



User-space Multipath UDP in Mosh

Matthieu Boutier, Juliusz Chroboczek

► **To cite this version:**

| Matthieu Boutier, Juliusz Chroboczek. User-space Multipath UDP in Mosh. 2015. hal-01114285

HAL Id: hal-01114285

<https://hal-univ-paris.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01114285>

Preprint submitted on 9 Feb 2015

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

User-space Multipath UDP in Mosh

Matthieu Boutier
boutier@pps.univ-paris-diderot.fr
Sorbonne Paris Cité, PPS, UMR 7126, CNRS, F-75205 Paris, France

Juliusz Chroboczek
jch@pps.univ-paris-diderot.fr

Abstract

In many network topologies, hosts have multiple IP addresses, and may choose among multiple network paths by selecting the source and destination addresses of the packets that they send. This can happen with multihomed hosts (hosts connected to multiple networks), or in multihomed networks using source-specific routing [2]. A number of efforts have been made to dynamically choose between multiple addresses in order to improve the reliability or the performance of network applications, at the network layer, as in Shim6 [5], or at the transport layer, as in MPTCP [9]. In this paper, we describe our experience of implementing dynamic address selection at the application layer within the *Mosh* Mobile Shell [12]. While our work is specific to Mosh, we hope that it is generic enough to serve as a basis for designing UDP-based multipath applications or even more general APIs.

1 Introduction

Standard networking APIs are mainly designed with the implicit assumption that a client with a single address connects to a server with a single address. This assumption is often incorrect: many hosts have multiple addresses, either because they are multihomed (connected to multiple networks) or connected to a network that is itself multihomed.




Figure 1: A multihomed host

Multihomed hosts Many hosts have are connected to multiple networks (Figure 1). The most common case is that of a mobile host connected to the Internet over multiple network technologies (e.g. WiFi and cellular or WiFi

and Ethernet), but this is also the case of servers with redundant connectivity. Since hosts do not typically participate in the routing protocol, multihomed hosts have multiple addresses, one per network interface.

A similar situation arises with double-stack hosts, that have both IPv4 and IPv6 addresses. While both addresses are assigned to the same network interface, such hosts are multihomed from the point of view of the higher layers.




Figure 2: A network connected to two providers

Source-specific routing and multihomed networks

Similar to a multihomed host, a multihomed network (Figure 2) is one that is connected to the Internet over multiple physical links, either for fault tolerance or in order to improve throughput or reduce cost. Classically, such networks are assigned *Provider-Independent* (PI) addresses that are announced over all links, in which case the dynamic nature of the routing protocol automatically provided for fault-tolerance; improvements in throughput and reductions in cost can be achieved by careful engineering of the routing protocol.

PI addresses need to be announced in the Internet’s global “Default-Free Zone” and cannot be easily aggregated; they are therefore a costly resource. For smaller networks, it is a natural proposition to announce multiple *Provider-Dependent* prefixes, one to each provider. In this case, the internal routing protocol must be able to perform *source-specific routing* (sometimes called *SADR*), where outgoing packets are routed to the right gateway depending on their *source*. We describe our experience with source-specific routing elsewhere [2].

1.1 Choosing addresses dynamically

In the presence of multiple addresses, hosts must choose a pair of a source and a destination address for every packet that they send. The usual approach is to make this choice at connection establishment: the set of possible (source, destination) pairs is ordered according to a set of static rules [4], and the first that works is used throughout the lifetime of the connection. This is sometimes slightly refined by probing all of the possible pairs in parallel [11].

An obvious drawback of such a relatively static approach is that the choice of addresses cannot be changed once a connection has been established, with the consequence that a network hiccup will cause all established connections to drop (or, worse, to hang). A number of researchers have come up with protocols that switch addresses mid-connection; this can be done at the network layer, at the transport layer, or, as in our work, at the application layer.

