Internet Engineering Task Force
INTERNET-DRAFT
draft-irtf-tmrg-tools-00.ps
Expires: March 2006

S. Floyd
E. Kohler
Editors

13 September 2005

Tools for the Evaluation of Simulation and Testbed Scenarios

Status of this Memo

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 becomes aware will be disclosed, in accordance with Section 6 of BCP 79.

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 March 2006.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2005). All Rights Reserved.

Abstract

This document describes tools for the evaluation of simulation and testbed scenarios used in research on Internet congestion control mechanisms. We believe that research in congestion control mechanisms has been seriously hampered by the lack of good models underpinning analysis, simulation, and testbed experiments, and that tools for the evaluation of simulation and testbed scenarios can help in the construction of better scenarios, based on better underlying models. One use of the tools described in this document is in comparing key characteristics of test scenarios with known characteristics from the diverse and ever-changing real world. Tools characterizing the aggregate traffic on a link include the distribution of per-packet round-trip times, the distribution of packet sequence numbers, and the like. Tools characterizing end-to-end paths include drop rates as a function of packet size and of burst size, the synchronization ratio between two end-to-end TCP flows, and the like. For each characteristic, we describe what aspects of the scenario determine this characteristic, how the characteristic can affect the results of simulations and experiments for the evaluation of congestion control mechanisms, and what is known about this characteristic in the real world. We also explain why the use of such tools can add considerable power to our understanding and evaluation of simulation and testbed scenarios.

1. Conventions

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [RFC 2119].

2. Introduction

This document discusses tools for the evaluation of simulation and testbed scenarios used in research on Internet congestion control mechanisms. These tools include but are not limited to measurement tools; the tools discussed in this document are largely ways of characterizing aggregate traffic on a link, or characterizing the end-to-end path. One use of these tools is for understanding key characteristics of test scenarios; many characteristics, such as the distribution of per-packet round-trip times on the link, don't come from a single input parameter but are determined by a range of inputs. A second use of the tools is to compare key characteristics of test scenarios with what is known of the same characteristics of the past and current Internet, and with what can be conjectured about these characteristics of future networks. This paper follows the general approach from "Internet Research Needs Better Models" [FK02].

As an example of the power of tools for characterizing scenarios, a great deal is known about the distribution of connection sizes on a link, or equivalently, the distribution of per-packet sequence numbers. It has been conjectured that a heavy-tailed distribution of connection sizes is an invariant feature of Internet traffic. A test scenario with mostly long-lived traffic, or with a mix with only long-lived and very short flows, does not have a realistic distribution of connection sizes, and can give unrealistic results in simulations or experiments evaluating congestion control mechanisms. For instance, the distribution of packet sequence numbers makes clear the fraction of traffic on a link from medium-sized connections, e.g., with packet sequence numbers from 100 to 1000. These medium-sized connections can slow-start up to a large congestion window, possibly coming to an abrupt stop soon afterwards, contributing significantly to the burstiness of the aggregate traffic, and to the problems facing congestion control.

In the sections below we will discuss a number of tools for describing and evaluating scenarios, show how these characteristics can affect the results of research on congestion control mechanisms, and summarize what is known about these characteristics in real-world networks.

3. Tools

The tools or characteristics that we discuss are the following.

3.1. Characterizing Aggregate Traffic on a Link

- Distribution of per-packet round-trip times.
- Distribution of packet sequence numbers.
- Distribution of packet sizes.
- Distribution of peak flow rates.
- Distribution of transport protocols.

3.2. Characterizing an End-to-End Path

- Synchronization ratio.

- Drop rates as a function of packet size.
- Drop rates as a function of burst size.
- Degree of packet drops.
- Range of queueing delay.

3.3. Other Characteristics

- Congestion control mechanisms for background or competing traffic.
- Characterization of congested links in terms of bandwidth and typical levels of congestion (in terms of packet drop rates).
- Characterization of challenging lower layers in terms of reordering, delay variation, packet corruption, and the like.
- Characterization of network changes affecting congestion, such as routing changes or link outages.

Below we will discuss each characteristic in turn, giving the definition, the factors determining that characteristic, the effect on congestion control metrics, and what is known so far from measurement studies in the Internet.

