

Network Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Informational  
Expires: April 29, 2018

T. Mizrahi  
Marvell  
J. Fabini  
Vienna University of Technology  
A. Morton  
AT&T Labs  
October 26, 2017

Guidelines for Defining Packet Timestamps  
draft-ietf-ntp-packet-timestamps-00

## Abstract

This document specifies guidelines for defining binary packet timestamp formats in networking protocols at various layers. It also presents three recommended timestamp formats. The target audience of this memo includes network protocol designers. It is expected that a new network protocol that requires a packet timestamp will, in most cases, use one of the recommended timestamp formats. If none of the recommended formats fits the protocol requirements, the new protocol specification should specify the format of the packet timestamp according to the guidelines in this document.

## 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 April 29, 2018.

## Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2017 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

<u>1.</u>	Introduction . . . . .	<u>2</u>
<u>2.</u>	Terminology . . . . .	<u>3</u>
<u>2.1.</u>	Requirements Language . . . . .	<u>3</u>
<u>2.2.</u>	Abbreviations . . . . .	<u>3</u>
<u>3.</u>	Packet Timestamp Format Specification . . . . .	<u>3</u>
<u>4.</u>	Recommended Timestamp Formats . . . . .	<u>4</u>
<u>4.1.</u>	Using a Recommended Timestamp Format . . . . .	<u>5</u>
<u>4.2.</u>	NTP Timestamp Formats . . . . .	<u>5</u>
<u>4.2.1.</u>	NTP 64-bit Timestamp Format . . . . .	<u>5</u>
<u>4.2.2.</u>	NTP 32-bit Timestamp Format . . . . .	<u>6</u>
<u>4.3.</u>	The PTP Truncated Timestamp Format . . . . .	<u>8</u>
<u>5.</u>	Timestamp Use Cases . . . . .	<u>9</u>
<u>5.1.</u>	Example 1 . . . . .	<u>9</u>
<u>5.2.</u>	Example 2 . . . . .	<u>10</u>
<u>6.</u>	Packet Timestamp Control Field . . . . .	<u>10</u>
<u>7.</u>	IANA Considerations . . . . .	<u>11</u>
<u>8.</u>	Security Considerations . . . . .	<u>11</u>
<u>9.</u>	Acknowledgments . . . . .	<u>12</u>
<u>10.</u>	References . . . . .	<u>12</u>
<u>10.1.</u>	Normative References . . . . .	<u>12</u>
<u>10.2.</u>	Informative References . . . . .	<u>12</u>
	Authors' Addresses . . . . .	<u>14</u>

## 1. Introduction

Timestamps are widely used in network protocols for various purposes, including delay measurement, clock synchronization, and logging or reporting the time of an event.

Timestamps are represented in the RFC series in one of two forms: text-based timestamps, and packet timestamps. Text-based timestamps [RFC3339] are represented as user-friendly strings, and are widely used in the RFC series, for example in information objects and data models, e.g., [RFC5646], [RFC6991], and [RFC7493]. Packet timestamps, on the other hand, are represented by a compact binary field that has a fixed size, and are not intended to have a human-friendly format. Packet timestamps are also very common in the RFC

series, and are used for example for measuring delay and for synchronizing clocks, e.g., [[RFC5905](#)], [[RFC4656](#)], and [[RFC1323](#)].

This memo presents guidelines for defining a packet timestamp format in network protocols. Three recommended timestamp formats are presented. It is expected that a new network protocol that requires a packet timestamp will, in most cases, use one of the recommended timestamp formats. If none of the recommended formats fits the protocol requirements, the new protocol specification should specify the format of the packet timestamp according to the guidelines in this document.

## 2. Terminology

### 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 [RFC 2119](#) [[RFC2119](#)].

### 2.2. Abbreviations

NTP                Network Time Protocol [[RFC5905](#)]

PTP                Precision Time Protocol [[IEEE1588](#)]

## 3. Packet Timestamp Format Specification

This memo recommends to use the timestamp formats defined in [Section 4](#). In cases where these timestamp formats do not satisfy the protocol requirements, the timestamp specification should clearly state the reasons for defining a new format. Moreover, it is recommended to derive the new timestamp format from an existing timestamp format, either a timestamp format from this memo, or any other previously defined timestamp format.

This section defines a template for specifying packet timestamp formats. A timestamp format specification **MUST** include the following aspects:

Timestamp field format:

The format of the timestamp field consists of:

+ Size: The number of bits (or octets) used to represent the packet timestamp field.

+ Units: The units used to represent the timestamp.

If the timestamp is comprised of more than one field, the format of each field is specified.

