

Network Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: May 3, 2020

G. Mirsky  
X. Min  
ZTE Corp.  
H. Nydell  
Accedian Networks  
R. Foote  
Nokia  
A. Masputra  
Apple Inc.  
E. Ruffini  
OutSys  
October 31, 2019

Simple Two-way Active Measurement Protocol Optional Extensions  
draft-ietf-ippm-stamp-option-tlv-02

## Abstract

This document describes optional extensions to Simple Two-way Active Measurement Protocol (STAMP) which enable measurement performance metrics in addition to ones supported by the STAMP base specification.

## 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 May 3, 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

Internet-Draft

STAMP Extensions

October 2019

(<https://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

## Table of Contents

<a href="#">1.</a>	Introduction . . . . .	<a href="#">2</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	Conventions used in this document . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">2.1.</a>	Terminology . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">2.2.</a>	Requirements Language . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	Theory of Operation . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">4.</a>	TLV Extensions to STAMP . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">4.1.</a>	Extra Padding TLV . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">4.2.</a>	Location TLV . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">4.3.</a>	Timestamp Information TLV . . . . .	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">4.4.</a>	Class of Service TLV . . . . .	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">4.5.</a>	Direct Measurement TLV . . . . .	<a href="#">10</a>
<a href="#">4.6.</a>	Access Report TLV . . . . .	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">4.7.</a>	Follow-up Telemetry TLV . . . . .	<a href="#">13</a>
<a href="#">5.</a>	IANA Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">14</a>
<a href="#">5.1.</a>	STAMP TLV Registry . . . . .	<a href="#">14</a>
<a href="#">5.2.</a>	Synchronization Source Sub-registry . . . . .	<a href="#">15</a>
<a href="#">5.3.</a>	Timestamping Method Sub-registry . . . . .	<a href="#">16</a>
<a href="#">5.4.</a>	Access ID Sub-registry . . . . .	<a href="#">17</a>
<a href="#">5.5.</a>	Return Code Sub-registry . . . . .	<a href="#">17</a>
<a href="#">6.</a>	Security Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">18</a>
<a href="#">7.</a>	Acknowledgments . . . . .	<a href="#">18</a>
<a href="#">8.</a>	Contributors . . . . .	<a href="#">18</a>
<a href="#">9.</a>	References . . . . .	<a href="#">19</a>
<a href="#">9.1.</a>	Normative References . . . . .	<a href="#">19</a>
<a href="#">9.2.</a>	Informative References . . . . .	<a href="#">19</a>
	Authors' Addresses . . . . .	<a href="#">20</a>

[1.](#) Introduction

Simple Two-way Active Measurement Protocol (STAMP)

[[I-D.ietf-ippm-stamp](#)] supports the use of optional extensions that use Type-Length-Value (TLV) encoding. Such extensions are to enhance the STAMP base functions, such as measurement of one-way and round-

trip delay, latency, packet loss, as well as ability to detect packet duplication and out-of-order delivery of the test packets. This specification provides definitions of optional STAMP extensions, their formats, and theory of operation.

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

### [2.1.](#) Terminology

STAMP - Simple Two-way Active Measurement Protocol

DSCP - Differentiated Services Code Point

ECN - Explicit Congestion Notification

NTP - Network Time Protocol

PTP - Precision Time Protocol

HMAC Hashed Message Authentication Code

TLV Type-Length-Value

BITS Building Integrated Timing Supply

SSU Synchronization Supply Unit

GPS Global Positioning System

GLONASS Global Orbiting Navigation Satellite System

LORAN-C Long Range Navigation System Version C

MBZ Must Be Zeroed

CoS Class of Service

PMF Performance Measurement Function

### [2.2.](#) Requirements Language










Figure 3: Extra Padding TLV

where fields are defined as the following:

- o Extra Padding Type - TBA1 allocated by IANA [Section 5.1](#)
- o Length - two octets long field equals length on the Extra Padding field in octets.
- o Extra Padding - a pseudo-random sequence of numbers. The field MAY be filled with all zeroes.

The Extra Padding TLV is similar to the Packet Padding field in TWAMP-Test packet [[RFC5357](#)]. The in STAMP the Packet Padding field is used to ensure symmetrical size between Session-Sender and Session-Reflector test packets. Extra Padding TLV MUST be used to create STAMP test packets of larger size.

