

# The Pragmatic General Multicast (PGM)

Anshika Katiyar,

Student, Amity University(AIIT), Jaipur, Rajasthan

Submitted: 15-02-2022

Revised: 25-02-2022

Accepted: 28-02-2022

**ABSTRACT:** The Pragmatic General Multicast (PGM) transport protocol is a dependable multicast transport mechanism. It is suitable for applications that are multi-receiver file transfer because it can reliably transfer a sequence of packets to multiple receivers simultaneously. It provides best efforts over datagram services. It is aimed at applications that need sequential, delicacy-free multicast data delivery.

PGM uses a hybrid technique that includes suppression, NAK<sup>1</sup> elimination, constrained forwarding, and FEC to achieve scalability. PGM is capable of high-speed operations, supports Asymmetric Networks,<sup>2</sup> and achieves high network utilization.

Though PGM is not a standard yet, it is an IETF experimental protocol, but it is still used in lots of commercial and educational settings, like networking devices such as operating systems like windows.

Still PGM is not perfect, In addition to usual end to end authentication vulnerabilities, PGM have other security issues as well. This assignment provides basic information about the PGM, security issues with PGM and its vulnerabilities, later we will see some of the solutions for the same. In this assignment, we will also touch on the architecture of PGM. In which we will see about Source functions, receiver functions and network element functions of PGM.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The Pragmatic General Multicast (PGM) transport protocol is a dependable multicast transport mechanism. It is suitable for applications that are multi-receiver file transfer because it can reliably transfer a sequence of packets to multiple receivers simultaneously. It provides best efforts over datagram services. It is aimed at applications that need sequential, delicacy-free multicast data delivery. PGM is capable of high-speed operations, supports asymmetric networks, and

achieves high network utilization. It is better than the traditional end-to-end protocols that exploit Internet multicast.

It has Acknowledgement (ACK) and Negative acknowledgement (NAK)<sup>3</sup> both, as an attempt to overcome the scaling and protocol reliability problems due to lousy IP networks. PGM makes sure either receiver receives all the data packets or it detects unrecoverable lost data packets. The Pragmatic General Multicast (PGM) transport protocol is a dependable multicast transport mechanism.

## MULTICAST PROTOCOLS:

Networks employ multicast protocols to make receiving and relinquishing membership in multicast groups easier. Whenever there is one-to-many communications, then the word multicast is used. Multitasking is a technology that allows a single packet to be sent to many destinations. This is advantageous for bandwidth reduction, network parallelism, and transmitter cost reduction.

1. NAK: Negative acknowledgement, Sent by receiver to ask for repairs.
2. Asymmetric Network: A network has various routes for incoming and outgoing network traffic. As such traffic takes an alternate route when entering or leaving the network.
3. An Acknowledgment (ACK) or Negative Acknowledgment (NACK) is a short message sent by the recipient to the transmitter to show whether it has accurately or erroneously got a data packet, respectively.

Reliable multicast: the most well-known reliable transport protocol is TCP which makes sure sequential delivery of data packets. But it is used for unicast transmission, not multicast, for multicast, such protocol does not exist yet.

By reliable we can say a protocol that is capable of:

- Loss recovery
- No duplication
- Ordered delivery
- Isolation of independent failures

Reliable multicast is getting more important every day as we need it in many applications nowadays like media conferencing. Because of the demand for

multicast communication, many reliable multicast protocols have been made but although several protocols have been created, none of them are as reliable as TCP for unicast transmission.

Many protocols attempted to emulate TCP, in which the receiver provides an acknowledgement after receiving the data packet, with transmitting continued in the same manner as TCP, based on the results of the slowest receiver.

The problem with this type of approach is that it can cause the message "implosion".

A protocol reliability can be sender-initiated or receiver-initiated which means either sender or receiver will be responsible for the detection of lost data packets (if any).

**Receiver-initiated reliability protocol:** It requires receivers to detect if there is any loss of packets. The receiver generates a negative acknowledgement (NAK) in case of loss of the packet. The packet can be retransmitted in response. There is always a chance of NAK implosion if many receivers lose data packets.

There are many ways to deal with implosion like suppression mechanism, to minimize the number of duplicate NAK's.

