

Network Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: December 26, 2012

A. Morton  
AT&T Labs  
June 24, 2012

Rate Measurement Problem Statement  
draft-ietf-ippm-rate-problem-00

Abstract

There is a rate measurement scenario which has wide-spread attention of users and seemingly all industry participants, including regulators. This memo presents an access rate-measurement problem statement for IP Performance Metrics. Key aspects require the ability to control packet size on the tested path and enable asymmetrical packet size testing in a controller-responder architecture.

Requirements Language

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [RFC 2119](#) [[RFC2119](#)].

Status of this Memo

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

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <http://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 December 26, 2012.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2012 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  
 (<http://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 . . . . . [3](#)
- [2.](#) Purpose and Scope . . . . . [3](#)
- [3.](#) Active Rate Measurement . . . . . [4](#)
- [4.](#) Measurement Method Categories . . . . . [6](#)
- [5.](#) Test Protocol Control & Generation Requirements . . . . . [7](#)
- [6.](#) Security Considerations . . . . . [7](#)
- [7.](#) IANA Considerations . . . . . [8](#)
- [8.](#) Acknowledgements . . . . . [8](#)
- [9.](#) Appendix . . . . . [8](#)
- [10.](#) References . . . . . [8](#)
  - [10.1.](#) Normative References . . . . . [8](#)
  - [10.2.](#) Informative References . . . . . [9](#)
- Author's Address . . . . . [9](#)

## 1. Introduction

There are many possible rate measurement scenarios. This memo describes one rate measurement problem and presents a rate-measurement problem statement for IP Performance Metrics (IPPM).

The access-rate scenario or use case has wide-spread attention of users and seemingly all industry participants, including regulators. It is being approached with many different measurement methods.

## 2. Purpose and Scope

The scope and purpose of this memo is to define the measurement problem statement for access rate measurement on production networks. We characterize this scenario as follows:

- o The Access portion of the network is the focus of this effort. The user typically subscribes to a service with bi-directional access partly described by rates in bits per second.
- o Rates at the edge of the network are several orders of magnitude less than aggregation and core portions.
- o Asymmetrical ingress and egress rates are prevalent.
- o Extremely large scale of access services requires low complexity devices participating at the user end of the path.

Today, the majority of widely deployed access services achieve rates less than 100 Mbit/s, and this is the rate-regime for which a solution is sought now.

This problem statement assumes that the most-likely bottleneck device or link is adjacent to the remote (user-end) measurement device, or is within one or two router/switch hops of the remote measurement

device.

Other use cases for rate measurement involve situations where the packet switching and transport facilities are leased by one operator from another and the actual capacity available cannot be directly determined (e.g., from device interface utilization). These scenarios could include mobile backhaul, Ethernet Service access networks, and/or extensions of a layer 2 or layer 3 networks. The results of rate measurements in such cases could be employed to select alternate routing, investigate whether capacity meets some previous agreement, and/or adapting the rate of certain traffic sources if a capacity bottleneck is found via the rate measurement.

In the case of aggregated leased networks, available capacity may also be asymmetric. In these cases, the tester is assumed to have a sender and receiver location under their control. We refer to this scenario below as the aggregated leased network case.

Only active measurement methods will be addressed here, consistent with the IPPM working group's current charter. Active measurements require synthetic traffic dedicated to testing, and do not use user traffic.

The actual path used may influence the rate measurement results for some forms of access, as it may differ between user and test traffic.

- o This issue requires further study to list the likely causes for this behavior. The possibilities include IP address assignment, transport protocol used (where TCP packets may be routed differently from UDP).

Although the user may have multiple instances of network access available to them, the primary intent is to measure one form of access at a time. It is plausible that a solution for the single access problem will be applicable to simultaneous measurement of multiple access instances, but this is beyond the current scope.

A key consideration is whether active measurements will be conducted with user traffic present (In-Service Testing), or not present (Out-of-Service Testing), such as during pre-service testing or maintenance that interrupts service temporarily. Out-of-Service testing includes activities described as "service commissioning",

"service activation", and "planned maintenance". Both In-Service and Out-of-Service Testing are within the scope of this problem.

