

ippm  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: August 26, 2021

R. Geib, Ed.  
Deutsche Telekom  
February 22, 2021

A Connectivity Monitoring Metric for IPPM  
draft-ietf-ippm-connectivity-monitoring-01

## 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 August 26, 2021.

## Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2021 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

February 2021

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="#">3</a>
<a href="#">1.1.</a>	<a href="#">Requirements Language</a>	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	<a href="#">A brief segment routing connectivity monitoring framework</a>	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	<a href="#">Topology and measurement loop set up requirements</a>	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">3.1.</a>	<a href="#">General network topology requirements</a>	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">3.2.</a>	<a href="#">Sub-path Monitoring measurement loop routing requirements</a>	<a href="#">10</a>
<a href="#">3.3.</a>	<a href="#">Path</a>	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">4.</a>	<a href="#">Generic Type-P-SR-Path-Periodic-* metric</a>	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">4.1.</a>	<a href="#">Metric Name</a>	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">4.2.</a>	<a href="#">Generic Metric Parameters</a>	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">4.3.</a>	<a href="#">Metric Units</a>	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">5.</a>	<a href="#">Singleton Definition for Type-P-SR-Path-Periodic-Delay</a>	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">5.1.</a>	<a href="#">Metric Name</a>	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">5.2.</a>	<a href="#">Metric Parameters</a>	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">5.3.</a>	<a href="#">Delay Metric Units</a>	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">5.4.</a>	<a href="#">Definition</a>	<a href="#">13</a>
<a href="#">5.5.</a>	<a href="#">Discussion</a>	<a href="#">13</a>
<a href="#">5.6.</a>	<a href="#">Methodologies</a>	<a href="#">13</a>
<a href="#">5.7.</a>	<a href="#">Errors and Uncertainties</a>	<a href="#">13</a>
<a href="#">5.8.</a>	<a href="#">Reporting the metric</a>	<a href="#">13</a>
<a href="#">6.</a>	<a href="#">Definition of Samples for Type-P-SR-Path-Periodic-Delay</a>	<a href="#">13</a>
<a href="#">6.1.</a>	<a href="#">Generic Type-P-SR-Path-Periodic-Delay-* metric</a>	<a href="#">13</a>
<a href="#">6.1.1.</a>	<a href="#">Metric Name</a>	<a href="#">14</a>
<a href="#">6.1.2.</a>	<a href="#">Metric Parameters</a>	<a href="#">14</a>
<a href="#">6.1.3.</a>	<a href="#">Metric Units</a>	<a href="#">14</a>
<a href="#">6.1.4.</a>	<a href="#">Metric Defintion</a>	<a href="#">14</a>
<a href="#">6.1.5.</a>	<a href="#">Discussion</a>	<a href="#">14</a>
<a href="#">6.1.6.</a>	<a href="#">Errors and uncertainties</a>	<a href="#">14</a>
<a href="#">6.2.</a>	<a href="#">Definition of Type-P-SR-Path-Periodic-Delay-Stream</a>	<a href="#">14</a>
<a href="#">6.2.1.</a>	<a href="#">Metric Name</a>	<a href="#">15</a>
<a href="#">6.3.</a>	<a href="#">Definition of Type-P-SR-Path-Periodic-Delay-Variation</a>	<a href="#">15</a>
<a href="#">6.3.1.</a>	<a href="#">Metric Name</a>	<a href="#">15</a>
<a href="#">6.3.2.</a>	<a href="#">Methodologies</a>	<a href="#">15</a>
<a href="#">6.3.3.</a>	<a href="#">Discussion of SRDV</a>	<a href="#">15</a>
<a href="#">6.3.4.</a>	<a href="#">Errors and uncertainties</a>	<a href="#">15</a>
<a href="#">6.4.</a>	<a href="#">Definition of Type-P-SR-Path-Periodic-Delay-Variation-Stream</a>	<a href="#">15</a>
<a href="#">6.4.1.</a>	<a href="#">Metric Name</a>	<a href="#">15</a>

6.4.2. Metric Defintion . . . . .	16
7. Statistic Definitions for SR-Path-Periodic-*Stream samples .	16
7.1. SR-Path-Periodic-*-Mean . . . . .	16
7.2. SR-Path-Periodic-*-Std . . . . .	16
8. Sub-Path monitoring metrics derived from samples captured	