**Advantages:** more scalable, no ACK.

**Disadvantages:** complex, NAK implosion, unlimited buffering.

**Sender-Initiated reliability protocol:** It requires the sender to detect any packet loss that may occur. A positive acknowledgement is sent by the receiver on receiving the packet, if acknowledgement is not received the packet is considered lost and the packet may get retransmitted.

**Advantages:** simple and limited buffering. **Disadvantage:** ACK implosion, scalability. There are many other reliable multicast protocols like SRM, RMTP, MTP-2, RAMP, TMTP, Log-based,

**RMP.** Multicast protocols essentially are divided into 2 classes:

- Data reliability and ordering, as well as causation, in multicast protocols.
- Data-reliable multicast protocols without ordering or causation.

Protocols can also be different in terms of the logical structure of communication pathways, do they use ACK/NAK or both, their design, receiver/sender reliability, etc. Several schemes

were used to make multicast protocols more reliable like improving scalability via hierarchy or trying NAK suppression.<sup>4</sup>

A strategy for Negative acknowledgment (NAK) Suppression, the technique involving the means of: verifying that a NAK should be transmitted; deciding whether data or other channel information that presents should be transmitted over a channel; and transmitting the NAK

#### **PGM PROTOCOL DESCRIPTION:**

PGM is a dependable multicast transport protocol, as previously stated. PGM was created with simplicity in mind, and it achieves scalability with a hybrid method that incorporates suppression, NAK removal, limited forwarding, and FEC. Hierarchy is constructed using PGM-capable Network Elements.

PGM was designed to be compatible with non-PGM-based NE's as well though with less efficiency when the number of PGM-based NEs is low, the PGM tree's fan-out increases, making suppression and FEC more important in providing some scalability.

PGM is compatible with networks that only offer multicast from sender to receiver since it works OK with receivers that don't support multicast. It also makes optimal use of asymmetric networks by utilizing backchannel and width, as asymmetric networks feature high capacity sender-to-receiver channels while having confined backchannels, i.e. from receiver to sender.

An example of application that use PGM can be disk imaging, it does not wait for sluggish receivers to collect the missing data later using typical client-server techniques in this application; instead, it just continues with the new data.

#### **PGM FUNCTIONALITY:**

- Source Path Establishment<sup>5</sup>
- NAK Suppression (refer to footnote 3)
- NAK Elimination<sup>6</sup>
- NAK Anticipation<sup>7</sup>
- Basic Data Transfer
- Restraint Constraint<sup>8</sup>

assuming data and other channel data shouldn't be transmitted over the channel, in any case buffering the NAK. The method of claim further containing the means of: deciding whether a predetermined number of NAKs have been buffered; and sending the NAKs of the predetermined number.

4. Interleaved with ODATA, sources intermittently multicast Source Path Messages (SPM: Sent by sources: used to establish up turn around way from receivers to sources.) to set up source path state for a given TSI in all

PGM network elements and receivers on the distribution tree from the source. SPMs are propagated PGM-hop by PGM-hop from the source along the distribution tree for the TSI.

5. PGM network elements make Retransmit State for each NAK they get. The Retransmit State is related with the interface on which the NAK is sent. It records the TSI and SQN of the NAK alongside a list of the interfaces on which any occurrence of the NAK was gotten. Once the retransmit state exists for a given TSI/SQN, the PGM network elements affirm but don't forward further occurrences of that NAK.
6. In expectation of response to and taking out copies of the NAK that might show up from downstream network elements build up a repair state without outgoing interfaces when hears an upstream NCF (NCF: Sent by network elements to NAKers).
7. When a NAK is received, the source multicasts the mentioned retransmission (RDATA: Data parcels detest from a source in answer to a NAK.). The PGM network elements forward the
  - Loss and Detection Recovery<sup>9</sup>
  - Local Repair<sup>10</sup>
  - Transmit Window Advancement<sup>11</sup>
  - Options

RDATA provided that they have the relating Retransmit State and just on those interfaces in the comparing interface list. Simultaneously, the PGM network elements dispose of the current Retransmit State.

