

IPPM Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: 13 March 2022

R. Gandhi, Ed.  
C. Filsfils  
Cisco Systems, Inc.  
D. Voyer  
Bell Canada  
M. Chen  
Huawei  
B. Janssens  
Colt  
R. Foote  
Nokia  
9 September 2021

Simple TWAMP (STAMP) Extensions for Segment Routing Networks  
draft-ietf-ippm-stamp-srpm-02

## Abstract

Segment Routing (SR) leverages the source routing paradigm. SR is applicable to both Multiprotocol Label Switching (SR-MPLS) and IPv6 (SRv6) forwarding planes. This document specifies [RFC 8762](#) (Simple Two-Way Active Measurement Protocol (STAMP)) extensions for SR networks, for both SR-MPLS and SRv6 forwarding planes by augmenting the optional extensions defined in [RFC 8972](#).

## 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 13 March 2022.

## 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 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>	Requirements Language . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">2.2.</a>	Abbreviations . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">2.3.</a>	Reference Topology . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	Destination Node Address TLV . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">4.</a>	Return Path TLV . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">4.1.</a>	Return Path Sub-TLVs . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">4.1.1.</a>	Return Path Control Code Sub-TLV . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">4.1.2.</a>	Return Address Sub-TLV . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">4.1.3.</a>	Return Segment List Sub-TLVs . . . . .	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">5.</a>	Security Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">6.</a>	IANA Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">10</a>
<a href="#">7.</a>	References . . . . .	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">7.1.</a>	Normative References . . . . .	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">7.2.</a>	Informative References . . . . .	<a href="#">12</a>
	Acknowledgments . . . . .	<a href="#">13</a>
	Authors' Addresses . . . . .	<a href="#">13</a>

## [1.](#) Introduction

Segment Routing (SR) leverages the source routing paradigm for Software Defined Networks (SDNs). SR is applicable to both Multiprotocol Label Switching (SR-MPLS) and IPv6 (SRv6) forwarding planes [[RFC8402](#)]. SR Policies as defined in [[I-D.ietf-spring-segment-routing-policy](#)] are used to steer traffic through a specific, user-defined paths using a stack of Segments. Built-in SR Performance Measurement (PM) is one of the essential requirements to provide Service Level Agreements (SLAs).

The Simple Two-Way Active Measurement Protocol (STAMP) provides capabilities for the measurement of various performance metrics in IP

networks [[RFC8762](#)] without the use of a control channel to pre-signal session parameters. [[RFC8972](#)] defines optional extensions for STAMP. Note that the YANG data model defined in [[I-D.ietf-ippm-stamp-yang](#)] can be used to provision the STAMP Session-Sender and STAMP Session-Reflector.

The STAMP test packets are transmitted along an IP path between a Session-Sender and a Session-Reflector to measure performance delay and packet loss along that IP path. It may be desired in SR networks that the same path (same set of links and nodes) between the Session-Sender and Session-Reflector is used for the STAMP test packets in both directions. This is achieved by using the STAMP [[RFC8762](#)] extensions for SR-MPLS and SRv6 networks specified in this document by augmenting the optional extensions defined in [[RFC8972](#)].

## [2.](#) Conventions Used in This Document

### [2.1.](#) 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 [[RFC2119](#)] [[RFC8174](#)] when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

### [2.2.](#) Abbreviations

MPLS: Multiprotocol Label Switching.

PM: Performance Measurement.

SID: Segment ID.

SL: Segment List.

SR: Segment Routing.

SR-MPLS: Segment Routing with MPLS forwarding plane.

SRv6: Segment Routing with IPv6 forwarding plane.


SSID: STAMP Session Identifier.

STAMP: Simple Two-Way Active Measurement Protocol.

### 2.3. Reference Topology

In the reference topology shown below, the STAMP Session-Sender S1 initiates a STAMP test packet and the STAMP Session-Reflector R1 transmits a reply test packet. The reply test packet may be transmitted to the Session-Sender S1 on the same path (same set of links and nodes) or a different path in the reverse direction from the path taken towards the Session-Reflector R1.

The nodes S1 and R1 may be connected via a link or an SR path [[RFC8402](#)]. The link may be a physical interface, virtual link, or Link Aggregation Group (LAG) [[IEEE802.1AX](#)], or LAG member link. The SR path may be an SR Policy [[I-D.ietf-spring-segment-routing-policy](#)] on node S1 (called head-end) with destination to node R1 (called tail-end).