Network layer Shim6 [5, 8] is a host-centric layer 3 shim which provides reliability in multihomed networks. When a connection is established by higher layers to a remote host, Shim6 exchanges the local and remote addresses. If the connection is broken, Shim6 finds an alternative working path and changes the source and destination addresses of both the outgoing and incoming packets of the connection. This operation is totally transparent to the higher layers.

Shim6 detects failures based on the natural traffic of the application: if packets are sent without response, then it is likely that a failure has occurred. In that case, Shim6 finds another responsive path using the reachability protocol (REAP) [1].

REAP builds a list of all possible paths, and probes them to find one that works. REAP probes can be fairly heavyweight, since they contain information about the other probes sent and received, allowing REAP to detect and benefit from unidirectional paths. To limit the overhead of probes, REAP sorts the flows with a number of heuristics before probing them with an exponential back-off interval between two probes. Naderi et al. [6] remark that having more aggressive probing is desirable in practice, since it achieves fastest convergence while the overhead will likely be less than the broken connection's traffic.

Transport layer Multiple source and destination addresses can be chosen by the transport protocol, as is the case in Multipath TCP (MPTCP) [9] and SCTP [10].

MPTCP is a reliable flow-oriented TCP-compatible protocol which establishes as many alternative paths as possible. These paths are called *subflows*, and provide

both reliability and better performance: MPTCP is able to balance traffic between its subflows, without performance losses due to slow flows. Subflows are continuously estimated by regular TCP messages, which act as probes.

SCTP is a reliable, message-oriented, connection-oriented protocol, designed to achieve reliability in multihomed networks. When a SCTP connection (*association*) is established, a *primary path* is selected by each end-point and used to send packets to the other one. A number of mechanisms allow the end-points to exchange their addresses and build alternate paths. These paths are regularly probed at fixed intervals (*heartbeats*) to check their reliability. When a failure is detected on the primary path, one of the working alternate paths is selected to be the new primary path. The protocol definition gives no guidelines about the strategy to be used to switch to a better path when the primary path is active but less efficient than other paths.

Application layer A server's addresses are usually stored within the DNS, and the client will try them all, either in turn [4] or in parallel [11]. Once a flow is established, it is no longer possible to change the source and destination addresses — from the user's point of view, all connections are broken whenever a link outage forces a change of address.

A TCP connection is bound to a pair of addresses at connection establishment; however, a number of modern applications are based upon UDP and implement their own scheduling and retransmission strategies. This is notably the case of VoIP applications (SIP, Skype, etc.), of some recent peer-to-peer file transfer applications [7], and of *Mosh*, the *Mobile Shell*, an SSH replacement designed for lossy and high-latency links [12].

Since standard Mosh doesn't implement full multipath, it is unable to survive certain classes of topology changes. In the rest of this paper, we describe our implementation of multipath for Mosh, and our experiences with our implementation.

2 The original Mobile Shell

The Mobile Shell is a lightweight and responsive remote shell. It differs from SSH mainly by two aspects. On the one hand, it predicts what should display the terminal while waiting for a server confirmation, which increase the user experience on slow links, and on the other hand, it uses the UDP transport protocol with an algorithm limiting the impact of packet loss and reordering.

Mosh is composed of multiple layers: the front-end layer, the transport layer and the network layer. The front-end layer is in charge of interaction with the user,

1 bit	direction	} 64 bits nonce
63 bits	sequence number	
16 bits	timestamp	
16 bits	timestamp reply	

Figure 3: Original Mosh packet format

client-side, and with the remote host, server-side. It includes the prediction algorithm, and communicates with the server through the Mosh transport layer.

The transport layer is in charge of keeping the states of the two peers in sync and of data fragmentation. It is also its responsibility to deal with packet loss and re-ordering: essentially, it maintains the knowledge of the last acknowledged state, and tries to send deltas from that state to the current local state. If a packet is lost, its content will (probably) be included in the next packet, avoiding the need for a retransmission. Reordering is also not a problem: as newer packets have also the information bring by the older, the older has just to be ignored.

