

Operations and Management Area Working Group
Internet Draft
Intended status: Informational
Expires: July 2014

T. Mizrahi
Marvell
N. Sprecher
NSN
E. Bellagamba
Ericsson
Y. Weingarten

January 9, 2014

**An Overview of
Operations, Administration, and Maintenance (OAM) Tools
draft-ietf-opsawg-oam-overview-12.txt**

Abstract

Operations, Administration, and Maintenance (OAM) is a general term that refers to a toolset for fault detection and isolation, and for performance measurement. Over the years various OAM tools have been defined for various layers in the protocol stack.

This document summarizes some of the OAM tools defined in the IETF in the context of IP unicast, MPLS, MPLS for the transport profile (MPLS-TP), pseudowires, and TRILL. This document focuses on tools for detecting and isolating failures in networks and for performance monitoring. Control and management aspects of OAM are outside the scope of this document. Network repair functions such as Fast Reroute (FRR) and protection switching, which are often triggered by OAM protocols, are also out of the scope of this document.

The target audience of this document includes network equipment vendors, network operators and standard development organizations, and can be used as an index to some of the main OAM tools defined in the IETF. This document provides a brief description of each of the OAM tools in the IETF. At the end of the document a list of the OAM toolsets and a list of the OAM functions are presented as a summary.

Status of this Memo

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

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), its areas, and its working groups. Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts.

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."

The list of current Internet-Drafts can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/ietf/1id-abstracts.txt>.

The list of Internet-Draft Shadow Directories can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html>.

This Internet-Draft will expire on July 9, 2014.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2014 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	4
1.1.	Background	4
1.2.	Target Audience	5
1.3.	OAM-related Work in the IETF	5
1.4.	Focusing on the Data Plane	6
2.	Terminology	7
2.1.	Abbreviations	7
2.2.	Terminology used in OAM Standards	9
2.2.1.	General Terms	9
2.2.2.	Operations, Administration and Maintenance	9
2.2.3.	Functions, Tools and Protocols	10
2.2.4.	Data Plane, Control Plane and Management Plane	10
2.2.5.	The Players	11
2.2.6.	Proactive and On-demand Activation	12
2.2.7.	Connectivity Verification and Continuity Checks	12
2.2.8.	Connection Oriented vs. Connectionless Communication	13
2.2.9.	Point-to-point vs. Point-to-multipoint Services	14

2.2.10.	Failures	15
3.	OAM Functions	15
4.	OAM Tools in the IETF - a Detailed Description	16
4.1.	IP Ping	16
4.2.	IP Traceroute	17
4.3.	Bidirectional Forwarding Detection (BFD)	18
4.3.1.	Overview	18
4.3.2.	Terminology	18
4.3.3.	BFD Control	18
4.3.4.	BFD Echo	19
4.4.	MPLS OAM	19
4.5.	MPLS-TP OAM	20
4.5.1.	Overview	20
4.5.2.	Terminology	21
4.5.3.	Generic Associated Channel	22
4.5.4.	MPLS-TP OAM Toolset	23
4.5.4.1.	Continuity Check and Connectivity Verification	23
4.5.4.2.	Route Tracing	24
4.5.4.3.	Lock Instruct	24
4.5.4.4.	Lock Reporting	24
4.5.4.5.	Alarm Reporting	24
4.5.4.6.	Remote Defect Indication	24
4.5.4.7.	Client Failure Indication	25
4.5.4.8.	Performance Monitoring	25
4.5.4.8.1.	Packet Loss Measurement (LM)	25
4.5.4.8.2.	Packet Delay Measurement (DM)	25
4.6.	Pseudowire OAM	26
4.6.1.	Pseudowire OAM using Virtual Circuit Connectivity Verification (VCCV)	26
4.6.2.	Pseudowire OAM using G-ACh	27
4.6.3.	Attachment Circuit - Pseudowire Mapping	27
4.7.	OWAMP and TWAMP.....	27
4.7.1.	Overview	27
4.7.2.	Control and Test Protocols	28
4.7.3.	OWAMP	29
4.7.4.	TWAMP	29
4.8.	TRILL	30
5.	Summary	30
5.1.	Summary of OAM Tools	31
5.2.	Summary of OAM Functions	33
5.3.	Guidance to Network Equipment Vendors	34
6.	Security Considerations	34
7.	IANA Considerations	34
8.	Acknowledgments	35
9.	References	35
9.1.	Informative References	35
Appendix A.	List of OAM Documents	40

A.1. List of IETF OAM Documents	40
A.2. List of Selected Non-IETF OAM Documents	45

[1. Introduction](#)

OAM is a general term that refers to a toolset for detecting, isolating and reporting failures and for monitoring the network performance.

There are several different interpretations to the "OAM" acronym. This document refers to Operations, Administration and Maintenance, as recommended in Section 3 of [[OAM-Def](#)].

This document summarizes some of the OAM tools defined in the IETF in the context of IP unicast, MPLS, MPLS for the transport profile (MPLS-TP), pseudowires, and TRILL.

This document focuses on tools for detecting and isolating failures and for performance monitoring. Hence, this document focuses on the tools used for monitoring and measuring the data plane; control and management aspects of OAM are outside the scope of this document. Network repair functions such as Fast Reroute (FRR) and protection switching, which are often triggered by OAM protocols, are also out of the scope of this document.

[1.1. Background](#)

OAM was originally used in traditional communication technologies such as E1 and T1, evolving into PDH and then later in SONET/SDH. ATM was probably the first technology to include inherent OAM support from day one, while in other technologies OAM was typically defined in an ad hoc manner after the technology was already defined and deployed. Packet-based networks were traditionally considered unreliable and best-effort, but as packet-based networks evolved, they have become the common transport for both data and telephony, replacing traditional transport protocols. Consequently, packet-based networks were expected to provide a similar "carrier grade" experience, and specifically to support OAM.

As typical networks have a multi-layer architecture, the set of OAM protocols similarly take a multi-layer structure; each layer has its own OAM protocols. Moreover, OAM can be used at different levels of hierarchy in the network to form a multi-layer OAM solution, as shown in the example in Figure 1.

Figure 1 illustrates a network in which IP traffic between two customer edges is transported over an MPLS provider network. MPLS OAM

is used at the provider-level for monitoring the connection between the two provider edges, while IP OAM is used at the customer-level for monitoring the end-to-end connection between the two customer edges.




Figure 1 Example: Multi-layer OAM

1.2. Target Audience

The target audience of this document includes:

- o Standard development organizations - both IETF working groups and non-IETF organizations can benefit from this document when designing new OAM protocols, or when looking to reuse existing OAM tools for new technologies.
- o Network equipment vendors and network operators - can use this document as an index to some of the common IETF OAM tools.

It should be noted that this document is not necessarily suitable for beginners without any background in OAM.

1.3. OAM-related Work in the IETF

This memo provides an overview of the different sets of OAM tools defined by the IETF. The set of OAM tools described in this memo are applicable to IP unicast, MPLS, pseudowires, MPLS for the transport profile (MPLS-TP), and TRILL. While OAM tools that are applicable to other technologies exist, they are beyond the scope of this memo.

This document focuses on IETF documents that have been published as RFCs, while other ongoing OAM-related work is outside the scope.

The IETF has defined OAM protocols and tools in several different contexts. We roughly categorize these efforts into a few sets of OAM-related RFCs, listed in Table 1. Each set defines a logically-coupled set of RFCs, although the sets are in some cases intertwined by common tools and protocols.

The discussion in this document is ordered according to these sets.

+-----+-----+	
Toolset	Transport
	Technology
+-----+-----+	
IP Ping	IPv4/IPv6
+-----+-----+	
IP Traceroute	IPv4/IPv6
+-----+-----+	
BFD	generic
+-----+-----+	
MPLS OAM	MPLS
+-----+-----+	
MPLS-TP OAM	MPLS-TP
+-----+-----+	
Pseudowire OAM	Pseudowires
+-----+-----+	
OWAMP and	IPv4/IPv6
TWAMP	
+-----+-----+	
TRILL OAM	TRILL
+-----+-----+	

Table 1 OAM Toolset Packages in the IETF Documents

This document focuses on OAM tools that have been developed in the IETF. A short summary of some of the significant OAM standards that have been developed in other standard organizations is presented in [Appendix A.2](#).

[1.4](#). Focusing on the Data Plane

OAM tools may, and quite often do, work in conjunction with a control plane and/or management plane. OAM provides instrumentation tools for measuring and monitoring the data plane. OAM tools often use

control plane functions, e.g., to initialize OAM sessions and to exchange various parameters. The OAM tools communicate with the management plane to raise alarms, and often OAM tools may be activated by the management (as well as by the control plane), e.g. to locate and localize problems.

The considerations of the control plane maintenance tools and the functionality of the management plane are out of scope for this document, which concentrates on presenting the data plane tools that are used for OAM. Network repair functions such as Fast Reroute (FRR) and protection switching, which are often triggered by OAM protocols, are also out of the scope of this document.

Since OAM protocols are used for monitoring the data plane, it is imperative for OAM tools to be capable of testing the actual data plane in as much accuracy as possible. Thus, it is important to enforce fate-sharing between OAM traffic that monitors the data plane and the data plane traffic it monitors.