#### [4.2.](#) Location TLV

STAMP session-sender MAY include the Location TLV to request information from the session-reflector. The session-sender SHOULD NOT fill any information fields except for Type and Length. The

session-reflector MUST validate the Length value against the address family of the transport encapsulating the STAMP test packet. If the value of the Length field is invalid, the session-reflector MUST zero all fields and MUST NOT return any information to the session-sender. The session-reflector MUST ignore all other fields of the received Location TLV.




Figure 4: Session-Reflector Location TLV

where fields are defined as the following:

- o Location Type - TBA2 allocated by IANA [Section 5.1](#)
- o Length - two octets long field equals length on the Value field in octets. Length field value MUST be 20 octets for the IPv4 address family. For the IPv6 address family value of the Length field MUST be 44 octets. All other values are invalid.
- o Source MAC - 6 octets 48 bits long field. The session-reflector MUST copy Source MAC of received STAMP packet into this field.
- o Reserved A - two octets long field. MUST be zeroed on transmission and ignored on reception.
- o Destination IP Address - IPv4 or IPv6 destination address of the received by the session-reflector STAMP packet.
- o Source IP Address - IPv4 or IPv6 source address of the received by the session-reflector STAMP packet.
- o Dest.port - one octet long UDP destination port number of the received STAMP packet.

- o Src.port - one octet long UDP source port number of the received



STAMP packet.

- o Reserved B - two octets long field. MUST be zeroed on transmission and ignored on reception.

The Location TLV MAY be used to determine the last-hop addressing for STAMP packets including source and destination IP addresses as well as the MAC address of the last-hop router. Last-hop MAC address MAY be monitored by the Session-Sender whether there has been a path switch on the last hop, closest to the Session-Reflector. The IP addresses and UDP port will indicate if there is a NAT router on the path, and allows the Session-Sender to identify the IP address of the Session-Reflector behind the NAT, detect changes in the NAT mapping that could cause sending the STAMP packets to the wrong Session-Reflector.

#### 4.3. Timestamp Information TLV

STAMP session-sender MAY include the Timestamp Information TLV to request information from the session-reflector. The session-sender SHOULD NOT fill any information fields except for Type and Length. The session-reflector MUST validate the Length value of the STAMP test packet. If the value of the Length field is invalid, the session-reflector MUST zero all fields and MUST NOT return any information to the session-sender.




Figure 5: Timestamp Information TLV

where fields are defined as the following:

- o Timestamp Information Type - TBA3 allocated by IANA [Section 5.1](#)
- o Length - two octets long field, equals four octets.
- o Sync Src In - one octet long field that characterizes the source of clock synchronization at the ingress of Session-Reflector. There are several of methods to synchronize the clock, e.g., Network Time Protocol (NTP) [[RFC5905](#)], Precision Time Protocol (PTP) [[IEEE.1588.2008](#)], Synchronization Supply Unit (SSU) or

Building Integrated Timing Supply (BITS), or Global Positioning System (GPS), Global Orbiting Navigation Satellite System (GLONASS) and Long Range Navigation System Version C (LORAN-C). The value is one of the listed in Table 4.

- o Timestamp In - one octet long field that characterizes the method by which the ingress of Session-Reflector obtained the timestamp T2. A timestamp may be obtained with hardware assist, via software API from a local wall clock, or from a remote clock (the latter referred to as "control plane"). The value is one of the listed in Table 6.
- o Sync Src Out - one octet long field that characterizes the source of clock synchronization at the egress of Session-Reflector. The value is one of the listed in Table 4.
- o Timestamp Out - one octet long field that characterizes the method by which the egress of Session-Reflector obtained the timestamp T3. The value is one of the listed in Table 6.

4.4. Class of Service TLV

The STAMP session-sender MAY include Class of Service (CoS) TLV in the STAMP test packet. If the CoS TLV is present in the STAMP test packet and the value of the DSCP1 field is zero, then the STAMP session-reflector MUST copy the values of Differentiated Services Code Point (DSCP) ECN fields from the received STAMP test packet into DSCP2 and ECN fields respectively of the CoS TLV of the reflected STAMP test packet. If the value of the DSCP1 field is non-zero, then the STAMP session-reflector MUST use DSCP1 value from the CoS TLV in the received STAMP test packet as DSCP value of STAMP reflected test packet and MUST copy DSCP and ECN values of the received STAMP test packet into DSCP2 and ECN fields of Class of Service TLV in the STAMP reflected a packet. The Session-Sender, upon receiving the reflected packet, will save the DSCP and ECN values for analysis of the CoS in the reverse direction.




