

# MCQUIC - A Multicast Extension for QUIC

Max Franke<sup>1</sup>, Jake Holland<sup>2</sup>, and Stefan Schmid<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>TU Berlin

<sup>2</sup>Akamai

<sup>3</sup>TU Berlin & Fraunhofer SIT

## Abstract

Mass live content, such as world cups, the Superbowl or the Olympics, attract audiences of hundreds of millions of viewers. While such events were predominantly consumed on TV, more and more viewers follow big events on the Internet, which poses a scalability challenge: current unicast delivery over the web comes with large overheads and is inefficient. An attractive alternative are multicast-based transmissions, however, current solutions have several drawbacks, mostly related to security and privacy, which prevent them from being implemented in browsers.

In this paper we introduce a multicast extension to QUIC, a widely popular transport protocol standardized by the IETF, that solves several of these problems. It enables multicast delivery by offering encryption as well as integrity verification of packets distributed over multicast and automatic unicast fallback, which solves one of multicasts major obstacles to large scale deployment. It is transparent to applications and can be easily utilized by simply enabling an option in QUIC. This extension is solely focused on the transport layer and uses already existing multicast mechanisms on the network layer.

## 1 Introduction

A big part of today's network traffic is caused by multiple users simultaneously accessing the same content. In these scenarios, the predominant method of delivery over unicast can be highly inefficient. Using multicast delivery instead would reduce load on many parts of the network infrastructure, especially content delivery servers and ISP networks, by removing the need to send the

same exact packet multiple times to different receivers.

Two concrete examples for cases where unicast delivery is reaching its limit are live streaming and game downloads. As of May 2023, the highest traffic peak that Akamai, one of the worldwide largest CDN providers, recorded across its network was 250 terabit per second [Tec22]. A 4k livestream has a bitrate of around 40 Mbps [Cli21]. This means that 6.25 million concurrent viewers are enough to fully utilize Akamai's available capacity. This is less than 2% of the average viewership of e.g. the EURO finals [UEF20]. This is not even considering an increase in bitrate due to HDR or 8k. Similarly, new game releases can cause huge bursts of traffic. One such release is GTA V, as the fastest selling game of all time it sold over 11 million copies on the first day [Mak13]. With a file size close to a 100GB [Bhu20], it would take all of Akamai's capacity almost 10 hours to handle the downloads on its launch day. Since its release, file size has also continuously grown, now reaching up to 231GB for certain games [Aku21]. Both of these cases illustrate that already today unicast delivery is becoming unsustainable, while traffic demand is certain to further increase. This might soon lead to an inflection point where increases in link capacities can no longer keep up with demand. Utilizing multicast for delivery of the described types of content would offer a solution for the mentioned scalability problems.

While multicast is widely used for intra-domain use cases, such as mDNS [CK13], its inter-domain applications are very limited. Even though there exists a multicast backbone, called the MBONE, it is mostly comprised of educational networks such as Internet2 and GÉANT, while carrier and ISP networks usually disable generic native inter-domain multicast. This was and is largely due to a lack of legitimate applications that use multicast, a lack of privacy and security [HT00, Kru98, CGI+99] when compared to unicast, and the large amounts of overhead required to create and main-

---

This work has been supported by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research of Germany in the programme of "Souveraen. Digital. Vernetzt." Joint project 6G-RIC, project identification number (PIN): FKZ 16KISK030

tain any-source multicast (ASM) trees [DLL<sup>+</sup>00].

Two recent developments have eased these issues. For one, ASM has been officially deprecated [ACGE20] for inter-domain use cases, removing much of the complexity related to finding multicast sources. On the other hand, the traditional protocols used to maintain multicast trees, most notably PIM [FHH<sup>+</sup>16], are being replaced by BIER [WRD<sup>+</sup>17] which provides a way to route multicast packets without the need to maintain multicast trees and thus state on each router. Furthermore, automatic multicast tunneling (AMT) [Bum15] provides a way to bridge networks that do not support native multicast. As such, the time might have come to make another attempt to deploy multicast delivery to the web.

One of the critical pieces that are now missing is a way to enable multicast reception on end user devices. Most current multicast transport protocols, such as NORM or FLUTE, focus on reliable file transfers and are thus not suitable for transmission of live content. Furthermore, since most users use browsers for web content, finding a way to receive multicast packets in them would be advantageous. However, browsers rightfully place very high bars when it comes to user privacy and security. As such, using bare, native multicast would not be feasible for a variety of reasons, which we will further explain in Section 3.