Reference Topology

### 3. Destination Node Address TLV

The Session-Sender may need to transmit test packets to the Session-Reflector with a different destination address not matching an address on the Session-Reflector e.g. when the STAMP test packet is encapsulated by a tunneling protocol or an MPLS Segment List with IPv4 address from 127/8 range or Segment Routing Header (SRH) with IPv6 address `::1/128`. For testing ECMPs, the Session-Sender may

select different IPv4 addresses from 127/8 range or select different Flow Label values for IPv6. In an error condition, the STAMP test packet may not reach the intended Session-Reflector, an un-intended node may transmit reply test packets resulting in reporting of invalid measurement metrics.

[RFC8972] defines STAMP test packets that can include one or more optional TLVs. In this document, Destination Node Address TLV (Type TBA1) is defined for STAMP test packet [RFC8972] and has the following format shown in Figure 1:




Figure 1: Destination Node Address TLV Format

The Length field is used to decide the Address Family of the Address.

The STAMP TLV Flags are set using the procedures described in [RFC8972].

The Destination Node Address TLV is optional. The Destination Node Address TLV indicates the address of the intended Session-Reflector node of the test packet. When Session-Sender test packet destination address is different than the actual Session-Reflector address, the actual Session-Reflector address MUST be transmitted to the Session-Reflector with a Destination Node Address TLV.

The Session-Reflector that supports this TLV, MUST transmit reply test packet with Error D (Wrong Destination) in the STAMP TLV Flags field if it is not the intended destination of the received Session-Sender test packet.

D (Wrong Destination): A one-bit flag at position TBA3. A Session-Sender MUST set the D flag to 0 before transmitting an extended STAMP test packet. A Session-Reflector MUST set the D flag to 1 if the

Session-Reflector determined that it is not the intended Destination as identified in the Destination Node Address TLV. Otherwise, the Session-Reflector MUST set the D flag in the Reply test packet to 0.

Note that the Destination Node Address TLV is applicable to the P2P SR paths only.

#### 4. Return Path TLV

For end-to-end SR paths, the Session-Reflector may need to transmit the reply test packet on a specific return path. The Session-Sender can request this in the test packet to the Session-Reflector using a Return Path TLV. With this TLV carried in the Session-Sender test packet, signaling and maintaining dynamic SR network state for the STAMP sessions on the Session-Reflector are avoided.

For links, the Session-Reflector may need to transmit the reply test packet on the same incoming link in the reverse direction. The Session-Sender can request this in the test packet to the Session-Reflector using a Return Path TLV.

[RFC8972] defines STAMP test packets that can include one or more optional TLVs. In this document, the TLV Type (value TBA2) is defined for the Return Path TLV that carries the return path for the Session-Sender test packet. The format of the Return Path TLV is shown in Figure 2:




Figure 2: Return Path TLV

The STAMP TLV Flags are set using the procedures described in [\[RFC8972\]](#).

The Return Path TLV is optional. The Session-Sender MUST only insert

one Return Path TLV in the STAMP test packet. The Session-Reflector that supports this TLV, MUST only process the first Return Path TLV in the test packet and ignore other Return Path TLVs if present, and it MUST NOT add Return Path TLV in the reply test packet. The Session-Reflector that supports this TLV MUST reply using the Return Path received in the Session-Sender test packet. Otherwise, the procedure defined in [RFC8762] is followed by the Session-Reflector.

#### 4.1. Return Path Sub-TLVs

The Return Path TLV contains one or more Sub-TLVs to carry the information for the requested return path. A Return Path Sub-TLV can carry Return Path Control Code, Return Path IP Address or Return Path Segment List.

The STAMP Sub-TLV Flags are set using the procedures described in [RFC8972].


When Return Path Sub-TLV is present in the Session-Sender test packet, the Session-Reflector that supports this TLV, MUST transmit reply test packet using the return path information specified in the Return Path Sub-TLV.

A Return Path TLV MUST NOT contain both Control Code Sub-TLV as well as Return Address or Return Segment List Sub-TLV.

##### 4.1.1. Return Path Control Code Sub-TLV

The format of the Return Path Control Code Sub-TLV is shown in Figure 3. The Type of the Return Path Control Code Sub-TLV is defined as following:

\* Type (value 1): Return Path Control Code. The Session-Sender can request the Session-Reflector to transmit the reply test packet based on the flags defined in the Control Code field.






Figure 3: Control Code Sub-TLV in Return Path TLV

Control Code Flags (32-bit): Defined as follows.

0x0: No Reply Requested.

0x1: Reply Requested on the Same Link.

