

Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: March 27, 2020

G. Mirsky
ZTE Corp.
G. Jun
ZTE Corporation
H. Nydell
Accedian Networks
R. Foote
Nokia
September 24, 2019

Simple Two-way Active Measurement Protocol
draft-ietf-ippm-stamp-08

Abstract

This document describes a Simple Two-way Active Measurement Protocol which enables the measurement of both one-way and round-trip performance metrics like delay, delay variation, and packet loss.

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 March 27, 2020.

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

Internet-Draft

STAMP

September 2019

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
2.	Conventions used in this document	3
2.1.	Terminology	3
2.2.	Requirements Language	3
3.	Operation and Management of Performance Measurement Based on STAMP	3
4.	Theory of Operation	4
4.1.	Session-Sender Behavior and Packet Format	5
4.1.1.	Session-Sender Packet Format in Unauthenticated Mode	5
4.1.2.	Session-Sender Packet Format in Authenticated Mode	6
4.2.	Session-Reflector Behavior and Packet Format	7
4.2.1.	Session-Reflector Packet Format in Unauthenticated Mode	8
4.2.2.	Session-Reflector Packet Format in Authenticated Mode	9
4.3.	Integrity Protection in STAMP	10
4.4.	Confidentiality Protection in STAMP	11
4.5.	Interoperability with TWAMP Light	11
5.	Operational Considerations	12
6.	IANA Considerations	12
7.	Security Considerations	12
8.	Acknowledgments	13
9.	References	13
9.1.	Normative References	13
9.2.	Informative References	14
	Authors' Addresses	15

[1.](#) Introduction

Development and deployment of Two-Way Active Measurement Protocol (TWAMP) [[RFC5357](#)] and its extensions, e.g., [[RFC6038](#)] that defined Symmetrical Size for TWAMP provided invaluable experience. Several independent implementations of both TWAMP and TWAMP Light exist, have been deployed, and provide important operational performance measurements.

At the same time, there has been noticeable interest in using a more straightforward mechanism for active performance monitoring that can

provide deterministic behavior and inherit separation of control (vendor-specific configuration or orchestration) and test functions. Recent work on IP Edge to Customer Equipment using TWAMP Light from Broadband Forum [[BBF.TR-390](#)] demonstrated that interoperability among implementations of TWAMP Light is challenged because the composition

and operation of TWAMP Light were not sufficiently specified in [[RFC5357](#)]. According to [[RFC8545](#)], TWAMP Light includes sub-set of TWAMP-Test functions to provide comprehensive solution requires support by other applications that provide, for example, control and security.

This document defines an active performance measurement test protocol, Simple Two-way Active Measurement Protocol (STAMP), that enables measurement of both one-way and round-trip performance metrics like delay, delay variation, and packet loss. Some TWAMP extensions, e.g., [[RFC7750](#)] are supported by the extensions to STAMP base specification in [[I-D.ietf-ippm-stamp-option-tlv](#)].

[2.](#) Conventions used in this document

[2.1.](#) Terminology

STAMP - Simple Two-way Active Measurement Protocol

NTP - Network Time Protocol

PTP - Precision Time Protocol

HMAC Hashed Message Authentication Code

OWAMP One-Way Active Measurement Protocol

TWAMP Two-Way Active Measurement Protocol

MBZ May be Zero

[2.2.](#) Requirements Language

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





Figure 2: STAMP Session-Sender test packet format in unauthenticated mode

where fields are defined as the following:

- o Sequence Number is four octets long field. For each new session its value starts at zero and is incremented with each transmitted packet.