Epoch:

The origin of the timescale used for the timestamp; the moment in time used as a reference for the timestamp value.

Resolution:

The timestamp resolution; the resolution is equal to the timestamp field unit. If the timestamp consists of two or more fields using different time units, then the resolution is the smallest time unit.

Wraparound:

The wraparound period of the timestamp; any further wraparound-related considerations should be described here.

#### 4. Recommended Timestamp Formats

This memo recommends to use one of the timestamp formats specified below.

Clearly, different network protocols may have different requirements and constraints, and consequently may use different timestamp formats. The choice of the specific timestamp format for a given protocol may depend on a various factors. A few examples of factors that may affect the choice of the timestamp format:

- o Timestamp size: while some network protocols may allow a large timestamp fields, in other cases there may be constraints with respect to the timestamp size, affecting the choice of the timestamp format.
- o Resolution: the time resolution is another factor that may directly affect the selected timestamp format. Similarly, the wraparound periodicity of the timestamp may also affect the selected format.
- o Wraparound period: the length of the time interval in which the timestamp is unique may also be an important factor in choosing the timestamp format. Along with the timestamp resolution, these two factors determine the required number of bits in the timestamp.

- o Common format for multiple protocols: if there are two or more network protocols that use timestamps and are often used together in typical systems, using a common timestamp format should be preferred if possible. Specifically, if the network protocol that is being defined typically runs on a PC, then an NTP-based timestamp format may allow easier integration with an NTP-synchronized timer. In contrast, a protocol that is typically deployed on a hardware-based platform, may make better use of a PTP-based timestamp, allowing more efficient integration with a PTP-synchronized timer.

#### [4.1.](#) Using a Recommended Timestamp Format

A specification that uses one of the recommended timestamp formats should specify explicitly that this is a recommended timestamp format, and point to the relevant section in the current memo.


A specification that uses one of the recommended timestamp formats should also include a section on Synchronization Aspects. Any assumptions or requirements related to synchronization should be specified in this section. For example, the synchronization aspects may specify whether nodes populating the timestamps should be synchronized among themselves, and whether the timestamp is measured with respect to a central reference clock such as an NTP server. If time is assumed to be synchronized to a time standard such as UTC or TAI, it should be specified in this section. Further considerations may be discussed in this section, such as required accuracy, or leap second handling.

#### [4.2.](#) NTP Timestamp Formats

##### [4.2.1.](#) NTP 64-bit Timestamp Format

The Network Time Protocol (NTP) 64-bit timestamp format is defined in [\[RFC5905\]](#). This timestamp format is used in several network protocols, including [\[RFC6374\]](#), [\[RFC4656\]](#), and [\[RFC5357\]](#). Since this timestamp format is used in NTP, this timestamp format should be preferred in network protocols that are typically deployed in concert with NTP.

The format is presented in this section according to the template defined in [Section 3](#).

Figure 1: NTP [[RFC5905](#)] 64-bit Timestamp Format

Timestamp field format:

Seconds: specifies the integer portion of the number of seconds since the epoch.

+ Size: 32 bits.

+ Units: seconds.

Fraction: specifies the fractional portion of the number of seconds since the epoch.

+ Size: 32 bits.

+ Units: the unit is  $2^{(-32)}$  seconds, which is roughly equal to 233 picoseconds.

Epoch:

The epoch is 1 January 1900 at 00:00 UTC.

Resolution:

The resolution is  $2^{(-32)}$  seconds.

Wraparound:

This time format wraps around every  $2^{32}$  seconds, which is roughly 136 years. The next wraparound will occur in the year 2036.

#### [4.2.2.](#) NTP 32-bit Timestamp Format

The Network Time Protocol (NTP) 32-bit timestamp format is defined in [[RFC5905](#)]. This timestamp format is used in [[I-D.morton-ippm-mbm-registry](#)]. This timestamp format should be preferred in network protocols that are typically deployed in concert with NTP. The 32-bit format can be used either when space

constraints do not allow the use of the 64-bit format, or when the 32-bit format satisfies the resolution and wraparound requirements.

The format is presented in this section according to the template defined in [Section 3](#).




Figure 2: NTP [[RFC5905](#)] 32-bit Timestamp Format

Timestamp field format:

Seconds: specifies the integer portion of the number of seconds since the epoch.

+ Size: 16 bits.

+ Units: seconds.

Fraction: specifies the fractional portion of the number of seconds since the epoch.

+ Size: 16 bits.

+ Units: the unit is  $2^{-16}$  seconds, which is roughly equal to 15.3 microseconds.

Epoch:

The epoch is 1 January 1900 at 00:00 UTC.

