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packets is also known as In-situ OAM (IOAM). IOAM records
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document defines how IOAM data fields are transported as part of the
Segment Routing with IPv6 data plane (SRv6) header.
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1. Introduction

OAM and PM information from the SR endpoints can be piggybacked in the data packet. The OAM and PM information piggybacking in the data packets is also known as In-situ OAM (IOAM). IOAM records OAM information within the packet while the packet traverses a particular network domain. The term "in-situ" refers to the fact that the IOAM data fields are added to the data packets rather than being sent within probe packets specifically dedicated to OAM.

This document defines how IOAM data fields are transported as part of the Segment Routing with IPv6 data plane (SRv6) header [I-D.6man-segment-routing-header].

The IOAM data fields carried are defined in [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data], and can be used for various use-cases including Performance Measurement (PM) and Proof-of-Transit (PoT).
2. Conventions

2.1. Requirement Language

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

2.2. Abbreviations

Abbreviations used in this document:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IOAM</td>
<td>In-situ Operations, Administration, and Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAM</td>
<td>Operations, Administration, and Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Performance Measurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoT</td>
<td>Proof-of-Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>Segment Routing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRH</td>
<td>SRv6 Header</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRv6</td>
<td>Segment Routing with IPv6 Data plane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. OAM Metadata Piggybacked in Data Packets

OAM and PM information from the SR endpoints can be piggybacked in the data packet. The OAM and PM information piggybacking in the data packets is also known as In-situ OAM (IOAM). This section describes IOAM functionality in SRv6 network.

The IOAM data is carried in SRH.TLV. This enables the IOAM mechanism to build on the network programmability capability of SRv6. Specifically, the ability for an SRv6 endpoint to determine whether to process or ignore some specific SRH TLVs is based on the SID function. This enables collection of the IOAM information hardware friendly based on the intermediate endpoint capability. The nodes that are not capable of supporting the IOAM functionality does not have to look or process SRH TLV (i.e., such nodes can simply ignore the SRH IOAM TLV). This also enable collection of IOAM data only from segment endpoint.

3.1 IOAM Data Field Encapsulation in SRH

The SRv6 encapsulation header (SRH) is defined in [I-D.ietf-6man-segment-routing-header]. IOAM data fields are carried in the SRH, using a single pre-allocated SRH TLV. The different IOAM data fields defined in [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data] are added as sub-TLVs.

```
+----------+----------+----------+----------+
| SRH-TLV-Type | LEN | RESERVED |
+----------+----------+----------+
+----------+----------+----------+----------+
| IOAM-Type | IOAM HDR LEN | RESERVED |
+----------+----------+----------+----------+
```

Figure 1: IOAM data encapsulation in SRH

SRH-TLV-Type: IOAM TLV Type for SRH is defined as TBA1.

The fields related to the encapsulation of IOAM data fields in the SRH are defined as follows:

IOAM-Type: 8-bit field defining the IOAM Option type, as defined in Section 7.2 of [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data].

IOAM HDR LEN: 8-bit unsigned integer. Length of the IOAM HDR in 4-octet units.
RESERVED: 8-bit reserved field MUST be set to zero upon transmission and ignored upon receipt.

IOAM Option and Data Space: IOAM option header and data is present as defined by the IOAM-Type field, and is defined in Section 4 of [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data].

4. Procedure

This section summarizes the procedure for IOAM data encapsulation in SRv6 SRH. The SR nodes implementing the IOAM functionality follows the MTU and other considerations outlined in [I-D.6man-extension-header-insertion].

4.1. Ingress Node

As part of the SRH encapsulation, the ingress node of an SR domain or an SR Policy [I-D.ietf-spring-segment-routing-policy] MAY add the IOAM TLV in the SRH of the data packet. If an ingress node supports IOAM functionality and, based on a local configuration, wants to collect IOAM data, it adds IOAM TLV in the SRH. Based on the size of the segment list (SL), the ingress node preallocates space in the IOAM TLV.

If IOAM data from the last node in the segment-list (Egress node) is desired, the ingress uses an Ultimate Segment Pop (USP) SID advertised by the Egress node.

The ingress node MAY also insert the IOAM data about the local information in the IOAM TLV in the SRH at index 0 of the preallocated IOAM TLV.