2. Terminology

2.1. Abbreviations

ACH	Associated Channel Header
AIS	Alarm Indication Signal
ATM	Asynchronous Transfer Mode
BFD	Bidirectional Forwarding Detection
CC	Continuity Check
CV	Connectivity Verification
DM	Delay Measurement
ECMP	Equal Cost Multiple Paths
FEC	Forwarding Equivalence Class
FRR	Fast Reroute
G-ACh	Generic Associated Channel
GAL	Generic Associated Label

ICMP	Internet Control Message Protocol
L2TP	Layer Two Tunneling Protocol
LCCE	L2TP Control Connection Endpoint
LDP	Label Distribution Protocol
LER	Label Edge Router
LM	Loss Measurement
LSP	Label Switched Path
LSR	Label Switched Router
ME	Maintenance Entity
MEG	Maintenance Entity Group
MEP	MEG End Point
MIP	MEG Intermediate Point
MP	Maintenance Point
MPLS	Multiprotocol Label Switching
MPLS-TP	MPLS Transport Profile
MTU	Maximum Transmission Unit
OAM	Operations, Administration, and Maintenance
OWAMP	One-way Active Measurement Protocol
PDH	Plesiochronous Digital Hierarchy
PE	Provider Edge
PW	Pseudowire
PWE3	Pseudowire Emulation Edge-to-Edge
RBridge	Routing Bridge
RDI	Remote Defect Indication

SDH Synchronous Digital Hierarchy

SONET Synchronous Optical Networking

TRILL Transparent Interconnection of Lots of Links

TTL Time To Live

TWAMP Two-way Active Measurement Protocol

VCCV Virtual Circuit Connectivity Verification

[2.2.](#) Terminology used in OAM Standards

[2.2.1.](#) General Terms

A wide variety of terms is used in various OAM standards. This section presents a comparison of the terms used in various OAM standards, without fully quoting the definition of each term.

An interesting overview of the term OAM and its derivatives is presented in [[OAM-Def](#)]. A thesaurus of terminology for MPLS-TP terms is presented in [[TP-Term](#)], and provides a good summary of some of the OAM related terminology.

[2.2.2.](#) Operations, Administration and Maintenance

The following definition of OAM is quoted from [[OAM-Def](#)]:

The components of the "OAM" acronym (and provisioning) are defined as follows:

- o Operations - Operation activities are undertaken to keep the network (and the services that the network provides) up and running. It includes monitoring the network and finding problems. Ideally these problems should be found before users are affected.
- o Administration - Administration activities involve keeping track of resources in the network and how they are used. It includes all the bookkeeping that is necessary to track networking resources and the network under control.

- o Maintenance - Maintenance activities are focused on facilitating repairs and upgrades -- for example, when equipment must be replaced, when a router needs a patch for an operating system image, or when a new switch is added to a network. Maintenance also involves corrective and preventive measures to make the managed network run more effectively, e.g., adjusting device configuration and parameters.

2.2.3. Functions, Tools and Protocols

OAM Function

An OAM function is an instrumentation measurement type or diagnostic.

OAM functions are the atomic building blocks of OAM, where each function defines an OAM capability.

Typical examples of OAM functions are presented in [Section 3](#).

OAM Protocol

A protocol used for implementing one or more OAM functions.

The OWAMP-Test [[OWAMP](#)] is an example of an OAM protocol.

OAM Tool

An OAM tool is a specific means of applying one or more OAM functions.

In some cases an OAM protocol *is* an OAM tool, e.g., OWAMP-Test. In other cases an OAM tool uses a set of protocols that are not strictly OAM-related; for example, Traceroute ([Section 4.2.](#)) can be implemented using UDP and ICMP messages, without using an OAM protocol per se.

2.2.4. Data Plane, Control Plane and Management Plane

Data Plane

The data plane is the set of functions used to transfer data in the stratum or layer under consideration [[ITU-Terms](#)].

The Data Plane is also known as the Forwarding Plane or the User Plane.

Control Plane

The control plane is the set of protocols and mechanisms that enable routers to efficiently learn how to forward packets towards their final destination (based on [\[Comp\]](#)).

Management Plane

The term Management Plane, as described in [\[Mng\]](#), is used to describe the exchange of management messages through management protocols (often transported by IP and by IP transport protocols) between management applications and the managed entities such as network nodes.

Data Plane vs. Control Plane vs. Management Plane

The distinction between the planes is at times a bit vague. For example, the definition of "Control Plane" above may imply that OAM tools such as ping, BFD and others are in fact in the control plane.

This document focuses on tools used for monitoring the data plane. While these tools could arguably be considered to be in the control plane, these tools monitor the data plane, and hence it is imperative to have fate-sharing between OAM traffic that monitors the data plane and the data plane traffic it monitors.

Another potentially vague distinction is between the management plane and control plane. The management plane should be seen as separate from, but possibly overlapping with, the control plane (based on [\[Mng\]](#)).

2.2.5. The Players

An OAM tool is used between two (or more) "players". Various terms are used in IETF documents to refer to the players that take part in OAM. Table 2 summarizes the terms used in each of the toolsets discussed in this document.

+-----+-----+	
Toolset	Terms
+-----+-----+	
Ping / Traceroute	-Host
([ICMPv4], [ICMPv6],	-Node
[TCPIP-Tools])	-Interface
	-Gateway

+ -----	+ -----	+
BFD [BFD]	System	
+ -----	+ -----	+
MPLS OAM [MPLS-OAM-FW]	LSR	
+ -----	+ -----	+
MPLS-TP OAM [TP-OAM-FW]	-End Point - MEP	
	-Intermediate Point - MIP	
+ -----	+ -----	+
Pseudowire OAM [VCCV]	-PE	
	-LCCE	
+ -----	+ -----	+
OWAMP and TWAMP	-Host	
([OWAMP], [TWAMP])	-End system	
+ -----	+ -----	+
TRILL OAM [TRILL-OAM]	-RBridge	
+ -----	+ -----	+

Table 2 Maintenance Point Terminology

2.2.6. Proactive and On-demand Activation

The different OAM tools may be used in one of two basic types of activation:

Proactive

Proactive activation - indicates that the tool is activated on a continual basis, where messages are sent periodically, and errors are detected when a certain number of expected messages are not received.

On-demand

On-demand activation - indicates that the tool is activated "manually" to detect a specific anomaly.

2.2.7. Connectivity Verification and Continuity Checks

Two distinct classes of failure management functions are used in OAM protocols, connectivity verification and continuity checks. The distinction between these terms is defined in [[MPLS-TP-OAM](#)], and is used similarly in this document.

Continuity Check

Continuity checks are used to verify that a destination is reachable, and are typically sent proactively, though they can be invoked on-demand as well.

Connectivity Verification

A connectivity verification function allows Alice to check whether she is connected to Bob or not. It is noted that while the CV function is performed in the data plane, the "expected path" is predetermined either in the control plane or in the management plane. A connectivity verification (CV) protocol typically uses a CV message, followed by a CV reply that is sent back to the originator. A CV function can be applied proactively or on-demand.

Connectivity Verification tools often perform path verification as well, allowing Alice to verify that messages from Bob are received through the correct path, thereby verifying not only that the two MPs are connected, but also that they are connected through the expected path, allowing detection of unexpected topology changes.

Connectivity verification and continuity checks are considered complementary mechanisms, and are often used in conjunction with each other.

2.2.8. Connection Oriented vs. Connectionless Communication

Connection Oriented

In Connection Oriented technologies an end-to-end connection is established (by a control protocol or provisioned by a management system) prior to the transmission of data.

Typically a connection identifier is used to identify the connection. In connection oriented technologies it is often the case (although not always) that all packets belonging to a specific connection use the same route through the network.

Connectionless

In Connectionless technologies data is typically sent between end points without prior arrangement. Packets are routed independently based on their destination address, and hence different packets may be routed in a different way across the network.

Discussion

The OAM tools described in this document include tools that support connection oriented technologies, as well as tools for connectionless technologies.

In connection oriented technologies OAM is used to monitor a **specific** connection; OAM packets are forwarded through the same route as the data traffic and receive the same treatment. In connectionless technologies, OAM is used between a source and destination pair without defining a specific connection. Moreover, in some cases the route of OAM packets may differ from the one of the data traffic. For example, the connectionless IP Ping ([Section 4.1.](#)) tests the reachability from a source to a given destination, while the connection oriented LSP Ping ([Section 4.4.](#)) is used for monitoring a specific LSP (connection), and provides the capability to monitor all the available paths used by an LSP.

It should be noted that in some cases connectionless protocols are monitored by connection oriented OAM protocols. For example, while IP is a connectionless protocol, it can monitored by BFD ([Section 4.3.](#)), which is connection oriented.

2.2.9. Point-to-point vs. Point-to-multipoint Services

Point-to-point (P2P)

A P2P service delivers data from a single source to a single destination.

Point-to-multipoint (P2MP)

A P2MP service delivers data from a single source to a one or more destinations (based on [[Signal](#)]).

An MP2MP service is a service that delivers data from more than one source to one or more receivers (based on [[Signal](#)]).

Note: the two definitions for P2MP and MP2MP are quoted from [[Signal](#)]. Although [[Signal](#)] describes a specific case of P2MP and MP2MP which is MPLS-specific, these two definitions also apply to non-MPLS cases.

Discussion

The OAM tools described in this document include tools for P2P services, as well as tools for P2MP services.

The distinction between P2P services and P2MP services affects the corresponding OAM tools. A P2P service is typically simpler to monitor, as it consists of a single pair of end points. P2MP services present several challenges. For example, in a P2MP service, the OAM mechanism not only verifies that each of the destinations is reachable from the source, but also verifies that the P2MP distribution tree is intact and loop-free.

2.2.10. Failures

The terms Failure, Fault, and Defect are used interchangeably in the standards, referring to a malfunction that can be detected by a connectivity or a continuity check. In some standards, such as 802.1ag [[IEEE802.1Q](#)], there is no distinction between these terms, while in other standards each of these terms refers to a different type of malfunction.