Resolution:

The resolution is  $2^{-16}$  seconds.

Wraparound:

This time format wraps around every  $2^{16}$  seconds, which is roughly 18 hours.

### 4.3. The PTP Truncated Timestamp Format

The Precision Time Protocol (PTP) [[IEEE1588](#)] uses an 80-bit timestamp format. The truncated timestamp format is a 64-bit field, which is the 64 least significant bits of the 80-bit PTP timestamp. Since this timestamp format is similar to the one used in PTP, this timestamp format should be preferred in network protocols that are typically deployed in PTP-capable devices.

The PTP truncated timestamp format is used in several protocols, such as [[RFC6374](#)], [[RFC7456](#)], [[RFC8186](#)] and [[ITU-T-Y.1731](#)].




Figure 3: PTP [[IEEE1588](#)] Truncated Timestamp Format

Timestamp field format:

Seconds: specifies the integer portion of the number of seconds since the epoch.

+ Size: 32 bits.

+ Units: seconds.

Nanoseconds: specifies the fractional portion of the number of seconds since the epoch.

+ Size: 32 bits.

+ Units: nanoseconds. The value of this field is in the range 0 to  $(10^9)-1$ .

Epoch:

The PTP [[IEEE1588](#)] epoch is 1 January 1970 00:00:00 TAI, which is 31 December 1969 23:59:51.999918 UTC.

Resolution:

The resolution is 1 nanosecond.

Wraparound:

This time format wraps around every  $2^{32}$  seconds, which is roughly 136 years. The next wraparound will occur in the year 2106.

## 5. Timestamp Use Cases

Packet timestamps are used in various network protocols. Typical applications of packet timestamps include delay measurement, clock synchronization, and others. The following table presents a (non-exhaustive) list of protocols that use packet timestamps, and the timestamp formats used in each of these protocols.

Protocol	Recommended formats			Other format
	NTP 64-bit	NTP 32-bit	PTP Trunc.	
NTP [ <a href="#">RFC5905</a> ]	+			
OWAMP [ <a href="#">RFC4656</a> ]	+			
TWAMP [ <a href="#">RFC5357</a> ]	+			
TWAMP [ <a href="#">RFC8186</a> ]			+	
TRILL [ <a href="#">RFC7456</a> ]			+	
MPLS [ <a href="#">RFC6374</a> ]			+	
TCP [ <a href="#">RFC1323</a> ]				+
RTP [ <a href="#">RFC3550</a> ]	+			+

Figure 4: Protocols that use Packet Timestamps

The rest of this section presents two hypothetical examples of network protocol specifications that use one of the recommended timestamp formats. The examples include the text that specifies the information related to the timestamp format.

### 5.1. Example 1

Timestamp:

The timestamp format used in this specification is the NTP [[RFC5905](#)] 64-bit format, as specified in Section 4.2.1 of [[I-D.mizrahi-intarea-packet-timestamps](#)].

Synchronization aspects:

It is assumed that nodes that run this protocol are synchronized to UTC using a synchronization mechanism that is outside the scope of this document. In typical deployments this protocol will be run on a machine that uses NTP [[RFC5905](#)] for synchronization. Thus, the timestamp may be derived from the NTP-synchronized clock, allowing the timestamp to be measured with respect to the clock of an NTP server.

## [5.2.](#) Example 2

Timestamp:

The timestamp format used in this specification is the PTP [[IEEE1588](#)] Truncated format, as specified in Section 4.2.3 of [[I-D.mizrahi-intarea-packet-timestamps](#)].

Synchronization aspects:

It is assumed that nodes that run this protocol are synchronized among themselves. Nodes may be synchronized to a global reference time. Note that if PTP [[IEEE1588](#)] is used for synchronization, the timestamp may be derived from the PTP-synchronized clock, allowing the timestamp to be measured with respect to the clock of an PTP Grandmaster clock.

## [6.](#) Packet Timestamp Control Field

In some cases it is desirable to have a control field that includes information about the timestamp format. This section defines a recommended format of a timestamp-related control field that is intended for network protocols that require such timestamp-related control information.

The recommended control field includes the following sub-fields:

- o Timestamp format.
- o Precision - the resolution or granularity of the system clock.
- o Epoch.

- o Era - the number of times the time has wrapped around since the epoch.

## 7. IANA Considerations

This memo includes no request to IANA.

## 8. Security Considerations

A network protocol that uses a packet timestamp MUST specify the security considerations that result from using the timestamp. This section provides an overview of some of the common security considerations of using timestamps.

Any metadata that is attached to control or data packets, and specifically packet timestamps, can facilitate network reconnaissance; by passively eavesdropping to timestamped packets an attacker can gather information about the network performance, and about the level of synchronization between nodes.