Internet-Draft	Abbreviated Title	February 2021
	along the measurement loops . . . . .	17
	8.1. Baseline measurement . . . . .	17
	8.2. Discussion of the baseline measurement . . . . .	18
	8.3. Definition of SR-Path-Sub-Path-RTD-Estimate . . . . .	18
	8.4. Definition of SR-Path-Sub-Path-*-Changepoint . . . . .	19
	8.5. Discussion of SR-Path-Sub-Path-*-Changepoint . . . . .	19
	8.6. Definition of SR-Path-Sub-Path-Congestion-Location . . . . .	20
	8.7. Discussion of SR-Path-Sub-Path-*-Location . . . . .	21
	9. Discussion of Temporal Resolution . . . . .	21
	10. IANA Considerations . . . . .	22
	11. Security Considerations . . . . .	22
	12. References . . . . .	22
	12.1. Normative References . . . . .	22
	12.2. Informative References . . . . .	23
	Author's Address . . . . .	24

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 detects a link-loss, if the change in end-to-end delay along a new route is differing from that of the original path.

A Segment Routing PMS is part of an SR domain. The PMS 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 Segment IDs. Basically, the SR connectivity metric as specified by this document requires set up of a number of constrained, overlaid measurement loops (or measurement paths). The delay of the packets sent along each of these measurement loops is measured. A single congested interface or a single loss of connectivity of a monitored sub-path cause a delay change on several measurement paths. Any single event of that type on one of the monitored sub-paths changes delays of a unique subset of measurement loops. The number of measurement loops may be limited to one per sub-path (or connection) to be monitored, if a hub-and-spoke like sub-path topology as described below is monitored. In addition to

information revealed by a commodity ICMP ping measurement, the metrics and methods 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 loop set up and later on to evaluate the captured delay measurements.

There's another difference as compared with commodity ping: the measurement loop packets remain in the data plane of passed routers. These need to forward the measurement packets without additional processing apart from that.

It is recommended to consider automated measurement loop set-ups. The methods proposed here are error-prone if the topology and measurement loop design isn't followed properly. While details of an automated set-up are not within scope of this document, some formal definitions of constraints to respected are given.

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 limited to the Segment Routing 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 [[RFC8667](#)], 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, [[RFC8287](#)] 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 [[RFC8287](#)] methods as a replacement of Adj-SIDs is out of scope of this document.

An active 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 notice that or 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 to form a partial overlay. If done properly, any network change impacts more than a single measurement loop's round trip delay (or causes drops of packets of more than one loop). Randomly chosen measurement loop paths including the interfaces or paths to be monitored may fail to produce the desired unique result patterns, hence commodity network tomography methods aren't applicable here [[CommodityTomography](#)]. The approach pursued here uses a pre-specified measurement loop overlay design.

A centralised monitoring approach doesn't require report collection and result correlation from two (or more) receivers (the measured delays of different measurement loops still need to be correlated).

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 sub-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 metrics prefer precision to accuracy and the mentioned processing differences are relatively stable, resulting in relatively precise delay estimates for each monitored sub-path.

An example hub and spoke network, operated as SR domain, is shown

below. The included PMS shown is supposed to monitor the connectivity of all 6 links (a very generic kind of sub-path) attaching the spoke-nodes L050, L060 and L070 to the hub-nodes L100 and L200.



Hub and spoke 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 and so on (note that the Adj-SID are locally assigned per node interface, meaning two per link).

Monitoring the 6 links between hub nodes Ln00 (where n=1,2) and spoke nodes L0m0 (where m=5,6,7) requires 6 measurement loops, which have the following properties:

- o Each measurement loop follows a single round trip from one hub Ln00 to one spoke L0m0 (e.g., between L100 and L050).
- o Each measurement loop passes two more links: one between the same hub Ln00 and another spoke L0m0 and from there to the alternate hub Ln00 (e.g., between L100 and L060 and then from L060 to L200)
- o Every monitored link is passed by a single round trip measurement

loop only once and further only once unidirectional by two other loops. These unidirectional measurement loop sections forward packets in opposing direction along the monitored link. In the end, three measurement loops pass each single monitored link (sub-path). In figure 1, e.g., one measurement loop having a round trip L100 to L050 and back (M1, see below), a second loop passing L100 to L050 only (M3) and a third loop passing L050 to L100 only (M6).

Note that any 6 links connecting two to five nodes can be monitored that way too. Further note that the measurement loop overlay chosen is optimised for 6 links and a hub and spoke topology of two to five nodes. The 'one measurement loop per measured sub-path' paradigm only works under these conditions.

