

ippm
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: September 12, 2019

R. Geib, Ed.
Deutsche Telekom
March 11, 2019

A Connectivity Monitoring Metric for IPPM
draft-geib-ippm-connectivity-monitoring-00

Abstract

Segment Routed measurement packets can be sent along pre-determined paths. This allows new kinds of measurements. Connectivity monitoring allows to supervise the state of a connection or a (sub)path from one or a few central monitoring systems. This document specifies a suitable type-P connectivity monitoring metric.

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 September 12, 2019.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2019 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

1.	Introduction	2
1.1.	Requirements Language	3
2.	A brief segment routing connectivity monitoring framework	3
3.	Singleton Definition for Type-P-Path-Connectivity-and-Congestion	6
3.1.	Metric Name	6
3.2.	Metric Parameters	6
3.3.	Metric Units	7
3.4.	Defintion	7
3.5.	Discussion	7
3.6.	Methodologies	7
3.7.	Errors and Uncertainties	9
3.8.	Reporting the Metric	9
4.	IANA Considerations	9
5.	Security Considerations	9
6.	References	10
6.1.	Normative References	10
6.2.	Informative References	10
	Author's Address	11

[1.](#) Introduction

Segment Routing enables sending measurement packets along pre-determined segment routed paths [[RFC8402](#)]. A segment routed path may consist of pre-determined sub paths down to specific router-interfaces. It may also consist of sub paths spanning multiple routers, given that all segments to address a desired path are available and known at the SR domain edge interface.

A Path Monitoring System or PMS (see [[RFC8403](#)]) is a dedicated rather central Segment Routing domain monitoring device (as compared to a distributed monitoring approach based on router data and functions only). Monitoring individual sub-paths or point-to-point connections is executed for different purposes. IGP routing exchanges hello messages between neighbors to keep alive routing and switfly adapt to changes. Network Operators may be interested in monitoring connectivity and lasting congestion of interfaces or sub-paths at a higher timescale,e.g., on the order of seconds. This is still significantly faster than interface monitoring based on router information, which may be collected on a minute timescale to reduce the CPU load caused by monitoring.

The IPPM architecture was a first step to that direction [[RFC2330](#)]. Commodity IPPM solutions require dedicated measurement systems, a large number of measurement agents and synchronised clocks. Monitoring a domain from edge to edge by commodity IPPM solutions

helps to increase scalability of the monitoring system, but localising a source cause of a detected change in network behaviour then may require network tomography methods.

A Segment Routing PMS which is part of an SR domain is IGP topology aware, covering the IP and (if present) the MPLS layer topology [[RFC8402](#)]. This enables to design a PMS which can steer packets along arbitrary pre-determined concatenated sub-paths, identified by suitable segments. Combining the SR measurement path configuration with a priori network tomography assumptions and methods allows for localisation of detected changes. The latter requires setting up multiple measurement paths which share sub-paths following the constraints derived from network tomography, and a suitable evaluation.

This document specifies a type-p metric determining properties of an SR path which allows to monitor connectivity and congestion of interfaces and further allows to locate the connection or interface which caused a change in the reported type-p metric. This document is focussed on the MPLS layer, but the methodology may be applied within SR domains or MPLS domains in general.

1.1. 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](#)].

2. A brief segment routing connectivity monitoring framework

The Segment Routing IGP topology information consists of the IP and (if present) the MPLS layer topology. The minimum SR topology information are Node-Segment-Identifiers (Node-SID), identifying an SR router. The IGP exchange of Adjacency-SIDs [I-D.[draft-ietf-isis-segment-routing-extensions](#)], which identify local interfaces to adjacent nodes, is optional. It is RECOMMENDED to distribute Adj-SIDs in a domain operating a PMS to monitor connectivity as specified below. If Adj-SIDs aren't available, [[RFC8029](#)] provides methods how to steer packets along desired paths by the proper choice of an MPLS Echo-request IP-destination address. A detailed description of [[RFC8029](#)] methods as a replacement of Adj-SIDs is out of scope of this document.


A round trip measurement between two adjacent nodes is a simple method to monitor connectivity of a connecting link. If multiple links are operational between two adjacent nodes and only a single one fails, a single plain round trip measurement may fail to identify which link has failed. A round trip measurement also fails to

identify which interface is congested, even if only a single link connects two adjacent nodes.

Segment Routing enables the set-up of extended measurement loops. Several different measurement loops can be set up. If these form a partial overlay, any change in the network properties impacts more than a single loops round trip time (or drops packets of more than one loop). An randomly chosen paths may fail to produce unique result patterns. A centralised monitoring approach further benefits from keeping the number of measurement loops low, as this improves scalability one hand and keeps the number of results to be evaluated and correlated low.

Segment Routing enables the set-up of extended measurement loops. Several different measurement loops can be set up. If these form a partial overlay, any change in the network properties impacts more than a single loops round trip time (or drops packets of more than one loop). An randomly chosen paths may fail to produce unique result patterns. A centralised monitoring approach further benefits from keeping the number of measurement loops low, as this improves scalability one hand and keeps the number of results to be evaluated and correlated low.