4. Distribution of per-packet round-trip times

Definition: The distribution of per-packet round-trip times on a link is defined formally by assigning to each packet the most recent round trip time measured for that end-to-end connection. In practice, coarse-grained information is generally sufficient, even though it has been shown that there is significant variability in round-trip times within a TCP connection [AKSJ03], and it is sufficient to assign to each packet the first round-trip time measurement for that connection, or to assign the current round-trip time estimate maintained by the TCP connection.

Determining factors: The distribution of per-packet round-trip times on a link is determined by end-to-end propagation delays, by queueing delays along end-to-end paths, and by the congestion control mechanisms used by the traffic. For example, for a scenario using TCP, TCP connections with smaller round-trip times will receive a proportionally larger fraction of traffic than competing TCP connections with larger round-trip times, all else being equal, due to the dynamics of TCP favoring flows with smaller round-trip times. This will generally shift the distribution of per-packet RTTs lower relative to the distribution of per-connection RTTs, since short-RTT connections will have more packets.

Effect on congestion control metrics: The distribution of per-packet round-trip times on a link affects the burstiness of the aggregate traffic, and therefore can affect congestion control performance in a range of areas such as delay/throughput tradeoffs. The distribution of per-packet round-trip times can also affect metrics of fairness, degree of oscillations, and the like. For example, long-term oscillations of queueing delay are more likely to occur in scenarios with a narrow range of round-trip times [FK02].

Measurements: The distribution of per-packet round-trip times for TCP traffic on a link can be measured from a packet trace with the passive TCP round-trip time estimator from Jiang and Dovrolis [JD02]. [Add pointers to other estimators, such as ones mentioned in JD02. Add a pointer to Mark Allman's loss detection tool.] Their paper shows the distribution of per-packet round-trip times for TCP packets for a number of different links. For the links measured, the percent of packets with round-trip times at most 100 ms ranged from 30% to

80%, and the percent of packets with round-trip times at most 200 ms ranged from 55% to 90%, depending on the link.

In the NS simulator, the distribution of per-packet round-trip times for TCP packets on a link can be reported by the queue monitor, using TCP's estimated round-trip time added to packet headers. This is illustrated in the validation test "./test-all-simple stats3" in the directory tcl/test.

Scenarios: [FK02] shows a relatively simple scenario, with a dumbbell topology with four access links on each end, that gives a fairly realistic range of round-trip times. [Look for the other citations to add.]

5. Distribution of packet sequence numbers

Definition: The distribution of packet sequence numbers on a link is defined by giving each packet a sequence number, where the first packet in a connection has sequence number 1, the second packet has sequence number 2, and so on. The distribution of packet sequence numbers can be derived in a straightforward manner from the distribution of connection sizes, and vice versa; however, the distribution of connection sizes is more suited for traffic generators, and the distribution of packet sequence numbers is more suited for measuring and illustrating the packets actually seen on a link over a fixed interval of time. There has been a considerably body of research over the last ten years on the heavy-tailed distribution of connection sizes for traffic on the Internet. [CBC95] [Add citations.]

Determining factors: The distribution of connection sizes is largely determined by the traffic generators used in a scenario. For example, is there a single traffic generator characterized by a distribution of connection sizes? A mix of long-lived and web traffic, with the web traffic characterized by a distribution of connection sizes? Or something else?

Effect on congestion control metrics: The distribution of packet sequence numbers affects the burstiness of aggregate traffic on a link, thereby affecting all congestion control metrics for which this is a factor. As an example, [FK02] illustrates that the traffic mix can affect the queue dynamics on a congested link. [Find more to cite, about the effect of the distribution of packet sequence numbers on congestion control metrics.]

[Add a paragraph about the impact of medium-size flows.]

[Add a paragraph about the impact of flows starting and stopping.]

[Add a warning about scenarios that use only long-lived flows, or a mix of long-lived and very short flows.]

Measurements: [Cite some of the literature.]

Traffic generators: Some of the available traffic generators are listed on the web site for "Traffic Generators for Internet Traffic" [TG]. This includes pointers to traffic generators for peer-to-peer traffic, traffic from online games, and traffic from Distributed Denial of Service (DDoS) attacks.