The above overlay scheme 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. These parts of the measurement loops are omitted here for brevity (some discussion may be found below). The following delays are measured along the SR paths of each measurement loop:

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 Evaluation of the measurement loop Round Trip Delays M1 - M6 allow to detect the following state-changes of the monitored sub-paths:

- 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. The traffic to the Node-SIDs is rerouted (in the case of a single links loss, no node is completely disconnected in the example network).
- o If the loops are set up using Adj-SIDs only, any single complete loss of connectivity caused by a failing single link between any Ln00 and any L0m0 node terminates the traffic along three measurement loops. The packets of all three loops will be dropped, until the link gets back into service. Traffic to Adj-SIDs is not rerouted. Note that Node-SIDs may be used to forward the measurement packets from the PMS to the hub node, where the first sub-path to be monitored begins and from the hub node, receiving the measurement from the last monitored sub path, to the PMS.
- 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 link (sub-path) Round Trip Delay (RTD) is shown here  $4 * RTD_{L100-L050-L100} = 3 * M1 + M3 + M6 - M2 - M4 - M5$ . This formula is reproducible for all other links: sum up  $3 * RTD$  measured along the loop passing the monitored link of interest in round trip fashion, and add the RTDs of the two measurement loops passing the link of interest only in a single direction. From this sum subtract the RTD measured on all loops not passing the monitored link of interest to get four times the RTD of the monitored link of interest.

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 set of measurement loops which can be determined a-priori. 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.

Assume that the measurement loops are set up while there's no congestion. In that case, the congestion free RTDs of all monitored links can be calculated as shown above. A single congestion event adds queuing delay to the RTD measured by two specific measurement loops. The two measurement loops impacted allow to distinct the congested interface and calculation of the queue-depth in terms of seconds. As an example, assume a queue of an average depth of 20 ms to build up at interface L200 to L070 after the uncongested measurement interval T0. The measurement loops M5 and M6 are the only ones passing the interface in that direction. Both indicate a congestion M5 and M6 of + 20 ms during measurement interval T1, while M1-4 indicate no change. The location of the congested interface is determined by the combination of the two (and only two) measurement loops M5 and M6 showing an increased delay. The average queue depth = ( M5[T1] - M5[T0] + M6[T1] - M6[T0] )/2.

As mentioned there's a constant delay added for each measurement loop, which is the delay of the path transversed from PMS -> L100 + L200 -> PMS. Please note, that this added delay is appearing twice in the formula resulting in the monitored link delay estimate of the example network. Then it is the RTD PMS -> L100 + RTD L200 -> PMS. Both RTDs can be directly measured by two additional measurements Cor1 = RTD ( PMS -> L100 -> PMS) and Cor2 = RTD (PMS -> L200 -> PMS). The monitored link RTD formula was  $\text{linkRTD}_{\text{uncor}} = 3 * M_x + M_y + M_z - M_s - M_t - M_u$ . The correct  $4 * \text{linkRTD}_x = 4 * \text{linkRTD}_{\text{uncor}} - \text{Cor1} - \text{Cor2}$ .

If the interface between PMS and L100/L200 is congested, all measurements loops M1-M6 as well as Cor1 and Cor2 will see a change. A congested interface of a monitored link doesn't impact the RTDs captured by Cor1 and Cor2.

The measurement loops may also be set up between hub nodes L100 and L200, if that's preferred and supported by the nodes. In that case, the above formulas apply without correction.

### [3.](#) Topology and measurement loop set up requirements

#### [3.1.](#) General network topology requirements

The metric and methods specified below can be applied to monitor

networks or sub-paths forming a hub and spoke topology. A single sub-path status change of type loss of connectivity or congestion can

be detected. The nodes don't have to act as hubs or spokes, this terminology is only chosen to describe a topology requirement. In detail, the topology to be monitored MUST meet the following constraints:

- o The SR domain sub-paths to be monitored create a hub and spoke topology with a PMS connected to all hub nodes. The PMS may reside in a hub.
- o Exactly 6 (six) sub-paths are monitored.
- o The monitored sub-paths connect at least two and no more than 5 nodes.
- o Every spoke node MUST have at least one path to every hub node.
- o Every spoke node MUST at least be connected to one (or more) hub node(s) by two monitored sub-paths.
- o Sub-paths between spokes can't be monitored and therefore are out of scope (the overlay measurement loops can't be set up as desired).

Shared resources, like a Shared Risk Link Group (e.g., a single fiber bundle) or a shared queue passed by several logical links need to be considered during set up. Shared resources may either be desired or to be avoided. As an example, if a set of logical links share one parental scheduler queue, it is sufficient to monitor a single logical connection to monitor the state of that parental scheduler.

### [3.2.](#) Sub-path Monitoring measurement loop routing requirements

The methodologies specified by this document REQUIRE a measurement loop path overlay of all path delay measurement streams  $F_i$ ,  $i$  in  $[1, 2...6]$  as defined in this section. In the following, a path delay measurement stream  $F_i$  is called measurement (loop)  $F_i$  for brevity.