Upon receipt of a NAK, a source multicasts the mentioned retransmission (RDATA). The RDATA packets have the very same format as ODATA packets, but they contrast in the type field. Therefore, retransmissions only propagate across the network segments, which arrive at receiver that lost the relating transmission.

8. A DLR is a committed host function configured to go about as a re-transmitter for chosen packets in which it should likewise go about as a receiver. In response of the NCFs that it gets for these chosen groups, it multicasts a repeat of that NCF with a choice giving its own NLA.
9. Any receiver that gets a NCF for which it has the corresponding RDATA may multicast that RDATA (following a random back-off), in this manner bringing about a lessening in retransmit latency underneath the point of local recovery.

10. Sources may advance the trailing edge of the window discretionarily. Executions might uphold automatic adjustments like keeping the window at a fixed size in bytes or packets, or fixed real time duration. Furthermore they may optionally postpone window advancements in absence of NAKs.

## II. ARCHITECTURE:

Because PGM is an end-to-end transport protocol, it specifies both sender and receiver packet formats and procedures. To increase the dependability of NAKs and the transmission of repairs, it also specifies packet formats and procedures for network elements.

This section explains how these functions are divided: SOURCE FUNCTIONS:

### Data Transmission:

- ODATA packets<sup>12</sup> gets multicast by the source with a specific transmission rate.

### Source Path State:

- SPM<sup>13</sup>s (Source path messages) are used to create a source path state, SPMs are transmitted with ODATA to establish SPS (source path state).

### NAK Reliability:

- Source sends an NCF<sup>14</sup> on receiving packets, so if it is easier to detect if any packet is lost.

### Repairs:

- RDATA<sup>15</sup> are retransmitted by the source when they receive NAK for data sent with the transmit window.

### Transmit Window Advance:

- Sources might propel the following edge of the window as per one of various methodologies. Automatic changes, such as keeping the window at a particular size in bytes, a specific number of packets, or a defined real-time length, may be maintained by executions. Furthermore, they MAY defer window advances for a period of time if NAK-silence is detected.

### RECEIVER FUNCTIONS:

#### Source Path State:

- When receivers need to ascertain the PGM network's last hop, they employ SPMs for each TSI to which they direct their NAKs.

#### Data Reception

- Duplicates need to be eliminated, so receivers use ODATA and find if there are any duplicates.

11. ODATA: This packet is sent by the server/source on multicast address.
12. SPM: Sent by sources: used to establish reverse path from receivers to sources.
13. NCF: Sent by network elements to NAKers.
14. RDATA: Data packets resent from a source in reply to a NAK.

#### Repairs:

- If a data packet is lost, the receiver must continuously send NAKs until a matching NCF is received. The receiver unicasts NAKs to the final hop PGM network for data packets that were missing from this sequence (receiver can also multicast NAKs with a TTL of 1 to the local group).

#### NAK Suppression:

- During the back-off interval receivers suppress the NAK for which matching NAK/ NCF is already received to avoid duplication.

#### Receive Window Advance:

- If a PGM data packet/SPM is received within the transmit window and it moves to the receive window, the receiver advances their receive window instantly.

#### NETWORK ELEMENT FUNCTIONS:

##### Source Path State:

- Before multicasting SPMs in the usual way network elements intercept SPMs and for each corresponding TSI use them to establish the source path state.

##### NAK Reliability:

- For each NAK received network element send a NCF in response. A repair state is produced for each NAK received by network components, which records the transport session identification and the NAK's sequence number.

##### Constraint NAK Forwarding:

- Only the first copy of any NAK is repeatedly unicast forward by the network elements for a NAK they receive until a NCF is received in response upstream. PGM network node on the distribution channel for the TSI with a TTL of 1, it may also multicast this NAK upstream.

##### NAK Elimination:

- All the duplicate NAKs are eliminated by the network element for which they already have a repair state, and then it responds with a corresponding NCF.

##### Constrained RDATA Forwarding:

- RDATA is sent to interfaces where upon the component receiving NAK was received, network elements use NA

K to keep up with the repair state comprising of these interfaces.

#### NAK Anticipation:

- As soon as it hears an upstream NCF, it enters a repair mode without outgoing interfaces in preparation of reacting to and deleting duplicates of the NAK that may arrive from downstream network elements.

