

ippm
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: January 4, 2021

R. Geib, Ed.
Deutsche Telekom
July 3, 2020

A Connectivity Monitoring Metric for IPPM
draft-geib-ippm-connectivity-monitoring-03

Abstract

Within a Segment Routing domain, segment routed measurement packets can be sent along pre-determined paths. This enables new kinds of measurements. Connectivity monitoring allows to supervise the state and performance 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 January 4, 2021.

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

Internet-Draft

Abbreviated Title

July 2020

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	4
2.	A brief segment routing connectivity monitoring framework . .	4
3.	Singleton Definition for Type-P-SR-Path-Connectivity-and- Congestion	7
3.1.	Metric Name	7
3.2.	Metric Parameters	7
3.3.	Metric Units	8
3.4.	Definition	8
3.5.	Discussion	8
3.6.	Methodologies	9
3.7.	Errors and Uncertainties	10
3.8.	Reporting the Metric	11
4.	Singleton Definition for Type-P-SR-Path-Round-Trip-Delay- Estimate	11
5.	IANA Considerations	12
6.	Security Considerations	12
7.	References	12
7.1.	Normative References	12
7.2.	Informative References	13
	Author's Address	13

[1.](#) Introduction

Within a Segment Routing domain, measurement packets can be sent along pre-determined segment routed paths [[RFC8402](#)]. A segment routed path may consist of pre-determined sub paths, specific router-interfaces or a combination of both. A measurement path 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 central Segment Routing (SR) 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 exchanges hello messages between neighbors to keep alive routing and swiftly adapt routing to

topology changes. Network Operators may be interested in monitoring connectivity and congestion of interfaces or sub-paths at a timescale of seconds, minutes or hours. In both cases, the periodicity is significantly smaller than commodity interface monitoring based on

router counters, which may be collected on a minute timescale to keep the processor- or monitoring data-load low.

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 increases scalability of the monitoring system. But localising the site of a detected change in network behaviour may then require network tomography methods.

The IPPM Metrics for Measuring Connectivity offer generic connectivity metrics [[RFC2678](#)]. These metrics allow to measure connectivity between end nodes without making any assumption on the paths between them. The metric and the type-p packet specified by this document follow a different approach: they are designed to monitor connectivity and performance of a specific single link or a path segment. The underlying definition of connectivity is partially the same: a packet not reaching a destination indicates a loss of connectivity. An IGP re-route may indicate a loss of a link, while it might not cause loss of connectivity between end systems. The metric specified here enables link-loss detection, if the change in end-to-end delay along a new route is differing from that of the original path.

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 allows to steer PMS measurement packets along arbitrary pre-determined concatenated sub-paths, identified by suitable segments. Basically, a number of overlaid measurement paths is set up. The delays of packets sent along each on of these paths is measured. Single changes in topology cause correlated changes in the measurement packet delay (or packet loss) of different measurement paths. By a suitable set up, the number of measurement paths may be limited to one per connection (or sub-path) to be monitored. In addition to information revealed by a commodity ICMP

ping measurement, the metric and method specified here identify the location of a congested interface. To do so, tomography assumptions and methods are combined to first plan the overlaid SR measurement path set up and later on to evaluate the captured delay measurements.

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 path 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 consists of 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 loop's round trip time (or causes drops of packets of more than one loop). Randomly chosen loop paths including the interfaces or paths to be monitored may fail to produce unique result patterns. The approach picked here uses specified measurement loop and path overlay design. A centralised monitoring approach benefits from keeping the number of required measurement loops low. This improves scalability by minimising the number of measurement loops. This also keeps the number of required packets and results to be evaluated and correlated low.

An additional property of the measurement path set-up specified below is that it allows to estimate the packet round trip and the one way delay of a monitored link (or path). The delay along a single link is not perfectly symmetric. Packet processing causes small delay differences per interface and direction. These cause an error, which can't be quantified or removed by the specified method. Quantifying

this error requires a different measurement set-up. As this will introduce additional measurements loops, packets and evaluations, the cost in terms of reduced scalability is not felt to be worth the benefit in measurement accuracy. IPPM however honors precision more than accuracy and the mentioned processing differences are relatively stable, resulting in relatively precise delay estimates.

An example SR domain is shown below. The PMS shown should monitor the connectivity of all 6 links between nodes L100 and L200 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

Monitoring the 6 links between Ln00 and L0m0 nodes requires 6 measurement loops, each of which has the following properties:

- o Each loop follows a single round trip from one Ln00 to one L0m0 (e.g., between L100 and L050).
- o Each loop passes two more links: one between that Ln00 and another L0m0 and from there to 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).

