5](#)
- [3.3 Implementing Another Multicast Routing Protocol](#) [5](#)
- [3.4 Embedding the RP Address in an IPv6 Multicast Address](#) [6](#)
- [4. Issues with IPv6 Multicast](#) [6](#)
- [4.1 Issues with Embedded RP](#) [6](#)
- [4.1.1 RP Failover with Embedded RP](#) [6](#)
- [4.1.2 Embedded RP and Control Mechanisms](#) [7](#)
- [4.2 Neighbor Discovery Using Multicast](#) [7](#)
- [4.3 Functionality Like MLD Snooping](#) [8](#)
- [5. Security Considerations](#) [8](#)
- [6. Acknowledgements](#) [8](#)
- [7. References](#) [8](#)
- [7.1 Normative References](#) [8](#)
- [7.2 Informative References](#) [9](#)
- Author's Address [10](#)
- [A. SSM Deployment Issues](#) [10](#)
- Intellectual Property and Copyright Statements [12](#)

1. Introduction

There are many issues concerning the deployment and implementation, and to a lesser degree, specification of IPv6 multicast. This memo describes known problems to raise awareness, and documents how previous problems have been resolved.

[Section 2](#) describes the justifications for providing an inter-domain multicast solution using Any Source Multicast (ASM) with IPv6.

[Section 3](#) in turn describes which options were considered for filling the requirements for the IPv6 inter-domain multicast solutions.

These sections are provided for historical reference of the discussion and consensus in the IETF MBONED working group.

[Section 4](#) lists issues that have come up with IPv6 multicast but have not yet been at least fully resolved, and may require raised awareness.

1.1 Multicast-related Abbreviations

ASM	Any Source Multicast
BSR	Bootstrap Router
CGMP	Cisco Group Management Protocol
DR	Designated Router
IGMP	Internet Group Management Protocol
MLD	Multicast Listener Discovery
MSDP	Multicast Source Discovery Protocol
PIM	Protocol Independent Multicast
PIM-SM	Protocol Independent Multicast - Sparse Mode
RP	Rendezvous Point
SSM	Source-specific Multicast

2. Justification for IPv6 Inter-domain ASM

This section documents the reasons and the discussion which led to the agreement that solution to IPv6 inter-domain ASM was necessary.

The main reason was that SSM [[RFC3569](#)] was not considered to solve all the relevant problems (e.g., many-to-many applications, source discovery), and that SSM was not sufficiently widely deployed and used. As these issues are more generic than just IPv6, they are described in [Appendix A](#).

2.1 Groups of Different Non-global Scopes

Many ASM applications are used with a smaller scope than global; some of these have a wider scope than others. However, groups of smaller

scope typically need to be in their own PIM-SM domains to prevent inappropriate data leakage.

Therefore if a site has groups of different scopes, it is important to have multiple PIM domain borders. However, this need can be obviated by using globally-scoped multicast addresses instead. It is easier to set scoping using globally scoped addresses, rather than having to configure (nesting) local multicast scopes.

In consequence there will be a need for inter-domain multicast solutions, as a means to simplify and obviate the need for operational hassles with local scoping. As many applications are relying on ASM characteristics, this further increases the need for an inter-domain ASM solution.

3. Different Solutions to Inter-domain Multicast

When ASM is used, the Internet must be divided into multiple PIM-SM domains for both administrative and technical reasons, which means there will be multiple PIM-SM RPs which need to share the source IP addresses between themselves.

On the other hand, SSM does not require RPs and also works in the inter-domain without such communication. [Section 2](#) describes the justification why Inter-domain ASM was still considered to be required. This section describes different solutions which were discussed to providing inter-domain multicast for IPv6.

For inter-domain multicast, MBONED WG came to consensus to continue using SSM, and also use Embedded-RP for ASM as appropriate.

This section provides historical reference of the discussion and decisions.

[3.1](#) Changing the Multicast Usage Model

As ASM model has been found to be complex and a bit problematic, some felt that this is a good incentive to move to SSM for good (at least for most cases). Below two paragraphs are adapted from [\[I-D.bhattach-diot-pimso\]](#):

The most serious criticism of the SSM architecture is that it does not support shared trees which may be useful for supporting many-to-many applications. In the short-term this is not a serious concern since the multicast application space is likely to be dominated by one-to-many applications. Some other classes of multicast applications that are likely to emerge in the future are few-to-few (e.g. private chat rooms, whiteboards), few-to-many

(e.g., video conferencing, distance learning) and many-to-many (e.g., large chat rooms, multi-user games). The first two classes can be easily handled using a few one-to-many source-based trees.