Timestamps can be spoofed or modified by on-path attackers, thus attacking the application that uses the timestamps. For example, if timestamps are used in a delay measurement protocol, an attacker can modify en route timestamps in a way that manipulates the measurement results. Integrity protection mechanisms, such as Hashed Message Authentication Codes (HMAC), can mitigate such attacks. The specification of an integrity protection mechanism is outside the scope of this document, as typically integrity protection will be defined on a per-network-protocol basis, and not specifically for the timestamp field.

Another potential threat that can have a similar impact is delay attacks. An attacker can maliciously delay some or all of the en route messages, with the same harmful implications as described in the previous paragraph. Mitigating delay attacks is a significant challenge; in contrast to spoofing and modification attacks, the delay attack cannot be prevented by cryptographic integrity protection mechanisms. In some cases delay attacks can be mitigated by sending the timestamped information through multiple paths, allowing to detect and to be resilient to an attacker that has access to one of the paths.

In many cases timestamping relies on an underlying synchronization mechanism. Thus, any attack that compromises the synchronization mechanism can also compromise protocols that use timestamping. Attacks on time protocols are discussed in detail in [[RFC7384](#)].

## 9. Acknowledgments

The authors thank Yaakov Stein and other members of the TICTOC and NTP working groups for many helpful comments.

## 10. References

### 10.1. 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>>.

### 10.2. Informative References

- [I-D.mizrahi-intarea-packet-timestamps]  
Mizrahi, T., Fabini, J., and A. Morton, "Guidelines for Defining Packet Timestamps", [draft-mizrahi-intarea-packet-timestamps-01](#) (work in progress), September 2017.
- [I-D.morton-ippm-mbm-registry]  
Morton, A. and M. Mathis, "Initial Performance Metric Registry Entries Part 2: MBM", [draft-morton-ippm-mbm-registry-01](#) (work in progress), March 2017.
- [IEEE1588]  
IEEE, "IEEE 1588 Standard for a Precision Clock Synchronization Protocol for Networked Measurement and Control Systems Version 2", 2008.
- [ITU-T-Y.1731]  
ITU-T, "OAM functions and mechanisms for Ethernet based Networks", 2013.
- [RFC1323] Jacobson, V., Braden, R., and D. Borman, "TCP Extensions for High Performance", [RFC 1323](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC1323, May 1992, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc1323>>.
- [RFC3339] Klyne, G. and C. Newman, "Date and Time on the Internet: Timestamps", [RFC 3339](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC3339, July 2002, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3339>>.
- [RFC3550] Schulzrinne, H., Casner, S., Frederick, R., and V. Jacobson, "RTP: A Transport Protocol for Real-Time Applications", STD 64, [RFC 3550](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC3550, July 2003, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3550>>.

- [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>>.
- [RFC5646] Phillips, A., Ed. and M. Davis, Ed., "Tags for Identifying Languages", [BCP 47](#), [RFC 5646](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5646, September 2009, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5646>>.
- [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>>.
- [RFC6374] Frost, D. and S. Bryant, "Packet Loss and Delay Measurement for MPLS Networks", [RFC 6374](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6374, September 2011, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6374>>.
- [RFC6991] Schoenwaelder, J., Ed., "Common YANG Data Types", [RFC 6991](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6991, July 2013, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6991>>.
- [RFC7384] Mizrahi, T., "Security Requirements of Time Protocols in Packet Switched Networks", [RFC 7384](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7384, October 2014, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7384>>.
- [RFC7456] Mizrahi, T., Senevirathne, T., Salam, S., Kumar, D., and D. Eastlake 3rd, "Loss and Delay Measurement in Transparent Interconnection of Lots of Links (TRILL)", [RFC 7456](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7456, March 2015, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7456>>.
- [RFC7493] Bray, T., Ed., "The I-JSON Message Format", [RFC 7493](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7493, March 2015, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7493>>.
- [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>>.

## Authors' Addresses

Tal Mizrahi  
Marvell  
6 Hamada st.  
Yokneam  
Israel

Email: [talmi@marvell.com](mailto:talmi@marvell.com)

Joachim Fabini  
Vienna University of Technology  
Gusshausstrasse 25/E389  
Vienna 1040  
Austria

Phone: +43 1 58801 38813

Fax: +43 1 58801 38898

Email: [Joachim.Fabini@tuwien.ac.at](mailto:Joachim.Fabini@tuwien.ac.at)

URI: <http://www.tc.tuwien.ac.at/about-us/staff/joachim-fabini/>

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/>