In the NS simulator, the distribution of packet sequence numbers for TCP packets on a link can be reported by the queue monitor at a router. This is illustrated in the validation test "./test-all-simple stats3" in the directory tcl/test.

6. The Distribution of Packet Sizes

Definition: The distribution of packet sizes is defined in a straightforward way, using packet sizes in bytes.

Determining factors: The distribution of packet sizes is determined by the traffic mix, the path MTUs, and by the packet sizes used by the transport-level senders.

The distribution of packet sizes on a link is also determined by the mix of forward-path TCP traffic and reverse-path TCP traffic in that scenario, for a scenario characterized by a 'forward path' (e.g., left to right on a particular link) and a 'reverse path' (e.g., right to left on the same link). For such a scenario, the forward-path TCP traffic contributes data packets to the forward link and acknowledgment packets to the reverse link, while the reverse-path TCP traffic contributes small acknowledgment packets to the forward link. The ratio between TCP data and TCP ACK packets on a link can be used as some indication of the ratio between forward-path and reverse-path TCP traffic.

Effect on congestion control metrics: The distribution of packet sizes on a link is an indicator of the ratio of forward-path and reverse-path TCP traffic in that network. The amount of reverse-path traffic determines the loss and queueing delay experienced by acknowledgement packets on the reverse path, significantly affecting the burstiness of the aggregate traffic on the forward path. [Add citations.] [In what other ways does the distribution of packet sizes affect congestion control metrics?]

Measurements: There has been a wealth of measurements over time on the packet size distribution of traffic [A00], [HMTG01]. These measurements are generally consistent with a model of roughly 10% of the TCP connections using an MSS of roughly 500 bytes, and with the other 90% of TCP connections using an MSS of 1460 bytes.

7. The Distribution of Per-Packet Peak Flow Rates

Definition: The distribution of peak flow rates is defined by assigning to each packet the peak sending rate in bytes per second of that connection, where the peak sending rate is defined over 0.1-second intervals. The distribution of peak flow rates gives some indication of the ratio of "alpha" and "beta" traffic on a link, where alpha traffic on a congested link is defined as traffic with that link at the main bottleneck, while the beta traffic on the link has a primary bottleneck elsewhere along its path [RSB01].

Determining factors: The distribution of peak flow rates is determined by flows with bottlenecks elsewhere along their end-to-end path, e.g., flows with low-bandwidth access links. The distribution of peak flow rates is also affected by applications with limited sending rates.

Effect on congestion control metrics: The distribution of peak flow rates affects the burstiness of aggregate traffic, with low-peak-rate traffic decreasing the aggregate burstiness, and adding to the traffic's tractability.

Measurements: [RSB01]. The distribution of peak rates can be expected to change over time, as there is an increasing number of high-bandwidth access links to the home, and of high-bandwidth Ethernet links at work and at other institutions.

Simulators: [For NS, add a pointer to the DelayBox, "http://dirt.cs.unc.edu/delaybox/", for more easily simulating low-bandwidth access links for flows.]

8. The Distribution of Transport Protocols.

Definition: The distribution of transport protocols on a congested link is straightforward, with each packet given its associated transport protocol (e.g., TCP, UDP). The distribution is often given both in terms of packets and in terms of bytes.

For UDP packets, it might be more helpful to classify them in terms of the port number, or the assumed application (e.g., DNS, RIP, games, Windows Media, RealAudio, RealVideo,

etc.) [MAWI]). Other traffic includes ICMP, IPSEC, and the like. In the future there could be traffic from SCTP, DCCP, or from other transport protocols.

Effect on congestion control metrics: The distribution of transport protocols affects metrics relating to the effectiveness of AQM mechanisms on a link.

Measurements: In the past, TCP traffic has typically consisted of 90% to 95% of the bytes on a link [UW02], [UA01]. [Get updated citations for this.] Measurement studies show that TCP traffic from web servers almost always uses conformant TCP congestion control procedures [MAF05].