### **III. SECURITY AND VULNERABILITIES WITH PGM:**

PGM is still an experimental protocol and has many issues with security as well as general, in this section we will see problems with PGM, as well as security issues faced by it.

- Network element memory requirements: If a NE is used in many PGM sessions, it may not have enough memory to hold all of the outstanding NAKs from all of the sessions. As a result, there are concerns with memory requirements.
- If the host system can't send raw IP packets at the same rate, a PGM implementation can't send at high rates. This necessitates the use of appropriate NICs, network buffer settings, and kernel settings. Additionally, enough RAM to retain the whole transmission window may be required to assure high-speed functioning.
- Even at dialup data rates, network use for PGM is quite high, and even when SPMs are increased to 5 per second, network utilization remains above 90%.
- SECURITY ISSUES: PGM is subject to a variety of security concerns, which are particular to the technique it utilizes to generate repair state, build source path state, recognize DLRs, forward NAKs, and disseminate repairs.
- Because network components switch as well as decrypt SPMs, NAKs, NCFs, and RDATA, all of which may be honestly communicated by PGM sources, receivers, and DLRs, these methods expose PGM network components to security threats. Short of full validation of every single receiver, adjoining source, network components, and DLRs, the protocol isn't impenetrable to mishandle. Even without addressing PGM, the elements related with DLRs, receivers, and sources alone provide enough security threats. These dangers include DOS due to CPU and memory exhaustion, as well as the loss of (repair) data communication due to the

obfuscation of repair status.

- False RDATA might cause PGM network element to destroy genuine repair state, resulting in the loss of actual RDATA in the end.
- False NAKs may cause PGM network elements to enter a deceptive repair state that will end only when the timer expires, causing memory depletion in the meanwhile.
- False SPMs might cause PGM network component to misdirect NAKs intended for the genuine source, resulting in the required RDATA not arriving.
- False NCFs may cause PGM network element to prematurely cease NAK transmitting, resulting in the loss of RDATA.

#### IV. SOME POSSIBLE EXISTING SOLUTIONS:

PGM is not perfect and still faces security and other issues which remain for future work but we still have some solutions available that can be used:

- Extending NAK shedding techniques to manage both the volume and the pace of confirmed NAKs. Regardless, these techniques aid network components in surviving NAK assaults at the expense of service availability. Network components might use the information on TSIs and their associated transmit windows acquired from SPMs to regulate the spread of repair state even more effectively.
- Issues with backchannel traffic can be handled using FEC. FEC also helps in reducing the probability of losing data packets.
- FEC can help in network utilization as well, without FEC every packet will be needed to be sent twice.
- In SPMs, jitter dampening of the network-header source address or path NLA value. While the network header source address is likely to change seldom, changes in fundamental multicast routing information are expected to cause NLA's route to change on a regular basis.
- To prevent buffer invasion at the receiver, the receiver application should be aware of the handling load necessary to read PGM packets from the network and give PGM a higher priority than other application-level tasks.
- Furthermore, operating system socket buffers must usually be enlarged to meet the capacities that PGM traffic from a well-tuned sender may reach.
- A three-way handshake between network elements and DL

scan aid network elements in determining if a claimed DLR is PGM familiar and can be identified by the supposed network header source address.

#### V. CONCLUSION:

PGM is a material with a wide range of applications. It has a phased deployment method, with suppression in the absence of router support and FEC managing a limited scaling load. As scalability requirements grow, PGM routers can be given to add further scalability through hierarchy. The best scalability and performance may be attained when all routers activate PGM. PGM utilizes a polling-based NAK delay tuning approach. This method works for both scaling up and down.

We also noticed that because to the utilization of FEC, NAK records, and unicast NAKs, PGM has a lot of asymmetric aid. We've also demonstrated how PGM achieves high organization use despite sluggish (dialup) connections. PGM has proved that it can operate at high speeds (>100 Mbps). PGM is a new experimental RFC that has been tested in both commercial and academic settings. Customer/server executions from Talarian (Smart PGM) and Microsoft are provided (Windows XP). PGM is now available on Cisco routers. Luigi Rizzo has given a public source execution of PGM.