To bridge this gap, this paper introduces an extension to the QUIC transport protocol [IT21], which has recently been specified and is implemented in most of the popular browsers. It provides many advantages compared to TCP, such as built-in encryption through TLS, the prevention of head of line blocking by the option to use multiple streams in parallel or support for mobility by having the option to keep a connection alive even when a client migrates networks and changes its IP address. Some of the mechanisms used by MCQUIC are reused from the Multipath Extension for QUIC that is also currently in the process of being standardized.[LMC<sup>+</sup>23] It should be noted that the extension uses already existing mechanisms and technologies to realize multicast on the network layer and is exclusively focused on the transport layer.

## 1.1 Our contributions

Utilizing QUIC’s features, in particular built in packet protection and multiple streams, we introduce MCQUIC, an extension to QUIC that combines both unicast and multicast to act as a new way to enable multicast reception support in browsers, which due to a lack of UDP support in them has so far not been possible.

Our extension allows clients to use encrypted multicast that is protected against injection of packets by third parties. This provides the option to trust packets received via multicast on public networks. It can be enabled with minimal changes to application layer implementations and offers automatic fallback to unicast QUIC in case the network does not support multicast.

The challenges we will specifically address are:

- Prevention of injection of packets by third parties
- Guaranteeing security and privacy under the Internet threat model
- Guaranteeing compatibility with networks that don’t support multicast by enabling automatic unicast fallback

## 1.2 Organization

We will first give a motivating example and basic design overview over our extension in Section 2. Following this in Section 3, we will explain in more detail how it solves the issues and challenges associated with traditional multicast. In Section 4 we will then take a closer look at MCQUIC, including some of the new frames it introduces and the design decisions behind them. We will list more use cases in Section 5 and provide some related work in section 6. Finally, Section 7 will conclude our work. MCQUIC is still in ongoing development, the most up-to-date version of its specification can be found on GitHub<sup>1</sup>.

# 2 Motivation and design overview

In this section we will give an example to motivate why MCQUIC is a useful addition to QUIC before giving some high level information on its design principles.

## 2.1 Motivating example

One of the main potential use cases for MCQUIC is the streaming of live media in browsers. As mentioned before, more and more people shift their content consumption from traditional (cable) TV to live streaming. As such, the number of people that are going to watch live sports digitally in the US alone is expected to increase from 57.5 million in 2021 to over 90 million by 2025 [Ver21]. This often either occurs in browsers directly or in browser

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/GrumpyOldTroll/draft-jholland-quic-multicast>

based apps on smart TVs or devices like Chromecast or AppleTV. As such, it was a core design requirement for our extension to be able to be used in browsers. This is also one of the reasons that we choose QUIC as a starting point since it is, as mentioned, available in all major distributions such as Chromium (and thus Chromium based browsers like Chrome or Edge), Firefox and Safari. Importantly, most browsers for security and privacy reasons do not offer a UDP API which means that using traditional, UDP based, multicast was not an option. Additionally, using the HTTP-based request response semantics that are common today are not efficient for multicast. In these, each video segment has to be specifically requested by the client. This would cause a great amount of unnecessary load when used with multicast delivery as those requests have to be sent over unicast and handled separately for each client. Unfortunately, server push has been recently deprecated from Chromium and gQUIC and is thus no longer an option. Instead, we envision using WebTransport, the successor to WebSockets. It allows servers to push data to browsers without it first having to be requested by the client.

Figure 1 shows a simple deployment using MCQUIC. Big data packets, such as video segments, are carried over the red multicast channel, which means the server only has to send them once and they are only transmitted once on each network segment, while the other three colors represent unicast QUIC connections used for control and integrity. This includes the client sending Acknowledgements for each packet received via multicast. As these are comparatively small amounts of data, compared to the actual content that gets carried on multicast, the overhead incurred on the server and network is much lower than sending everything over unicast. Additionally, the unicast connections could be used to transmit data that is client specific, such as subtitles for different languages or other auxiliary information. To make sure this data does not head of line block any video frames, it uses a different stream ID within QUIC. The unicast connection is also used to verify the integrity of all packets sent over multicast, guaranteeing to the client that they come from the intended source. Should any of the clients lose multicast connectivity e.g. due to a network change, the server will notice this by a lack of reception of Acknowledgements. As a result, the server might decide to deliver the data packets over unicast instead of multicast to this specific client. This guarantees that clients are able to receive all data, even in cases where no native multicast reception is available. This mechanic is some

what comparable to AMT in that it also makes multicast available in networks that don't support native reception.




