

6MAN Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: November 1, 2020

G. Fioccola  
T. Zhou  
Huawei  
M. Cociglio  
Telecom Italia  
F. Qin  
China Mobile  
April 30, 2020

**IPv6 Application of the Alternate Marking Method**  
**draft-fz-6man-ipv6-alt-mark-08**

**Abstract**

This document describes how the Alternate Marking Method can be used as the passive performance measurement tool in an IPv6 domain and reports implementation considerations. It proposes how to define a new Extension Header Option to encode alternate marking technique and also the Segment Routing case is discussed.

**Requirements Language**

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](#) [[RFC2119](#)].

**Status of This Memo**

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <https://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

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."

This Internet-Draft will expire on November 1, 2020.

## Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2020 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to [BCP 78](#) and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<https://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

## Table of Contents

|                      |  |                    |
|----------------------|--|--------------------|
| <a href="#">1.</a>   | <a href="#">Introduction</a>                               | <a href="#">2</a>  |
| <a href="#">2.</a>   | <a href="#">Alternate Marking application to IPv6</a>      | <a href="#">3</a>  |
| <a href="#">3.</a>   | <a href="#">Definition of the AltMark Option</a>           | <a href="#">4</a>  |
| <a href="#">3.1.</a> | <a href="#">Data Fields Format</a>                         | <a href="#">4</a>  |
| <a href="#">4.</a>   | <a href="#">Use of the AltMark Option</a>                  | <a href="#">5</a>  |
| <a href="#">5.</a>   | <a href="#">Alternate Marking Method Operation</a>         | <a href="#">7</a>  |
| <a href="#">5.1.</a> | <a href="#">Packet Loss Measurement</a>                    | <a href="#">7</a>  |
| <a href="#">5.2.</a> | <a href="#">Packet Delay Measurement</a>                   | <a href="#">8</a>  |
| <a href="#">5.3.</a> | <a href="#">Flow Monitoring Identification</a>             | <a href="#">9</a>  |
| <a href="#">5.4.</a> | <a href="#">Multipoint and Clustered Alternate Marking</a> | <a href="#">10</a> |
| <a href="#">5.5.</a> | <a href="#">Data Collection and Calculation</a>            | <a href="#">10</a> |
| <a href="#">6.</a>   | <a href="#">Security Considerations</a>                    | <a href="#">10</a> |
| <a href="#">7.</a>   | <a href="#">IANA Considerations</a>                        | <a href="#">11</a> |
| <a href="#">8.</a>   | <a href="#">Acknowledgements</a>                           | <a href="#">11</a> |
| <a href="#">9.</a>   | <a href="#">References</a>                                 | <a href="#">11</a> |
| <a href="#">9.1.</a> | <a href="#">Normative References</a>                       | <a href="#">11</a> |
| <a href="#">9.2.</a> | <a href="#">Informative References</a>                     | <a href="#">12</a> |
|                      | <a href="#">Authors' Addresses</a>                         | <a href="#">12</a> |

## [1. Introduction](#)

[RFC8321] and [[I-D.ietf-ippm-multipoint-alt-mark](#)] describe a passive performance measurement method, which can be used to measure packet loss, latency and jitter on live traffic. Since this method is based on marking consecutive batches of packets, the method is often referred as Alternate Marking Method.

The Alternate Marking Method has become mature to be implemented and encoded in the IPv6 protocol and this document defines how the it can be used to measure packet loss and delay metrics in IPv6.



The format of the IPv6 addresses is defined in [[RFC4291](#)] while [[RFC8200](#)] defines the IPv6 Header, including a 20-bit Flow Label and the IPv6 Extension Headers. The Segment Routing Header (SRH) is defined in [[RFC8754](#)].

[I-D.fioccola-v6ops-ipv6-alt-mark] reported a summary on the possible implementation options for the application of the Alternate Marking Method in an IPv6 domain. This document, starting from the outcome of [[I-D.fioccola-v6ops-ipv6-alt-mark](#)], introduces a new TLV that can be encoded in the Option Headers (both Hop-by-Hop or Destination) for the purpose of the Alternate Marking Method application in an IPv6 domain. The case of SRH ([[RFC8754](#)]) is also discussed.