The network layer is in charge to receive and send packets, estimate the Maximum Transmission Unit (MTU), Round Trip Time (RTT) and Retransmission TimeOut (RTO), encrypt and decrypt packets, and keep connection active, even in the presence of NAT. Our modifications to enable multipath are confined to the network layer.

Mosh network protocol The Mosh network protocol header is described in Figure 3, and consists of 12 octets (96 bits) The first 64 bits contain a cryptographic nonce, a flag indicating the direction of the flow (client to server, or server to client), and the message sequence number (seqno). The rest of the header consists of two timestamp fields used to measure the RTT.

RTT measurement When a packet is about to be sent, the timestamp field is filled with the host’s current timestamp, and the timestamp reply field is set to the last timestamp received from the remote peer plus the time elapsed since the packet bringing that timestamp was received. The RTT is computed as the difference of the current timestamp and the timestamp reply field of each packet; and is averaged by an exponential mean to compute the smoothed RTT (SRTT).

Figure 4 illustrates this process: the client sends a packet destined to the server (destination = 0), with seqno s , timestamp t_0 , and timestamp reply -1 , because it has not yet received a timestamp from the server. The server receives the packet at time u_0 , and stores both t_0 and u_0 as the last timestamps received from the client. When it next sends data to the client, at time u_1 , it fills the packet with the right destination field (destination = 1),




Figure 4: A Mosh network layer exchange

its seqno s' , the timestamp u_1 , and the timestamp reply $t'_0 = t_0 + \Delta = t_0 + (u_1 - u_0)$. On reception, the client computes the value of the RTT as $RTT = t_1 - t'_0$, and stores the two timestamps for future messages.

In order to keep accurate measurements, only in-order messages are considered, i.e. messages with a strictly increasing sequence number. The payload of out-of-order packets is still transmitted to the transport layer, but the control information is ignored.

Connection timeout As Mosh uses UDP, an unreliable transport protocol, it must determine when the connection has been lost. Mosh uses the standard RTO computation, as defined in TCP: $RTO = SRTT + 4 \times SRTT_{VAR}$. The timeout value is not used by the network layer, but by the higher layers, so that data are sent at regular intervals to continuously monitor the connection, and to inform the user that the connection has been lost.

Connection loss A connection can be lost due to many causes: network failure, link removal, changing IP addresses, or NAT timeouts. Mosh makes a best effort to keep the connection active, and will never give up without an explicit request from the user.

If the connection times out, data packets are still sent to the server, but at larger intervals. When the network offers connectivity again, the connection recovers almost immediately.

Mosh resists to IP address changes because by using the `sendto` system call with no explicit source address, leaving the responsibility of choosing the source address to the operating system. It is therefore possible to use the same Mosh session from multiple addresses (e.g. after moving a laptop).

NATs sometimes time out active connections. As NATs associate a connection to the 5-tuple (transport protocol, IP src, IP dst, port src, port dst), a Mosh client switches ports regularly when it has no sign of the server. This is done by creating and using a new socket to send

data. Mosh retains a small number of older sockets, in case a packet from the server arrives for a previously used port.

Limitations of Mosh In some cases, the mechanisms implemented in Mosh are not sufficient to keep a connection, or simply to choose the best connection among multiple possible ones. In a multi-address environment, a Mosh client may have multiple paths to reach the destination; since Mosh lets the system choose the source address, it will not switch to a better path or change protocol families.

3 Multipath Mosh

There are potentially as many different paths as pairs (s, d) of addresses, where s is a client address and d a server address. Our implementation of a multipath Mosh continually estimates the latency of each of these paths and selects the best one. We call *flow* the structure representing a path and its characteristics; this corresponds to MPTCP's subflows or SCTP's paths.

We have added a *flag* field to the network layer protocol in order to have more types of messages. We use it to differentiate data, probes, and address gathering. Protocol details are described in Section 4.