Figure 1: Schematic overview of a server and three clients using multicast QUIC. The red connection represents multicast, used to carry big data packets such as video frames, while the connections in the other 3 colors represent unicast connections, used only for control.

## 2.2 Design overview

MCQUIC has two main components:

- A regular unicast QUIC connection
- One or more multicast QUIC channels

The QUIC connection gets established like it usually does. It goes through the TLS handshake and cert chain to authenticate the server to the client and exchange the keying material required to encrypt the connection from there on out. The exact handshake process, as many other parts of QUIC, are beyond the scope of this document and can be looked up in RFC 9000 [IT21] and 9001 [TT21] respectively. During the handshake, server and client also exchange transport parameters that are used to specify capabilities and limits of each peer. These include a list of available cipher suites, the max idle timeout, the max ack delay etc.

MCQUIC introduces two new transport parameters, one server and one client specific. These are used to negotiate support for multicast. The

client will also use the parameter to communicate its own requirements and limitations related to multicast to the server.

The main design addition that MCQUIC brings is that, along with the normal unicast QUIC connection, clients can join one or more multicast QUIC channels. These are unidirectional data streams from server to client that carry data that is relevant for several clients at the same time. A server can instruct a client to join a specific channel that carries content that is desirable for the client to receive. Whether or not a channel gets joined is up to the client, it may refuse the joining of a channel for any reason, e.g. if it deems that doing so would violate its own bandwidth limits. If a client does decide to join a channel, it will indicate this to the server by sending a relevant frame over the unicast connection.

For clients to then receive multicast packets, they have to join an IP multicast group. There are two major flavors of multicast, the before mentioned and now deprecated ASM, and source-specific multicast (SSM), which is the only type supported by our extension. This decision was made as ASM requires different semantics and additional complexity when compared to SSM. As the main intended use case for MCQUIC lies in inter-domain applications, it was deemed that the additional design considerations required were not worth the effort at this time. The mechanisms for joining a group rely on the MLD [CV04] and IGMP [CDF+02] protocols. Any packets sent over multicast are encrypted and a hash for each packet gets securely transferred to allow the client to verify that it has indeed been sent by the original source and not injected by a third party. The verification of the packets requires the calculation of the hash by the receiver, the overhead incurred by this depends on which hash function is used. After verifying the integrity of a packet received over multicast, the client will handle it like it would handle a regular unicast packet. As such, to the application layer, it is transparent whether or not a packet was received over multicast or unicast.

This completes the brief overview of the extension. Before going into more detail on its specification, in the next section we will first give an overview of the how these mechanisms solve the issues with traditional multicast mentioned in the introduction.

## 3 Challenges solved

As mentioned previously, the main issues traditional multicast deployments face are related to security, privacy and a lack of support for native

multicast in many networks. In this section we will give a more detailed explanation on these issues and how our approach solves them.

### 3.1 Security and privacy

MCQUIC allows decryption keys to be distributed over the unicast connection. This allows packets sent over multicast to be protected by the same AEAD mechanism as regular unicast QUIC packets. As such, third parties are not able to gain any information (apart from fingerprinting) on what content is being carried on a particular multicast channel. However, as the same keying material is used by all receivers, an attacker could potentially gain access to the content if it can get a hold of the keys from any of the legitimately subscribed receivers. This is one of the reasons why it is important to regularly update the keying material through MC\_KEY frames. It is up to the server to make sure only legitimate clients are sent MC\_KEY frames. By utilizing the same encryption mechanisms that are used by other QUIC implementations, we can also make use of any already existing hardware offloading capabilities for cryptographic functions.

### 3.2 Prevention of packet injection

As multicast senders usually have no knowledge of number, much less identity, of receivers and there is no secured two way communication between them, there is no way for receivers to verify that a packet that arrived on a multicast channel has indeed been sent by the intended sender and not by a third party spoofing its IP address.

In multicast QUIC, we use identity frames that are anchored to a secure unicast QUIC connection, which required the sender to authenticate itself through the usual TLS cert chain procedure. The integrity frames use standard cryptographic hashes that are resistant against collision attacks. As such, receivers are able to verify each packet received over multicast against its corresponding hash. If they match it can be assured that the packet was sent by the intended sender and not injected by a third party.