- o Timestamp is eight octets long field. STAMP node MUST support Network Time Protocol (NTP) version 4 64-bit timestamp format [[RFC5905](#)], the format used in [[RFC5357](#)]. STAMP node MAY support IEEE 1588v2 Precision Time Protocol truncated 64-bit timestamp format [[IEEE.1588.2008](#)], the format used in [[RFC8186](#)].
- o Error Estimate is two octets long field with format displayed in Figure 3






Figure 4: STAMP Session-Sender test packet format in authenticated mode

The field definitions are the same as the unauthenticated mode, listed in [Section 4.1.1](#). Also, MBZ fields are used to align the packet on 16 octets boundary. The value of the field MAY be zeroed on transmission and MUST be ignored on receipt. Also, the packet includes a key-hashed message authentication code (HMAC) ([\[RFC2104\]](#)) hash at the end of the PDU. The detailed use of the HMAC field is described in [Section 4.3](#).

4.2. Session-Reflector Behavior and Packet Format

The Session-Reflector receives the STAMP test packet, verifies it, prepares and transmits the reflected test packet.

Two modes of STAMP Session-Reflector characterize the expected behavior and, consequently, performance metrics that can be measured:

- o Stateless - STAMP Session-Reflector does not maintain test state and will use the value in the Sequence Number field in the recieved packet as the value for the Sequence Number field in the reflected packet. As a result, values in Sequence Number and Session-Sender Sequence Number fields are the same, and only

round-trip packet loss can be calculated while the reflector is

operating in stateless mode.

- o Stateful - STAMP Session-Reflector maintains test state thus enabling the ability to determine forward loss, gaps recognized in the received sequence number. As a result, both near-end (forward) and far-end (backward) packet loss can be computed. That implies that the STAMP Session-Reflector MUST keep a state for each accepted STAMP-test session, uniquely identifying STAMP-test packets to one such session instance, and enabling adding a sequence number in the test reply that is individually incremented on a per-session basis.

4.2.1. Session-Reflector Packet Format in Unauthenticated Mode

For unauthenticated mode:




Figure 5: STAMP Session-Reflector test packet format in unauthenticated mode


where fields are defined as the following:

- o Sequence Number is four octets long field. The value of the Sequence Number field is set according to the mode of the STAMP Session-Reflector:

- * in the stateless mode the Session-Reflector copies the value from the received STAMP test packet's Sequence Number field;
- * in the stateful mode the Session-Reflector counts the received STAMP test packets in each test session and uses that counter to set the value of the Sequence Number field.
- o Timestamp and Receiver Timestamp fields are each eight octets long. The format of these fields, NTP or PTPv2, indicated by the Z flag of the Error Estimate field as described in [Section 4.1](#).
- o Error Estimate has the same size and interpretation as described in [Section 4.1](#).
- o Session-Sender Sequence Number, Session-Sender Timestamp, and Session-Sender Error Estimate are copies of the corresponding fields in the STAMP test packet sent by the Session-Sender.
- o Session-Sender TTL is one octet long field, and its value is the copy of the TTL field in IPv4 (or Hop Limit in IPv6) from the received STAMP test packet.
- o MBZ is used to achieve alignment on a four octets boundary. The value of the field MAY be zeroed on transmission and MUST be ignored on receipt.

[4.2.2](#). Session-Reflector Packet Format in Authenticated Mode

For the authenticated mode:



detailed use of the HMAC field is in [Section 4.3](#).

[4.3](#). Integrity Protection in STAMP

To provide integrity protection, each STAMP message is being authenticated by adding Hashed Message Authentication Code (HMAC). STAMP uses HMAC-SHA-256 truncated to 128 bits (similarly to the use of it in IPsec defined in [[RFC4868](#)]); hence the length of the HMAC field is 16 octets. HMAC uses its own key, and the definition of the

mechanism to distribute the HMAC key is outside the scope of this specification. One example is to use an orchestrator to configure HMAC key based on STAMP YANG data model [[I-D.ietf-ippm-stamp-yang](#)]. HMAC MUST be verified as early as possible to avoid using or propagating corrupted data.

[4.4](#). Confidentiality Protection in STAMP

If confidentiality protection for STAMP is required, a STAMP test session MUST use a secured transport. For example, STAMP packets could be transmitted in the dedicated IPsec tunnel or share the IPsec tunnel with the monitored flow. Also, Datagram Transport Layer Security protocol would provide the desired confidentiality protection.