When Control Code flag is set to 0x0 in the Session-Sender test packet, the Session-Reflector does not transmit reply test packet to the Session-Sender and terminates the STAMP test packet. Only the one-way measurement is applicable in this case. Optionally, the Session-Reflector may locally stream performance metrics via telemetry using the information from the received test packet. All other Return Path Sub-TLVs are ignored in this case.

When Control Code flag is set to 0x1 in the Session-Sender test packet, the Session-Reflector transmits the reply test packet over the same incoming link where the test packet is received in the reverse direction towards the Session-Sender. All other Return Path Sub-TLVs are ignored in this case.

#### [4.1.2.](#) Return Address Sub-TLV

The STAMP reply test packet may be transmitted to the Session-Sender to a different destination address on the Session-Sender using Return Path TLV. For this, the Session-Sender can specify in the test packet the receiving destination node address for the Session-Reflector reply test packet. When transmitting the STAMP test packet to a different destination address, the Session-Sender MUST follow the procedure defined in [Section 4.3 of \[RFC8762\]](#).

The format of the Return Address Sub-TLV is shown in Figure 4. The



Address Family field indicates the type of the address, and it SHALL be set to one of the assigned values in the "IANA Address Family Numbers" registry. The Type of the Return Address Sub-TLV is defined as following:

- \* Type (value 2): Return Address. Destination node address of the Session-Reflector reply test packet different than the Source Address in the Session-Sender test packet.




Figure 4: Return Address Sub-TLV in Return Path TLV

#### 4.1.3. Return Segment List Sub-TLVs

The format of the Segment List Sub-TLVs in the Return Path TLV is shown in Figure 5. The segment entries MUST be in network order. The Segment List Sub-TLV can be one of the following Types:

- \* Type (value 3): SR-MPLS Label Stack of the Return Path
- \* Type (value 4): SRv6 Segment List of the Return Path




Figure 5: Segment List Sub-TLV in Return Path TLV

An SR-MPLS Label Stack Sub-TLV may carry only Binding SID [[I-D.ietf-pce-binding-label-sid](#)] of the Return SR-MPLS Policy.

An SRv6 Segment List Sub-TLV may carry only Binding SID [[I-D.ietf-pce-binding-label-sid](#)] of the Return SRv6 Policy.

The Session-Sender MUST only insert one Segment List Return Path Sub-TLV in the test packet. The Session-Reflector MUST only process the first Segment List Return Path Sub-TLV in the test packet and ignore other Segment List Return Path Sub-TLVs if present.

Note that in addition to the P2P SR paths, the Return Segment List Sub-TLV is also applicable to the P2MP SR paths. For example, for P2MP SR paths, it may only carry the Node Segment Identifier of the Session-Sender in order for the reply test packet to follow an SR path to the Session-Sender.

## 5. Security Considerations

The usage of STAMP protocol is intended for deployment in limited domains [[RFC8799](#)]. As such, it assumes that a node involved in STAMP protocol operation has previously verified the integrity of the path and the identity of the far-end Session-Reflector.

If desired, attacks can be mitigated by performing basic validation and sanity checks, at the Session-Sender, of the timestamp fields in received reply test packets. The minimal state associated with these protocols also limits the extent of measurement disruption that can be caused by a corrupt or invalid test packet to a single test cycle.

The security considerations specified in [[RFC8762](#)] and [[RFC8972](#)] also apply to the extensions defined in this document. Specifically, the message integrity protection using HMAC, as defined in [[RFC8762](#)] [Section 4.4](#), also apply to the procedure described in this document.

STAMP uses the well-known UDP port number that could become a target of denial of service (DoS) or could be used to aid man-in-the-middle (MITM) attacks. Thus, the security considerations and measures to mitigate the risk of the attack documented in [Section 6 of \[RFC8545\]](#) equally apply to the STAMP extensions in this document.

The STAMP extensions defined in this document may be used for potential "proxying" attacks. For example, a Session-Sender may specify a return path that has a destination different from that of

the Session-Sender. But normally, such attacks will not happen in an SR domain where the Session-Senders and Session-Reflectors belong to

the same domain. In order to prevent using the extension defined in this document for proxying any possible attacks, the return path has destination to the same node where the forward path is from. The Session-Reflector may drop the Session-Sender test packet when it cannot determine whether the Return Path has the destination to the Session-Sender. That means, the Session-Sender should choose a proper source address according to the specified Return Path to help the Session-Reflector to make that decision.

## 6. IANA Considerations

IANA has created the "STAMP TLV Types" registry for [RFC8972]. IANA is requested to allocate a value for the Destination Address TLV Type and a value for the Return Path TLV Type from the IETF Review TLV range of the same registry.