### 3.3 Fallback to unicast

Currently, most networks do not support generic native multicast. As such, apps that want to utilize multicast always have to worry about implementing a fallback mechanism on the application layer. With MCQUIC, applications only have to indicate if they wish to enable support for multicast. From there, the QUIC implementation takes

care of the rest. If multicast is not supported by the clients network, it can automatically fallback to unicast and act like a regular QUIC connection. This fallback is, depending on the QUIC implementation, transparent to the application as it will always only see delivered data packets.

## 4 Detailed design

In this section we will give more details on some of the mechanics and design decisions of MCQUIC. We will first discuss some of the general QUIC mechanisms and how we adapt or change them to enable our extension before taking a look at some of the new frames we introduce.

### 4.1 Client limits

During connection establishment, both client and server can include an additional multicast transport parameter that indicates to the peer that multicast is supported. The clients parameter includes additional details, such as a list of supported hash and encryption algorithms and whether or not IPv4, IPv6, or both are supported for multicast reception. These parameters can be later updated by the client by sending an MC\_LIMITS frame to the server that contains the same parameters.

There are several reasons as to why we need separate transport parameters instead of using the ones already negotiated for unicast QUIC. Even though there might be support for both IPv4 and IPv6 via unicast, the client might be aware that due to a lack of MLD support, only IPv4 multicast is supported. In this case, disallowing IPv6 multicast from the get go saves time when the server would otherwise instruct the client to join an IPv6 multicast channel only to find out no reception is possible.

The list of hash and encryption algorithms might also differ from unicast QUIC as it can be assumed that only less sensitive data will be carried over multicast. This means that there might be an option or desire to use weaker algorithms, such as SHA-1, to reduce the size of the checksums carried in integrity frames. While it is true that SHA-1 is no longer considered to be entirely collision resistant [LP20], it might be a worthwhile trade off to still use it in certain cases where it is highly unlikely that an attacker can create a collision in time or where a collision would not pertain to any critical or sensitive data. In either case, it is always recommended to use collision resistant algorithms to prevent any such risks from occurring at all.

Also included in the client side transport parameter are the limits the client places on all multicast channels combined. These include the maximum number of announced or simultaneously joined channels, but most importantly the maximum aggregated rate across all channels. As the data carried over multicast is often of a steady and pre-determined rate, e.g. in video streams the bitrate is known beforehand, the server can reliably take restrictions of clients into consideration when assigning which channels to join. It might determine that the maximum allowed rate is not high enough to receive a 4K stream, which gets carried on one channel, so instead instructs the client to join a different channel that carries the stream in HD. More sophisticated models could make use of layered video [HHWH15] or similar to provide each client with an optimal utilization of its available bandwidth.

### 4.2 Multicast channels

In QUIC, clients and servers assign (multiple) connection IDs to each connection. These are included in each sent packet. This mechanic is used to enable mobility by making a connection identifiable even if the 5-tuple changes. For example, any packet sent from server to client contains a client selected ID so the client can associate it with a connection. In multicast QUIC channels, we use the connection ID field in packets and replace it with a channel ID that has the same format. This allows clients to associate each packet with a multicast channel, instead of a connection. Connection and channel IDs share the same space. For clients to learn that an ID is a channel ID and not a connection ID, the server sends channel announce frames that contain, among other parameters, channel IDs of available multicast channels.

These channels are abstractions that represent a source specific multicast channel along with additional parameters such as the AEAD algorithm used for header and packet protection. The secret for the header algorithm is also included and remains static during the lifetime of a channel while the secret for packet protection is sent separately in a KEY frame. Channels exist independent of any single unicast connection and may be joined by many clients. Their lifetime can range from a few seconds to days or even weeks. Channels share the stream ID space with each other and the unicast connection. This allows for the retransmission of lost packets over a different channel or unicast. Contrarily, each channel has its own packet number space to reduce the coordination required between channels. In addition to the ANNOUNCE and KEY frames, the server will

also send INTEGRITY frames that include hashes for each packet sent over the multicast channel. These are used to authenticate packets and as the hash algorithms used are secure against collision attacks, this mechanism protects against the injection of packets into the multicast channel by third parties.