4.2. Intermediate SR Segment Endpoint Node

The SR segment endpoint node is any node receiving an IPv6 packet where the destination address of that packet is a local SID. As part of the SR Header processing as described in [I-D.ietf-6man-segment-routing-header] and [I-D.ietf-spring-srv6-network-programming], the SR Segment Endpoint node performs the following IOAM operations.

If an intermediate SR segment endpoint node is not capable of processing IOAM TLV, it simply ignores it. I.e., it does not have to look or process SRH TLV.

If an intermediate SR segment endpoint node is capable of processing IOAM TLV and the local SID supports IOAM data recording, it checks if any SRH TLV is present in the packet using procedures defined in [I-D.ietf-6man-segment-routing-header]. If the node finds IOAM TLV in the SRH it finds the local index at which it is expected to record the IOAM data. The local index is found using the SRH.SL field. The node records the IOAM data at the desired preallocated space.
4.3. Egress Node

The Egress node is the last node in the segment-list of the SRH. When IOAM data from the Egress node is desired, a USP SID advertised by the Egress node is used by the Ingress node.

The processing of IOAM TLV at the Egress node is similar to the processing of IOAM TLV at the SR Segment Endpoint Node. The only difference is that the Egress node may telemeter the IOAM data to an external entity.

5. IANA Considerations

IANA is requested to allocate a mutable SRH TLV Type for IOAM TLV data fields under registry name "Segment Routing Header TLVs" requested by [I-D.6man-segment-routing-header].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRH TLV Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBA1 Greater than 128</td>
<td>TLV for IOAM Data Fields</td>
<td>This document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Security Considerations

The security considerations of SRv6 are discussed in [I-D.spring-srv6-network-programming] and [I-D.6man-segment-routing-header], and the security considerations of IOAM in general are discussed in [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data].

IOAM is considered a "per domain" feature, where one or several operators decide on leveraging and configuring IOAM according to their needs. Still, operators need to properly secure the IOAM domain to avoid malicious configuration and use, which could include injecting malicious IOAM packets into a domain.
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1  Background

To assess performance problems, measurements based on marking, sequence numbers and timing may be embedded in each packet. Such measurements may be interpreted in real-time or after the fact.

As defined in RFC8200 [RFC8200], destination options are carried by the IPv6 Destination Options extension header. Destination options include information that need be examined only by the IPv6 node given as the destination address in the IPv6 header, not by routers or "middle boxes".

RFC8200 [RFC8200] additionally defines the IPv6 Hop-by-Hop (HBH) Options extension header. This header may be processed and examined by end nodes, routers and "middle boxes".

This document specifies both the Marking Performance and Diagnostic Metrics (M-PDM) destination option as well as the M-PDM HBH Option.

1.1 Terminology

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].

1.2 Rationale for defined solution

The M-PDM Destination Option and M-PDM Hop-By-Hop Option are a combining of PDM [RFC8250] with Marking [RFC8321] to obtain path and middle box information.

The Marking Field is designed as:

The 2 currently used bits from the 8 bit Marking field are designated as Mark Field (MF).

```
+-----------------+
| reserved | MF |
+-----------------+
```

Mark Field (MF) is:

```
+----------+
|  S  |  D  |
+----------+
```
1.2.1 Alternate Marking Method Operation

[RFC8321] describes in detail the methodology, that we briefly illustrate also here.

1.2.1.1 Single Mark Measurement

As explained in the [RFC8321], marking can be applied to delineate blocks of packets based either on equal number of packets in a block or based on equal time interval. The latter method offers better control as it allows better account for capabilities of downstream nodes to report statistics related to batches of packets and, at the same time, time resolution that affects defect detection interval.

If the Single Mark measurement used, then the D flag MUST be set to zero on transmit and ignored by monitoring point.

The S flag is used to create alternate flows to measure the packet loss by switching value of the S flag. Delay metrics MAY be calculated with the alternate flow using any of the following methods:

- First/Last Batch Packet Delay calculation: timestamps are collected based on order of arrival so this method is sensitive to packet loss and re-ordering.

- Average Packet Delay calculation: an average delay is calculated by considering the average arrival time of the packets within a single block. This method only provides single metric for the duration of the block and it doesn’t give information about the delay distribution.