Figure 6: Class of Service TLV

where fields are defined as the following:

- o Class of Service Type - TBA4 allocated by IANA [Section 5.1](#)
- o Length - two octets long field, equals four octets.
- o DSCP1 - The Differentiated Services Code Point (DSCP) intended by the Session-Sender. To be used as the return DSCP from the Session-Reflector.
- o DSCP2 - The received value in the DSCP field at the Session-Reflector in the forward direction.
- o ECN - The received value in the ECN field at the Session-Reflector in the forward direction.
- o Reserved - 18 bits long field, must be zeroed in transmission and ignored on receipt.

A STAMP Session-Sender that includes the CoS TLV sets the value of the DSCP1 field and zeroes the value of the DSCP2 field. A STAMP Session-Reflector that received the test packet with the CoS TLV MUST include the CoS TLV in the reflected test packet. Also, the Session-Reflector MUST copy the value of the DSCP field of the IP header of the received STAMP test packet into the DSCP2 field in the reflected test packet. And, at last, the Session-Reflector MUST set the value of the DSCP field in the IP header of the reflected test packet equal to the value of the DSCP1 field of the test packet it has received.

Re-mapping of CoS in some use cases, for example, in mobile backhaul networks is used to provide multiple services, i.e., 2G, 3G, LTE, over the same network. But if it is misconfigured, then it is often difficult to diagnose the root cause of the problem that is viewed as an excessive packet drop of higher level service while packet drop for lower service packets is at a normal level. Using CoS TLV in STAMP test helps to troubleshoot the existing problem and also verify whether DiffServ policies are processing CoS as required by the configuration.

#### [4.5.](#) Direct Measurement TLV

The Direct Measurement TLV enables collection of "in profile" IP packets that had been transmitted and received by the Session-Sender and Session-Reflector respectfully. The definition of "in-profile packet" is outside the scope of this document.




Figure 7: Direct Measurement TLV

where fields are defined as the following:

- o Direct Measurement Type - TBA5 allocated by IANA [Section 5.1](#)
- o Length - two octets long field equals length on the Value field in octets. Length field value MUST be 12 octets.
- o Session-Sender Tx counter (S\_TxC) is four octets long field.
- o Session-Reflector Rx counter (R\_RxC) is four octets long field. MUST be zeroed by the Session-Sender and filled by the Session-Reflector.
- o Session-Reflector Tx counter (R\_TxC) is four octets long field. MUST be zeroed by the Session-Sender and filled by the Session-Reflector.

[4.6.](#) Access Report TLV



Access Report TLV in the reflected test packet. The Session-Reflector MUST set the value of the Access ID and Return Code fields equal to the values of the corresponding fields from the test packet it has received.

The Session-Sender MUST also arm a retransmission timer after sending a test packet that includes the Access Report TLV. This timer MUST be disarmed upon the reception of the reflected STAMP test packet that includes Access Report TLV. In the event the timer expires before such a packet is received, the Session-Sender MUST retransmit the STAMP test packet that contains the Access Report TLV. This retransmission SHOULD be repeated up to four times before the procedure is aborted. Setting the value for the retransmission timer is based on local policies, network environment. The default value of the retransmission timer for Access Report TLV SHOULD be three seconds. An implementation MUST provide control of the retransmission timer value and the number of retransmissions.

The Access Report TLV is used by the Performance Measurement Function (PMF) components of the Access Steering, Switching and Splitting feature for 5G networks [[TS23501](#)]. The PMF component in the User Equipment acts as the STAMP Session-Sender, and the PMF component in the User Plane Function acts as the STAMP Session-Reflector.

#### [4.7.](#) Follow-up Telemetry TLV

A Session-Reflector might be able to put in the Timestamp field only a "SW Local" (see Table 6) timestamp. But the hosting system might provide the timestamp closer to the start of actual packet transmission even though when it is not possible to deliver the information to the Session-Sender in the packet itself. This timestamp might nevertheless be important for the Session-Sender, as it helps in to improve the accuracy of measuring network delay by minimizing the impact of egress queuing delays on the measurement.