A server will then at some point send a JOIN frame that will indicate to the client that it is should now join the specified channel. If it decides to do so, it will achieve this by e.g. sending an IGMP or MLD report which triggers the joining of the SSM channel. If the network supports multicast and packets start to arrive, the client will send a STATE frame to the server indicating this. As the entire multicast process is server driven, the server might decide that if a specific timeout passes without receiving a STATE frame, that the clients network does not support multicast. In that case, it can fall back to unicast and send the data packets over the regular QUIC connection [GD22].

Any packets arriving on a multicast channel get acknowledged by the client over the unicast connection. This is necessary as the channels are strictly unidirectional from server to client. This also means that only specific frames, such as STREAM or DATAGRAM frames, can be sent on them. To reduce load and improve scalability, acknowledgements can be bundled and don't need to happen immediately. Lost packets may be retransmitted. This can occur over both unicast or multicast, depending on what the server deems more efficient.

### 4.3 Congestion and flow control

As there is no regular congestion or flow control mechanism on channels, the client specifies a maximum allowed aggregated rate across all channels. Depending on this rate, the server decides on which channels are suitable for the client to join to make sure that all joined channels combined stay under the clients limits. Each channel ANNOUNCE frame also includes the maximum rate of data that is expected to be sent on that channel. If the client thinks that joining a channel would violate its limits, it can refuse the join. A client can also update its allowed maximum aggregated rate, along with other parameters, during the lifetime of a connection by sending a LIMITS frame. Both server or client may decide that the client should leave a joined channel for a variety of reasons. These include, but are not limited to, high persistent loss on the channel, the end of the channels lifetime, or excessive amounts of spurious traffic (that may be injected by an attacker).

#### 4.3.1 Flow control

The usual mechanisms used for flow control in QUIC are too strict for use in multicast channels without modification. The multicast extension gives the client a new responsibility to be able to robustly handle multicast packets that would exceed its MAX\_DATA without aborting the connection, either by increasing its MAX\_DATA as needed to keep up with received multicast packets or by dropping the packet and leaving the channel (resulting in unicast fallback), for clients that cannot do so. As there are potentially many clients joined on a single channel, the server can not adjust its sending of data by limits imposed by any individual one. Additionally, the new transport parameter is used by clients to set their limits and change them by sending new Limit frames. The server has to make sure that the client stays within those limits by having it either join or leave channels appropriately.

#### 4.3.2 Congestion control

The server is aware of any multicast packet loss experienced by the client in the form of missing MC\_ACK frames. The server should make sure that clients leave channels that experience heavy sustained loss. If several clients that are subscribed to the same channels experience loss of the same packets, this might indicate an underlying issue further upstream. Contrarily, if a client experiences loss on several channels at once it might indicate an issue on its own end. As such, it should react by lowering its max rate parameter.

### 4.4 New frames

Our extension introduces a total of 9 new frames. Some of these behave similar to already existing frames, such as the MC\_ACK frame that has the same structure as a regular ACK frame with an added field for the channel ID to identify for which channel a packet gets acknowledged. We will now give explanations for the need of some of the new frames.

#### 4.4.1 MC\_ANNOUNCE

As previously mentioned, servers use Announce frames to send clients information that are required to later join multicast channels. Servers should send these frames for any channel the client could potentially be asked to join in the future. The reason for this is that the IDs used for channels share their space with the connection IDs used by the client. As such there is a potential for a collision that should be cleared up by the client before

it is asked to join the channel by the server. Another advantage of decoupling the announce from the join is that it allows for less overhead in cases when a client has to temporarily leave a channel, i.e. because it suffered a degradation of connection quality.

#### 4.4.2 MC\_JOIN, LEAVE, RETIRE and STATE

These 4 frames are used to handle state changes for announced channels. Join, leave and retire are sent by the server to instruct the client to switch the server into the specified state, retire indicating that the client should drop any stored state associated with that channel. State frames are sent by the client to the server to indicate that the state change was successful. Figure 2 shows the transition diagram for a QUIC channel from a clients point of view.




Figure 2: Transition state diagram for a channel from a client’s perspective.

#### 4.4.3 MC\_INTEGRITY

integrity frames are essentially a list of hashes for packets that are received via multicast. Each frame also includes the packet number for the packet the hash list starts from. The first integrity frame can act as the root of a Merkle tree. As such, it has to be transmitted using the unicast connection, as only that is initially secured by TLS against injection of packets by third parties. However, to reduce the unicast overhead even further, any subsequent frames can be included in packets sent over multicast as their integrity has already been verified by previous frames, either by ones included in earlier packets sent via multicast of the original unicast frame. The exact calculation of the hashes is of course dependent on the chosen hash algorithm. As mentioned, to reduce the size of the hashes, it could be considered to use algorithms that are less secure against collision attacks, especially for integrity frames that

are being sent over unicast.