- o Define the segment routed Sub-paths  $SP_i$ ,  $i$  in  $[1, 2...6]$  to be monitored. The Sub-paths  $SP_i$  SHOULD not share resources, if the

operator isn't aware of the impact of the shared resources on the measurement loops  $F_i$  and the methodologies defined below. The Sub-path  $SP_i$  topology SHOULD respect the general network topology requirements as specified above.

- o Set up  $i = 1, 2 \dots 6$  measurement loops  $F_i$  thus that measurement  $F_i$  passes  $SP_i$  and only  $SP_i$  bidirectional (or by a round-trip) from Hub to Spoke and back. Note that the correspondance of  $SP_i$  and  $F_i$

Geib

Expires August 26, 2021

[Page 10]

---

Internet-Draft

Abbreviated Title

February 2021

isn't strictly required. Measurement  $F_i$  thus however appears in all methodologies calculating a metric related to  $SP_i$ .

- o Set up the SR path per measurement loops  $F_j$  and  $F_k$  thus that  $SP_i$  is passed by exactly one other measurement loop  $F_j$  unidirectional in direction Hub to Spoke and by exactly one other measurement loop  $F_k$  unidirectional in the opposite direction (Spoke to Hub). The measurement loop  $F_i \neq F_j \neq F_k$ . As a description, one measurement loop  $F_j$  pass  $SP_i$  in "downstream" direction from Hub to Spoke, whereas measurement loop  $F_k$  passes  $SP_i$  in "upstream" direction from Spoke to Hub.
- o Set up each segment routed measurement loop path  $F_i$  thus that it passes  $SP_i$  bidirectional as specified above,  $SP_j$  unidirectional from Hub to Spoke and  $SP_k$  unidirectional from Spoke to Hub. The monitored Sub-path  $SP_i$  MUST NOT be equal to  $SP_j$  and MUST NOT be equal to  $SP_k$ .
- o The measurement loop set up to monitor all Sub-paths  $SP_i$  is completed, if:
  - o
  - \* Each Sub-path  $SP_i$  is passed by exactly three measurements loops  $F_i$ ,  $F_j$  and  $F_k$  as specified above.
  - \* Each segment routed measurement loop path  $F_i$  passes exactly three concatenated Sub-paths  $SP_i$ ,  $SP_m$  and  $SP_n$  as specified above (indices  $m$  and  $n$  are chosen here only to avoid misconceptions which may result from picking indices  $j$  and  $k$  already appearing before - equality of  $j$  and  $k$  with either  $m$  and  $n$  is neither excluded nor required).

### [3.3.](#) Path

This document specifies sub-path monitoring within a closed domain by a controlled and pre-designed measurement loop set-up. The path traversed by the packet SHOULD be reported, as detecting data plane forwarding in line with the desired measurement loop set-up is essential for the metric to enable and verify accurate evaluation. See [[RFC8287](#)] for SR MPLS OAM and [[ID.draft-ietf-6man-spring-srv6-oam](#)] for SRv6 OAM.

## 4. Generic Type-P-SR-Path-Periodic-\* metric

To reduce the redundant information presented in the detailed metrics sections that follow, this section presents the specifications that are common to two or more metrics. The section is organized using

Geib

Expires August 26, 2021

[Page 11]

---

Internet-Draft

Abbreviated Title

February 2021

the same subsections as the individual metrics, to simplify comparisons.

### [4.1.](#) Metric Name

All metrics use the Type-P convention as described in [[RFC2330](#)]. The rest of the name is unique to each metric.

### [4.2.](#) Generic Metric Parameters

Refer to [section 3.2](#). Metric Parameters: Type-P-\* of [[RFC6673](#)]. The following parameters are added, enhanced or removed:

Dst SHOULD be a diagnostic IP address as specified by [[RFC8287](#)] and [[RFC8029](#)], if MPLS OAM is operated to capture the metric.

Fi, where i in [1, 2...6], a selection function defining unambiguously a packet of one particular stream i forming part of the monitoring overlay measurement loop set up.

L, a packet length in bits. The packets of all Type-P-SR-Path-Delay-Periodic-Streams Fi SHOULD all be of the same length.

MLAi, a stack of Segment IDs determining a monitoring loop Fi. The Segment-IDs MUST be chosen so that a singleton type-p packet

of selection function  $F_i$  passes the sub-path  $i$  to be monitored.

No support: lambda (Poisson Streams remain ffs.)

### [4.3.](#) Metric Units

Refer to [section 3.4.](#) Metric Units: Type-P-\* of [[RFC6673](#)].