The terminology used in IETF MPLS-TP OAM is based on the ITU-T terminology, which distinguishes between these three terms in [[ITU-T-G.806](#)];

Fault

The term Fault refers to an inability to perform a required action, e.g., an unsuccessful attempt to deliver a packet.

Defect

The term Defect refers to an interruption in the normal operation, such as a consecutive period of time where no packets are delivered successfully.

Failure

The term Failure refers to the termination of the required function. While a Defect typically refers to a limited period of time, a failure refers to a long period of time.

3. OAM Functions

This subsection provides a brief summary of the common OAM functions used in OAM-related standards. These functions are used as building blocks in the OAM standards described in this document.

- o Connectivity Verification (CV), Path Verification and Continuity Checks (CC):
As defined in [Section 2.2.7](#).

- o Path Discovery / Fault Localization:

This function can be used to trace the route to a destination, i.e., to identify the nodes along the route to the destination. When more than one route is available to a specific destination, this function traces one of the available routes. When a failure occurs, this function also allows to detect the location of the failure.

Note that the term route tracing (or Traceroute) that is used in the context of IP and MPLS, is sometimes referred to as path tracing in the context of other protocols, such as TRILL.

- o Performance Monitoring:

Typically refers to:

- o Loss Measurement (LM) - monitors the packet loss rate.

- o Delay Measurement (DM) - monitors the delay and delay variation.

4. OAM Tools in the IETF - a Detailed Description

This section presents a detailed description of the sets of OAM-related tools in each of the toolsets in Table 1.

4.1. IP Ping

Ping is a common network diagnosis application for IP networks that uses ICMP. According to [[NetTerms](#)], 'Ping' is an abbreviation for Packet internet groper, although the term has been so commonly used that it stands on its own. As defined in [[NetTerms](#)], it is a program used to test reachability of destinations by sending them an ICMP echo request and waiting for a reply.

The ICMP Echo request/reply exchange in Ping is used as a continuity check function for the Internet Protocol. The originator transmits an ICMP Echo request packet, and the receiver replies with an Echo reply. ICMP ping is defined in two variants, [[ICMPv4](#)] is used for IPv4, and [[ICMPv6](#)] is used for IPv6.

Ping implementations typically use ICMP messages. UDP Ping is a variant that uses UDP messages instead of ICMP echo messages.

Ping is a single-ended continuity check, i.e., it allows the *initiator* of the Echo request to test the reachability. If it is desirable for both ends to test the reachability, both ends have to invoke Ping independently.

Note that since ICMP filtering is deployed in some routers and firewalls, the usefulness of Ping is sometimes limited in the wider internet. This limitation is equally relevant to Traceroute.

4.2. IP Traceroute

Traceroute ([[TCPIP-Tools](#)], [[NetTools](#)]) is an application that allows users to discover a path between an IP source and an IP destination.

The most common way to implement Traceroute [[TCPIP-Tools](#)] is described as follows. Traceroute sends a sequence of UDP packets to UDP port 33434 at the destination. By default, Traceroute begins by sending three packets (the number of packets is configurable in most Traceroute implementations), each with an IP Time-To-Live (or Hop Limit in IPv6) value of one to the destination. These packets expire as soon as they reach the first router in the path. Consequently, that router sends three ICMP Time Exceeded Messages back to the Traceroute application. Traceroute now sends another three UDP packets, each with the TTL value of 2. These messages cause the second router to return ICMP messages. This process continues, with ever increasing values for the TTL field, until the packets actually reach the destination. Because no application listens to port 33434 at the destination, the destination returns ICMP Destination Unreachable Messages indicating an unreachable port. This event indicates to the Traceroute application that it is finished. The Traceroute program displays the round-trip delay associated with each of the attempts.

While Traceroute is a tool that finds *a* path from A to B, it should be noted that traffic from A to B is often forwarded through Equal Cost Multiple Paths (ECMP). Paris Traceroute [[PARIS](#)] is an extension to Traceroute that attempts to discover all the available paths from A to B by scanning different values of header fields (such as UDP ports) in the probe packets.

It is noted that Traceroute is an application, and not a protocol. As such, it has various different implementations. One of the most common ones uses UDP probe packets, as described above. Other implementations exist that use other types of probe messages, such as ICMP or TCP.

Note that IP routing may be asymmetric. While Traceroute discovers a path between a source and destination, it does not reveal the reverse path.

A few ICMP extensions ([[ICMP-MP](#)], [[ICMP-Int](#)]) have been defined in the context of Traceroute. These documents define several extensions,

including extensions to the ICMP Destination Unreachable message, that can be used by Traceroute applications.

[4.3. Bidirectional Forwarding Detection \(BFD\)](#)

[4.3.1. Overview](#)

While multiple OAM tools have been defined for various protocols in the protocol stack, Bidirectional Forwarding Detection [[BFD](#)], defined by the IETF BFD working group, is a generic OAM tool that can be deployed over various encapsulating protocols, and in various medium types. The IETF has defined variants of the protocol for IP ([[BFD-IP](#)], [[BFD-Multi](#)]), for MPLS LSPs [[BFD-LSP](#)], and for pseudowires [[BFD-VCCV](#)]. The usage of BFD in MPLS-TP is defined in [[TP-CC-CV](#)].

BFD includes two main OAM functions, using two types of BFD packets: BFD Control packets, and BFD Echo packets.

[4.3.2. Terminology](#)

BFD operates between *systems*. The BFD protocol is run between two or more systems after establishing a *session*.

[4.3.3. BFD Control](#)

BFD supports a bidirectional continuity check, using BFD control packets, that are exchanged within a BFD session. BFD sessions operate in one of two modes:

- o Asynchronous mode (i.e. proactive): in this mode BFD control packets are sent periodically. When the receiver detects that no BFD control packets have been received during a predetermined period of time, a failure is detected.
- o Demand mode: in this mode, BFD control packets are sent on-demand. Upon need, a system initiates a series of BFD control packets to check the continuity of the session. BFD control packets are sent independently in each direction.

Each of the end-points (referred to as systems) of the monitored path maintains its own session identification, called a Discriminator, both of which are included in the BFD Control Packets that are exchanged between the end-points. At the time of session establishment, the Discriminators are exchanged between the two-end points. In addition, the transmission (and reception) rate is negotiated between the two end-points, based on information included

in the control packets. These transmission rates may be renegotiated during the session.

During normal operation of the session, i.e. no failures are detected, the BFD session is in the Up state. If no BFD Control packets are received during a period of time called the Detection Time, the session is declared to be Down. The detection time is a function of the pre-configured or negotiated transmission time, and a parameter called Detect Mult. Detect Mult determines the number of missing BFD Control packets that cause the session to be declared as Down. This parameter is included in the BFD Control packet.

4.3.4. BFD Echo

A BFD echo packet is sent to a peer system, and is looped back to the originator. The echo function can be used proactively, or on-demand.

The BFD echo function has been defined in BFD for IPv4 and IPv6 ([[BFD-IP](#)]), but is not used in BFD for MPLS LSPs, PWs, or in BFD for MPLS-TP.

4.4. MPLS OAM

The IETF MPLS working group has defined OAM for MPLS LSPs. The requirements and framework of this effort are defined in [[MPLS-OAM-FW](#)] and [[MPLS-OAM](#)], respectively. The corresponding OAM tool defined, in this context, is LSP Ping [[LSP-Ping](#)]. OAM for P2MP services is defined in [[MPLS-P2MP](#)].

LSP Ping is modeled after the Ping/Traceroute paradigm and thus it may be used in one of two modes:

- o "Ping" mode: In this mode LSP Ping is used for end-to-end connectivity verification between two LERs.
- o "Traceroute" mode: This mode is used for hop-by-hop fault isolation.

LSP Ping extends the basic ICMP Ping operation (of data-plane connectivity verification) with functionality to verify data-plane vs. control-plane consistency for a Forwarding Equivalence Class (FEC) and also Maximum Transmission Unit (MTU) problems.

The Traceroute functionality may be used to isolate and localize the MPLS faults, using the Time-to-live (TTL) indicator to incrementally identify the sub-path of the LSP that is successfully traversed before the faulty link or node.

The challenge in MPLS networks is that the traffic of a given LSP may be load balanced across Equal Cost Multiple paths (ECMP). LSP Ping monitors all the available paths of an LSP by monitoring its different Forwarding Equivalence Classes (FEC). Conversely, MPLS-TP does not use ECMP, and thus does not require OAM over multiple paths.

Another challenge is that an MPLS LSP does not necessarily have a return path, and thus responding to an LSP Ping message is not necessarily as trivial as in IP Ping, where the responder just swaps the source and destination IP addresses. Note that this challenge is not applicable to MPLS-TP, where a return path is always available.

It should be noted that LSP Ping supports unique identification of the LSP within an addressing domain. The identification is checked using the full FEC identification. LSP Ping is easily extensible to include additional information needed to support new functionality, by use of Type-Length-Value (TLV) constructs. The usage of TLVs is typically not easy to perform in hardware, and is thus typically handled by the control plane.

LSP Ping supports both asynchronous, as well as, on-demand activation.

[4.5. MPLS-TP OAM](#)

[4.5.1. Overview](#)

The MPLS working group has defined the OAM toolset that fulfills the requirements for MPLS-TP OAM. The full set of requirements for MPLS-TP OAM are defined in [[MPLS-TP-OAM](#)], and include both general requirements for the behavior of the OAM tools and a set of operations that should be supported by the OAM toolset. The set of mechanisms required are further elaborated in [[TP-OAM-FW](#)], which describes the general architecture of the OAM system as well as giving overviews of the functionality of the OAM toolset.