3.1 Address gathering

In order to build all possible flows, the client must gather both its local addresses and the server's addresses. Both the client and the server have access to their local addresses through standard APIs (such as `getifaddrs`) provided by the system. At bootstrap, the client has a reachable address of the server: in combination with its local addresses, it builds an initial set of flows.

Gathering server's addresses The client asks the server for its addresses at regular intervals. In particular, it sends an address request at bootstrap to quickly have a complete set of flows. Both the request and the reply messages are tagged with the `ADDR_FLAG` flag bit.

On reception of a message with the `ADDR_FLAG` set, the server answers with the set of its local addresses. The message bringing the answer is also tagged with the `ADDR_FLAG`, and may not contain other data than the server's addresses.

On reception of a message with the `ADDR_FLAG` set, the client parses the message and extracts the server's local addresses. It then completes the set of flows it has to the server. Existing flows are not modified.

Address pair filtering Some pairs of addresses will not lead to a valid flow: for example, an IPv4 source address cannot be used with an IPv6 destination address. Filtering such incompatible combinations can reduce the number of flows being probed. Of course, determining if combination is valid or not is not always obvious, and it is more desirable to consider too many flows rather than filter out good ones.

We only do very limited filtering in our implementation, such as verifying that the two addresses of the same pair have the same address family, are both loopback addresses or not, and are both link-local or not. While more discrimination would be possible, we prefer to keep a more general implementation, the overhead being tolerable (see Section 3.5).

3.2 Sending packets on a flow

To send a datagram on a given flow, we must specify both its source and destination IP addresses. There are three possible implementations:

- using one socket per flow, each bound both to a local address (with `bind`) and to a remote address (with `connect`). Sending and receiving messages on a particular flow is then done with the `send` and `recv` system calls: the socket parameters indicate without ambiguity which are the local and remote addresses of both outgoing and incoming packets.
- using one socket per local address, in combination with the `sendto` and `recvfrom` system calls, which respectively set the destination of outgoing packets, and retrieve the remote peer address of incoming packets. The local address is specified and retrieved as previously, by the socket.
- using one socket per network-layer protocol (IPv4, IPv6), with the `sendmsg` and `recvmsg` system calls which allow to specify and retrieve both the source and the destination address of each packet.

After a number of experiments, we have decided to use the third one: it results in a much simpler implementation, especially in the presence of port hopping (see above).

More precisely, messages are sent with the `sendmsg` system call, with the `msg_name` and `msg_nameLen` fields providing the destination address. The source address is provided by a control message (`msg_control` and `msg_controlLen`). In IPv4, we use `IP_PKTINFO` and `IP_SENDSRCADDR`, depending on the operating system; IPv6 provides the portable API `IPV6_PKTINFO`. (We have found out that this only works if the socket is explicitly bound to the wildcard address — on some systems, using an unbound socket leads to a kernel panic.)

We did consider using a single hybrid (IPv6 and IPv4) socket. Unfortunately, hybrid sockets' options are a small subset of plain IPv6 options, not sufficient for our needs.

3.3 Flow selection

Mosh is an interactive lightweight protocol: the metric we want to optimize is clearly the RTT, and load balancing is not in our scope. To measure the RTT, very small messages, called probes, are regularly sent on flows to estimate their latency. Probe exchanges are only initiated by the client: the server only response to probes.

We consider that paths are bidirectional and symmetric, so the client and the server use the same flow at any one given time. This flow is selected by the client, which chooses the flow with lowest RTT, while the server merely selects the flow of the latest in-order data packet received to send data back.

We didn't implement any mechanism to limit instability, which is not a problem in the case of Mosh. Indeed, having instability with two paths of roughly same RTT will at worst cause packet reordering, which is not a problem for the higher layers of Mosh. Our tests with flows of similar RTT exhibited good behaviour, but more investigation in this area may be needed.