The issue of many-to-many multicasting service on top of a SSM architecture is an open issue at this point. However, some feel that even many-to-many applications should be handled with multiple one-to-many instead of shared trees.

In any case, even though SSM would be preferable in many cases, SSM was not sufficiently widely available to completely replace ASM (see [Appendix A](#)), and that the IETF should not try to force the application writers to change their multicast usage models.

[3.2](#) Implementing MSDP for IPv6

In IPv4, notification of multicast sources between these PIM-SM RPs is done with Multicast Source Discovery Protocol (MSDP) [[RFC3618](#)]. The protocol is widely considered a sub-optimal solution and even dangerous to deploy; when it was specified, it was only meant as a "stop-gap" measure.

The easiest stop-gap solution (to a stop-gap solution) would have been to specify IPv6 TLV's for MSDP. This would be fairly straightforward, and existing implementations would probably be relatively easy to modify.

There is and has been resistance to this, as MSDP was not supposed to last this long in the first place; there is clear consensus that there should be no further work on it [[I-D.ietf-mboned-msdp-deploy](#)].

[3.3](#) Implementing Another Multicast Routing Protocol

One possibility might have been to specify and/or implement a different multicast routing protocol.

In fact, Border Gateway Multicast Protocol (BGMP) [[RFC3913](#)] has been specified; however, it is quite complex and there have been no implementations nor desire to write any. Lacking deployment experience and specification analysis, it is difficult to say which problems BGMP might solve (and possibly, which new ones BGMP might introduce). One probable reason why BGMP failed to attract continuing interest was its dependence on similarly heavy-weight multicast address allocation/assignment protocols.

As of this writing, no other inter-domain protocols have been specified, and BGMP is not considered a realistic option.

3.4 Embedding the RP Address in an IPv6 Multicast Address

One way to work around these problems was to allocate and assign multicast addresses in such a fashion that the address of the RP could be automatically calculated from the IPv6 multicast address.

Making some assumptions about how the RPs would configure Interface Identifiers, this is can achieved as described in [[RFC3956](#)]; PIM-SM implementations need to implement the Embedded RP group-to-RP mapping mechanism which processes this encoding.

To completely replace the need for MSDP for IPv6, a different way to implement "Anycast RP" [[RFC3446](#)] is also needed. One such approach is described in [[I-D.ietf-pim-anycast-rp](#)].

4. Issues with IPv6 Multicast

This section describes issues that have come up with IPv6 multicast but have not yet been at least fully resolved.

4.1 Issues with Embedded RP

4.1.1 RP Failover with Embedded RP

Embedded RP provides a means for ASM multicast without inter-domain MSDP. However, to continue providing failover mechanisms for RPs, a form of state sharing, Anycast-RP, should still be supported. Instead of MSDP, this can be achieved using a PIM-SM extension [[I-D.ietf-pim-anycast-rp](#)].

One should note that as Embedded RP does not require MSDP peerings between the RPs, it's possible to deploy more RPs in a PIM domain. For example, the scalability and redundancy could be achieved by co-locating RP functionality in the DRs: each major source, which "owns" a group, could have its own DR act as the RP. This has about the same redundancy characteristics as using SSM -- so there may not be an actually very urgent need for Anycast-RP if operational methods to include fate-sharing of the groups is followed.

In any case, "cold failover" redundancy without state sharing is still an option. This does not offer any load-balancing of RPs or shared trees, but provides only long-term redundancy. In this mechanism, multiple routers would be configured with the RP address (with appropriate unicast metrics), but only one of them would be active at any time: if the main RP goes down, another takes its place. However, the multicast state stored in the RP would be lost, unless it is synchronized by some out-of-band mechanism.

4.1.2 Embedded RP and Control Mechanisms

With ASM and MSDP deployment, the ISPs can better control who is using their RPs.

With Embedded RP, anyone could use a third-party RP to host their groups unless some mechanisms, for example access-lists, are in place to control the use of the RP [[RFC3956](#)].