[4.5](#). Interoperability with TWAMP Light

One of the essential requirements to STAMP is the ability to interwork with a TWAMP Light device. There are two possible combinations for such use case:

- o STAMP Session-Sender with TWAMP Light Session-Reflector;
- o TWAMP Light Session-Sender with STAMP Session-Reflector.

In the former case, the Session-Sender MAY not be aware that its Session-Reflector does not support STAMP. For example, a TWAMP Light Session-Reflector may not support the use of UDP port 862 as defined in [[RFC8545](#)]. Thus STAMP Session-Sender MAY use port numbers as defined in [Section 4](#). If any of STAMP extensions are used, the TWAMP Light Session-Reflector will view them as Packet Padding field.

In the latter scenario, if a TWAMP Light Session-Sender does not support the use of UDP port 862, the test management system MUST set STAMP Session-Reflector to use UDP port number as defined in [Section 4](#). If the TWAMP Light Session-Sender includes Packet Padding field in its transmitted packet, the STAMP Session-Reflector will return the reflected packet of the symmetrical size if the size of the received test packet is larger than the size of the STAMP base packet. The Session-Reflector MUST be set to use the default format for its timestamps, NTP.

STAMP does not support the Reflect Octets capability defined in [\[RFC6038\]](#). If the Server Octets field is present in the TWAMP Session-Sender packet, STAMP Session-Reflector will not copy the content starting from the Server Octets field but will transmit the reflected packet of equal size.

[5.](#) Operational Considerations

STAMP is intended to be used on production networks to enable the operator to assess service level agreements based on packet delay, delay variation, and loss. When using STAMP over the Internet, especially when STAMP test packets are transmitted with the destination UDP port number from the User Ports range, the possible impact of the STAMP test packets MUST be thoroughly analyzed. The use of STAMP for each case MUST be agreed by users of nodes hosting the Session-Sender and Session-Reflector before starting the STAMP test session.

Also, the use of the well-known port number as the destination UDP port number in STAMP test packets transmitted by a Session-Sender would not impede the ability to measure performance in an Equal Cost Multipath environment and analysis in [Section 5.3 \[RFC8545\]](#) fully applies to STAMP.

[6.](#) IANA Considerations

This document doesn't have any IANA action. This section may be removed before the publication.

[7.](#) Security Considerations

[RFC5357] does not identify security considerations specific to TWAMP-Test but refers to security considerations identified for OWAMP in [RFC4656]. Since both OWAMP and TWAMP include control plane and data plane components, only security considerations related to OWAMP-Test, discussed in Sections [6.2](#), [6.3](#) [RFC4656] apply to STAMP.

STAMP uses the well-known UDP port number allocated for the OWAMP-Test/TWAMP-Test Receiver port. Thus the security considerations and measures to mitigate the risk of the attack using the registered port number documented in [Section 6](#) [RFC8545] equally apply to STAMP. Because of the control and management of a STAMP test being outside the scope of this specification only the more general requirement is set:

To mitigate the possible attack vector, the control, and management of a STAMP test session MUST use the secured transport.

Load of STAMP test packets offered to a network MUST be carefully estimated, and the possible impact on the existing services MUST be thoroughly analyzed before launching the test session. [\[RFC8085\] section 3.1.5](#) provides guidance on handling network load for UDP-based protocol. While the characteristic of test traffic

depends on the test objective, it is highly recommended to stay in the limits as provided in [\[RFC8085\]](#).

Use of HMAC-SHA-256 in the authenticated mode protects the data integrity of the STAMP test packets.

[8.](#) Acknowledgments

Authors express their appreciation to Jose Ignacio Alvarez-Hamelin and Brian Weis for their great insights into the security and identity protection, and the most helpful and practical suggestions. Also, our sincere thanks to David Ball and Rakesh Gandhi for their thorough reviews and helpful comments.