3.4 Probing flows

Probing flows consists in periodically sending small messages, known as *probes*, that carry enough information to estimate the flow's RTT. The interval between two probes is determined dynamically: waiting for a flow RTT update should be of the same order of magnitude as the RTT itself; in effect, faster paths will be probed more often than slower ones. Beyond a certain frequency, however, sending more probes no longer improves the user experience. For that reason, our implementation never sends more than one probe every 500ms.

An additional issue is that of non-functional flows: since no probes will be received, the RTT will not be naturally increased, while a single packet loss should not be considered as a broken path. We maintain an *idle_time* field in the flow structure which represents the time during which a flow has not been responsive. The SRTT value of an idle flow is unchanged, but the value used for choosing flows is the sum of the SRTT and the idle time.

A packet loss, or lack of response, is detected using RTO. We use the standard TCP's RTO computation, also taking the idle time into account:

$$RTO := (SRTT + idle_time) + 4 \times SRTTVAR$$

When a RTO has elapsed with no response from the server, the client immediately sends another probe, even if the next probe for this flow was delayed, and the idle time is increased by one RTO. Increasing by no more than one RTO is important, even if more time elapsed since the last probe sending: the event loop may give us back control after a lot of time, leading to a significant over-estimation of idle time on a simple packet loss. We observed delays of several seconds, leading the mosh client to choose a worst flow. On the other hand, increasing by one RTO is enough: since the computation of the RTO takes the idle time into account, it is the same behaviour on idle flows as doubling the RTT each time:

$$idle_time := idle_time + RTO$$

Mosh uses delayed acknowledgements. To compensate, the Mosh network layer receives the maximum delay interval from the higher layers, and computes a delayed RTO (dRTO). The dRTO is used to compute the probing interval and the actual timeout of packet acknowledgements, but we keep the RTO value to increase the idle time: the delays induced by the delayed acknowledgements are not representative of the real idle time. This leads to the following equations:

$$dRTO := RTO + max_delack$$

$$probe_interval := max(dRTO, 500ms)$$

An example of the whole process is described in figure 5: the client sends a probe to the server, and schedules the next probe. The server receives the probe, and delays the acknowledgement before sending back a probe. The client receives the acknowledgement in dRTO, so it waits for the end of the probe interval to send again a probe to the server. This time, the server decides to send back the probe immediately, but the packet is lost. The client notices the loss when the event loop next yields control: it adds RTO to the flow's idle time, and immediately sends back a probe, without waiting for a whole probe interval.

3.5 Probe overhead

Our approach will lead to permanent overhead in the network, with regular probes on each flow. As the number of flows is the product of the number of local addresses and the number of remote addresses, it might in principle grow to fairly large values.

Figure 6 shows the overhead induced by one flow, depending on the probe interval. These values are real-world measurements (obtained using *wireshark*). One probe is contained in an Ethernet frame of less than 90 octets. An idle flow, having a probe interval higher than




Figure 5: Probe scheduling

Probe interval (ms)	100	500	1000	10000
IPv6 overhead (B/s)	900	180	90	9
IPv4 overhead (B/s)	720	144	72	7.2

Figure 6: Ethernet probing frame overhead of one flow.

10 seconds, will lead to an overhead of less than 10B/s, while an active and efficient flow will lead to an overhead of less than 200B/s.

Considering a client and a server having 4 (compatible) addresses each, 16 flows will be built. If each of these flows has latency better than 500ms, we will have an overhead of less than 3kB/s for the whole network.

4 Protocol details

In this section, we describe the modifications made to the Mosh network protocol. The new packet header is represented in Figure 7. There are two main modifications: the identification of flows by a flow ID, and the presence of a flags field.

Flow ID In standard mosh, the cryptographic nonce is constituted of the direction and the sequence number. The direction indicates if the message was sent by the client (with a value of 0), or by the server (value of 1), while the sequence number is used by the receiver to determine whether the packet is the most recent one. As the nonce has double usage, and needs to be unique, mosh gives up when the sequence number overflows (wraps around to 0). Since it is a 63-bit value, this is unlikely to be a serious problem.