## **2. Alternate Marking application to IPv6**

The Alternate Marking Method requires a marking field. As mentioned, several alternatives have been analysed in [[I-D.fioccola-v6ops-ipv6-alt-mark](#)] such as IPv6 Extension Headers, IPv6 Address and Flow Label.

The only correct and robust choice that can actually be standardized would be the use of a new TLV to be encoded in the Option (Hop-by-Hop or Destination) Header.

This approach is compliant with [[RFC8200](#)] indeed the Alternate Marking application to IPv6 involves the following operations:

- o The source node is the only one that writes the Option Header to mark alternately the flow (for both Hop-by-Hop and Destination Option).
- o In case of Hop-by-Hop Option Header carrying Alternate Marking bits, it is not inserted or deleted, but can be read by any node along the path. The intermediate nodes may be configured to support this Option or not. Anyway this does not impact the traffic since the measurement can be done only for the nodes configured to read the Option.
- o In case of Destination Option Header carrying Alternate Marking bits, it is not processed, inserted, or deleted by any node along the path until the packet reaches the destination node.

Hop-by-Hop Option Header is also useful to signal to routers on the path to process the Alternate Marking, anyway it is to be expected that some routers cannot process it unless explicitly configured.

The optimization of both implementation and scaling of the Alternate Marking Method is also considered and a way to identify flows is



required. The Flow Monitoring Identification field (FlowMonID), as introduced in the next sections, goes in this direction and it is used to identify a monitored flow.


Note that the FlowMonID is different from the Flow Label field of the IPv6 Header ([[RFC8200](#)]). Flow Label is used for application service, like load-balancing/equal cost multi-path (LB/ECMP) and QoS. Instead, FlowMonID is only used to identify the monitored flow. The reuse of flow label field for identifying monitored flows is not considered since it may change the application intent and forwarding behaviour. Furthermore the flow label may be changed en route and this may also violate the measurement task. Those reasons make the definition of the FlowMonID necessary for IPv6. Flow Label and FlowMonID within the same packet have different scope, identify different flows, and associate different uses.

### 3. Definition of the AltMark Option

The desired choice is to define a new TLV for the Option Extension Headers, carrying the data fields dedicated to the alternate marking method.

### 3.1. Data Fields Format

The following figure shows the data fields format for enhanced alternate marking TLV. This AltMark data is expected to be encapsulated in the IPv6 Option (Hop-by-Hop or Destination).



where:

- 0 Type/Option Type: 8 bit identifier of the type of Option/TLV that needs to be allocated. Unrecognised Types MUST be ignored on receipt. In case of Hop-by-Hop Options Header or Destination Options Header, [\[RFC8200\]](#) defines how to encode the three high-order bits of the Option Type field. The two high-order bits specify the action that must be taken if the processing IPv6 node does not recognize the Option Type; for AltMark these two bits MUST be set to 00 (skip over this Option and continue processing the header). The third-highest-order bit specifies whether or not the Option Data can change en route to the packet's final



destination; for AltMark the value of this bit MUST be set to 0 (Option Data does not change en route).

- o Length/Opt Data Len: The length of the length Data Fields of this Option/TLV in bytes.
- o FlowMonID: 20 bits unsigned integer. The FlowMon identifier is described hereinafter.
- o L: Loss flag for Packet Loss Measurement as described hereinafter;
- o D: Delay flag for Single Packet Delay Measurement as described hereinafter;
- o Reserved: is reserved for future use. These bits MUST be set to zero on transmission and ignored on receipt.

#### **4. Use of the AltMark Option**

The AltMark Option is the best way to implement the Alternate Marking method and can be carried by the Hop-by-Hop Options header and the Destination Options header. In case of Destination Option, it is processed only by the source and destination nodes: the source node inserts and the destination node removes it. While, in case of Hop-by-Hop Option, it may be examined by any node along the path, if explicitly configured to do so. In this way an unrecognized Hop-by-Hop Option may be just ignored without impacting the traffic.