9. The Synchronization Ratio

Definition: The synchronization ratio is defined as the degree of synchronization of loss events between two TCP flows on the same path. Thus, the synchronization ratio is defined as a characteristic of an end-to-end path. When one TCP flow of a pair has a loss event, the synchronization ratio is given by the fraction of those loss events for which the second flow has a loss event within one round-trip time. Each connection in a flow pair has a separate synchronization ratio, and the overall synchronization ratio of the pair of flows is the higher of the two ratios. When measuring the synchronization ratio, it is preferable to start the two TCP flows at slightly different times, with large receive windows.

Determining factors: The synchronization ratio is determined largely by the traffic mix on the congested link, and by the AQM mechanism (or lack of AQM mechanism).

Different types of TCP flows are also likely to have different synchronization measures. E.g., Two HighSpeed TCP flows might have higher synchronization measures that two Standard TCP flows on the same path, because of their more aggressive window increase rates.

Effect on congestion control metrics: The synchronization ratio affects convergence times for high-bandwidth TCPs. Convergence times are known to be poor for some high-bandwidth protocols in environments with high levels of synchronization. [Cite the papers by Leith and Shorten.] However, it is not clear if these environments with high levels of synchronization are realistic.

Measurements: Grenville Armitage and Qiang Fu have performed initial experiments of synchronization in the Internet, using Standard TCP flows, and have found very low levels of synchronization.

[Appenzeller et al, Sizing Router Buffers, reports that synchronization is rare as the number of competing flows increases. Kevin Jeffay has some results on synchronization also.]

Needed: We need measurements of the synchronization ratio for flows that use high-bandwidth protocols over high-bandwidth paths, given typical levels of competing traffic and with typical queuing mechanisms at routers (whatever these are), to see if there are higher levels of synchronization with high-bandwidth protocols such as HighSpeed TCP, Fast TCP, and the like, which are more aggressive than Standard TCP. The assumption would be that in many environments, high-bandwidth protocols have higher levels of synchronization than flows using Standard TCP.

10. Drop or Mark Rates as a Function of Packet Size

Definition: Drop rates as a function of packet size are defined by the actual drop rates for different packets on an end-to-end path or on a congested link over a particular time interval. In some cases, e.g., Drop-Tail queues in units of packets, general statements can

be made; e.g., that large and small packets will experience the same packet drop rates. However, in other cases, e.g., Drop-Tail queues in units of bytes, no such general statement can be made, and the drop rate as a function of packet size will be determined in part by the traffic mix at the congested link at that point of time.

Determining factors: The drop rate as a function of packet size is determined in part by the queue architecture. E.g., is the Drop-Tail queue in units of packets, of bytes, of 60-byte buffers, or of a mix of buffer sizes? Is the AQM mechanism in packet mode, dropping each packet with the same probability, or in byte mode, with the probability of dropping or marking a packet being proportional to the packet size in bytes.

The effect of packet size on drop rate would also be affected by the presence of preferential scheduling for small packets, or by differential scheduling for packets from different flows (e.g., per-flow scheduling, or differential scheduling for UDP and TCP traffic).

In many environments, the drop rate as a function of packet size will be heavily affected by the traffic mix at a particular time. For example, is the traffic mix dominated by large packets, or by smaller ones? In some cases, the overall packet drop rate could also affect the relative drop rates for different packet sizes.

Effect on congestion control metrics: The drop rate as a function of packet size has a significant effect on the performance of congestion control for VoIP and other small-packet flows. [Citation: "TFRC for Voice: the VoIP Variant", draft-ietf-dccp-tfrc-voip-02.txt, and earlier papers.] The drop rate as a function of packet size also has an effect on TCP performance, as it affects the drop rates for TCP's SYN and ACK packets. [Citation: Jeffay and others.]

Measurements: We need measurements of the drop rate as a function of packet size over a wide range of paths, or for a wide range of congested links. For tests of relative drop rates on end-to-end packets, one possibility would be to run successive TCP connections with 200-byte, 512-byte, and 1460-byte packets, and to compare the packet drop rates. The ideal test would include running TCP connections on the reverse path, to measure the drop rates for the small ACK packets on the forward path. It would also be useful to characterize the difference in drop rates for 200-byte TCP packets and 200-byte UDP packets, even though some of this difference could be due to the relative burstiness of the different connections.