## [5.](#) Singleton Definition for Type-P-SR-Path-Periodic-Delay

### [5.1.](#) Metric Name

Type-P-SR-Path-Periodic-Delay

### [5.2.](#) Metric Parameters

See section [Section 4.2.](#)

### [5.3.](#) Delay Metric Units

A sequence of consecutive time values. The value of a Type-P-SR-Path-Periodic-Delay is either a real number or an undefined

(informally, infinite) number of seconds per singleton of each stream  $F_i$ .

### [5.4.](#) Definition

[Section 3.4 of \[RFC7679\]](#) applies per singleton of each stream  $F_i$ . The additional information related to singletons of [section 4.2.4 of \[RFC3432\]](#) applies too.

### [5.5.](#) Discussion

See [section 3.5 of \[RFC7679\]](#). One generalisation seems appropriate: a global satellite navigation system affords one way to achieve synchronization within usec.

### [5.6.](#) Methodologies

[Section 3.6 of \[RFC7679\]](#) applies per stream  $F_i$  with one exception: at

the Src host, select Src and Dst IP addresses, if IP-routing is applied, or select the proper functional IP-destination address if an [RFC8287] SR MPLS OAM packet format is applied. Further add the appropriate stack of Segment IDs ML*A*<sub>*i*</sub> determining the monitoring loop *F*<sub>*i*</sub> and form a test packet of Type-P with these addresses and the segment stack.

### [5.7.](#) Errors and Uncertainties

See [section 3.7 of \[RFC7679\]](#) and [section 4.6 of \[RFC3432\]](#).

### [5.8.](#) Reporting the metric

See [section 3.8 of \[RFC7679\]](#).

## [6.](#) Definition of Samples for Type-P-SR-Path-Periodic-Delay

This sections defines metric samples and metrics derived from samples.

### [6.1.](#) Generic Type-P-SR-Path-Periodic-Delay-\* metric

To reduce the redundant information presented in the detailed metrics sections that follow, this section presents the specifications that are common to two or more metrics. The section is organized using the same subsections as the individual metrics, to simplify comparisons.

#### [6.1.1.](#) Metric Name

Type-P-SR-Path-Periodic-Delay-\*

#### [6.1.2.](#) Metric Parameters

Src, the IP address of a host

Dst, the IP address of a host

ML*A*<sub>*i*</sub>, a stack of Segment IDs

T0, a time

Tf, a time

incT, a time

### [6.1.3.](#) Metric Units

See section [Section 5.3.](#)

### [6.1.4.](#) Metric Defintion

Given T0 and Tf and nominal inter-packet interval incT, those time values greater than or equal to T0 and less than or equal to Tf are then selected. At each of the selected times in this process, we obtain one value of Type-P-SR-Path-Periodic-Delay. The value of the sample is the sequence made up of the resulting [time, delay] pairs. If there are no such pairs, the sequence is of length zero and the sample is said to be empty.

### [6.1.5.](#) Discussion

See [section 4.4 of \[RFC3432\]](#).

### [6.1.6.](#) Errors and uncertainties

See [section 4.6 of \[RFC3432\]](#).

## [6.2.](#) Definition of Type-P-SR-Path-Periodic-Delay-Stream

The only definition required for this metric is a unique metric name.

### [6.2.1.](#) Metric Name

Type-P-SR-Path-Periodic-Delay-Stream



### [6.3.](#) Definition of Type-P-SR-Path-Periodic-Delay-Variation

The smallest sample Type-P-SR-Path-Periodic-Delay-Stream is one of two consecutively received values. These may be used to calculate a Segment Routed Path Delay-Variation (SRDV) singleton, defined below.

#### [6.3.1.](#) Metric Name

Type-P-SR-Path-Periodic-Delay-Variation

#### [6.3.2.](#) Methodologies

SRDV[i,j], for each sample of packets j and j-1 of stream Fi, j > 1, the delay variation between successive packets is calculated as:

$$\text{SRDV}[i,j] = \text{Delay}[i,j] - \text{Delay} [i,j-1],$$

j in [2,3...N] and N the total number of packets received at Dst. If one or more of the M packets sent by Src are lost, they are ignored for the metric, as no reasonable metric value is defined here. If N > 1, the metric is calculated for every valid packet received and the preceding one.

#### [6.3.3.](#) Discussion of SRDV

Evaluation statistics of differential SRDV metric samples may help to identify issues.

#### [6.3.4.](#) Errors and uncertainties

See [section 2.7 of \[RFC3393\]](#).

### [6.4.](#) Definition of Type-P-SR-Path-Periodic-Delay-Variation-Stream

The only definition required for this metric is a unique metric name.