So it is important to highlight that the Option Layout can be used both as Destination Option and as Hop-by-Hop Option depending on the Use Cases it is based on the chosen type of performance measurement. In general, it is needed to perform both end to end and hop by hop measurements, and the alternate marking methodology allows, by definition, both performance measurements. Anyway, in many cases the end-to-end measurement is not enough and it is required also the hop-by-hop measurement, so the most complete choice is the Hop-by-Hop Options Header.

IPv6, as specified in [[RFC8200](#)], allows nodes to optionally process Hop-by-Hop headers. Specifically the Hop-by-Hop Options header is not inserted or deleted, but may be examined or processed by any node along a packet's delivery path, until the packet reaches the node (or each of the set of nodes, in the case of multicast) identified in the Destination Address field of the IPv6 header. Also, it is expected that nodes along a packet's delivery path only examine and process the Hop-by-Hop Options header if explicitly configured to do so.





The Hop-by-Hop Option defined in this document is designed to take advantage of the property of how Hop-by-Hop options are processed. Nodes that do not support this Option SHOULD ignore them. This can mean that, in this case, the performance measurement does not account for all links and nodes along a path.

Another application that can be mentioned is SRv6. SRv6 leverages the Segment Routing header which consists of a new type of routing header. Like any other use case of IPv6, HBH and Destination Options are useable when SRv6 header is present. Because SRv6 is a routing header, Destination Options before the routing header are processed by each destination in the route list.

SRH TLV can also be used to encode the AltMark Data Fields for SRv6. Furthermore, the intermediated nodes that are not in the SID list may consider the SRH as a green field, therefore they cannot support and bypass or support and dig into the SRH TLV. But the usage of SRH TLV is still under discussion within the community and so it is not the preferred solution.

In summary, it is possible to list the alternative possibilities:

Destination Option => measurement only by node in Destination Address.

Hop-by-Hop Option => every router on the path with feature enabled.

SRH TLV => every node that is an identity in the SR path.

Destination Option + SRH => every node that is an identity in the SR path.

Note that the SRH TLV and Destination Option + SRH could be considered equivalent. Anyway, in general, HBH and Destination Options are the most suitable ways to implement Alternate Marking.

New Hop-by-Hop Options are not strongly recommended in [[RFC7045](#)] and [[RFC8200](#)] because nodes may be configured to ignore the Options Header, drop or assign packets containing an Options Header to a slow processing path. For this reason, there has to be a clear justification to standardize a new Hop-by-Hop Option. Indeed, in case of the AltMark data fields described in this document, the new Hop-by-Hop Option is needed for OAM and an intermediate node can read it or not but, this does not affect the packet behavior. The source node is the only one that writes the Hop-by-Hop Option to mark alternately the flow, so, the performance measurement can be done for those nodes configured to read this Option, while the others are



simply not considered for the metrics. Moreover, in case of SRv6, the use of SRH TLV for every node along the SR path could also be a good choice to implement hop by hop measurements.

In addition to the previous alternatives, for legacy network it is possible to mention a non-conventional application of the SRH TLV and Destination Option for the hop by hop usage. [RFC8200] defines that the nodes along a path examine and process the Hop-by-Hop Options header only if HBH processing is explicitly configured. On the other hand, using the SRH TLV or Destination Option for hop by hop action would cause worse performance than Hop-by-Hop. The only motivation for the hop by hop usage of Destination Options can be for compatibility reasons but in general it is not recommended.

## **5. Alternate Marking Method Operation**

This section describes how the method operates. [RFC8321] introduces several alternatives but in this section the most applicable methods are reported and a new field is introduced to facilitate the deployment and improve the scalability.

### **5.1. Packet Loss Measurement**

The measurement of the packet loss is really straightforward. The packets of the flow are grouped into batches, and all the packets within a batch are marked by setting the L bit (Loss flag) to a same value. The source node can switch the value of the L bit between 0 and 1 after a fixed number of packets or according to a fixed timer, and this depends on the implementation. By counting the number of packets in each batch and comparing the values measured by different network nodes along the path, it is possible to measure the packet loss occurred in any single batch between any two nodes. Each batch represents a measurable entity unambiguously recognizable by all network nodes along the path.