Ping experiments could also be used to get measurements of drop rates as a function size, but it would be necessary to make sure that the ping sending rates were adjusted to be TCP-friendly.

[Cite the known literature on drop rates as a function of packet size.]

Our conjecture is that there is a wide range of behaviors for this characteristic in the real world. Routers include Drop-Tail queues in packets, bytes, and buffer sizes in between; these will have quite different drop rates as a function of packet size. Some routers include RED in byte mode (the default for RED in Linux) and some have RED in packet mode (Cisco, I believe). This also affects drop rates as a function of packet size.

Some routers on congested access links use per-flow scheduling. In this case, does the per-flow scheduling have the goal of fairness in *bytes* per second or in *packets* per second? What effect does the per-flow scheduling have on the drop rate as a function of packet size, for packets in different flows (e.g., a small-packet VoIP flow competing against a large-packet TCP flow) or for packets within the same flow (small ACK packets and large data packets on a two-way TCP connection).

11. Drop Rates as a Function of Burst Size.

Definition: Burst-tolerance, or drop rates as a function of burst size, can be defined in terms of an end-to-end path, or in terms of aggregate traffic on a congested link.

The burst-tolerance of an end-to-end path is defined in terms of connections with different degrees of burstiness within a round-trip time. When packets are sent in bursts of N packets, does the drop rate vary as a function of N? For example, if the TCP sender sends small bursts of K packets, for K less than the congestion window, how does the size of K affect the loss rate? Similarly, for a ping tool sending pings at a certain rate in packets per second, one could see how the clustering of the ping packets in clusters of size K affects the packet drop rate. As always with such ping experiments, it would be important to adjust the sending rate to maintain a longer-term sending rate that was TCP-friendly.

Determining factors: The burst-tolerance is determined largely by the AQM mechanisms for the congested routers on a path, and by the traffic mix. For a Drop-Tail queue with only a small number of competing flows, the burst-tolerance is likely to be low, and for AQM mechanisms where the packet drop rate is a function of the average queue size rather than the instantaneous queue size, the burst tolerance should be quite high.

Effect on conjestion control metrics: The burst-tolerance of the path or congested link can affect fairness between competing flows with different round-trip times; for example, Standard TCP flows with longer round-trip times are likely to have a more bursty arrival pattern at the congested link that that of Standard TCP flows with shorter round-trip times. As a result, in environment with low burst tolerance (e.g., scenarios with Drop-Tail queues), longer-round-trip-time TCP connections can see higher packet drop rates than other TCP connections, and receive an even smaller fraction of the link bandwidth than they would otherwise. [FJ92](Section 3.2). We note that some TCP traffic is inherently bursty, e.g., Standard TCP without rate-based pacing, particularly in the presence of dropped ACK packets or of ACK compression. The burst-tolerance of a router can also affect the delay-throughput tradeoffs and packet drop rates of the path or of the congested link.

Measurements: One could measure the burst-tolerance of an end-to-end path by running successive TCP connections, forcing bursts of size at least K by dropping an appropriate fraction of the ACK packets to the TCP receiver. Alternately, if one had control of the TCP sender, one could modify the TCP sender to send bursts of K packets when the congestion window was K or more segments.

[Look at Crovella's paper on loss pairs.]

[Look at: M. Allman and E. Blanton, "Notes on Burst Mitigation for Transport Protocols", ACM Computer Communication Review, vol. 35(2), (2005).]

Making inferences about the AQM mechanism for the congested router on an end-to-end path: One potential use of measurement tools for determining the burst-tolerance of an end-to-end path would be to make inferences about the presence or absence of an AQM mechanism at the congested link or links. As a simple test, one could run a TCP connection until the connection comes out of slow-start. If the receive window of the TCP connection was sufficiently high that the connection exited slow-start with packet drops or marks instead of because of the limitation of the receive window, one could record the congestion window at the end of slow-start, and the number of packets dropped from this window. A high packet drop rate might be more typical of a Drop-Tail queue with small-scale statistical multiplexing on the congested link, and a single packet drop coming out of slow-start would suggest an AQM mechanism at the congested link.