#### [6.4.1.](#) Metric Name

Type-P-SR-Path-Periodic-Delay-Variation-Stream

### [6.4.2.](#) Metric Defintion

Given  $T_0$  and  $T_f$ , those time values greater than or equal to  $T_0$  and less than or equal to  $T_f$  are then selected. At each of the selected times in this process, we obtain one value of Type-P-SR-Path-Periodic-Delay. The value of the sample is the sequence made up of the resulting [time, delay-variation] pairs with time being set to the Dst timestamp of the Delay-Variation singleton, for which a valid singleton is calculated. If there are no such pairs, the sequence is of length zero and the sample is said to be empty. If  $N$  Delay singletons are captured and sampled  $N-1$  Delay-Variation singletons are sampled during the same interval

## [7.](#) Statistic Definitions for SR-Path-Periodic-\*Stream samples

Change point detection requires statistical defintions. These are provided below. The names of the statistics contain an "\*" placeholder, which may be replaced by "Delay" or "Delay-Variation" [Editor note: a "Loss" metric remains tbd].

### [7.1.](#) SR-Path-Periodic-\*Mean

For a type-p metric, the mean is specified by:

$$SR-*Mean = (1/N) * \text{Sum}(\text{from } i=1 \text{ to } N, \text{value}[i])$$

- o  $N$  sample size
- o value sample value of a sampled [time, value] pair

### [7.2.](#) SR-Path-Periodic-\*Std

For a type-p metric, the Standard-Deviation Std is specified by:

$$SR-*Std = [1/(N-1)] * \text{Sum}(\text{from } i=1 \text{ to } N, [SR-*Mean - \text{value}[i]]^2 )$$

- o  $N$  sample size
- o value sample value of a sampled [time, value] pair
- o  $SR-*Mean$  sample mean of the same metric as defined above

The definition as given above requires a two-pass calculation per sample. Algorithms estimating the standard-deviation by one-pass calculation have been published and might be preferable, if metric singletons and samples aren't buffered or calculations need to be fast.

Internet-Draft

Abbreviated Title

February 2021

## [8.](#) Sub-Path monitoring metrics derived from samples captured along the measurement loops

To produce meaningful sub-path monitoring values, the measurement loop metrics are captured during a phase with stable networking conditions. In a backbone network domain, the absence of congestion often is a sufficient condition (frequent traffic shifts due to changes in routing and traffic engineering aren't expected). This may be different in a network based on a shared medium. It may be outright difficult in networks with frequently changing traffic management- and routing-policies.

In the following, the index CS indicates a statistic captured during a measurement interval with stable routing and no congestion.

### [8.1.](#) Baseline measurement

Capture a sample of delay values Type-P-SR-Path-Periodic-Delay-Stream of sample size N for each measurement loop Fi. As a rule of thumb choose N in [30, 100].

For each measurement loop Fi, calculate the following metrics characterising the monitored Sub-Paths during stable and congestion free network conditions:

- o SR-Path-Delay-MeanCSi, the mean delay captured along measurement loop Fi
- o SR-Path-Delay-StdCSi, the standard-deviation of the delay captured along measurement loop Fi
- o SR-Path-Delay-Variation-MeanCSi, the mean delay variation captured along measurement loop Fi
- o SR-Path-Delay-Variation-StdCSi, the standard-deviation of the delay variation captured along measurement loop Fi

A stable and uncongested network should produce rather constant delays, resulting in low standard-deviation values and almost zero mean delay variation.

Example data was captured in a lightly loaded Gigabit network. 11 routers are passed per measurement loop. The sample size is 30 packets, more than 200 samples were captured per measurement loop. The loops are set up for a different purpose than specified here, they are picked due to a high number of passed routers. Note that SR-DV-Mean here refers to an abs(SR-DV-Mean) sample, thus small, positive, non-zero means result. The time unit is microseconds.

Metric	Quantile	SR-D-Mean	SR-D-Std	SR-DV-Mean	SR-DV-Std
Loop1	95%	34510	40	28	49
Loop2	95%	35104	45	34	49
Loop1	50%	34495	17	15	13
Loop2	50%	35088	15	14	12
Loop1	5%	34504	10	12	11
Loop2	5%	35080	13	12	9

Example baseline metrics for an 11 hop measurement loop

Figure 2

## 8.2. Discussion of the baseline measurement

Delay outliers may occur at any time in any communication network, and the measurement system packet processing itself may also produce some. It is fair to expect only single outliers in a stable, not congested network. It may be worth to capture several consecutive SR-Path-Periodic-\*Stream samples and compare their statistics, before picking reasonable baseline metric values. Samples showing higher standard deviations (compare the 95% quantile values in the above figure to the 50% quantile values) may benefit from removing the maximum singleton value from the sample. This will smooth the mean and standard-deviation, and if the result then is closer to those of the majority of the samples, foster confidence in

determining the baseline metrics. Depending on the preferred method of data-processing and storing, this may require capturing the sample maximum as a separate metric.