Such abuse is of questionable benefit, though, as anyone with a /64 could form an RP of its own.

Whether this is a sufficiently serious problem worth designing a (potentially complex) solution for is still under debate, as of this writing.

4.2 Neighbor Discovery Using Multicast

Neighbor Discovery [[RFC2461](#)] uses link-local multicast in Ethernet media, not broadcast as ARP does with IPv4. This has been seen to cause operational problems with some equipment. This section documents these as "lessons (hopefully) learned" so that other vendors could better avoid them.

There are equipment which do not forward (IPv6) multicast frames appropriately; these could be considered "bugs", but are sufficiently commonplace so that the behaviour is worth mentioning.

In particular, many WLAN IEEE 802.11b access points, working in the bridged mode, do not forward IPv6 Ethernet multicast frames across the bridge. When procuring WLAN equipment, it is probably a good idea to check out this functionality explicitly.

In some Ethernet switches, IPv6 frames are likewise not forwarded. The problem has likely been with building multicast forwarding state based on Layer 3 information (which the vendor does support with IPv6); state using Layer 2 information would work just fine [[I-D.ietf-magma-snoop](#)]. Therefore the snooping switch developers should be aware of the tradeoff of using Layer 2 vs Layer 3 information on multicast data forwarding, especially if IPv6 snooping is not supported.

There are no good workarounds for these problems, except disseminating information about them (e.g., at <http://www.v6fix.net>) and complaining to the vendor.

4.3 Functionality Like MLD Snooping

On Ethernet, multicast frames are forwarded to every port, even without subscribers (or IPv6 support).

Especially if multicast traffic is relatively heavy (e.g., video streaming), it becomes particularly important to have some feature like Multicast Listener Discovery (MLD) snooping implemented, to reduce the amount of flooding [[I-D.ietf-magma-snoop](#)].

Looking at the actual problem from a higher view, it is not clear that MLD snooping is the right long-term solution. It makes the switches complex, requires the processing of datagrams above the link-layer, and should be discouraged [[I-D.ietf-mboned-iesg-gap-analysis](#)]: the whole idea of L2-only devices having to peek into L3 datagrams seems like a severe layering violation -- and often the devices aren't upgradeable (if there are bugs or missing features, which could be fixed later) in any way. Better mechanisms could be having routers tell switches which multicasts to forward where (e.g., [[CGMP](#)]) or by using some other mechanisms [[GARP](#)].

5. Security Considerations

Only deployment and implementation issues are considered, and these do not have any particular security considerations; security considerations for each technology are covered in the respective specifications.

6. Acknowledgements

Early discussions with Stig Venaas, Jerome Durand, Tim Chown et al. led to the writing of this draft. Brian Haberman offered extensive comments along the way. "Itojun" Hagino brought up the need for MLD snooping in a presentation. Bill Nickless pointed out issues in the gap analysis and provided a pointer to GARP/GMRP; Havard Eidnes made a case for a protocol like CGMP. Leonard Giuliano pointed out a more complete analysis of SSM with different kind of applications.

7. References

7.1 Normative References

[I-D.ietf-mboned-msdp-deploy]
McBride, M., "Multicast Source Discovery Protocol (MSDP) Deployment Scenarios",
Internet-Draft [draft-ietf-mboned-msdp-deploy-06](#), March 2004.