Some of the basic requirements for the OAM toolset for MPLS-TP are:

- o MPLS-TP OAM must be able to support both an IP based and non-IP based environment. If the network is IP based, i.e. IP routing and forwarding are available, then the MPLS-TP OAM toolset should rely on the IP routing and forwarding capabilities. On the other hand, in environments where IP functionality is not available, the OAM tools must still be able to operate without dependence on IP forwarding and routing.

- o OAM packets and the user traffic are required to be congruent (i.e. OAM packets are transmitted in-band) and there is a need to differentiate OAM packets from data plane ones. Inherent in this requirement is the principle that MPLS-TP OAM be independent of any existing control-plane, although it should not preclude use of the control-plane functionality.
OAM packets are identified by the Generic Associated Label (GAL), which is a reserved MPLS label value (13).

4.5.2. Terminology

Maintenance Entity (ME)

The MPLS-TP OAM tools are designed to monitor and manage a Maintenance Entity (ME). An ME, as defined in [\[TP-OAM-FW\]](#), defines a relationship between two points of a transport path to which maintenance and monitoring operations apply.

The term Maintenance Entity (ME) is used in ITU-T Recommendations (e.g. [\[ITU-T-Y1731\]](#)), as well as in the MPLS-TP terminology ([\[TP-OAM-FW\]](#)).

Maintenance Entity Group (MEG)

The collection of one or more MEs that belongs to the same transport path and that are maintained and monitored as a group are known as a Maintenance Entity Group (based on [\[TP-OAM-FW\]](#)).

Maintenance Point (MP)

A Maintenance Point (MP) is a functional entity that is defined at a node in the network, and can initiate and/or react to OAM messages. This document focuses on the data-plane functionality of MPs, while MPs interact with the control plane and with the management plane as well.

The term MP is used in IEEE 802.1ag, and was similarly adopted in MPLS-TP ([\[TP-OAM-FW\]](#)).

Maintenance End Point (MEP)

A Maintenance End Point (MEP) is one of the end points of an ME, and can initiate OAM messages and respond to them (based on [\[TP-OAM-FW\]](#)).

Maintenance Intermediate Point (MIP)

In between MEPs, there are zero or more intermediate points, called Maintenance Entity Group Intermediate Points (based on [\[TP-OAM-FW\]](#)).

A Maintenance Intermediate Point (MIP) is an intermediate point that does not generally initiate OAM frames (one exception to this is the use of AIS notifications), but is able to respond to OAM frames that are destined to it. A MIP in MPLS-TP identifies OAM packets destined to it by the value of the TTL field in the OAM packet. The term Maintenance Point is a general term for MEPs and MIPs.

Up and Down MEPs

The IEEE 802.1ag [\[IEEE802.1Q\]](#) defines a distinction between Up MEPs and Down MEPs. A MEP is a bridge interface that is monitored by an OAM protocol either in the direction facing the network, or in the direction facing the bridge. A Down MEP is a MEP that receives OAM packets from, and transmits them to the direction of the network. An Up MEP receives OAM packets from, and transmits them to the direction of the bridging entity. MPLS-TP ([\[TP-OAM-FW\]](#)) uses a similar distinction on the placement of the MEP - either at the ingress, egress, or forwarding function of the node (Down / Up MEPs). This placement is important for localization of a failure.

The distinction between Up and Down MEPs was defined in [\[TP-OAM-FW\]](#), but has not been used in other MPLS-TP RFCs, as of the writing of this document.

[4.5.3. Generic Associated Channel](#)

In order to address the requirement for in-band transmission of MPLS-TP OAM traffic, MPLS-TP uses a Generic Associated Channel (G-ACh), defined in [\[G-ACh\]](#) for LSP-based OAM traffic. This mechanism is based on the same concepts as the PWE3 ACH and VCCV mechanisms. However, to address the needs of LSPs as differentiated from PW, the following concepts were defined for [\[G-ACh\]](#):

- o An Associated Channel Header (ACH), that uses a format similar to the PW Control Word, is a 4-byte header that is prepended to OAM packets.
- o A Generic Associated Label (GAL). The GAL is a reserved MPLS label value (13) that indicates that the packet is an ACH packet and the payload follows immediately after the label stack.

It should be noted that while the G-ACh was defined as part of the MPLS-TP definition effort, the G-ACh is a generic tool that can be used in MPLS in general, and not only in MPLS-TP.

4.5.4. MPLS-TP OAM Toolset

To address the functionality that is required of the OAM toolset, the MPLS WG conducted an analysis of the existing IETF and ITU-T OAM tools and their ability to fulfill the required functionality. The conclusions of this analysis are documented in [[OAM-Analys](#)]. The MPLS working group currently plans to use a mixture of OAM tools that are based on various existing standards, and adapt them to the requirements of [[MPLS-TP-OAM](#)]. Some of the main building blocks of this solution are based on:

- o Bidirectional Forwarding Detection ([[BFD](#)], [[BFD-LSP](#)]) for proactive continuity check and connectivity verification.
- o LSP Ping as defined in [[LSP-Ping](#)] for on-demand connectivity verification.
- o New protocol packets, using G-ACH, to address different functionality.
- o Performance measurement protocols that are based on the functionality that is described in [[ITU-T-Y1731](#)].

The following sub-sections describe the OAM tools defined for MPLS-TP as described in [[TP-OAM-FW](#)].

4.5.4.1. Continuity Check and Connectivity Verification

Continuity Check and Connectivity Verification are presented in [Section 2.2.7](#). of this document. As presented there, these tools may be used either proactively or on-demand. When using these tools proactively, they are generally used in tandem.

For MPLS-TP there are two distinct tools, the proactive tool is defined in [[TP-CC-CV](#)] while the on-demand tool is defined in [[OnDemand-CV](#)]. In on-demand mode, this function should support monitoring between the MEPs and, in addition, between a MEP and MIP. [[TP-OAM-FW](#)] highlights, when performing Connectivity Verification, the need for the CC-V messages to include unique identification of the MEG that is being monitored and the MEP that originated the message.

The proactive tool [[TP-CC-CV](#)] is based on extensions to BFD (see [Section 4.3](#).) with the additional limitation that the transmission and receiving rates are based on configuration by the operator. The on-demand tool [[OnDemand-CV](#)] is an adaptation of LSP Ping (see [Section 4.4](#).) for the required behavior of MPLS-TP.

4.5.4.2. Route Tracing

[MPLS-TP-OAM] defines that there is a need for functionality that would allow a path end-point to identify the intermediate and end-points of the path. This function would be used in on-demand mode. Normally, this path will be used for bidirectional PW, LSP, and sections, however, unidirectional paths may be supported only if a return path exists. The tool for this is based on the LSP Ping (see [Section 4.4.](#)) functionality and is described in [[OnDemand-CV](#)].

4.5.4.3. Lock Instruct

The Lock Instruct function [[Lock-Loop](#)] is used to notify a transport path end-point of an administrative need to disable the transport path. This functionality will generally be used in conjunction with some intrusive OAM function, e.g. Performance measurement, Diagnostic testing, to minimize the side-effect on user data traffic.

4.5.4.4. Lock Reporting

Lock Reporting is a function used by an end-point of a path to report to its far-end end-point that a lock condition has been affected on the path.

4.5.4.5. Alarm Reporting

Alarm Reporting [[TP-Fault](#)] provides the means to suppress alarms following detection of defect conditions at the server sub-layer. Alarm reporting is used by an intermediate point of a path, that becomes aware of a fault on the path, to report to the end-points of the path. [[TP-OAM-FW](#)] states that this may occur as a result of a defect condition discovered at a server sub-layer. This generates an Alarm Indication Signal (AIS) that continues until the fault is cleared. The consequent action of this function is detailed in [[TP-OAM-FW](#)].

4.5.4.6. Remote Defect Indication

Remote Defect Indication (RDI) is used proactively by a path end-point to report to its peer end-point that a defect is detected on a bidirectional connection between them. [[MPLS-TP-OAM](#)] points out that this function may be applied to a unidirectional LSP only if there a return path exists. [[TP-OAM-FW](#)] points out that this function is associated with the proactive CC-V function.

4.5.4.7. Client Failure Indication

Client Failure Indication (CFI) is defined in [\[MPLS-TP-OAM\]](#) to allow the propagation information from one edge of the network to the other. The information concerns a defect to a client, in the case that the client does not support alarm notification.

4.5.4.8. Performance Monitoring

The definition of MPLS performance monitoring was motivated by the MPLS-TP requirements [\[MPLS-TP-OAM\]](#), but was defined generically for MPLS in [\[MPLS-LM-DM\]](#). An additional document [\[TP-LM-DM\]](#) defines a performance monitoring profile for MPLS-TP.

4.5.4.8.1. Packet Loss Measurement (LM)

Packet Loss Measurement is a function used to verify the quality of the service. Packet loss, as defined in [\[IPPM-1LM\]](#) and [\[MPLS-TP-OAM\]](#), indicates the ratio of the number of user packets lost to the total number of user packets sent during a defined time interval.

There are two possible ways of determining this measurement:

- o Using OAM packets, it is possible to compute the statistics based on a series of OAM packets. This, however, has the disadvantage of being artificial, and may not be representative since part of the packet loss may be dependent upon packet sizes and upon the implementation of the MEPs that take part in the protocol.
- o Sending delimiting messages for the start and end of a measurement period during which the source and sink of the path count the packets transmitted and received. After the end delimiter, the ratio would be calculated by the path OAM entity.