### 8.3. Definition of SR-Path-Sub-Path-RTD-Estimate

Within a single evaluation interval of identical Time  $T_0$  and  $T_f$ , SR-Path-Delay-MeanCS<sub>i</sub>(from now on DMeanCS<sub>i</sub>) is the mean delay of the measurement loop passing the monitored Sub-Path SP<sub>i</sub> by a round trip. Let's keep the index  $i$  applied above, then  $F_j$  and  $F_k$  with captured mean delays DMeanCS<sub>j</sub> and DMeanCS<sub>k</sub> pass SP<sub>i</sub> unidirectional. Further, 3 measurement loops  $F_x$ ,  $F_y$  and  $F_z$  don't pass Sub-Path at all. The corresponding mean delays are DMeanCS<sub>s</sub>, DMeanCS<sub>t</sub> and DMeanCS<sub>u</sub>.

Geib

Expires August 26, 2021

[Page 18]

---

Internet-Draft

Abbreviated Title

February 2021

The the SR-Path-Sub-Path-RTD-Estimate of the Round Trip Delay along the monitored Sub-Path  $F_i$ ,  $RTD_{F_i}$ , is

$$RTD_{F_i} = (3 * DMeanCS_i + DMeanCS_j + DMeanCS_k - DMeanCS_x - DMeanCS_y - DMeanCS_z) / 4$$

### 8.4. Definition of SR-Path-Sub-Path-\*--Changepoint

The asterisk stands for "Interface" as well as "Connectivity" (the latter may be indicated by packet drops, but also a change in sub-path routes with a change in measurement loop delay may be applied to detect and locate this event).

Network changes are often characterised by a change in the mean delay of a monitoring measurement. CUSUM (cumulative sum) charts have been shown to be efficient in detecting shifts in the mean of a process [[NIST](#)]. The upper bound CUSUM is defined as:

$$Sup(t)_{F_i-Delay} = \max(0, Sup(t-1) + x_t - SR-Path-*--MeanCS_i - k_i)$$

with  $Sh_0 = 0$ ,  $k_i = \Delta * SR-Path-*--StdCS_i$  ( $\Delta$  is a dimensionless integer number),  $x_t = Type-P-SR-Path-Periodic-*$  singleton for measurement loop  $F_i$  at time  $t$ .

The actual SR-Path-Delay-Mean of Measurement Loop  $F_i$  is decided to be significantly above  $SR-Path-*--MeanCS_i$ , if:

$Sup(t)-Fi-Delay > h_{SP}$ , with  $h_{SP} = d \cdot k_i$  ( $d$  is a dimensionless integer number).

An analogous CUSUM controls changes to a lower mean delay (which may be caused by a re-routing event):

$$Slo(t)-Fi-Delay = \max(0, Slo(t-1) + SR-Path-* - MeanCSi - x_j - k)$$

The actual SR-Path-Delay-Mean of  $F_i$  is decided to be significantly below SR-Path-\* - MeanCSi, if:

$$Slo(t)-Fi-Delay > h_{SP}$$

#### [8.5.](#) Discussion of SR-Path-Sub-Path-\* - Changepoint

CUSUM chart based changepoint detection is sensible even to small changes in the mean. CUSUM charts offer a limited protection against single, isolated outliers. A cumulated sum only grows, if the controlled process consistently changes its mean (or standard deviation, respectively). Assuming constant physical minimum delays to characterise wireline communication networks, a change in standard

deviation not affecting the mean delay doesn't seem to be caused by a change in networking conditions.

The measured delays will change once a Sub-Path route has changed, or once persistent congestion starts to fill a queue. Both indicate changes in the network. As the Sub-Pathes  $SP_i$  form an overlay with designed properties, every network change affecting a sub-path creates correlated SR-Path-\* metric changes. As the correspondance of network changes to Sub-Path metrics is known a-priory, detecting correlated SR-Path-\* metric changes allows to locate the change.

In the absence of packet re-routing, packet loss is characterising a loss of connectivity. Packet loss requires a time threshold when to decide that an active measurement packet was lost, and consecutive loss requires receiver awareness, that packets have been sent (this argues for the sender to be the receiver, unless both communicate fast and reliable out of band).

The preferred CUSUM parametrisation will depend on the kind of events

to detected and on the outlier characteristics.

$k_i = \Delta * SR\text{-}Path\text{-}*\text{-}StdCS_i$  may be set to a value relevant high enough to exclude single outliers to trigger an alert, but low enough to indicate persistent changes in delay. The same holds for the to be picked for  $d$ .