1.2.2 Double Mark Measurement

Double Mark method allows more detailed measurement of delays for the monitored flow but it requires more nodal and network resources. If the Double Mark method used, then the S flag MUST be used to create the alternate flow. The D flag MUST be used to mark single packets to measure delay jitter.

The first marking (S flag alternation) is needed for packet loss and also for average delay measurement. The second marking (D flag is put to one) creates a new set of marked packets that are fully identified and dedicated for delay. This method is useful to have not only the average delay but also to know more about the statistic distribution of delay values.
1.3 IPv6 Transition Technologies

In the path to full implementation of IPv6, transition technologies such as translation or tunneling may be employed. It is possible that an IPv6 packet containing M-PDM may be dropped if using IPv6 transition technologies. For example, an implementation using a translation technique (IPv6 to IPv4) which does not support or recognize the IPv6 Destination Options extension header or a new HBH option may simply drop the packet rather than translating it without the extension header.

It is also possible that some devices in the network may not correctly handle multiple IPv6 Extension Headers, including the IPv6 Destination Option. For example, adding the PDM header to a packet may push the layer 4 information to a point in the packet where it is not visible to filtering logic, and may be dropped. This kind of situation is expected to become rare over time.

2 Measurement Information Derived from PDM

Each packet contains information about the sender and receiver. In IP protocol, the identifying information is called a "5-tuple".

The 5-tuple consists of:

SADDR : IP address of the sender
SPORT : Port for sender
DADDR : IP address of the destination
DPORT : Port for destination
PROTC : Protocol for upper layer (ex. TCP, UDP, ICMP, etc.)

The PDM contains the following base fields:

PSNTP : Packet Sequence Number This Packet
PSNLR : Packet Sequence Number Last Received
DELTATLR : Delta Time Last Received
DELTATLS : Delta Time Last Sent

This information, combined with the 5-tuple, allows the measurement of the following metrics:

1. Round-trip delay
2. Server delay

These are further described in RFC8250 [RFC8250].

Performance measurements described in [RFC8321] are allowed.
3 Marking and Performance and Diagnostic Metrics (M-PDM) Destination Option Layout

3.1 Destination Options Header

The IPv6 Destination Options Header is used to carry information that needs to be examined only by a packet’s destination node(s). The Destination Options Header is identified by a Next Header value of 60 in the immediately preceding header and is defined in RFC8200 [RFC8200]. The IPv6 Marking and Performance and Diagnostic Metrics Destination Option (M-PDM) is implemented as an IPv6 Option carried in the Destination Options Header. M-PDM does not require time synchronization.

3.2 Marking and Performance and Diagnostic Metrics (M-PDM) Destination Option

3.2.1 M-PDM Layout

The IPv6 Marking and Performance and Diagnostic Metrics Destination Option (M-PDM) contains the following fields:

- PSNTP : Packet Sequence Number This Packet
- PSNLR : Packet Sequence Number Last Received
- DELTATLR : Delta Time Last Received
- DELTATLS : Delta Time Last Sent

PDM has alignment requirements. Following the convention in IPv6, these options are aligned in a packet so that multi-octet values within the Option Data field of each option fall on natural boundaries (i.e., fields of width n octets are placed at an integer multiple of n octets from the start of the header, for n = 1, 2, 4, or 8) [RFC8200].