4.5.4.8.2. Packet Delay Measurement (DM)

Packet Delay Measurement is a function that is used to measure one-way or two-way delay of a packet transmission between a pair of the end-points of a path (PW, LSP, or Section). Where:

- o One-way packet delay, as defined in [\[IPPM-1DM\]](#), is the time elapsed from the start of transmission of the first bit of the packet by a source node until the reception of the last bit of that packet by the destination node. Note that one-way delay measurement requires the clocks of the two end-points to be synchronized.

- o Two-way packet delay, as defined in [[IPPM-2DM](#)], is the time elapsed from the start of transmission of the first bit of the packet by a source node until the reception of the last bit of the loop-backed packet by the same source node, when the loopback is performed at the packet's destination node. Note that due to possible path asymmetry, the one-way packet delay from one end-point to another is not necessarily equal to half of the two-way packet delay.
As opposed to one-way delay measurement, two-way delay measurement does not require the two end-points to be synchronized.

For each of these two metrics, the DM function allows the MEP to measure the delay, as well as the delay variation. Delay measurement is performed by exchanging timestamped OAM packets between the participating MEPs.

[4.6. Pseudowire OAM](#)

[4.6.1. Pseudowire OAM using Virtual Circuit Connectivity Verification \(VCCV\)](#)

VCCV, as defined in [[VCCV](#)], provides a means for end-to-end fault detection and diagnostics tools to be extended for PWs (regardless of the underlying tunneling technology). The VCCV switching function provides a control channel associated with each PW. [[VCCV](#)] defines three Control Channel (CC) types, i.e., three possible methods for transmitting and identifying OAM messages:

- o CC Type 1: In-band VCCV, as described in [[VCCV](#)], is also referred to as "PWE3 Control Word with 0001b as first nibble". It uses the PW Associated Channel Header [[PW-ACH](#)].
- o CC Type 2: Out-of-band VCCV [[VCCV](#)], is also referred to as "MPLS Router Alert Label". In this case the control channel is created by using the MPLS router alert label [[MPLS-ENCAPS](#)] immediately above the PW label.
- o CC Type 3: TTL expiry VCCV [[VCCV](#)], is also referred to as "MPLS PW Label with TTL == 1", i.e., the control channel is identified when the value of the TTL field in the PW label is set to 1.

VCCV currently supports the following OAM tools: ICMP Ping, LSP Ping, and BFD. ICMP and LSP Ping are IP encapsulated before being sent over the PW ACH. BFD for VCCV [[BFD-VCCV](#)] supports two modes of encapsulation - either IP/UDP encapsulated (with IP/UDP header) or PW-ACH encapsulated (with no IP/UDP header) and provides support to signal the AC status. The use of the VCCV control channel provides

the context, based on the MPLS-PW label, required to bind and bootstrap the BFD session to a particular pseudo wire (FEC), eliminating the need to exchange Discriminator values.

VCCV consists of two components: (1) signaled component to communicate VCCV capabilities as part of VC label, and (2) switching component to cause the PW payload to be treated as a control packet.

VCCV is not directly dependent upon the presence of a control plane. The VCCV capability negotiation may be performed as part of the PW signaling when LDP is used. In case of manual configuration of the PW, it is the responsibility of the operator to set consistent options at both ends. The manual option was created specifically to handle MPLS-TP use cases where no control plane was a requirement. However, new use cases such as pure mobile backhaul find this functionality useful too.

The PWE3 working group has conducted an implementation survey of VCCV [[VCCV-SURVEY](#)], which analyzes which VCCV mechanisms are used in practice.

[4.6.2. Pseudowire OAM using G-ACh](#)

As mentioned above, VCCV enables OAM for PWs by using a control channel for OAM packets. When PWs are used in MPLS-TP networks, rather than the control channels defined in VCCV, the G-ACh can be used as an alternative control channel. The usage of the G-ACh for PWs is defined in [[PW-G-ACh](#)].

[4.6.3. Attachment Circuit - Pseudowire Mapping](#)

The PWE3 working group has defined a mapping and notification of defect states between a pseudowire (PW) and the Attachment Circuits (ACs) of the end-to-end emulated service. This mapping is of key importance to the end-to-end functionality. Specifically, the mapping is provided by [[PW-MAP](#)], by [[L2TP-EC](#)] for L2TPv3 pseudowires, and Section 5.3 of [[ATM-L2](#)] for ATM.

[4.7. OWAMP and TWAMP](#)

[4.7.1. Overview](#)

The IPPM working group in the IETF defines common criteria and metrics for measuring performance of IP traffic ([[IPPM-FW](#)]). Some of the key RFCs published by this working group have defined metrics for measuring connectivity [[IPPM-Con](#)], delay ([[IPPM-1DM](#)], [[IPPM-2DM](#)]), and packet loss [[IPPM-1LM](#)]. It should be noted that the work of the

IETF in the context of performance metrics is not limited to IP networks; [[PM-CONS](#)] presents general guidelines for considering new performance metrics.

The IPPM working group has defined not only metrics for performance measurement, but also protocols that define how the measurement is carried out. The One-way Active Measurement Protocol [[OWAMP](#)] and the Two-Way Active Measurement Protocol [[TWAMP](#)] define a method and protocol for measuring performance metrics in IP networks.

OWAMP [[OWAMP](#)] enables measurement of one-way characteristics of IP networks, such as one-way packet loss and one-way delay. For its proper operation OWAMP requires accurate time of day setting at its end points.

TWAMP [[TWAMP](#)] is a similar protocol that enables measurement of both one-way and two-way (round trip) characteristics.

OWAMP and TWAMP are both comprised of two separate protocols:

- o OWAMP-Control/TWAMP-Control: used to initiate, start, and stop test sessions and to fetch their results. Continuity Check and Connectivity Verification are tested and confirmed by establishing the OWAMP/TWAMP Control Protocol TCP connection.
- o OWAMP-Test/TWAMP-Test: used to exchange test packets between two measurement nodes. Enables the loss and delay measurement functions, as well as detection of other anomalies, such as packet duplication and packet reordering.

It should be noted that while [[OWAMP](#)] and [[TWAMP](#)] define tools for performance measurement, they do not define the accuracy of these tools. The accuracy depends on scale, implementation and network configurations.

Alternative protocols for performance monitoring are defined, for example, in MPLS-TP OAM ([[MPLS-LM-DM](#)], [[TP-LM-DM](#)]), and in Ethernet OAM [[ITU-T-Y1731](#)].

[4.7.2. Control and Test Protocols](#)

OWAMP and TWAMP control protocols run over TCP, while the test protocols run over UDP. The purpose of the control protocols is to initiate, start, and stop test sessions, and for OWAMP to fetch results. The test protocols introduce test packets (which contain sequence numbers and timestamps) along the IP path under test according to a schedule, and record statistics of packet arrival.

Multiple sessions may be simultaneously defined, each with a session identifier, and defining the number of packets to be sent, the amount of padding to be added (and thus the packet size), the start time, and the send schedule (which can be either a constant time between test packets or exponentially distributed pseudo-random). Statistics recorded conform to the relevant IPPM RFCs.

OWAMP and TWAMP test traffic is designed with security in mind. Test packets are hard to detect because they are simply UDP streams between negotiated port numbers, with potentially nothing static in the packets. OWAMP and TWAMP also include optional authentication and encryption for both control and test packets.

4.7.3. OWAMP

OWAMP defines the following logical roles: Session-Sender, Session-Receiver, Server, Control-Client, and Fetch-Client. The Session-Sender originates test traffic that is received by the Session-Receiver. The Server configures and manages the session, as well as returning the results. The Control-Client initiates requests for test sessions, triggers their start, and may trigger their termination. The Fetch-Client requests the results of a completed session. Multiple roles may be combined in a single host - for example, one host may play the roles of Control-Client, Fetch-Client, and Session-Sender, and a second playing the roles of Server and Session-Receiver.

In a typical OWAMP session the Control-Client establishes a TCP connection to port 861 of the Server, which responds with a server greeting message indicating supported security/integrity modes. The Control-Client responds with the chosen communications mode and the Server accepts the modes. The Control-Client then requests and fully describes a test session to which the Server responds with its acceptance and supporting information. More than one test session may be requested with additional messages. The Control-Client then starts a test session and the Server acknowledges. The Session-Sender then sends test packets with pseudorandom padding to the Session-Receiver until the session is complete or until the Control-client stops the session. Once finished, the Fetch-Client sends a fetch request to the server, which responds with an acknowledgement and immediately thereafter the result data.

4.7.4. TWAMP

TWAMP defines the following logical roles: session-sender, session-reflector, server, and control-client. These are similar to the

OWAMP roles, except that the Session-Reflector does not collect any packet information, and there is no need for a Fetch-Client.

In a typical TWAMP session the Control-Client establishes a TCP connection to port 862 of the Server, and mode is negotiated as in OWAMP. The Control-Client then requests sessions and starts them. The Session-Sender sends test packets with pseudorandom padding to the Session-Reflector which returns them with insertion of timestamps.

4.8. TRILL

The requirements of OAM in TRILL are defined in [[TRILL-OAM](#)]. The challenge in TRILL OAM, much like in MPLS networks, is that traffic between RBridges RB1 and RB2 may be forwarded through more than one path. Thus, an OAM protocol between RBridges RB1 and RB2 must be able to monitor all the available paths between the two RBridge.

During the writing of this document the detailed definition of the TRILL OAM tools are still work in progress. This subsection presents the main requirements of TRILL OAM.