It is important to mention that for the application of this method there are two elements to consider: the clock error between network nodes and the network delay. These can create offsets between the batches and out-of-order of the packets. The consequence is that it is necessary to define a waiting interval where to get stable counters and to avoid these issues. In addition this implies that the length of the batches MUST be chosen large enough so that it is not affected by those factors.






Figure 1: Packet Loss Measurement and Single-Marking Methodology using L bit

## 5.2. Packet Delay Measurement

The same principle used to measure packet loss can be applied also to one-way delay measurement. Delay metrics MAY be calculated using the two possibilities:

1. **Single-Marking Methodology:** This approach uses only the L bit to calculate both packet loss and delay. In this case, the D flag MUST be set to zero on transmit and ignored by the monitoring points. The alternation of the values of the L bit can be used as a time reference to calculate the delay. Whenever the L bit changes and a new batch starts, a network node can store the timestamp of the first packet of the new batch, that timestamp can be compared with the timestamp of the first packet of the same batch on a second node to compute packet delay. Anyway this measurement is accurate only if no packet loss occurs and if there is no packet reordering at the edges of the batches. A different approach can also be considered and it is based on the concept of the mean delay. The mean delay for each batch is calculated by considering the average arrival time of the packets for the relative batch. There are limitations also in this case indeed, each node needs to collect all the timestamps and calculate the average timestamp for each batch. In addition the information is limited to a mean value.
2. **Double-Marking Methodology:** This approach is more complete and uses the L bit only to calculate packet loss and the D bit (Delay flag) is fully dedicated to delay measurements. The idea is to use the first marking with the L bit to create the alternate flow and, within the batches identified by the L bit, a second marking is used to select the packets for measuring delay. The D bit creates a new set of marked packets that are fully identified over the network, so that a network node can store the timestamps



of these packets; these timestamps can be compared with the timestamps of the same packets on a second node to compute packet delay values for each packet. The most efficient and robust mode is to select a single double-marked packet for each batch, in this way there is no time gap to consider between the double-marked packets to avoid their reorder. If a double-marked packet is lost, the delay measurement for the considered batch is simply discarded, but this is not a big problem because it is easy to recognize the problematic batch and skip the measurement just for that one. So in order to have more information about the delay and to overcome out-of-order issues this method is preferred.




Figure 2: Double-Marking Methodology using L bit and D bit

Similar to packet delay measurement (both for Single Marking and Double Marking), the method can also be used to measure the inter-arrival jitter.

### 5.3. Flow Monitoring Identification

The Flow Monitoring Identification (FlowMonID) is required for some general reasons:

First, it helps to reduce the per node configuration. Otherwise, each node needs to configure an access-control list (ACL) for each of the monitored flows. Moreover, using a flow identifier allows a flexible granularity for the flow definition.

Second, it simplifies the counters handling. Hardware processing of flow tuples (and ACL matching) is challenging and often incurs into performance issues, especially in tunnel interfaces.





Third, it eases the data export encapsulation and correlation for the collectors.

The FlowMon identifier field is to uniquely identify a monitored flow within the measurement domain. The field is set at the source node. The FlowMonID can be uniformly assigned by the central controller or algorithmically generated by the source node. The latter approach cannot guarantee the uniqueness of FlowMonID but it may be preferred for local or private network, where the conflict probability is small due to the large FlowMonID space.

#### **5.4. Multipoint and Clustered Alternate Marking**

The Alternate Marking method can also be extended to any kind of multipoint to multipoint paths, and the network clustering approach allows a flexible and optimized performance measurement, as described in [[I-D.ietf-ippm-multipoint-alt-mark](#)].

The Cluster is the smallest identifiable subnetwork of the entire Network graph that still satisfies the condition that the number of packets that goes in is the same that goes out. With network clustering, it is possible to use the partition of the network into clusters at different levels in order to perform the needed degree of detail. So, for Multipoint Alternate Marking, FlowMonID can identify in general a multipoint-to-multipoint flow and not only a point-to-point flow.

#### **5.5. Data Collection and Calculation**

The nodes enabled to perform performance monitoring collect the value of the packet counters and timestamps. There are several alternatives to implement Data Collection and Calculation, but this is not specified in this document.