[9.](#) References

[9.1.](#) Normative References

- [I-D.ietf-ippm-stamp-option-tlv]
Mirsky, G., Xiao, M., Jun, G., Nydell, H., Foote, R., and A. Masputra, "Simple Two-way Active Measurement Protocol Optional Extensions", [draft-ietf-ippm-stamp-option-tlv-01](#) (work in progress), September 2019.
- [IEEE.1588.2008]
"Standard for a Precision Clock Synchronization Protocol for Networked Measurement and Control Systems", IEEE Standard 1588, March 2008.
- [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>>.
- [RFC4656] Shalunov, S., Teitelbaum, B., Karp, A., Boote, J., and M. Zekauskas, "A One-way Active Measurement Protocol (OWAMP)", [RFC 4656](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4656, September 2006, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4656>>.
- [RFC5357] Hedayat, K., Krzanowski, R., Morton, A., Yum, K., and J. Babiarez, "A Two-Way Active Measurement Protocol (TWAMP)", [RFC 5357](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5357, October 2008, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5357>>.
- [RFC5905] Mills, D., Martin, J., Ed., Burbank, J., and W. Kasch, "Network Time Protocol Version 4: Protocol and Algorithms Specification", [RFC 5905](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5905, June 2010, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5905>>.

- [RFC6038] Morton, A. and L. Ciavattone, "Two-Way Active Measurement Protocol (TWAMP) Reflect Octets and Symmetrical Size Features", [RFC 6038](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6038, October 2010, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6038>>.
- [RFC6335] Cotton, M., Eggert, L., Touch, J., Westerlund, M., and S. Cheshire, "Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) Procedures for the Management of the Service Name and Transport Protocol Port Number Registry", [BCP 165](#), [RFC 6335](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6335, August 2011, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6335>>.

- [RFC8174] Leiba, B., "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in [RFC 2119](#) Key Words", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 8174](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8174, May 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8174>>.
- [RFC8186] Mirsky, G. and I. Meilik, "Support of the IEEE 1588 Timestamp Format in a Two-Way Active Measurement Protocol (TWAMP)", [RFC 8186](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8186, June 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8186>>.
- [RFC8545] Morton, A., Ed. and G. Mirsky, Ed., "Well-Known Port Assignments for the One-Way Active Measurement Protocol (OWAMP) and the Two-Way Active Measurement Protocol (TWAMP)", [RFC 8545](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8545, March 2019, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8545>>.

9.2. Informative References

- [BBF.TR-390]
"Performance Measurement from IP Edge to Customer Equipment using TWAMP Light", BBF TR-390, May 2017.
- [I-D.ietf-ippm-stamp-yang]
Mirsky, G., Xiao, M., and W. Luo, "Simple Two-way Active Measurement Protocol (STAMP) Data Model", [draft-ietf-ippm-stamp-yang-04](#) (work in progress), September 2019.
- [RFC2104] Krawczyk, H., Bellare, M., and R. Canetti, "HMAC: Keyed-Hashing for Message Authentication", [RFC 2104](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC2104, February 1997, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2104>>.
- [RFC4868] Kelly, S. and S. Frankel, "Using HMAC-SHA-256, HMAC-SHA-384, and HMAC-SHA-512 with IPsec", [RFC 4868](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4868, May 2007, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4868>>.

- [RFC7750] Hedin, J., Mirsky, G., and S. Baillargeon, "Differentiated Service Code Point and Explicit Congestion Notification Monitoring in the Two-Way Active Measurement Protocol (TWAMP)", [RFC 7750](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7750, February 2016,

<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7750>>.

[RFC8085] Eggert, L., Fairhurst, G., and G. Shepherd, "UDP Usage Guidelines", [BCP 145](#), [RFC 8085](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8085, March 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8085>>.

Authors' Addresses

Greg Mirsky
ZTE Corp.

Email: gregimirsky@gmail.com

Guo Jun
ZTE Corporation
68# Zijinghua Road
Nanjing, Jiangsu 210012
P.R.China

Phone: +86 18105183663
Email: guo.jun2@zte.com.cn

Henrik Nydell
Accedian Networks

Email: hnydell@accedian.com

Richard Foote
Nokia

Email: footer.foote@nokia.com