The main requirements defined in [[TRILL-OAM](#)] are:

- o Continuity Checking (CC) - the TRILL OAM protocol must support a function for CC between any two RBridges RB1 and RB2.
- o Connectivity Verification (CV) - connectivity between two RBridges RB1 and RB2 can be verified on a per-flow basis.
- o Path Tracing - allows an RBridge to trace all the available paths to a peer RBridge.
- o Performance monitoring - allows an RBridge to monitor the packet loss and packet delay to a peer RBridge.

5. Summary

This section summarizes the OAM tools and functions presented in this document. This summary is an index to some of the main OAM tools defined in the IETF. This compact index that can be useful to all readers from network operators to standard development organizations. The summary includes a short subsection that presents some guidance to network equipment vendors.

5.1. Summary of OAM Tools

This subsection provides a short summary of each of the OAM toolsets described in this document.

A detailed list of the RFCs related to each toolset is given in [Appendix A.1](#).

Toolset	Description	Transport Technology
IP Ping	Ping ([IntHost] , [NetTerms]) is a simple application for testing reachability that uses ICMP Echo messages ([ICMPv4] , [ICMPv6]).	IPv4/IPv6
IP Traceroute	Traceroute ([TCPIP-Tools] , [NetTools]) is an application that allows users to trace the path between an IP source and an IP destination, i.e., to identify the nodes along the path. If more than one path exists between the source and destination Traceroute traces *a* path. The most common implementation of Traceroute uses UDP probe messages, although there are other implementations that use different probes, such as ICMP or TCP.	IPv4/IPv6
BFD	Bidirectional Forwarding Detection (BFD) is defined in [BFD] as a framework for a lightweight generic OAM tool. The intention is to define a base tool that can be used with various encapsulation types, network environments, and in various medium types.	generic
MPLS OAM	MPLS LSP Ping, as defined in [MPLS-OAM] , [MPLS-OAM-Fw] and [LSP-Ping] , is an OAM tool for point-to-point and point-to-multipoint MLPS LSPs.	MPLS

	It includes two main functions: Ping and Traceroute.	
	It is noted that while this category focuses on LSP Ping, other OAM tools can be used in MPLS networks, e.g., BFD.	
+-----+-----+-----+		
MPLS-TP OAM	MPLS-TP OAM is defined in a set of RFCs. The OAM requirements for MPLS Transport Profile (MPLS-TP) are defined in [MPLS-TP-OAM]. Each of the tools in the OAM toolset is defined in its own RFC, as specified in Section A.1.	MPLS-TP
+-----+-----+-----+		
Pseudowire OAM	The PWE3 OAM architecture defines control channels that support the use of existing IETF OAM tools to be used for a pseudowire (PW). The control channels that are defined in [VCCV] and [PW-G-ACh] may be used in conjunction with ICMP Ping, LSP Ping, and BFD to perform CC and CV functionality. In addition the channels support use of any of the MPLS-TP based OAM tools for completing their respective OAM functionality for a PW.	Pseudowire
+-----+-----+-----+		
OWAMP and TWAMP	The One Way Active Measurement Protocol (OWAMP) and the Two Way Active Measurement Protocols (TWAMP) are two protocols defined in the IP Performance Metrics (IPPM) working group in the IETF. These protocols allow various performance metrics to be measured, such as packet loss, delay and delay variation, duplication and reordering.	IPv4/IPv6
+-----+-----+-----+		
TRILL OAM	The requirements of OAM in TRILL are defined in [TRILL-OAM]. These requirements include continuity checking, connectivity verification, path tracing and performance monitoring. During the writing of this document the detailed	TRILL

	definition of the TRILL OAM tools		
	is work in progress.		
+-----+	+-----+	+-----+	+-----+

Table 3 Summary of OAM-related IETF Tools

5.2. Summary of OAM Functions

Table 4 summarizes the OAM functions that are supported in each of the toolsets that were analyzed in this section. The columns of this tables are the typical OAM functions described in [Section 1.3](#).

Toolset	Continuity Check	Connectivity Verification	Path Discovery	Performance Monitoring	Other Functions
IP Ping	Echo				
IP Traceroute			Traceroute		
BFD	BFD Control / Echo	BFD Control			RDI using BFD Control
MPLS OAM (LSP Ping)		"Ping" mode	"Traceroute" mode		
MPLS-TP OAM	CC	CV/pro-active or on-demand	Route Tracing	-LM -DM	-Diagnostic Test -Lock -Alarm Reporting -Client Failure Indication -RDI
Pseudowire OAM	BFD	-BFD -ICMP	LSP-Ping		

		Ping				
		-LSP-				
		Ping				
+-----+	+-----+	+-----+	+-----+	+-----+	+-----+	+-----+
OWAMP and	- control			-Delay		
TWAMP	protocol			measur		
				ement		
				-Packet		
				loss		
				measur		
				ement		
+-----+	+-----+	+-----+	+-----+	+-----+	+-----+	+-----+
TRILL OAM	CC	CV	Path	-Delay		
			tracing	measur		
				ement		
				-Packet		
				loss		
				measur		
				ement		
+-----+	+-----+	+-----+	+-----+	+-----+	+-----+	+-----+

Table 4 Summary of the OAM Functionality in IETF OAM Tools

5.3. Guidance to Network Equipment Vendors

As mentioned in [Section 1.4.](#) , it is imperative for OAM tools to be capable of testing the actual data plane in as much accuracy as possible. While this guideline may appear obvious, it is worthwhile to emphasize the key importance of enforcing fate-sharing between OAM traffic that monitors the data plane and the data plane traffic it monitors.

6. Security Considerations

This memo presents an overview of existing OAM tools, and proposes no new OAM tools. Therefore, this document introduces no security considerations. However, the OAM tools reviewed in this document can and do present security issues. The reader is encouraged to review the Security Considerations section of each document referenced by this memo.

7. IANA Considerations

There are no new IANA considerations implied by this document.

8. Acknowledgments

The authors gratefully acknowledge Sasha Vainshtein, Carlos Pignataro, David Harrington, Dan Romascanu, Ron Bonica and other members of the OPSAWG mailing list for their helpful comments.

This document was prepared using 2-Word-v2.0.template.dot.

9. References

9.1. Informative References

- [ATM-L2] Singh, S., Townsley, M., and C. Pignataro, "Asynchronous Transfer Mode (ATM) over Layer 2 Tunneling Protocol Version 3 (L2TPv3)", [RFC 4454](#), May 2006.
- [BFD] Katz, D., Ward, D., "Bidirectional Forwarding Detection (BFD)", [RFC 5880](#), June 2010.
- [BFD-Gen] Katz, D., Ward, D., "Generic Application of Bidirectional Forwarding Detection (BFD)", [RFC 5882](#), June 2010.
- [BFD-IP] Katz, D., Ward, D., "Bidirectional Forwarding Detection (BFD) for IPv4 and IPv6 (Single Hop)", [RFC 5881](#), June 2010.
- [BFD-LSP] Aggarwal, R., Kompella, K., Nadeau, T., and Swallow, G., "Bidirectional Forwarding Detection (BFD) for MPLS Label Switched Paths (LSPs)", [RFC 5884](#), June 2010.
- [BFD-Multi] Katz, D., Ward, D., "Bidirectional Forwarding Detection (BFD) for Multihop Paths", [RFC 5883](#), June 2010.
- [BFD-VCCV] Nadeau, T., Pignataro, C., "Bidirectional Forwarding Detection (BFD) for the Pseudowire Virtual Circuit Connectivity Verification (VCCV)", [RFC 5885](#), June 2010.
- [Comp] Bonaventure, O., "Computer Networking: Principles, Protocols and Practice", 2008.
- [Dup] Uijterwaal, H., "A One-Way Packet Duplication Metric", [RFC 5560](#), May 2009.

- [G-ACh] Bocci, M., Vigoureux, M., Bryant, S., "MPLS Generic Associated Channel", [RFC 5586](#), June 2009.
- [ICMP-Ext] Bonica, R., Gan, D., Tappan, D., Pignataro, C., "ICMP Extensions for Multiprotocol Label Switching", [RFC 4950](#), August 2007.
- [ICMP-Int] Atlas, A., Bonica, R., Pignataro, C., Shen, N., Rivers, JR., "Extending ICMP for Interface and Next-Hop Identification", [RFC 5837](#), April 2010.
- [ICMP-MP] Bonica, R., Gan, D., Tappan, D., Pignataro, C., "Extended ICMP to Support Multi-Part Messages", [RFC 4884](#), April 2007.
- [ICMPv4] Postel, J., "Internet Control Message Protocol", STD 5, [RFC 792](#), September 1981.
- [ICMPv6] Conta, A., Deering, S., and M. Gupta, "Internet Control Message Protocol (ICMPv6) for the Internet Protocol Version 6 (IPv6) Specification", [RFC 4443](#), March 2006.
- [IEEE802.1Q] IEEE 802.1Q, "IEEE Standard for Local and metropolitan area networks - Media Access Control (MAC) Bridges and Virtual Bridged Local Area Networks", October 2012.
- [IEEE802.3ah] IEEE 802.3, "IEEE Standard for Information technology - Local and metropolitan area networks - Carrier sense multiple access with collision detection (CSMA/CD) access method and physical layer specifications", clause 57, December 2008.
- [IntHost] Braden, R., "Requirements for Internet Hosts -- Communication Layers", [RFC 1122](#), October 1989.
- [IPPM-1DM] Almes, G., Kalidindi, S., Zekauskas, M., "A One-way Delay Metric for IPPM", [RFC 2679](#), September 1999.
- [IPPM-1LM] Almes, G., Kalidindi, S., Zekauskas, M., "A One-way Packet Loss Metric for IPPM", [RFC 2680](#), September 1999.
- [IPPM-2DM] Almes, G., Kalidindi, S., Zekauskas, M., "A Round-trip Delay Metric for IPPM", [RFC 2681](#), September 1999.
- [IPPM-Con] Mahdavi, J., Paxson, V., "IPPM Metrics for Measuring Connectivity", [RFC 2678](#), September 1999.