We use a separate flow ID, allocated by the client, to identify flows, and sequence numbers increase independently for each flow. Both the flow ID and sequence

1 bit	direction	} 64 bits nonce
15 bits	flow ID	
48 bits	sequence number	
16 bits	flags	
16 bits	timestamp	
16 bits	timestamp reply	

Figure 7: Multipath Mosh packet format

length	family	port	address
1	1	2	length - 3

Figure 8: Address sub-messages format

number are encoded in the nonce, and the server and the client must retain flow IDs. The client reuses existing flow IDs when new pairs of addresses become possible: both the client and the server will have a limited amount of flow's structure in memory, equal to the maximum number of simultaneous flows encountered during the session.

Flags The Flags field is used to extend the network layer protocol. Two flags are defined: the PROBE_FLAG and the ADDR_FLAG. Currently, the flags serve as a message type: either none or exactly one of the two flags will be set, identifying the type of message.

Because the main objective of a probe is to be lightweight, a probe does not carry any extra data from higher layers, and therefore is exactly 14 bytes long.

An address request message, i.e. a message with ADDR_FLAG set and originated by the client, doesn't carry any extra-information, like a probe. An address response message contains the list of the server's addresses, in the format described in figure 8: 1 octet for the sub-message length (in octets), 1 octet for the address family, 2 octets for the port number, and the rest for the address (4 octets for IPv4 addresses, and 16 octets for IPv6 addresses).

Since an address request is always sent at the beginning of the connection, it may in principle be possible for a malicious program to send duplicates of a message containing an address request; since the server's reply is much larger than the request, this could be used for an amplification attack. For that reason, we ignore address request packets unless they are in-order.

5 Results

We tested our implementation in a simple testbed illustrated in figure 9: the client and the server are connected to two routers connected by two distinct paths. We use the Linux *netem* module to simulate variable delay and loss ratios on our links, and unplug an Ethernet cable to




Figure 9: Testing mp-mosh on delayed or broken paths

simulate a connection loss with no address changes. The routing is assured by the Babel routing protocol [3].

In this graph, we only use two flows, and we bound the higher plots to 3 seconds, both for readability purposes. Each of the black segments at the bottom of the graph represents a sent packet, and indicates which flow has been chosen to send the data. The two curves indicate the RTT values computed by Mosh.

Initially, both paths have negligible delay. At time 7s, we add 300ms delay on (the path taken by) flow 5: Mosh’s estimate converges slowly to that value while data are sent on flow 1. This paths happened to experiment two isolated packet losses, which increased the idle time, but didn’t disturb the SRTT value computation.

At time 17s, we add 200ms on flow 1: its SRTT computation grows quickly to the expected value, and data continue taking this flow, which still has the lower latency. The convergence of the RTT is faster, since flow 1 received a larger number of packets. Only a small number of probes were sent on flow 5.

At time 28s, we unplug the Ethernet cable used by flow 1. The first data packets are sent on flow 5 roughly one second later, and the RTT of flow 1 grows without bound (bounded at 3s on the figure).

Finally, at time 38s, we plug back the Ethernet cable. This time, Mosh takes around 21 seconds to recover, which is the time needed for the lower layers (notably routing) to recover, and to the probing interval which has already reached its maximum value (10s in our implementation).

6 Limitations and future work

Mosh doesn’t consume much bandwidth. Contrary to MPTCP, we didn’t need to balance the load on multi-

ple flows, but only choose the most responsive. As the Mosh-transport layer is resilient to packet’s reordering, it would be possible to split traffic among multiple flows; we have not investigated this possibility.