- [I-D.ietf-pim-anycast-rp]
Farinacci, D., "Anycast-RP using PIM",
Internet-Draft [draft-ietf-pim-anycast-rp-02](#), June 2004.
- [I-D.ietf-pim-sm-v2-new]
Fenner, B., Handley, M., Holbrook, H. and I. Kouvelas,
"Protocol Independent Multicast - Sparse Mode PIM-SM):
Protocol Specification (Revised)",
Internet-Draft [draft-ietf-pim-sm-v2-new-11](#), October 2004.
- [RFC2461] Narten, T., Nordmark, E. and W. Simpson, "Neighbor
Discovery for IP Version 6 (IPv6)", [RFC 2461](#), December
1998.
- [RFC3446] Kim, D., Meyer, D., Kilmer, H. and D. Farinacci, "Anycast
Rendezvous Point (RP) mechanism using Protocol Independent
Multicast (PIM) and Multicast Source Discovery Protocol
(MSDP)", [RFC 3446](#), January 2003.
- [RFC3569] Bhattacharyya, S., "An Overview of Source-Specific
Multicast (SSM)", [RFC 3569](#), July 2003.
- [RFC3618] Fenner, B. and D. Meyer, "Multicast Source Discovery
Protocol (MSDP)", [RFC 3618](#), October 2003.
- [RFC3810] Vida, R. and L. Costa, "Multicast Listener Discovery
Version 2 (MLDv2) for IPv6", [RFC 3810](#), June 2004.
- [RFC3913] Thaler, D., "Border Gateway Multicast Protocol (BGMP):
Protocol Specification", [RFC 3913](#), September 2004.
- [RFC3956] Savola, P. and B. Haberman, "Embedding the Rendezvous
Point (RP) Address in an IPv6 Multicast Address",
[RFC 3956](#), November 2004.

7.2 Informative References

- [CGMP] "Cisco Group Management Protocol",
<<http://www.javvin.com/protocolCGMP.html>>.
- [GARP] Tobagi, F., Molinero-Fernandez, P. and M. Karam, "Study of
IEEE 802.1p GARP/GMRP Timer Values", 1997.
- [I-D.bhattach-diot-pimso]
Bhattacharyya, S., Diot, C., Giuliano, L. and R. Rockell,
"Deployment of PIM-SO at Sprint (PIM-SO)", March 2000.
- [I-D.ietf-magma-snoop]

Christensen, M., Kimball, K. and F. Solensky,
"Considerations for IGMP and MLD Snooping Switches",
Internet-Draft [draft-ietf-magma-snoop-11](#), May 2004.

[I-D.ietf-mboned-iesg-gap-analysis]

Meyer, D. and B. Nickless, "Internet Multicast Gap
Analysis from the MBONED Working Group for the IESG",
Internet-Draft [draft-ietf-mboned-iesg-gap-analysis-00](#),
July 2002.

[I-D.ietf-pim-sm-bsr]

Fenner, B., "Bootstrap Router (BSR) Mechanism for PIM",
Internet-Draft [draft-ietf-pim-sm-bsr-04](#), July 2004.

[RFC3678] Thaler, D., Fenner, B. and B. Quinn, "Socket Interface
Extensions for Multicast Source Filters", [RFC 3678](#),
January 2004.

[SSMSNOOP]

"Operational Problems with IGMP snooping switches", March
2003, <<http://www.ietf.org/proceedings/03mar/148.htm>>.

Author's Address

Pekka Savola
CSC/FUNET
Espoo
Finland

Email: psavola@funet.fi

[Appendix A](#). SSM Deployment Issues

To be deployed, SSM requires changes to:

1. routers
2. IGMP/MLD-snooping Ethernet switches
3. hosts
4. application programming interfaces (APIs)
5. multicast usage models

Introducing SSM support in the routers has been straightforward as
PIM-SSM is a subset of PIM-SM [[I-D.ietf-pim-sm-v2-new](#)].

IGMP-snooping Ethernet switches have been a more difficult issue [[SSMSNOOP](#)]; some which perform IGMPv2 snooping discard IGMPv3 reports or queries, or multicast transmissions associated to them. If MLDv1 snooping had been implemented (or is implemented in a similar manner), this would likely have affected that as well.

Host systems require MLDv2 [[RFC3810](#)] support. The situation has improved with respect to MLDv2 support for end systems, and interoperability has increased after the publication of the RFC due to the stabilization of the ICMP types used.

The multicast source filtering API specification has also been completed [[RFC3678](#)]; its deployment is likely roughly equal (or slightly worse) than MLDv2. The API is required for creating (cross-platform) SSM applications.

The most difficult issue, multicast usage models, remains a problem as of this writing as described below. SSM is an excellent fit for one-to-many distribution topologies, and porting such applications to use SSM would likely be rather simple. However, a significant number of current applications are many-to-many (e.g., conferencing applications) which cannot be converted to SSM without significant effort, including, for example, out-of-band source discovery. For such applications to be usable for IPv6 at least in a short to medium term, ASM -like techniques seem to be required.

Intellectual Property Statement

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.

Disclaimer of Validity

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.

Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2005). 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.

Acknowledgment

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