- [IPPM-FW] Paxson, V., Almes, G., Mahdavi, J., and Mathis, M., "Framework for IP Performance Metrics", [RFC 2330](#), May 1998.
- [ITU-G8113.1] ITU-T Recommendation G.8113.1/Y.1372.1, "Operations, Administration and Maintenance mechanism for MPLS-TP in Packet Transport Network (PTN)", November 2012.
- [ITU-G8113.2] ITU-T Recommendation G.8113.2/Y.1372.2, "Operations, administration and maintenance mechanisms for MPLS-TP networks using the tools defined for MPLS", November 2012.
- [ITU-T-CT] Betts, M., "Allocation of a Generic Associated Channel Type for ITU-T MPLS Transport Profile Operation, Maintenance, and Administration (MPLS-TP OAM)", [RFC 6671](#), November 2012.
- [ITU-T-G.806] ITU-T Recommendation G.806, "Characteristics of transport equipment - Description methodology and generic functionality", January 2009.
- [ITU-T-Y1711] ITU-T Recommendation Y.1711, "Operation & Maintenance mechanism for MPLS networks", February 2004.
- [ITU-T-Y1731] ITU-T Recommendation G.8013/Y.1731, "OAM Functions and Mechanisms for Ethernet-based Networks", July 2011.
- [ITU-Terms] ITU-R/ITU-T Terms and Definitions, online, 2013.
- [L2TP-EC] McGill, N. and C. Pignataro, "Layer 2 Tunneling Protocol Version 3 (L2TPv3) Extended Circuit Status Values", [RFC 5641](#), August 2009.
- [Lock-Loop] Boutros, S., Sivabalan, S., Aggarwal, R., Vigoureux, M., Dai, X., "MPLS Transport Profile Lock Instruct and Loopback Functions", [RFC 6435](#), November 2011.
- [LSP-Ping] Kompella, K., Swallow, G., "Detecting Multi-Protocol Label Switched (MPLS) Data Plane Failures", [RFC 4379](#), February 2006.
- [Mng] Farrel, A., "Inclusion of Manageability Sections in Path Computation Element (PCE) Working Group Drafts", [RFC 6123](#), February 2011.

- [MPLS-ENCAPS] Rosen, E., Tappan, D., Fedorkow, G., Rekhter, Y., Farinacci, D., Li, T. and A. Conta, "MPLS Label Stack Encoding", [RFC 3032](#), January 2001.
- [MPLS-LM-DM] Frost, D., Bryant, S., "Packet Loss and Delay Measurement for MPLS Networks", [RFC 6374](#), September 2011.
- [MPLS-OAM] Nadeau, T., Morrow, M., Swallow, G., Allan, D., Matsushima, S., "Operations and Management (OAM) Requirements for Multi-Protocol Label Switched (MPLS) Networks", [RFC 4377](#), February 2006.
- [MPLS-OAM-FW] Allan, D., Nadeau, T., "A Framework for Multi-Protocol Label Switching (MPLS) Operations and Management (OAM)", [RFC 4378](#), February 2006.
- [MPLS-P2MP] Yasukawa, S., Farrel, A., King, D., Nadeau, T., "Operations and Management (OAM) Requirements for Point-to-Multipoint MPLS Networks", [RFC 4687](#), September 2006.
- [MPLS-TP-OAM] Vigoureux, M., Ward, D., Betts, M., "Requirements for OAM in MPLS Transport Networks", [RFC 5860](#), May 2010.
- [NetTerms] Jacobsen, O., Lynch, D., "A Glossary of Networking Terms", [RFC 1208](#), March 1991.
- [NetTools] Enger, R., Reynolds, J., "FYI on a Network Management Tool Catalog: Tools for Monitoring and Debugging TCP/IP Internets and Interconnected Devices", [RFC 1470](#), June 1993.
- [OAM-Analys] Sprecher, N., Fang, L., "An Overview of the OAM Tool Set for MPLS based Transport Networks", [RFC 6669](#), July 2012.
- [OAM-Def] Andersson, L., Van Helvoort, H., Bonica, R., Romascanu, D., Mansfield, S., "Guidelines for the use of the OAM acronym in the IETF ", [RFC 6291](#), June 2011.
- [OAM-Label] Ohta, H., "Assignment of the 'OAM Alert Label' for Multiprotocol Label Switching Architecture (MPLS) Operation and Maintenance (OAM) Functions", [RFC 3429](#), November 2002.

- [OnDemand-CV] Gray, E., Bahadur, N., Boutros, S., Aggarwal, R. "MPLS On-Demand Connectivity Verification and Route Tracing", [RFC 6426](#), November 2011.
- [OWAMP] Shalunov, S., Teitelbaum, B., Karp, A., Boote, J., and Zekauskas, M., "A One-way Active Measurement Protocol (OWAMP)", [RFC 4656](#), September 2006.
- [PARIS] Brice Augustin, Timur Friedman and Renata Teixeira, "Measuring Load-balanced Paths in the Internet", IMC, 2007.
- [PM-CONS] Clark, A. and B. Claise, "Guidelines for Considering New Performance Metric Development", [BCP 170](#), [RFC 6390](#), October 2011.
- [PW-ACH] Bryant, S., Swallow, G., Martini, L., McPherson, D., "Pseudowire Emulation Edge-to-Edge (PWE3) Control Word for Use over an MPLS PSN", [RFC 4385](#), February 2006.
- [PW-G-ACh] Li, H., Martini, L., He, J., Huang, F., "Using the Generic Associated Channel Label for Pseudowire in the MPLS Transport Profile (MPLS-TP)", [RFC 6423](#), November 2011.
- [PW-MAP] Aissaoui, M., Busschbach, P., Martini, L., Morrow, M., Nadeau, T., and Y(J). Stein, "Pseudowire (PW) Operations, Administration, and Maintenance (OAM) Message Mapping", [RFC 6310](#), July 2011.
- [Reorder] Morton, A., Ciavattone, L., Ramachandran, G., Shalunov, S., and J. Perser, "Packet Reordering Metrics", [RFC 4737](#), November 2006.
- [Signal] Yasukawa, S., "Signaling Requirements for Point-to-Multipoint Traffic-Engineered MPLS Label Switched Paths (LSPs)", [RFC 4461](#), April 2006.
- [TCPIP-Tools] Kessler, G., Shepard, S., "A Primer On Internet and TCP/IP Tools and Utilities", [RFC 2151](#), June 1997.
- [TP-CC-CV] Allan, D., Swallow, G., Drake, J., "Proactive Connectivity Verification, Continuity Check and Remote Defect indication for MPLS Transport Profile", [RFC 6428](#), November 2011.

- [TP-Fault] Swallow, G., Fulignoli, A., Vigoureux, M., Boutros, S., "MPLS Fault Management Operations, Administration, and Maintenance (OAM)", [RFC 6427](#), November 2011.
- [TP-LM-DM] Frost, D., Bryant, S., "A Packet Loss and Delay Measurement Profile for MPLS-Based Transport Networks", [RFC 6375](#), September 2011.
- [TP-OAM-FW] Busi, I., Allan, D., "Operations, Administration and Maintenance Framework for MPLS-based Transport Networks ", [RFC 6371](#), September 2011.
- [TP-Term] Van Helvoort, H., Andersson, L., Sprecher, N., "A Thesaurus for the Terminology used in MPLS Transport Profile (MPLS-TP) Internet-Drafts and RFCs in the Context of the ITU-T's Transport Network Recommendations", [RFC 7087](#), December 2013.
- [TRILL-OAM] Senevirathne, T., Bond, D., Aldrin, S., Li, Y., Watve, R., "Requirements for Operations, Administration, and Maintenance (OAM) in Transparent Interconnection of Lots of Links (TRILL)", [RFC 6905](#), March 2013.
- [TWAMP] Hedayat, K., Krzanowski, R., Morton, A., Yum, K., and Babiarz, J., "A Two-Way Active Measurement Protocol (TWAMP)", [RFC 5357](#), October 2008.
- [VCCV] Nadeau, T., Pignataro, C., "Pseudowire Virtual Circuit Connectivity Verification (VCCV): A Control Channel for Pseudowires", [RFC 5085](#), December 2007.
- [VCCV-SURVEY] Del Regno, N., Malis, A., "The Pseudowire (PW) and Virtual Circuit Connectivity Verification (VCCV) Implementation Survey Results", [RFC 7079](#), November 2013.

[Appendix A.](#)

List of OAM Documents

[A.1.](#) List of IETF OAM Documents

Table 5 summarizes the OAM related RFCs published by the IETF.

It is important to note that the table lists various RFCs that are different by nature. For example, some of these documents define OAM tools or OAM protocols (or both), while others define protocols that

are not strictly OAM-related, but are used by OAM tools. The table also includes RFCs that define the requirements or the framework of OAM in a specific context (e.g., MPLS-TP).

The RFCs in the table are categorized in a few sets as defined in [Section 1.3](#).