A STAMP Session-Sender MAY include the Follow-up Telemetry TLV to request information from the Session-Reflector. The Session-Sender MUST set the Follow-up Telemetry Type and Length fields to their appropriate values. Sequence Number and Timestamp fields MUST be zeroed on transmission by the Session-Sender and ignored by the Session-Reflector upon receipt of the STAMP test packet that includes the Follow-up Telemetry TLV. The Session-Reflector MUST validate the

Length value of the STAMP test packet. If the value of the Length field is invalid, the Session-Reflector MUST zero Sequence Number and Timestamp fields. If the Session-Reflector is in stateless mode (defined in [Section 4.2 \[I-D.ietf-ippm-stamp\]](#)), it MUST zero Sequence Number and Timestamp fields.




Figure 9: Follow-up Telemetry TLV

where fields are defined as follows:

- o Follow-up Telemetry Type - TBA7 allocated by IANA [Section 5.1](#).
- o Length - two octets long field, equals 12 octets.
- o Sequence Number - four octets long field indicating the sequence number of the last packet reflected in the same STAMP-test session. Since the Session-Reflector runs in the stateful mode

(defined in [Section 4.2 \[I-D.ietf-ippm-stamp\]](#)), it is the Session-Reflector's Sequence Number of the previous reflected packet.

- o Timestamp - eight octets long field, with the format indicated by the Z flag of the Error Estimate field as described in [Section 4.1 \[I-D.ietf-ippm-stamp\]](#). It carries the timestamp when the reflected packet with the specified sequence number was sent..
- o Timestamp M(ode) - one octet long field that characterizes the method by which the entity that transmits a reflected STAMP packet obtained the timestamp. The value is one of the listed in

Table 6.

- o Reserved - the field MUST be zeroed on transmission and ignored on receipt.

## 5. IANA Considerations

### 5.1. STAMP TLV Registry

IANA is requested to create the STAMP TLV Type registry. All code points in the range 1 through 32759 in this registry shall be allocated according to the "IETF Review" procedure as specified in [RFC8126]. Code points in the range 32760 through 65279 in this registry shall be allocated according to the "First Come First Served" procedure as specified in [RFC8126]. Remaining code points are allocated according to Table 1:

Value	Description	Reference
0	Reserved	This document
1- 32767	Mandatory TLV, unassigned	IETF Review
32768 - 65279	Optional TLV, unassigned	First Come First Served
65280 - 65519	Experimental	This document
65520 - 65534	Private Use	This document
65535	Reserved	This document

Table 1: STAMP TLV Type Registry

This document defines the following new values in the STAMP TLV Type registry:

Value	Description	Reference
TBA1	Extra Padding	This document



TBA2	Location	This document
TBA3	Timestamp Information	This document
TBA4	Class of Service	This document
TBA6	Access Report	This document
TBA7	Follow-up Telemetry	This document

Table 2: STAMP Types

## 5.2. Synchronization Source Sub-registry

IANA is requested to create Synchronization Source sub-registry as part of STAMP TLV Type registry. All code points in the range 1 through 127 in this registry shall be allocated according to the "IETF Review" procedure as specified in [RFC8126]. Code points in the range 128 through 239 in this registry shall be allocated according to the "First Come First Served" procedure as specified in [RFC8126]. Remaining code points are allocated according to Table 1:

Value	Description	Reference
0	Reserved	This document
1- 127	Unassigned	IETF Review
128 - 239	Unassigned	First Come First Served
240 - 249	Experimental	This document
250 - 254	Private Use	This document
255	Reserved	This document

Table 3: Synchronization Source Sub-registry

This document defines the following new values in the Synchronization Source sub-registry:

Value	Description	Reference
1	NTP	This document
2	PTP	This document
3	SSU/BITS	This document
4	GPS/GLONASS/LORAN-C	This document
5	Local free-running	This document

Table 4: Synchronization Sources

### 5.3. Timestamping Method Sub-registry

IANA is requested to create Timestamping Method sub-registry as part of STAMP TLV Type registry. All code points in the range 1 through 127 in this registry shall be allocated according to the "IETF Review" procedure as specified in [RFC8126]. Code points in the range 128 through 239 in this registry shall be allocated according to the "First Come First Served" procedure as specified in [RFC8126]. Remaining code points are allocated according to Table 1:

Value	Description	Reference
0	Reserved	This document
1- 127	Unassigned	IETF Review
128 - 239	Unassigned	First Come First Served
240 - 249	Experimental	This document
250 - 254	Private Use	This document
255	Reserved	This document

Table 5: Timestamping Method Sub-registry

This document defines the following new values in the Timestamping Methods sub-registry:

Value	Description	Reference
1	HW Assist	This document
2	SW local	This document
3	Control plane	This document