### **6. Security Considerations**

This document aims to apply a method to perform measurements that does not directly affect Internet security nor applications that run on the Internet. However, implementation of this method must be mindful of security and privacy concerns. There are two types of security concerns: potential harm caused by the measurements and potential harm to the measurements.

Security concerns are limited since the method implies modifications to an Option of the data packets but this must be performed in a way that doesn't alter the quality of service experienced by packets subject to measurements and that preserves stability of nodes. In addition, an attacker cannot gain information about network



performance from a monitoring node; it must use synchronized monitoring nodes at multiple points on the path but this is very difficult since the alternate methodology is applied only in the context of a controlled domain.

Privacy concerns are also limited because the method only relies on information contained in the Option Header without any release of user data.

## 7. IANA Considerations

The Option Type should be assigned in IANA's "Destination Options and Hop-by-Hop Options" registry. Also, the SRH TLV type should be assigned from Segment Routing Header TLVs Registry.

This draft requests the following IPv6 Option Type assignments from the Destination Options and Hop-by-Hop Options sub-registry of Internet Protocol Version 6 (IPv6) Parameters (<https://www.iana.org/assignments/ipv6-parameters/>).

| Hex Value | Binary Value | Description | Reference    |
|-----------|--------------|-------------|--------------|
|           | act chg rest |             |              |
| -----     | -----        | -----       | -----        |
| TBD       | 00 0 tbd     | AltMark     | [This draft] |

## 8. Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Bob Hinden, Ole Troan, Tom Herbert, Stefano Previdi, Brian Carpenter, Eric Vyncke, Ron Bonica for the precious comments and suggestions.

## 9. References

### 9.1. Normative References

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.
- [RFC8200] Deering, S. and R. Hinden, "Internet Protocol, Version 6 (IPv6) Specification", STD 86, [RFC 8200](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8200, July 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8200>>.



## 9.2. Informative References

- [I-D.fioccola-v6ops-ipv6-alt-mark]  
Fioccola, G., Velde, G., Cociglio, M., and P. Muley, "IPv6 Performance Measurement with Alternate Marking Method", [draft-fioccola-v6ops-ipv6-alt-mark-01](#) (work in progress), June 2018.
- [I-D.ietf-ippm-multipoint-alt-mark]  
Fioccola, G., Cociglio, M., Sapio, A., and R. Sisto, "Multipoint Alternate Marking method for passive and hybrid performance monitoring", [draft-ietf-ippm-multipoint-alt-mark-09](#) (work in progress), March 2020.
- [RFC4291] Hinden, R. and S. Deering, "IP Version 6 Addressing Architecture", [RFC 4291](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4291, February 2006, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4291>>.
- [RFC7045] Carpenter, B. and S. Jiang, "Transmission and Processing of IPv6 Extension Headers", [RFC 7045](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7045, December 2013, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7045>>.
- [RFC8321] Fioccola, G., Ed., Capello, A., Cociglio, M., Castaldelli, L., Chen, M., Zheng, L., Mirsky, G., and T. Mizrahi, "Alternate-Marking Method for Passive and Hybrid Performance Monitoring", [RFC 8321](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8321, January 2018, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8321>>.
- [RFC8754] Filsfils, C., Ed., Dukes, D., Ed., Previdi, S., Leddy, J., Matsushima, S., and D. Voyer, "IPv6 Segment Routing Header (SRH)", [RFC 8754](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8754, March 2020, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8754>>.

### Authors' Addresses

Giuseppe Fioccola  
Huawei  
Riesstrasse, 25  
Munich 80992  
Germany

Email: [giuseppe.fioccola@huawei.com](mailto:giuseppe.fioccola@huawei.com)



Tianran Zhou  
Huawei  
156 Beiqing Rd.  
Beijing 100095  
China

Email: zhoutianran@huawei.com

Mauro Cociglio  
Telecom Italia  
Via Reiss Romoli, 274  
Torino 10148  
Italy

Email: mauro.cociglio@telecomitalia.it

Fengwei Qin  
China Mobile  
32 Xuanwumenxi Ave.  
Beijing 100032  
China

Email: qinfengwei@chinamobile.com