#### 4.4.4 MC\_KEY

The MC\_KEY frame is used to send a secret. The secret is then used to derive the IV and key in the same way the TLS traffic key is calculated. While instead of using a KDF a key could be transmitted directly, as the secret is only used to derive one key and not multiple ones, there are several reasons for using this approach. For one, the secret itself can be smaller than the key as the KDF extends it. This results in reduced overhead as the KEY frames can be smaller. Additionally, many of the built in decryption functions in various QUIC (software and hardware) implementations are based on secrets and KDFs instead of plain keys. This means that there is less adaptation required when implementing multicast support and optimizations can be more easily carried over.

The server is periodically sending out secrets from which new keys will be derived. The reason this is done this way instead of the usual QUIC key rotation utilizing the key phase is to prevent the sharing of secrets to unauthorized subscribers of the multicast channel. If the secret remained constant for the entire lifetime of a channel, a single bad acting client could leak it and compromise the channel going forward.

For clients that are newly joining a channel, the key has to be distributed via unicast. However, similar to integrity frames, subsequent key updates could also be done via the multicast channel itself to further reduce unicast overhead. To provide forward secrecy, key updates are occasionally required to be done over unicast to prevent any clients that are no longer connected via unicast from accessing the content of the channel.

To allow the client to know which secret is relevant for which packet, each Key frame also includes a packet number, indicating starting from which packet the key has to be used. A key remains active until a new key with a higher packet number is received. As the packet number is part of the protected portion of the QUIC header, the header protection key has to remain the same for the lifetime of the channel as clients would otherwise not be able to decrypt the header and thus not know when to apply a new key.

## 5 A live streaming use case

One of the main use cases we envision for MC-QUIC is the streaming of live content. One possible deployment would utilize Twitchs WARP

[Cur22] protocol that can be used to stream video over QUIC. In it, each video segment is sent on a separate QUIC stream. Streams rise in priority to make sure newer segments get transferred first in case of congestion. We can combine this mechanism with MCQUIC by having several channels for the different offered stream qualities. Clients would be told to join the channel which is most suitable, according to the limits they specified to the server. Since each video segment is its own stream, clients do not have to worry about receiving data on a stream that has already been active before they joined. Thus, they don't have to consider an already existing Stream offset when joining a channel. It should be noted that for browser based use cases for MCQUIC, the common request-response semantics no longer apply. As such, for browser deployment, WebTransport[Vas22] push or similar would be required.

The given example is just the most basic use case. It is conceivable that in the future mechanisms like layered video could be used to combine several channels to achieve a higher overall quality while still allowing for each channel to be useable on its own. The IETF has only very recently started to focus on media over QUIC and we hope to also be able to contribute to this effort in the future.

## 6 Related work

As mentioned in the introduction, there recently has been an influx of work on multicast.

One major ongoing effort is the TreeDN [GLA23] project championed by Juniper. It tries to solve a similar problem of delivery of live video content via multicast. However, instead of aiming at a browser based implementation it mainly makes use of AMT and the AMT module of the VLC media player. It provides the ability to stream videos from the MBONE to domestic networks that do not support native multicast reception by going through an AMT relay that is deployed on the MBONE. It also provides a content portal, similar to YouTube or Twitch, on which content can be found and streamed. Finally, it includes a service that can automatically translate a unicast stream to multicast and ingest it into the MBONE.

The second major ongoing work relating to multicast is the mentioned BIER [WRD+17], which tries to change the way multicast routing is done. Instead of the traditional approach of constructing multicast trees, it works by separating the Internet into multiple BIER domains. These could take the

form of a company network, an autonomous system or even an entire ISPs network. If a multicast packet enters a BIER domain through an ingest router, it gets tagged with IDs for all routers, either inside the domain or on its edge, it has to be delivered to. This means that routers no longer have to keep state for multicast trees as all the necessary information for routing is included in the BIER header of each individual packet. BIER has been implemented and evaluated in P4 [MLM21]. The downside to this approach is that unlike PIM, it is not a general purpose protocol but instead requires a different mechanism for the tagging of packets at the ingress router depending on the use base, e.g. there are BIER extensions for ISIS [GPAZ18], OSPF [PNW+18], multicast VPN [RSA+19] etc.

