

IPPM
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: December 2, 2021

H. Song
D. Linda
Futurewei Technologies
May 31, 2021

In-band Edge-to-Edge Round Trip Time Measurement
draft-song-ippm-inband-e2e-rtt-measurement-01

Abstract

This draft describes a lightweight in-band edge-to-edge network round trip time measurement architecture and suggests implementations. By augmenting the IOAM E2E option header, the process can be fully done in data plane without needing to involve the control plane to maintain any states.

Requirements Language

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "NOT RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [BCP 14](#) [RFC2119][RFC8174] when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

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 December 2, 2021.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2021 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to [BCP 78](#) and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<https://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	2
2.	In-band E2E RTT Measurement Architecture	3
3.	Implementation Considerations	4
4.	Security Considerations	5
5.	IANA Considerations	6
6.	Contributors	6
7.	Acknowledgments	6
8.	References	6
8.1.	Normative References	6
8.2.	Informative References	6
	Authors' Addresses	7

[1.](#) Introduction

In-network service-based traffic engineering or load balancing needs to monitor particular flows' edge-to-edge performance, such as round trip time (RTT), in the operator's network domain. The host-based ping using ICMPv6 [[RFC4443](#)] is of no use because it is usually beyond the access of network operators. The router-based ping, as an active measurement approach, cannot reflect the real performance of the specific flows under scrutiny. This is also true for the other active measurement approaches such as TWAMP [[RFC5357](#)].

In-situ OAM (IOAM) [[I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data](#)] supports in-band flow-based performance measurement. However, on the one hand, the IOAM trace option is too heavy for the applications which do not care about the per-hop performance; on the other hand, the IOAM E2E option only supports the one-way measurement.

Alternate Marking(AM) [[RFC8321](#)], mainly designed for one-way measurement, can be used to measure the two-way edge-to-edge delay if both edges initiate a one-way measurement session. However, AM's measurement interval needs to be large enough to avoid the measurement ambiguity, and it requires both edges to conduct the measurements and export results to a controller.

We need a lightweight in-band flow RTT measurement method.

"Lightweight" means the extra header overhead is low, and the extra network processing overhead is also low. A network operator should be able to pick a flow to monitor and get fine-grained per-packet RTT measurement for edge to edge. Moreover, the method should be stateless and does not need a control plane to maintain sessions. Depending on the application scenario and the network domain scope, the edge can extend to the host, the network interface card (NIC), or the network switch or router. To this end, we propose an in-band edge-to-edge RTT measurement method and suggest the implementation approaches.

Such measurement only reflects the network delay for a flow but excludes the application layer delay incurred by server or client.

2. In-band E2E RTT Measurement Architecture

The measurement architecture is shown in Figure 1. The controller, either on a remote machine or on the edge node's control plane, configures the ingress edge node to measure some flow's RTT between the ingress edge and the egress edge. The ingress edge node uses ACL to filter the flow packets and, at given interval or probability, add the timestamp and the other metadata to the selected packets. The egress edge, after capturing the data, either piggyback the data on a reverse flow packet, or generate a feedback packet carrying the data back to the ingress edge node. Once the ingress edge node receives the feedback data, it sends the data along with the current timestamp to the controller. The controller can then calculate the flow RTT and react with followup actions.

The RTT calculation is done in the slow path, the metadata incurs only small and fix header overhead, and the nodes in the domain does not do any processing. All these make the measurement lightweight, accurate, and have little impact to the network forwarding performance.

To enable the two-way measurement behavior, we need to add some indicator to the IOAM E2E option header to indicate the request for a feedback. We also need another indicator to tell if the current packet is a feedback.

To support this, we can either introduce another IOAM two-way E2E option while keeping the current IOAM E2E option unchanged, or simply modify the current IOAM E2E option header specification to extend its usage. The simplest modification is to reserve a few flag bits and among them, two bits are used for the two-way measurement. One possible layout is shown in Figure 2. Alternatively, the flags can take several bits from the Namespace-ID field.




Figure 2: Modified IOAM E2E Option Header

The data field can carry the timestamp, the sequence number, of a unique packet identifier number. Other data types can also be carried to enrich the feedback information.

A packet can serve as both a forward packet and a feedback packet when both flags are set. In this case, there are two records for each data type in the data field. The forward packet's data are located in front of the feedback packet's data.

4. Security Considerations

To prevent the timestamp to be maliciously altered during the packet forwarding, the ingress edge can instead keep the timestamp locally and only send a packet identifier (e.g., a random data). When a reverse flow packet carrying the same identifier is received, the current timestamp along with the saved timestamp are forwarded to the controller.

The ingress edge node can limit the frequency of measurement to the flow packets. The egress edge node can also rate limit the feedback. So the potential DoS attack can be mitigated.

5. IANA Considerations

Depending on the discussion output, either a registry for a new IOAM option is required or a modification to the current IOAM E2E option specification is needed.

6. Contributors

TBD.

7. Acknowledgments

TBD.

8. References

8.1. Normative References

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.
- [RFC8174] Leiba, B., "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in [RFC 2119](#) Key Words", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 8174](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8174, May 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8174>>.

8.2. Informative References

- [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data] Brockners, F., Bhandari, S., and T. Mizrahi, "Data Fields for In-situ OAM", [draft-ietf-ippm-ioam-data-12](#) (work in progress), February 2021.
- [RFC4443] Conta, A., Deering, S., and M. Gupta, Ed., "Internet Control Message Protocol (ICMPv6) for the Internet Protocol Version 6 (IPv6) Specification", STD 89, [RFC 4443](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4443, March 2006, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4443>>.
- [RFC5357] Hedayat, K., Krzanowski, R., Morton, A., Yum, K., and J. Babiarz, "A Two-Way Active Measurement Protocol (TWAMP)", [RFC 5357](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5357, October 2008, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5357>>.

[RFC8321] Fioccola, G., Ed., Capello, A., Cociglio, M., Castaldelli, L., Chen, M., Zheng, L., Mirsky, G., and T. Mizrahi, "Alternate-Marking Method for Passive and Hybrid Performance Monitoring", [RFC 8321](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8321, January 2018, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8321>>.

Authors' Addresses

Haoyu Song
Futurewei Technologies
Santa Clara
USA

Email: haoyu.song@futurewei.com

Linda Dunbar
Futurewei Technologies
Plano
USA

Email: linda.dunbar@futurewei.com