Our implementation makes no efforts to avoid instability when multiple flows have similar latency; this did not appear to be a problem in our experiments. In high-throughput scenarios, Mosh may fragment messages into multiple UDP datagrams; in that case, Mosh only buffers a single message; if two different fragmented messages overlap, both might be discarded. Further experimentation is necessary in order to determine if this is a problem in practice, and whether it is more desirable to increase the amount of buffering done by Mosh, or to limit the amount of instability, which might in turn decrease our algorithm’s responsiveness to link outages (and perhaps the amount of natural load balancing due to instability.)

Mosh is an application designed to have a mobile client and a fixed server. Client and server thus have strongly asymmetric roles. We have used this property, putting all the intelligence on the client side with no choice of the path on the server side. In other applications, both the client and the server might be mobile, which would require smarter server-side algorithms.

Our implementation assumes that the links are symmetric, both in reachability and in delay. Asymmetric protocols such as REAP require larger probes, since each probe needs to carry information about the other flows. It is not clear to us whether this is worthwhile in real-world topologies, and whether the overhead can be somehow reduced.

7 Conclusion

We have designed and implemented a multipath version of mosh, using the assumption that using different source and destination addresses leads to different paths. We use active and continuous probing to estimate the RTT of the flows induced by these paths, while having techniques to (i) limit and adapt the number of probes depending on the performances of the flows, (ii) quickly discriminate idle flows while not being affected by occasional packet loss, and (iii) deal with external time delays to allow delayed acknowledgements and event loop integration.

Our implementation achieves fast re-convergence, small overhead, and does not interrupt the event-loop to generate extra traffic. Our modifications are contained in the Mosh network layer, built as a separate C++ library: it could in principle be used by any UDP-based application that would benefit from multiple paths.

8 Available software

Our multipath mosh implementation is available at:

<http://github.com/boutier/mosh>

References

- [1] ARKKO, J., AND VAN BEIJNUM, I. Failure Detection and Locator Pair Exploration Protocol for IPv6 Multihoming. RFC 5534 (Proposed Standard), June 2009.
- [2] BOUTIER, M., AND CHROBOCZEK, J. Source-specific routing. *submitted for publication* (2014).
- [3] CHROBOCZEK, J. The Babel Routing Protocol. RFC 6126 (Experimental), Apr. 2011.
- [4] DRAVES, R. Default Address Selection for Internet Protocol version 6 (IPv6). RFC 3484 (Proposed Standard), Feb. 2003. Obsoleted by RFC 6724.
- [5] GARCÍA-MARTÍNEZ, A., BAGNULO, M., AND VAN BEIJNUM, I. The shim6 architecture for ipv6 multihoming. *Communications Magazine, IEEE* 48, 9 (2010), 152–157.
- [6] NADERI, H., AND CARPENTER, B. Experience with ipv6 path probing. Internet-Draft draft-naderi-ipv6-probing-00, IETF Secretariat, October 2014. <http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-naderi-ipv6-probing-00.txt>.
- [7] Arvid Norberg. uTorrent transport protocol. BEP-29, October 2012. http://bittorrent.org/beps/bep_0029.html.
- [8] NORDMARK, E., AND BAGNULO, M. Shim6: Level 3 Multihoming Shim Protocol for IPv6. RFC 5533 (Proposed Standard), June 2009.
- [9] RAICIU, C., PAASCH, C., BARRÉ, S., FORD, A., HONDA, M., DUCHENE, F., BONAVENTURE, O., AND HANDLEY, M. How hard can it be? designing and implementing a deployable multipath tcp. In *USENIX Symposium of Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI'12), San Jose (CA)* (2012).
- [10] STEWART, R. Stream Control Transmission Protocol. RFC 4960 (Proposed Standard), Sept. 2007. Updated by RFCs 6096, 6335.
- [11] WING, D., AND YOURTCHENKO, A. Happy Eyeballs: Success with Dual-Stack Hosts. RFC 6555 (Proposed Standard), Apr. 2012.
- [12] WINSTEIN, K., AND BALAKRISHNAN, H. Mosh: An interactive remote shell for mobile clients. In *USENIX Annual Technical Conference* (2012), pp. 177–182.