In general, the advantages of using multicast for content delivery have been well known. Research in this area reaches from multicast in mobile networks [JN02] over using overlay networks to connect multicast islands [JCC09] to multimedia conferencing with multicast [McC99].

## 7 Conclusion

In this paper we introduced a new extension to the QUIC transport protocol that enables the delivery of (mass media) content via multicast. It overcomes many of the obstacles traditional multicast implementations and deployments face by utilizing a base unicast QUIC connection as a security anchor for multicast channels. It provides the well established scalability benefits of multicast while only adding a small amount of overhead. Integrity of delivered packets is guaranteed as well as fallback to unicast delivery in networks that don't support multicast.

There are many opportunities for future research related to MCQUIC. For one, it is the first time multicast senders can get telemetry information from all their receivers. This information can be used to optimize the management of channels as well as when to switch between unicast and multicast. Finding good heuristics or models to determine these configurations is part of possible future work. On the other hand, enabling multicast delivery for media content allows to reevaluate other technologies that have so far been deemed unsuitable or inefficient in unicast scenarios. One example for this is scalable video encoding, which sees no use currently but might be a good way to combine multiple multicast channels into one media stream.



## References

- [ACGE20] Mikael Abrahamsson, Tim Chown, Lenny Giuliano, and Toerless Eckert. Deprecating Any-Source Multicast (ASM) for Interdomain Multicast. RFC 8815, August 2020.
- [Aku21] ANTHONY Akugbe. 15 biggest pc games by file size, ranked. <https://gamerant.com/pc-games-file-size-hd-space-biggest-huge/>, 04 2021.
- [Bhu20] Rahul Bhushan. Gta v download size. <https://www.sportskeeda.com/esports/gta-v-download-size>, 08 2020.
- [Bum15] Gregory Bumgardner. Automatic Multicast Tunneling. RFC 7450, February 2015.
- [CDF<sup>+</sup>02] Bradley Cain, Dr. Steve E. Deering, Bill Fenner, Isidor Kouvelas, and Ajit Thyagarajan. Internet Group Management Protocol, Version 3. RFC 3376, October 2002.
- [CGI<sup>+</sup>99] Ran Canetti, Juan Garay, Gene Itkis, Daniele Micciancio, Moni Naor, and Benny Pinkas. Multicast security: A taxonomy and some efficient constructions. In *IEEE INFOCOM'99. Conference on Computer Communications. Proceedings. Eighteenth Annual Joint Conference of the IEEE Computer and Communications Societies. The Future is Now (Cat. No. 99CH36320)*, volume 2, pages 708–716. IEEE, 1999.
- [CK13] Stuart Cheshire and Marc Krochmal. Multicast DNS. RFC 6762, February 2013.
- [Cli21] Scott Cliburn. 4k bitrate video: The outlook for 2021 and beyond. <https://www.zype.com/blog/4k-bitrate-video>, 06 2021.
- [Cur22] Luke Curley. Warp - Segmented Live Media Transport. Internet-Draft draft-lcurley-warp-01, Internet Engineering Task Force, July 2022. Work in Progress.
- [CV04] Luis Costa and Rolland Vida. Multicast Listener Discovery Version 2 (MLDv2) for IPv6. RFC 3810, June 2004.
- [DLL<sup>+</sup>00] Christophe Diot, Brian Neil Levine, Bryan Lyles, Hassan Kassem, and Doug Balensiefen. Deployment issues for the ip multicast service and architecture. *IEEE network*, 14(1):78–88, 2000.
- [FHH<sup>+</sup>16] Bill Fenner, Mark J. Handley, Hugh Holbrook, Isidor Kouvelas, Rishabh Parekh, Zhaohui (Jeffrey) Zhang, and Lianshu Zheng. Protocol Independent Multicast - Sparse Mode (PIM-SM): Protocol Specification (Revised). RFC 7761, March 2016.
- [GD22] James Gruessing and Spencer Dawkins. Media Over QUIC - Use Cases and Requirements for Media Transport Protocol Design. Internet-Draft draft-guessing-moq-requirements-03, Internet Engineering Task Force, November 2022. Work in Progress.
- [GLA23] Lenny Giuliano, Chris Lenart, and Rich Adam. TreeDN- Tree-based CDNs for Live Streaming to Mass Audiences. Internet-Draft draft-ietf-mops-treedn-00, Internet Engineering Task Force, January 2023. Work in Progress.
- [GPAZ18] Les Ginsberg, Tony Przygienda, Sam Aldrin, and Zhaohui (Jeffrey) Zhang. Bit Index Explicit Replication (BIER) Support via IS-IS. RFC 8401, June 2018.
- [HHWH15] Yongkai Huo, Cornelius Hellge, Thomas Wiegand, and Lajos Hanzo. A tutorial and review on inter-layer fec coded layered video streaming. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, 17(2):1166–1207, 2015.
- [HT00] Thomas Hardjono and Gene Tsudik. Ip multicast security: Issues and directions. In *Annales des télécommunications*, volume 55, pages 324–340. Springer, 2000.
- [IT21] Jana Iyengar and Martin Thomson. QUIC: A UDP-Based Multiplexed and Secure Transport. RFC 9000, May 2021.
- [JCC09] Xing Jin, Kan-Leung Cheng, and S-H Gary Chan. Island multicast: combining ip multicast with overlay data