Table 6: Timestamping Methods

Internet-Draft

STAMP Extensions

October 2019

#### [5.4.](#) Access ID Sub-registry

IANA is requested to create Access ID sub-registry as part of STAMP TLV Type registry. All code points in the range 1 through 127 in this registry shall be allocated according to the "IETF Review" procedure as specified in [[RFC8126](#)]. Code points in the range 128 through 239 in this registry shall be allocated according to the "First Come First Served" procedure as specified in [[RFC8126](#)]. Remaining code points are allocated according to Table 7:

Value	Description	Reference
0	Reserved	This document
1- 127	Unassigned	IETF Review
128 - 239	Unassigned	First Come First Served
240 - 249	Experimental	This document
250 - 254	Private Use	This document
255	Reserved	This document

Table 7: Access ID Sub-registry

This document defines the following new values in the Access ID sub-registry:

Value	Description	Reference
1	3GPP	This document
2	Non-3GPP	This document

Table 8: Access IDs

#### [5.5.](#) Return Code Sub-registry

IANA is requested to create Return Code sub-registry as part of STAMP TLV Type registry. All code points in the range 1 through 127 in this registry shall be allocated according to the "IETF Review"

procedure as specified in [RFC8126]. Code points in the range 128 through 239 in this registry shall be allocated according to the "First Come First Served" procedure as specified in [RFC8126]. Remaining code points are allocated according to Table 7:

Value	Description	Reference
0	Reserved	This document
1- 127	Unassigned	IETF Review
128 - 239	Unassigned	First Come First Served
240 - 249	Experimental	This document
250 - 254	Private Use	This document
255	Reserved	This document

Table 9: Return Code Sub-registry

This document defines the following new values in the Return Code sub-registry:

Value	Description	Reference
1	Network available	This document
2	Network unavailable	This document

Table 10: Return Codes

## 6. Security Considerations

Use of HMAC in authenticated mode may be used to simultaneously verify both the data integrity and the authentication of the STAMP test packets.

## 7. Acknowledgments

Authors much appreciate the thorough review and thoughtful comments received from Tianran Zhou.

## 8. Contributors

The following people contributed text to this document:

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

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

Mirsky, et al.

Expires May 3, 2020

[Page 18]

---

Internet-Draft

STAMP Extensions

October 2019

## 9. References

### 9.1. Normative References

[I-D.ietf-ippm-stamp]

Mirsky, G., Jun, G., Nydell, H., and R. Foote, "Simple Two-way Active Measurement Protocol", [draft-ietf-ippm-stamp-09](#) (work in progress), October 2019.

[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>>.

[RFC5357] Hedayat, K., Krzanowski, R., Morton, A., Yum, K., and J. Babiarz, "A Two-Way Active Measurement Protocol (TWAMP)", [RFC 5357](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5357, October 2008, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5357>>.

[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>>.

[RFC8126] Cotton, M., Leiba, B., and T. Narten, "Guidelines for Writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs", [BCP 26](#),

[RFC 8126](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8126, June 2017,  
<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8126>>.

[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>>.

## 9.2. Informative References

[IEEE.1588.2008]

"Standard for a Precision Clock Synchronization Protocol for Networked Measurement and Control Systems", IEEE Standard 1588, March 2008.

[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>>.

Mirsky, et al.

Expires May 3, 2020

[Page 19]

---

Internet-Draft

STAMP Extensions

October 2019

[TS23501] 3GPP (3rd Generation Partnership Project), "Technical Specification Group Services and System Aspects; System Architecture for the 5G System; Stage 2 (Release 16)", 3GPP TS23501, 2019.

## Authors' Addresses

Greg Mirsky  
ZTE Corp.

Email: [gregimirsky@gmail.com](mailto:gregimirsky@gmail.com)

Xiao Min  
ZTE Corp.

Email: [xiao.min2@zte.com.cn](mailto:xiao.min2@zte.com.cn)

Henrik Nydell  
Accedian Networks

Email: [hnydell@accedian.com](mailto:hnydell@accedian.com)

Richard Foote  
Nokia

Email: [footer.foote@nokia.com](mailto:footer.foote@nokia.com)

Adi Masputra  
Apple Inc.  
One Apple Park Way  
Cupertino, CA 95014  
USA

Email: [adi@apple.com](mailto:adi@apple.com)

Ernesto Ruffini  
OutSys  
via Caracciolo, 65  
Milano 20155  
Italy

Email: [eruffini@outsys.org](mailto:eruffini@outsys.org)