An example SR domain is shown below. The PMS shown should monitor the connectivity of all 6 links between nodes L100 and L200 one one side and the connected nodes L050, L060 and L070 on the other side. The round trip times per measurement loop are assumed to exhibit unique delays.



Connectivity verification with a PMS

Figure 1

The SID values are picked for convenient reading only. Node-SID: 100 identifies L100, Node-SID: 300 identifies L300 and so on. Adj-SID 10050: Adjacency L100 to L050, Adj-SID 10060: Adjacency L100 to L060, Adj-SID 60200: Adjacency L60 to L200

This requires 6 measurement paths, each of which has the following properties:

- o It follows a single round trip from one Ln00 to one L0m0 (e.g., between L100 and L050).
- o It passes two more links between that Ln00 one more L0m0 and the other Ln00 (e.g., between L100 and L060 and then L060 to L200)
- o Every link is passed by a single round trip per measurement loop only once and only once unidirectional by two other loops, and the latter two pass along opposing directions (that's three loops passing each single link, e.g., one having a round trip L100 to L050 and back, a second passing L100 to L050 only and a third loop passing L050 to L100 only).

This results in 6 measurement loops for the given example (the start and end of each measurement loop is PMS to L300 to L100 or L200 and a similar sub-path on the return leg. It is omitted here for brevity):

1. L100 -> L050 -> L100 -> L060 -> L200
2. L100 -> L060 -> L100 -> L070 -> L200
3. L100 -> L070 -> L100 -> L050 -> L200
4. L200 -> L050 -> L200 -> L060 -> L100
5. L200 -> L060 -> L200 -> L070 -> L100
6. L200 -> L070 -> L200 -> L050 -> L100

The measurement loops set up as shown have the following properties:

- o Any single complete loss of connectivity caused by a failing single link briefly between any Ln00 and any L0m0 node disturbs (and changes the measured delay) of three loops.
- o Whereas any congested single interface between any Ln00 and any L0m0 node only impacts the measured delay of two measurement loops.

A closer look reveals that each single event of interest for the proposed metric, which are a loss of connectivity or a case of congestion, uniquely only impacts a single a-priori determinable set of measurement loops. If, e.g., connectivity is lost between L200 and L050, measurement loops (3), (4) and (6) indicate a change in the measured delay.

As a second example, if the interface L070 to L100 is congested, measurement loops (3) and (5) indicate a change in the measured delay. Without listing all events, all cases of single losses of connectivity or single events of congestion influence only delay measurements of a unique set of measurement loops.

3. Singleton Definition for Type-P-Path-Connectivity-and-Congestion

3.1. Metric Name

Type-P-Path-Connectivity-and-Congestion

3.2. Metric Parameters

- o Src, the IP address of a source host
- o Dst, the IP address of a destination host if IP routing is applicable; in the case of MPLS routing, a diagnostic address as specified by [[RFC8029](#)]
- o T, a time
- o lambda, a rate in reciprocal seconds
- o L, a packet length in bits. The packets of a Type P packet stream from which the sample Path-Connectivity-and-Congestion metric is taken MUST all be of the same length.
- o MLA, a Monitoring Loop Address information ensuring that a singleton passes a single sub-path_a to be monitored bidirectional, a sub-path_b to be monitored unidirectional and a sub-path_c to be monitored unidirectional, where sub-path_a, -_b and -_c MUST NOT be identical.
- o P, the specification of the packet type, over and above the source and destination addresses
- o DS, a constant time interval between two type-P packets

3.3. Metric Units

A sequence of consecutive time values.

3.4. Defintion

A moving average of AV time values per measurement path is compared by a change point detection algorithm. The temporal packet spacing value DS represents the smallest period within which a change in connectivity or congestion may be detected.

A single loss of connectivity of a sub-path between two nodes affects three different measurement paths. Depending on the value chosen for DS, packet loss might occur (note that the moving average evaluation needs to span a longer period than convergence time; alternatively, packet-loss visible along the three measurement paths may serve as an evaluation criterium). After routing convergence the type-p packets along the three measurement paths show a change in delay.

A congestion of a single interface of a sub-path connecting two nodes affects two different measurement paths. The the type-p packets along the two congested measurement paths show an additional change in delay.

3.5. Discussion

Detection of a multiple losses of monitored sub-path connectivity or congestion of a multiple monitored sub-paths may be possible. These cases have not been investigated, but may occur in the case of Shared Risk Link Groups. Monitoring Shared Risk LinkGroups and sub-paths with multiple failures abd congestion is not within scope of this document.