Note that any 6 links between two to six nodes can be monitored that way too (if multiple parallel links between two nodes are monitored, the differences in delay may require a sufficiently high clock resolution, if applicable).

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. M1 is the delay along L100 -> L050 -> L100 -> L060 -> L200
2. M2 is the delay along L100 -> L060 -> L100 -> L070 -> L200
3. M3 is the delay along L100 -> L070 -> L100 -> L050 -> L200
4. M4 is the delay along L200 -> L050 -> L200 -> L060 -> L100
5. M5 is the delay along L200 -> L060 -> L200 -> L070 -> L100
6. M6 is the delay along L200 -> L070 -> L200 -> L050 -> L100

An example for a stack of a loop consisting of Node-SID segments allowing to capture M1 is (top to bottom): 100 | 050 | 100 | 060 | 200 | PMS.

An example for a stack of Adj-SID segments the loop resulting in M1 is (top to bottom): 100 | 10050 | 50100 | 10060 | 60200 | PMS. As can be seen, the Node-SIDs 100 and PMS are present at top and bottom of the segment stack. Their purpose is to transport the packet from the PMS to the start of the measurement loop at L100 and return it to the PMS from its end.

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

- o If the loops are set up using Node-SIDs only, any single complete loss of connectivity caused by a failing single link between any Ln00 and any L0m0 node briefly disturbs (and changes the measured delay) of three loops. Traffic to Node-SIDs is rerouted.
- o If the loops are set up using Adj-SIDs only (and Node-SIDs only to send the packet from PMS to the loop starting point and from the loop end back to the PMS), any single complete loss of

connectivity caused by a failing single link between any Ln00 and any L0m0 node terminates the traffic along three loops. The packets of these loops will be dropped, until the link gets back into service. Traffic to Adj-SIDs is not rerouted.

- o Any congested single interface between any Ln00 and any L0m0 node only impacts the measured delay of two measurement loops.

- o As an example, the formula for a single Round Trip Delay (RTD) is shown here $4 * RTD_{L100-L050-L100} = 3 * M1 + M3 + M6 - M2 - M4 - M5$

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.

A congestion event adding latency to two specific measurement loops allows calculation of the delay added by the queue at the congested interface. Thus, the resulting RTD increase can be assigned to a single interface.

[3.](#) Singleton Definition for Type-P-SR-Path-Connectivity-and-Congestion

[3.1.](#) Metric Name

Type-P-SR-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. Definition

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.

Geib

Expires January 4, 2021

[Page 10]

Internet-Draft

Abbreviated Title

July 2020

[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.

The temporal resolution of the detected events depends on the spacing interval of packets transmitted per measurement path. An identical sending interval is chosen for every measurement path. As a rule of thumb, an event is reliably detected if a sample consists of at least 5 probes indicating the same underlying change in behavior. Depending on the underlying event either two or three measurement paths are impacted. At least two consecutively received measurement packets per measurement path should suffice to indicate a change. The values chosen for an operational network will have to reflect scalability constraints of a PMS measurement interface. As an example, a PMS may work reliable if no more than one measurement packet is transmitted per millisecond. Further, measurement is configured so that the measurement packets return to the sender interface. Assume always groups of 6 links to be monitored as described above by 6 measurements paths. If one packet is sent per measurement path within 500 ms, up to 498 links can be monitored with a reliable temporal resolution of roughly one second per detected event.

Note that per group measurement packet spacing, measurement loop delay difference and latency caused by congestion impact the reporting interval. If each measurement path of a single 6 link monitoring group is addressed in consecutive milliseconds (within the 500 ms interval) and the sum of maximum physical delay of the per group measurement paths and latency possibly added by congestion is below 490 ms, the one second reports reliably capture 4 packets of

two different measurement paths, if two measurement paths are congested, or 6 packets of three different measurement paths, if a link is lost.

A variety of reporting options exist, if scalability issues and network properties are respected.

4. Singleton Definition for Type-P-SR-Path-Round-Trip-Delay-Estimate

This section will be added in a later version, if there's interest in picking up this work.

Geib Expires January 4, 2021 [Page 11]

Internet-Draft Abbreviated Title July 2020

5. IANA Considerations

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

6. 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.

7. References

7.1. 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>>.

[RFC2678] Mahdavi, J. and V. Paxson, "IPPM Metrics for Measuring Connectivity", [RFC 2678](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC2678, September 1999, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2678>>.

- [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>>.

Geib

Expires January 4, 2021

[Page 12]

Internet-Draft

Abbreviated Title

July 2020

[7.2.](#) 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