Toolset	Title	RFC
IP Ping	Requirements for Internet Hosts -- Communication Layers [IntHost]	RFC 1122
	A Glossary of Networking Terms [NetTerms]	RFC 1208
	Internet Control Message Protocol [ICMPv4]	RFC 792
	Internet Control Message Protocol (ICMPv6) for the Internet Protocol Version 6 (IPv6) Specification [ICMPv6]	RFC 4443
IP Traceroute	A Primer On Internet and TCP/IP Tools and Utilities [TCPIP-Tools]	RFC 2151
	FYI on a Network Management Tool Catalog: Tools for Monitoring and Debugging TCP/IP Internets and Interconnected Devices [NetTools]	RFC 1470
	Internet Control Message Protocol [ICMPv4]	RFC 792
	Internet Control Message Protocol (ICMPv6) for the Internet Protocol Version 6 (IPv6) Specification [ICMPv6]	RFC 4443
	Extended ICMP to Support Multi-Part Messages [ICMP-MP]	RFC 4884

	Extending ICMP for Interface and Next-Hop Identification [ICMP-Int]	RFC 5837
BFD	Bidirectional Forwarding Detection [BFD]	RFC 5880
	Bidirectional Forwarding Detection (BFD) for IPv4 and IPv6 (Single Hop) [BFD-IP]	RFC 5881
	Generic Application of Bidirectional Forwarding Detection [BFD-Gen]	RFC 5882
	Bidirectional Forwarding Detection (BFD) for Multihop Paths [BFD-Multi]	RFC 5883
	Bidirectional Forwarding Detection for MPLS Label Switched Paths (LSPs) [BFD-LSP]	RFC 5884
	Bidirectional Forwarding Detection for the Pseudowire Virtual Circuit Connectivity Verification (VCCV) [BFD-VCCV]	RFC 5885
MPLS OAM	Operations and Management (OAM) Requirements for Multi-Protocol Label Switched (MPLS) Networks [MPLS-OAM]	RFC 4377
	A Framework for Multi-Protocol Label Switching (MPLS) Operations and Management (OAM) [MPLS-OAM-FW]	RFC 4378
	Detecting Multi-Protocol Label Switched (MPLS) Data Plane Failures [LSP-Ping]	RFC 4379
	Operations and Management (OAM) Requirements for Point-to-Multipoint MPLS Networks [MPLS-P2MP]	RFC 4687

	ICMP Extensions for Multiprotocol Label Switching [ICMP-Ext]	RFC 4950
MPLS-TP OAM	Requirements for OAM in MPLS-TP [MPLS-TP-OAM]	RFC 5860
	MPLS Generic Associated Channel [G-ACh]	RFC 5586
	MPLS-TP OAM Framework [TP-OAM-Fw]	RFC 6371
	Proactive Connectivity Verification, Continuity Check, and Remote Defect Indication for the MPLS Transport Profile [TP-CC-CV]	RFC 6428
	MPLS On-Demand Connectivity Verification and Route Tracing [OnDemand-CV]	RFC 6426
	MPLS Fault Management Operations, Administration, and Maintenance (OAM) [TP-Fault]	RFC 6427
	MPLS Transport Profile Lock Instruct and Loopback Functions [Lock-Loop]	RFC 6435
	Packet Loss and Delay Measurement for MPLS Networks [MPLS-LM-DM]	RFC 6374
	A Packet Loss and Delay Measurement Profile for MPLS-Based Transport Networks [TP-LM-DM]	RFC 6375
Pseudowire OAM	Pseudowire Virtual Circuit Connectivity Verification (VCCV): A Control Channel for Pseudowires [VCCV]	RFC 5085

	Bidirectional Forwarding Detection for the Pseudowire Virtual Circuit Connectivity Verification (VCCV) [BFD-VCCV]	RFC 5885
	Using the Generic Associated Channel Label for Pseudowire in the MPLS Transport Profile (MPLS-TP) [PW-G-ACh]	RFC 6423
	Pseudowire (PW) Operations, Administration, and Maintenance (OAM) Message Mapping [PW-MAP]	RFC 6310
OWAMP and TWAMP	A One-way Active Measurement Protocol [OWAMP]	RFC 4656
	A Two-Way Active Measurement Protocol [TWAMP]	RFC 5357
	Framework for IP Performance Metrics [IPPM-FW]	RFC 2330
	IPPM Metrics for Measuring Connectivity [IPPM-Con]	RFC 2678
	A One-way Delay Metric for IPPM [IPPM-1DM]	RFC 2679
	A One-way Packet Loss Metric for IPPM [IPPM-1LM]	RFC 2680
	A Round-trip Delay Metric for IPPM [IPPM-2DM]	RFC 2681
	Packet Reordering Metrics [Reorder]	RFC 4737
	A One-Way Packet Duplication Metric [Dup]	RFC 5560

TRILL OAM	Requirements for Operations,	RFC 6905	
	Administration, and Maintenance (OAM)		
	in Transparent Interconnection of		
	Lots of Links (TRILL)		
+-----+	+-----+	+-----+	+-----+

Table 5 Summary of IETF OAM Related RFCs

A.2. List of Selected Non-IETF OAM Documents

In addition to the OAM tools defined by the IETF, the IEEE and ITU-T have also defined various OAM tools that focus on Ethernet, and various other transport network environments. These various tools, defined by the three standard organizations, are often tightly coupled, and have had a mutual effect on each other. The ITU-T and IETF have both defined OAM tools for MPLS LSPs, [[ITU-T-Y1711](#)] and [[LSP-Ping](#)]. The following OAM standards by the IEEE and ITU-T are to some extent linked to IETF OAM tools listed above and are mentioned here only as reference material:

- o OAM tools for Layer 2 have been defined by the ITU-T in [[ITU-T-Y1731](#)], and by the IEEE in 802.1ag [[IEEE802.1Q](#)]. The IEEE 802.3 standard defines OAM for one-hop Ethernet links [[IEEE802.3ah](#)].
- o The ITU-T has defined OAM for MPLS LSPs in [[ITU-T-Y1711](#)], and MPLS-TP OAM in [[ITU-G8113.1](#)] and [[ITU-G8113.2](#)].

It should be noted that these non-IETF documents deal in many cases with OAM functions below the IP layer (Layer 2, Layer 2.5) and in some cases operators use a multi-layered OAM approach, which is a function of the way their networks are designed.

Table 6 summarizes some of the main OAM standards published by non-IETF standard organizations. This document focuses on IETF OAM standards, but these non-IETF standards are referenced in this document where relevant.

+-----+	+-----+	+-----+	+-----+
	Title		Standard/Draft
+-----+	+-----+	+-----+	+-----+
ITU-T	Operation & Maintenance mechanism	ITU-T Y.1711	
MPLS OAM	for MPLS networks [ITU-T-Y1711]		
	+-----+	+-----+	+-----+
	Assignment of the 'OAM Alert Label'	RFC 3429	
	for Multiprotocol Label Switching		

	Architecture (MPLS) Operation and Maintenance (OAM) Functions [OAM-Label]	
	Note: although this is an IETF document, it is listed as one of the non-IETF OAM standards, since it was defined as a complementary part of ITU-T Y.1711.	
+-----+		
ITU-T MPLS-TP OAM	Operations, administration and Maintenance mechanisms for MPLS-TP networks using the tools defined for MPLS [ITU-G8113.2]	ITU-T G.8113.2
	Note: this document describes the OAM toolset defined by the IETF for MPLS-TP, whereas ITU-T G.8113.1 describes the OAM toolset defined by the ITU-T.	
+-----+		
	Operations, Administration and Maintenance mechanism for MPLS-TP in Packet Transport Network (PTN)	ITU-T G.8113.1
+-----+		
	Allocation of a Generic Associated Channel Type for ITU-T MPLS Transport Profile Operation, Maintenance, and Administration (MPLS-TP OAM) [ITU-T-CT]	RFC 6671
	Note: although this is an IETF document, it is listed as one of the non-IETF OAM standards, since it was defined as a complementary part of ITU-T G.8113.1.	
+-----+		
ITU-T Ethernet OAM	OAM Functions and Mechanisms for Ethernet-based Networks [ITU-T-Y1731]	ITU-T Y.1731
+-----+		

IEEE	Connectivity Fault Management	IEEE 802.1ag	
CFM	[IEEE802.1Q]		
	Note: CFM was originally published		
	as IEEE 802.1ag, but is now		
	incorporated in the 802.1Q standard.		
+-----+			
IEEE	Management of Data Driven and Data	IEEE 802.1ag	
DDCFM	Dependent Connectivity Faults		
	[IEEE802.1Q]		
	Note: DDCFM was originally published		
	as IEEE 802.1Qaw, but is now		
	incorporated in the 802.1Q standard.		
+-----+			
IEEE	Media Access Control Parameters,	IEEE 802.3ah	
802.3	Physical Layers, and Management		
link level	Parameters for Subscriber Access		
OAM	Networks [IEEE802.3ah]		
	Note: link level OAM was originally		
	defined in IEEE 802.3ah, and is now		
	incorporated in the 802.3 standard.		
+-----+			

Table 6 Non-IETF OAM Standards Mentioned in this Document

Authors' Addresses

Tal Mizrahi
 Marvell
 6 Hamada St.
 Yokneam, 20692
 Israel

Email: talmi@marvell.com

Nurit Sprecher
 NSN
 3 Hanagar St. Neve Ne'eman B

Hod Hasharon, 45241
Israel

Email: nurit.sprecher@nsn.com

Elisa Bellagamba
Ericsson
6 Farogatan St.
Stockholm, 164 40
Sweden

Phone: +46 761440785

Email: elisa.bellagamba@ericsson.com

Yaacov Weingarten
34 Hagefen St.
Karnei Shomron, 4485500
Israel

Email: wyaacov@gmail.com