3.6. Methodologies

For the given type-p, the methodology is as follows:

- o The set of measurement paths MUST be routed in a way that each single loss of connectivity and each case of single interface congestion of one of the sub-paths passed by a type-p packet creates a unique pattern of type-p packets belonging to a subset of all configured measurement paths indicate a change in the measured delay. As a minimum, each sub-path to be monitored MUST be passed

o

- * by one measurement_path_1 and its type-p packet in bidirectional direction
 - * by one measurement_path_2 and its type-p packet in "downlink" direction
 - * by one measurement_path_3 and its type-p packet in "uplink" direction
- o "Uplink" and "Downlink" have no architectural relevance. The terms are chosen to express, that the packets of measurement_path_2 and measurement_path_3 pass the monitored sub-path unidirectional in opposing direction. Measurement_path_1, measurement_path_2 and measurement_path_3 MUST NOT be identical.
 - o All measurement paths SHOULD terminate between identical sender and receiver interfaces. It is recommended to connect the sender and receiver as closely to the paths to be monitored as possible. Each intermediate sub-path between sender and receiver on one hand and sub-paths to be monitored is an additional source of errors requiring separate monitoring.
 - o Segment Routed domains supporting Node- and Adj-SIDs should enable the monitoring path set-up as specified. Other routing protocols may be used as well, but the monitoring path set up might be complex or impossible.
 - o Pre-compute how the two and three measurement path delay changes correlate to sub-path connectivity and congestion patterns. Absolute change values aren't required, a simultaneous change of two or three particular measurement paths is.
 - o Ensure that the temporal resolution of the measurement clock allows to reliably capture a unique delay value for each configured measurement path while sub-path connectivity is complete and no congestion is present.
 - o Synchronised clocks are not strictly required, as the metric is evaluating differences in delay. Changes in clock synchronisation SHOULD NOT be close to the time interval within which changes in connectivity or congestion should be monitored.
 - o At the Src host, select Src and Dst IP addresses, and address information to route the type-p packet along one of the configured measurement path. Form a test packet of Type-P with these addresses.
 - o Configure the Dst host access to receive the packet.

- o At the Src host, place a timestamp, a sequence number and a unique identifier of the measurement path in the prepared Type-P packet, and send it towards Dst.
- o Capture the one-way delay and determine packet-loss by the metrics specified by [[RFC7679](#)] and [[RFC7680](#)] respectively and store the result for the path.
- o If two or three subpaths indicate a change in delay, report a change in connectivity or congestion status as pre-computed above.
- o If two or three sub paths indicate a change in delay, report a change in connectivity or congestion status as pre-computed above.

Note that monitoring 6 sub paths requires setting up 6 monitoring paths as shown in the figure above.

[3.7.](#) Errors and Uncertainties

Sources of error are:

- o Measurement paths whose delays don't indicate a change after sub-path connectivity changed.
- o A timestamps whose resolution is missing or inaccurate at the delays measured for the different monitoring paths.
- o Multiple occurrences of sub path connectivity and congestion.
- o Loss of connectivity and congestion along sub-paths connecting the measurement device(s) with the sub-paths to be monitored.

[3.8.](#) Reporting the Metric

The metric reports loss of connectivity of monitored sub-path or congestion of an interface and identifies the sub-path and the direction of traffic in the case of congestion.

[4.](#) IANA Considerations

If standardised, the metric will require an entry in the IPPM metric registry.

[5.](#) Security Considerations

This draft specifies how to use methods specified or described within [[RFC8402](#)] and [[RFC8403](#)]. It does not introduce new or additional SR

features. The security considerations of both references apply here too.

6. References

6.1. 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>>.
- [RFC7679] Almes, G., Kalidindi, S., Zekauskas, M., and A. Morton, Ed., "A One-Way Delay Metric for IP Performance Metrics (IPPM)", STD 81, [RFC 7679](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7679, January 2016, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7679>>.
- [RFC7680] Almes, G., Kalidindi, S., Zekauskas, M., and A. Morton, Ed., "A One-Way Loss Metric for IP Performance Metrics (IPPM)", STD 82, [RFC 7680](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7680, January 2016, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7680>>.
- [RFC8029] Kompella, K., Swallow, G., Pignataro, C., Ed., Kumar, N., Aldrin, S., and M. Chen, "Detecting Multiprotocol Label Switched (MPLS) Data-Plane Failures", [RFC 8029](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8029, March 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8029>>.
- [RFC8402] Filsfils, C., Ed., Previdi, S., Ed., Ginsberg, L., Decraene, B., Litkowski, S., and R. Shakir, "Segment Routing Architecture", [RFC 8402](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8402, July 2018, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8402>>.

6.2. Informative References

- [RFC2330] Paxson, V., Almes, G., Mahdavi, J., and M. Mathis, "Framework for IP Performance Metrics", [RFC 2330](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC2330, May 1998, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2330>>.
- [RFC8403] Geib, R., Ed., Filsfils, C., Pignataro, C., Ed., and N. Kumar, "A Scalable and Topology-Aware MPLS Data-Plane Monitoring System", [RFC 8403](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8403, July 2018, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8403>>.

Author's Address

Ruediger Geib (editor)
Deutsche Telekom
Heinrich Hertz Str. 3-7
Darmstadt 64295
Germany

Phone: +49 6151 5812747

Email: Ruediger.Geib@telekom.de