Value	Description	Reference
TBA1	Destination Node Address TLV	This document
TBA2	Return Path TLV	This document

Table 1: STAMP TLV Types

IANA is requested to create a sub-registry for "Return Path Sub-TLV Type". All code points in the range 1 through 175 in this registry shall be allocated according to the "IETF Review" procedure as specified in [RFC8126]. Code points in the range 176 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 2:

Value	Description	Reference
1 - 175	IETF Review	This document

176 - 239	First Come First Served	This document
240 - 251	Experimental Use	This document
252 - 254	Private Use	This document

Table 2: Return Path Sub-TLV Type Registry

IANA is requested to allocate the values for the following Sub-TLV Types from this registry.

Type	Description	Reference
0	Reserved	This document
1	Return Path Control Code	This document
2	Return Address	This document
3	SR-MPLS Label Stack of the Return Path	This document
4	SRv6 Segment List of the Return Path	This document
255	Reserved	This document

Table 3: Return Path Sub-TLV Types

IANA has created the "STAMP TLV Flags" subregistry. IANA is requested to allocate the following bit position in the "STAMP TLV Flags" subregistry.

Bit Position	Symbol	Description	Reference
TBA3	D	Wrong Destination	This document

Table 4: STAMP TLV Flags

## 7. References

### 7.1. Normative References

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.
- [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>>.

- [RFC8762] Mirsky, G., Jun, G., Nydell, H., and R. Foote, "Simple Two-Way Active Measurement Protocol", [RFC 8762](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8762, March 2020, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8762>>.
- [RFC8972] Mirsky, G., Min, X., Nydell, H., Foote, R., Masputra, A., and E. Ruffini, "Simple Two-Way Active Measurement Protocol Optional Extensions", [RFC 8972](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8972, January 2021, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8972>>.

### 7.2. Informative References

- [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>>.
- [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>>.
- [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>>.

[RFC8799] Carpenter, B. and B. Liu, "Limited Domains and Internet Protocols", [RFC 8799](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8799, July 2020, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8799>>.

[I-D.ietf-spring-segment-routing-policy]  
Filsfils, C., Talaulikar, K., Voyer, D., Bogdanov, A., and P. Mattes, "Segment Routing Policy Architecture", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, [draft-ietf-spring-segment-routing-policy-13](#), 28 May 2021, <<https://www.ietf.org/archive/id/draft-ietf-spring-segment-routing-policy-13.txt>>.

[I-D.ietf-pce-binding-label-sid]  
Sivabalan, S., Filsfils, C., Tantsura, J., Previdi, S., and C. L. (editor), "Carrying Binding Label/Segment Identifier in PCE-based Networks.", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, [draft-ietf-pce-binding-label-sid-10](#), 10 July 2021, <<https://www.ietf.org/archive/id/draft-ietf-pce-binding-label-sid-10.txt>>.

Gandhi, et al.

Expires 13 March 2022

[Page 12]

---

Internet-Draft

Simple TWAMP Extensions for SR

September 2021

[I-D.ietf-ippm-stamp-yang]  
Mirsky, G., Min, X., and W. S. Luo, "Simple Two-way Active Measurement Protocol (STAMP) Data Model", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, [draft-ietf-ippm-stamp-yang-09](#), 12 July 2021, <<https://www.ietf.org/archive/id/draft-ietf-ippm-stamp-yang-09.txt>>.

[IEEE802.1AX]  
IEEE Std. 802.1AX, "IEEE Standard for Local and metropolitan area networks - Link Aggregation", November 2008.

## Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Thierry Couture for the discussions on the use-cases for Performance Measurement in Segment Routing. The authors would also like to thank Greg Mirsky, Mike Koldychev, Gyan Mishra, Tianran Zhou, Al Mortons, Reshad Rahman, Zhenqiang Li, Frank

Brockners, and Cheng Li for providing comments and suggestions.

#### Authors' Addresses

Rakesh Gandhi (editor)  
Cisco Systems, Inc.  
Canada

Email: rgandhi@cisco.com

Clarence Filsfils  
Cisco Systems, Inc.

Email: cfilsfil@cisco.com

Daniel Voyer  
Bell Canada

Email: daniel.voyer@bell.ca

Mach(Guoyi) Chen  
Huawei

Email: mach.chen@huawei.com

Bart Janssens  
Colt

Email: Bart.Janssens@colt.net

Richard Foote  
Nokia

Email: footer.foote@nokia.com