PGM isn't perfect, and it still has security flaws that must be resolved in the future, but there are a few assurances that stand out, such as the ability to dampen changes in the sender address and PGM parent in SPMs (the sender address should just change rarely and the PGM parents should just change once in a while, as the underlying multicast routing changes). NEs can defend themselves from sessions that create an excessive quantity of NAKs by leaving the session. A three-way handshake between NEs and DLRs would allow a NE to more confidently verify whether a claimed DLR is PGM familiar and can be identified by the supposed network header source address.

#### VI. RELATED WORKS:

Numerous other solid multicast analysts have explored the utilization of ordered progression, for instance:

- Rizzo is responsible for the default erasure codes in PGM. Metzner was the first to suggest combining FEC and dependability.
- Suppression was pioneered by Ramakrishnan and Jain, and the SRM protocol pushed for reliable multicast.
- Papadopoulos and Laliotis investigated the gradual deployment of LMS (a protocol that

- shares many characteristics with PGM) and found that even partial deployment increased scalability across routers. They believe that PGM would see similar alterations.
- Bolot et al. proposed polling for feedback in a multicast session.
  - Rizzo also has presented a PGM-friendly TCP-friendly congestion management system. PGM NEs are not required to be modified.
  - Ker mode's simulations indicate how combining FEC, suppression, and hierarchy can be beneficial.
  - Generic Router Assist (GRA) is a protocol that generalises several of the concepts in PGM such that they aren't protocol specific. As with PGM, a tree of GRA-capable NEs is constructed as a subset of the IP multicast tree. GRA header fields that relate to "filters" are defined. Predetermined actions are taken when the header of a packet fits a filter definition. GRA filters, for example, might be used in PGM to handle parity NAKs and parity retransmissions.
  - PGM uses NAK lists and FEC with suppression, which is identical to Nonnenmacher et al.

#### REFERENCES:

- [1]. MARIA PSALTAKI, RODRIGO ARAUJO, GHADAH ALDABBAGH, PANAGIOTISKOUNIAKIS, ANDREAS GIANNOPOULOS, "Pragmatic General Multicast", University college London.
- [2]. Jim Gemmell, Todd Montgomery, Tony Speakman, Nidhi Bhaskar, Jon Crowcroft, "The PGM Reliable Multicast Protocol", University of Cambridge.
- [3]. McClellan Consulting, "Pragmatic General Multicast".
- [4]. Dr. Jean-Claude Franchitti: "Main Theme IP Multicast", New York University [https://cs.nyu.edu/~jcf/classes/g22.2.262-001\\_sp10/slides/session10/IPMulticast.pdf](https://cs.nyu.edu/~jcf/classes/g22.2.262-001_sp10/slides/session10/IPMulticast.pdf)
- [5]. J. Crowcroft, J. Gemmell, D. Farinacci, S. Lin, D. Leshchiner, M. Luby, T. Montgomery, L. Rizzo, A. Tweedly, N. Bhaskar, R. Edmonstone, R. Sumanasekera, L. Vicisano, "PGM Reliable transport protocol specification".
- [6]. N. Edmonstone, R. Sumanasekera, Speakman, T., Crowcroft, J., Gemmell, J., Rizzo, L., Tweedly, Farinacci, D., Lin, S., Leshchiner, D., Luby, M., Montgomery, T., A. Bhaskar, R. Vicisano, L., PGM Reliable Transport Protocol Specification, RFC3208
- [7]. L. Rizzo, "pgmcc: A TCP-friendly Single-Rate Multicast Congestion Control Scheme", Proc. of ACM SIGCOMM.
- [8]. C. Papadopoulos, "RAIMS: an Architecture for Router-Assisted Internet Multicast Services." Zurich.
- [9]. J. Chesterfield, A. Diana, A. Greenhalgh, M. Lad, and M. Lim, "ABSD Router Implementation of PGM"
- [10]. A. Giannopoulos, R. Araujo, G. Aldabbagh, P. Kouniak, and M. Psaltaki, "Pragmatic General Multicast (PGM) host implementation for FreeBSD."
- [11]. <http://web.jet.es/sola/inet98.html>. "Scalability of Internet Multicast Protocols".
- [12]. <http://www.mcclellanconsulting.com/whitepapers/pgm.html>.