A broader discussion on CUSUM parametrisation may be found in literature. Networking skills are required to parametrise CUSUM, as well as to interpret the results (notably to differ re-routing from congestion).

#### 8.6. Definition of SR-Path-Sub-Path-Congestion-Location

An interface along a single monitored Sub-Path  $SP_i$  whose queue is persistently filled adds latency to measurement loop  $F_i$  and one of the two unidirectional measurement loops  $F_j$  and  $F_k$  passing Sub-Path  $SP_i$ .  $F_j$  has been defined to pass  $SP_i$  from Hub to Spoke and  $F_k$  pass  $SP_i$  in opposite direction.

```
IF Sup(t)_SPi_Periodic-Delay + Sup(t)_SPj_Periodic-Delay > h_SP
AND h_SP > Sup(t)_SPk_Periodic-Delay
AND h_SP > Sup(t)_SPx_Periodic-Delay
AND h_SP > Sup(t)_SPy_Periodic-Delay
AND h_SP > Sup(t)_SPz_Periodic-Delay
```

Then Sub-Path  $SP_i$  faces congestion in direction "Hub to Spoke".

```
IF Sup(t)_SPi_Periodic-Delay + Sup(t)_SPk_Periodic-Delay > h_SP
AND h_SP > Sup(t)_SPj_Periodic-Delay
AND h_SP > Sup(t)_SPx_Periodic-Delay
AND h_SP > Sup(t)_SPy_Periodic-Delay
AND h_SP > Sup(t)_SPz_Periodic-Delay
```

Then Sub-Path  $SP_i$  faces congestion in direction "Spoke to Hub".

Here,  $h_{SP}$  is a universal threshold in unit time to indicate a filling queue or a significant change in delay due to a Sub-Path reroute or another persistent change in topology (like e.g. automated Layer 1 / Layer 2 topology changes).  $SP_x$ ,  $SP_y$  and  $SP_z$  don't pass

#### 8.7. Discussion of SR-Path-Sub-Path-\* -Location

[Editor Note: Discussion and a suitable connectivity monitoring metric Definition+Discussion to be added.]

#### 9. Discussion of Temporal Resolution

[Editor Note: requires a review..] 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.

## 10. IANA Considerations

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

## 11. 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.

## 12. References

### 12.1. 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>>.
- [RFC3393] Demichelis, C. and P. Chimento, "IP Packet Delay Variation Metric for IP Performance Metrics (IPPM)", [RFC 3393](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC3393, November 2002, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3393>>.

- [RFC3432] Raisanen, V., Grotefeld, G., and A. Morton, "Network performance measurement with periodic streams", [RFC 3432](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC3432, November 2002, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3432>>.
- [RFC6673] Morton, A., "Round-Trip Packet Loss Metrics", [RFC 6673](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6673, August 2012, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6673>>.
- [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>>.
- [RFC8287] Kumar, N., Ed., Pignataro, C., Ed., Swallow, G., Akiya, N., Kini, S., and M. Chen, "Label Switched Path (LSP) Ping/Traceroute for Segment Routing (SR) IGP-Prefix and IGP-Adjacency Segment Identifiers (SIDs) with MPLS Data Planes", [RFC 8287](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8287, December 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8287>>.
- [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>>.
- [RFC8667] Previdi, S., Ed., Ginsberg, L., Ed., Filsfils, C., Bashandy, A., Gredler, H., and B. Decraene, "IS-IS Extensions for Segment Routing", [RFC 8667](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8667, December 2019, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8667>>.

## 12.2. Informative References

Internet-Draft

Abbreviated Title

February 2021

## [CommodityTomography]

Lakhina, A., Papagiannaki, K., Crovella, M., Diot, C., Kolaczyk, ED., and N. Taft, "Structural analysis of network traffic flows", 2004, <[https://www.cc.gatech.edu/classes/AY2007/cs7260\\_spring/papers/odflows-sigm04.pdf](https://www.cc.gatech.edu/classes/AY2007/cs7260_spring/papers/odflows-sigm04.pdf)>.

[ID.[draft-ietf-6man-spring-srv6-oam](#)]

Zafar, A., Filsfils, C., Matsushima, S., Voyer, D., and M. Chen, "Operations, Administration, and Maintenance (OAM) in Segment Routing Networks with IPv6 Data plane (SRv6)", 2021.

## [NIST]

NIST, "NIST/SEMATECH e-Handbook of Statistical Methods, section CUSUM Control Charts", 2021, <<http://www.itl.nist.gov/div898/handbook/>>.

## [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](mailto:Ruediger.Geib@telekom.de)

Geib

Expires August 26, 2021

[Page 24]