The synchronization measure could also add information about the likely presence or absence of AQM on the congested link(s) of an end-to-end path, with paths with higher levels of synchronization being more likely to have Drop-Tail queues with small-scale statistical multiplexing on the congested link(s).

[Cite the relevant literature about tools for determining the AQM mechanism on an end-to-end path.]

12. Congestion Control Mechanisms for Background or Competing Traffic

Effect on congestion control metrics: Please don't evaluate AQM mechanisms by using Reno TCP, or evaluate new transport protocols by comparing them with the performance of Reno TCP! For an explanation, see [FK02](Section 3.4).

Measurements: See [MAF05].

13. Characterization of Congested Links in Terms of Bandwidth and Typical Levels of Congestion

[Pointers to the current state of our knowledge.]

14. Characterization of Challenging Lower Layers.

[This will just be a short set of pointers to the relevant literature, which is quite extensive.]

15. Characterization of Network Changes Affecting Congestion

[Pointers to the current state of our knowledge.]

16. Using the Tools Presented in this Document

[To be done.]

17. Related Work

[Cite "On the Effective Evaluation of TCP" by Allman and Falk.]

18. Conclusions

[To be done.]

19. Security Considerations

There are no security considerations in this document.

20. IANA Considerations

There are no IANA considerations in this document.

21. Acknowledgements

Informative References

[RFC 2119] S. Bradner. Key Words For Use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels. RFC 2119.

[MAWI] M.W. Group, Mawi working group traffic archive, URL "http://tracer.csl.sony.jp/mawi/".

[AKSJ03] J. Aikat, J. Kaur, F.D. Smith, and K. Jeffay, Variability in TCP Roundtrip Times, ACM SIGCOMM Internet Measurement Conference, Maimi, FL, October 2003, pp. 279-284.

[A00] M. Allman, A Web Server's View of the Transport Layer, Computer Communication Review, 30(5), October 200.

[CBC95] C. Cunha, A. Bestavros, and M. Crovella, "Characteristics of WWW Client-based Traces", BU Technical Report BUCS-95-010, 1995.

[FJ92] S. Floyd and V. Jacobson, On Traffic Phase Effects in Packet-Switched Gateways, Internetworking: Research and Experience, V.3 N.3, September 1992, p.115-156.

[FK02] S. Floyd and E. Kohler, Internet Research Needs Better Models, Hotnets-I, October 2002.

[HMTG01] C. Hollot, V. Misra, D. Towsley, and W. Gong, On Designing Improved Controllers for AQM Routers Supporting TCP Flows, IEEE Infocom, 2001.

[JD02] H. Jiang and C. Dovrolis, Passive Estimation of TCP Round-trip Times, Computer Communication Review, 32(3), July 2002.

[MAF05] A. Medina, M. Allman, and A. Floyd. Measuring the Evolution of Transport Protocols in the Internet. Computer Communication Review, April 2005.

[RSB01] R. Riedi, S. Sarvotham, and R. Varaniuk, Connection-level Analysis and Modeling of Network Traffic, SIGCOMM Internet Measurement Workshop, 2001.

[TG] Traffic Generators for Internet Traffic Web Page, URL "http://www.icir.org/models/trafficgenerators.html".

[UA01] U. of Auckland, Auckland-vi trace data, June 2001. URL "http://wans.cs.waikato.ac.nz/wand/wits/auck/6/".

[UW02] UW-Madison, Network Performance Statistics, October 2002. URL "http://wwwstats.net.wisc.edu/".

Editors' Addresses

Sally Floyd <floyd@icir.org>
ICSI Center for Internet Research
1947 Center Street, Suite 600
Berkeley, CA 94704
USA

Eddie Kohler <kohler@cs.ucla.edu>
4531C Boelter Hall
UCLA Computer Science Department
Los Angeles, CA 90095
USA

Full 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.

This document and the information contained herein are provided on an "AS IS" basis and THE CONTRIBUTOR, THE ORGANIZATION HE/SHE REPRESENTS OR IS SPONSORED BY (IF ANY), THE INTERNET SOCIETY AND THE INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE DISCLAIM ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR

IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION HEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

Intellectual Property

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

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

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