- distribution. *IEEE transactions on multimedia*, 11(5):1024–1036, 2009.
- [JN02] Christophe Jelger and Thomas Noel. Multicast for mobile hosts in ip networks: Progress and challenges. *IEEE Wireless Communications*, 9(5):58–64, 2002.
- [Kru98] Peter S Kruus. A survey of multicast security issues and architectures. Technical report, NAVAL RESEARCH LAB WASHINGTON DC, 1998.
- [LMC<sup>+</sup>23] Yanmei Liu, Yunfei Ma, Quentin De Coninck, Olivier Bonaventure, Christian Huitema, and Mirja Kühlewind. Multipath Extension for QUIC. Internet-Draft draft-ietf-quic-multipath-04, Internet Engineering Task Force, March 2023. Work in Progress.
- [LP20] Gaëtan Leurent and Thomas Peyrin. {SHA-1} is a shambles: First {Chosen-Prefix} collision on {SHA-1} and application to the {PGP} web of trust. In *29th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 20)*, pages 1839–1856, 2020.
- [Mak13] Eddie Makuch. Guinness claims gtav day-one sales total 11.2 million copies. <https://www.gamespot.com/articles/guinness-claims-gtav-day-one-sales-total-112-million-copies/1100-6415455/>, 10 2013.
- [McC99] Steven McCanne. Scalable multimedia communication using ip multicast and lightweight sessions. *IEEE Internet Computing*, 3(2):33–45, 1999.
- [MLM21] Daniel Merling, Steffen Lindner, and Michael Menth. Hardware-based evaluation of scalable and resilient multicast with bier in p4. *IEEE Access*, 9:34500–34514, 2021.
- [PNW<sup>+</sup>18] Peter Psenak, Nagendra Kumar Nainar, IJsbrand Wijnands, Andrew Dolganow, Tony Przygienda, Zhao-hui (Jeffrey) Zhang, and Sam Aldrin. OSPFv2 Extensions for Bit Index Explicit Replication (BIER). RFC 8444, November 2018.
- [RSA<sup>+</sup>19] Eric C. Rosen, Mahesh Sivakumar, Sam Aldrin, Andrew Dolganow, and Tony Przygienda. Multicast VPN Using Bit Index Explicit Replication (BIER). RFC 8556, April 2019.
- [Tec22] Akamai Technologies. Oops, we did it again, May 2022.
- [TT21] Martin Thomson and Sean Turner. Using TLS to Secure QUIC. RFC 9001, May 2021.
- [UEF20] UEFA. UEFA uefa euro 2020 impresses with 5.2 billion cumulative global live audience. <https://www.uefa.com/insideuefa/about-uefa/news/026d-132519672495-56a014558e80-1000--uefa-euro-2020>.
- [Vas22] Victor Vasiliev. The WebTransport Protocol Framework. Internet-Draft draft-ietf-webtrans-overview-04, Internet Engineering Task Force, July 2022. Work in Progress.
- [Ver21] Paul Verna. Us sports video 2021. <https://www.insiderintelligence.com/content/us-sports-video-2021>, 2021. Accessed: 2023-01-06.
- [WRD<sup>+</sup>17] IJsbrand Wijnands, Eric C. Rosen, Andrew Dolganow, Tony Przygienda, and Sam Aldrin. Multicast Using Bit Index Explicit Replication (BIER). RFC 8279, November 2017.