It is a non-goal to solve the measurement protocol specification problem in this memo.

It is a non-goal to standardize methods of measurement in this memo. However, the problem statement will mandate that support for one or more categories of rate measurement methods and adequate control features for the methods in the test protocol.

### 3. Active Rate Measurement

This section lists features of active measurement methods needed to measure access rates in production networks.

Test coordination between Source and Destination devices through control messages and other basic capabilities described in the

Morton

Expires December 26, 2012

[Page 4]

---

Internet-Draft

Rate Problem Statement

June 2012

methods of IPPM RFCs [[RFC2679](#)][RFC2680] are taken as given (these could be listed later, if desired).

Most forms of active testing intrude on user performance to some degree. One key tenet of IPPM methods is to minimize test traffic effects on user traffic in the production network. [Section 5 of \[RFC2680\]](#) lists the problems with high measurement traffic rates, and the most relevant for rate measurement is the tendency for measurement traffic to skew the results, followed by the possibility to introduce congestion on the access link. Obviously, categories of rate measurement methods that use less active test traffic than others with similar accuracy SHALL be preferred for In-Service Testing.

On the other hand, Out-of-Service Tests where the test path shares no links with In-Service user traffic have none of the congestion or skew concerns, but must address other practical concerns such as conducting measurements within a reasonable time from the tester's point of view. Out-of-Service Tests where some part of the test path is shared with In-Service traffic MUST respect the In-Service constraints.

The **intended metrics to be measured** have strong influence over the categories of measurement methods required. For example, using the terminology of [\[RFC5136\]](#), it may be possible to measure a Path Capacity Metric while In-Service if the level of background (user) traffic can be assessed and included in the reported result.

The measurement **architecture** MAY be either of one-way (e.g., [\[RFC4656\]](#)) or two-way (e.g., [\[RFC5357\]](#)), but the scale and complexity aspects of end-user or aggregated access measurement clearly favor two-way (with low-complexity user-end device and round-trip results collection, as found in [\[RFC5357\]](#)). However, the asymmetric rates of many access services mean that the measurement system MUST be able to assess each direction of transmission. In the two-way architecture, it is expected that both end devices MUST include the ability to launch test streams and collect the results of measurements in both (one-way) directions of transmission (this requirement is consistent with previous protocol specifications, it is not a unique problem for rate measurements).

The following paragraphs describe features for the roles of test packet SENDER, RECEIVER, and results REPORTER.

**SENDER:**

Ability to generate streams of test packets with various characteristics as desired (see [Section 4](#)). The SENDER may be

located at the user end of the access path, or may be located elsewhere in the production network, such as at one end of an aggregated leased network segment.

**RECEIVER:**

Ability to collect streams of test packets with various characteristics (as described above), and make the measurements necessary to support rate measurement at the other end of an end-user access or aggregated leased network segment.

**REPORTER:**

Ability to use information from test packets and local processes to measure delivered packet rates.

#### 4. Measurement Method Categories

The design of rate measurement methods can be divided into two phases: test stream design and measurement (SENDER and RECEIVER), and a follow-up phase for analysis of the measurement to produce results (REPORTER). The measurement protocol that addresses this problem MUST only serve the test stream generation and measurement functions.

For the purposes of this problem statement, we categorize the many possibilities for rate measurement stream generation as follows;

1. Packet pairs, with fixed intra-pair packet spacing and fixed or random time intervals between pairs in a test stream.
2. Multiple streams of packet pairs, with a range intra-pair spacing and inter-pair intervals.
3. One or more packet ensembles in a test stream, using a fixed ensemble size in packets and one or more fixed intra-ensemble packet spacings (including zero).
4. One or more packet chirps, where intra-packet spacing typically decreases between adjacent packets in the same chirp and each pair of packets represents a rate for testing purposes.

For all categories, the test protocol MUST support:

1. Variable payload lengths among packet streams
2. Variable length (in packets) among packet streams or ensembles

3. Variable header markings among packet streams
4. Variable number of packets-pairs, ensembles, or streams used in a test session

are additional variables that the test protocol MUST be able to communicate.

The test protocol SHALL support test packet ensemble generation (category 3), as this appears to minimize the demands on measurement accuracy. Other stream generation categories are OPTIONAL.

Measurements for each test packet transferred between SENDER and RECEIVER MUST be compliant with the singleton measurement methods described in IPPM RFCs [[RFC2679](#)][[RFC2680](#)] (these could be listed later, if desired). The time-stamp information or loss/arrival status for each packet MUST be available for communication to the protocol entity that collects results.

## 5. Test Protocol Control & Generation Requirements

Essentially, the test protocol MUST support the measurement features described in the sections above. This requires:

1. Communicating all test variables to the Sender and Receiver
2. Results collection in a one-way architecture
3. Remote device control for both one-way and two-way architectures
4. Asymmetric and/or pseudo-one-way test capability in a two-way measurement architecture

The ability to control packet size on the tested path and enable asymmetrical packet size testing in a two-way architecture are REQUIRED.

The test protocol SHOULD enable measurement of the [[RFC5136](#)] Capacity metric, either Out-of-Service, In-Service, or both. Other [[RFC5136](#)] metrics are OPTIONAL.

## 6. Security Considerations

The security considerations that apply to any active measurement of live networks are relevant here as well. See [[RFC4656](#)] and [[RFC5357](#)].

There may be a serious issue if a proprietary Service Level Agreement



involved with the access network segment provider were somehow leaked in the process of rate measurement. To address this, test protocols SHOULD NOT convey this information in a way that could be discovered by unauthorized parties.

## 7. IANA Considerations

This memo makes no requests of IANA.

## 8. Acknowledgements

Dave McDysan provided comments and text for the aggregated leased use case. Yaakov Stein suggested many considerations to address, including the in-service vs. out-of-service distinction and its implication on test traffic limits.

## 9. Appendix

This Appendix is intended to briefly summarize previous rate measurement experience. (There is a large body of research on rate measurement, so there is a question of what to include and what to omit.)

## 10. References

### 10.1. Normative References

- [RFC1305] Mills, D., "Network Time Protocol (Version 3) Specification, Implementation", [RFC 1305](#), March 1992.
- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [RFC2679] Almes, G., Kalidindi, S., and M. Zekauskas, "A One-way Delay Metric for IPPM", [RFC 2679](#), September 1999.
- [RFC2680] Almes, G., Kalidindi, S., and M. Zekauskas, "A One-way Packet Loss Metric for IPPM", [RFC 2680](#), September 1999.
- [RFC4656] Shalunov, S., Teitelbaum, B., Karp, A., Boote, J., and M. Zekauskas, "A One-way Active Measurement Protocol (OWAMP)", [RFC 4656](#), September 2006.

- [RFC5357] Hedayat, K., Krzanowski, R., Morton, A., Yum, K., and J. Babiarez, "A Two-Way Active Measurement Protocol (TWAMP)", [RFC 5357](#), October 2008.
- [RFC5618] Morton, A. and K. Hedayat, "Mixed Security Mode for the Two-Way Active Measurement Protocol (TWAMP)", [RFC 5618](#), August 2009.
- [RFC5938] Morton, A. and M. Chiba, "Individual Session Control Feature for the Two-Way Active Measurement Protocol (TWAMP)", [RFC 5938](#), August 2010.
- [RFC6038] Morton, A. and L. Ciavattoni, "Two-Way Active Measurement Protocol (TWAMP) Reflect Octets and Symmetrical Size Features", [RFC 6038](#), October 2010.

## [10.2](#). Informative References

- [RFC5136] Chimento, P. and J. Ishac, "Defining Network Capacity", [RFC 5136](#), February 2008.

## Author's Address

Al Morton  
AT&T Labs  
200 Laurel Avenue South  
Middletown,, NJ 07748  
USA

Phone: +1 732 420 1571  
Fax: +1 732 368 1192  
Email: [acmorton@att.com](mailto:acmorton@att.com)  
URI: <http://home.comcast.net/~acmacm/>