The M-PDM destination option is encoded in type-length-value (TLV) format as follows:

```
0                   1                   2                   3
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|  Option Type  | Option Length | Vrsn | RSVD |      Marking   |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|   PSN This Packet             |  PSN Last Received            |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|  Delta Time Last Sent         |  Delta Time Last Received     |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```
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Option Type

TBD = 0xXX (TBD) [To be assigned by IANA] [RFC2780]

In keeping with RFC8200 [RFC8200], the two high-order bits of the Option Type field are encoded to indicate specific processing of the option; for the PDM destination option, these two bits MUST be set to 00.

The third high-order bit of the Option Type field specifies whether or not the Option Data of that option can change en route to the packet’s final destination.

In M-PDM, the value of the third high-order bit MUST be 0.

Option Length

8-bit unsigned integer. Length of the option, in octets, excluding the Option Type and Option Length fields. This field MUST be set to 10.

Version

4-bit unsigned integer.

Reserved

4-bit unsigned integer.

Marking

8-bit unsigned integer. (2 currently used - 6 reserved)

Packet Sequence Number This Packet (PSNTP)

16-bit unsigned integer. This field will wrap. It is intended for use while analyzing packet traces.

This field is initialized at a random number and incremented monotonically for each packet of the session flow of the IP stack. The random-number initialization is intended to make it harder to spoof and insert such packets.
Packet Sequence Number Last Received (PSNLR)
16-bit unsigned integer. This is the PSNTP of the packet last received by the IP stack.
This field is initialized to 0.

Delta Time Last Sent (DELTATLS)
16-bit unsigned integer.
Delta Time Last Sent = (receive time packet n - send time packet (n - 1))

Delta Time Last Received (DELTATLR)
16-bit unsigned integer.
Delta Time Last Received = (send time packet n - receive time packet (n - 1))

3.2.2 Base Unit for Time Measurement
Fixed base. TBD. [More information needs to be added here.]

3.3 Header Placement
The M-PDM Destination Option is placed as defined in RFC8200 [RFC8200]. There may be a choice of where to place the Destination Options header. If using ESP mode, please see section 3.4 of this document for placement of the M-PDM Destination Options header.

For each IPv6 packet header, the M-PDM MUST NOT appear more than once. However, an encapsulated packet MAY contain a separate M-PDM associated with each encapsulated IPv6 header.

3.4 Header Placement Using IPSec ESP Mode
IPSec Encapsulating Security Payload (ESP) is defined in [RFC4303] and is widely used. Section 3.1.1 of [RFC4303] discusses placement of Destination Options Headers.

The placement of M-PDM is different depending on if ESP is used in tunnel or transport mode.
In ESP case, no 5-tuple is available, as there are no port numbers. ESP flow should be identified only by using SADDR, DADDR and PROTOC. The SPI numbers SHOULD be ignored when considering the flow over which M-PDM information is measured.

3.4.1 Using ESP Transport Mode

Note that Destination Options may be placed before or after ESP or both. If using M-PDM in ESP transport mode, M-PDM MUST be placed after the ESP header so as not to leak information.

3.4.2 Using ESP Tunnel Mode

Note that Destination Options may be placed before or after ESP or both in both the outer set of IP headers and the inner set of IP headers. A tunnel endpoint that creates a new packet may decide to use M-PDM independent of the use of M-PDM of the original packet to enable delay measurements between the two tunnel endpoints.

3.5 Implementation Considerations

3.5.1 M-PDM Activation

An implementation should provide an interface to enable or disable the use of M-PDM. This specification recommends having M-PDM off by default.

M-PDM MUST NOT be turned on merely if a packet is received with an M-PDM header. The received packet could be spoofed by another device.

3.5.2 M-PDM Timestamps

The M-PDM timestamps are intended to isolate wire time from server or host time, but may necessarily attribute some host processing time to network latency.

RFC2330 [RFC2330] "Framework for IP Performance Metrics" describes two notions of wire time in section 10.2. These notions are only defined in terms of an Internet host H observing an Internet link L at a particular location:

+ For a given IP packet P, the ‘wire arrival time’ of P at H on L is the first time T at which any bit of P has appeared at H’s observational position on L.
For a given IP packet P, the ‘wire exit time’ of P at H on L is the first time T at which all the bits of P have appeared at H’s observational position on L.

This specification does not define the exact H’s observing position on L. That is left for the deployment setups to define. However, the position where PDM timestamps are taken SHOULD be as close to the physical network interface as possible. Not all implementations will be able to achieve the ideal level of measurement.

3.6 Dynamic Configuration Options

If the M-PDM destination options extension header is used, then it MAY be turned on for all packets flowing through the host, applied to an upper-layer protocol (TCP, UDP, SCTP, etc), a local port, or IP address only. These are at the discretion of the implementation.

3.7 Information Access and Storage

Measurement information provided by M-PDM may be made accessible for higher layers or the user itself. Similar to activating the use of M-PDM, the implementation may also provide an interface to indicate if received.

M-PDM information may be stored, if desired. If a packet with M-PDM information is received and the information should be stored, the upper layers may be notified. Furthermore, the implementation should define a configurable maximum lifetime after which the information can be removed as well as a configurable maximum amount of memory that should be allocated for PDM information.
4 M-PDM HBH Option

The M-PDM Hop-by-Hop option is encoded in type-length-value (TLV) format. It has an alignment requirement of 4n + 2. (See [IPv6, Section 4.2] for discussion of option alignment.) The option has the following format:

```
0                   1                   2                   3
 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|  Option Type  | Option Length |Version|LastM |M | MType |     |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
                     | Middlebox Identifier          | Timestamp In                 |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
                     | Timestamp Out                | PSN This Packet              |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
                     | Middlebox Identifier          | Timestamp In                 |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
                     | Timestamp Out                | PSN This Packet              |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
                     | Middlebox Identifier          | Timestamp In                 |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
                     | Timestamp Out                | PSN This Packet              |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
                     | Middlebox Identifier          | Timestamp In                 |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
                     | Timestamp Out                | PSN This Packet              |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
                     | Middlebox Identifier          | Timestamp In                 |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
                     | Timestamp Out                | PSN This Packet              |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
                     | Middlebox Identifier          | Timestamp In                 |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
                     | Timestamp Out                | PSN This Packet              |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
                     | Middlebox Identifier          | Timestamp In                 |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
                     | Timestamp Out                | PSN This Packet              |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
                     | Middlebox Identifier          | Timestamp In                 |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
                     | Timestamp Out                | PSN This Packet              |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
                     | Middlebox Identifier          | Timestamp In                 |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
                     | Timestamp Out                | PSN This Packet              |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

**Option Type**

TBD = 0xXX (TBD)  [To be assigned by IANA] [RFC2780]

In keeping with RFC 8200 [RFC8200], the two high-order bits of the Option Type field are encoded to indicate specific processing of the option; for the M-PDM HBH option, these two bits MUST be set to 00.

The third high-order bit of the Option Type field specifies whether or not the Option Data of that option can change en route to the packet's final destination.

In M-PDM, the value of the third high-order bit MUST be 0.
Option Length

8-bit unsigned integer. Length of the option, in octets, excluding the Option Type and Option Length fields. This field MUST be set to 10.

Version

4-bit unsigned integer.

Last Middlebox

4-bit unsigned integer. Indicates which middlebox number was last done. For example, 3 would indicate that this is the third middlebox. This field could be used to quickly find which set of data to fill. If there have been more than 5 middleboxes, then wrapping will happen and fields will get overwritten.

Marking

2-bit unsigned integer.

Marking Type (M-Type)

4-bit unsigned integer. This indicates the type of marking method being used for the timestamp.

If marking is not used, then the timestamp will be when the packet left the IP interface on this middlebox.

If marking method is used, then this field will contain:

1 - the timestamp of the first packet of a marked batch
2 - the average timestamp of the packets of a batch
3 - a double-marked packet

RSVD

2-bit unsigned integer

Middle Box Identifier

16-bit unsigned integer.
This field MUST be zero if not used. The zeros are intended to make it harder to leak data via the HBH header.

This could be some portion of the IPv4 or IPv6 address or the router ID. [Note to readers: any suggestions for this field are most welcome!]

Timestamp In

16-bit unsigned integer. This can be the timestamp of the packet received by the IP interface on this middlebox. If marking method is used, it can identify the timestamp of the first packet of a marked batch or the average timestamp of the packets of a batch or a double-marked packet, depending on which method is used to perform delay measurements.

This field is initialized to 0.

This timestamp is the delta in nanoseconds from the initial starting timestamp of January 1, 2019 00:00:00.0000000000.

See the section on HBH Timestamps for more on this measurement.

Timestamp Out

16-bit unsigned integer. This can be the timestamp of the packet left the IP interface on this middlebox. If marking method is used, it can identify the timestamp of the first packet of a marked batch or the average timestamp of the packets of a batch or a double-marked packet, depending on which method is used to perform delay measurements.

This field is initialized to 0.

This timestamp is the delta in nanoseconds from the initial starting timestamp of January 1, 2019 00:00:00.0000000000.

See the section on HBH Timestamps for more on this measurement.

Packet Sequence Number This Packet (PSNTP)

16-bit unsigned integer. This field will wrap. It is intended for use while analyzing packet traces.

This field is initialized at a random number and incremented monotonically for each packet of the session flow of the IP stack.
The random-number initialization is intended to make it harder to spoof and insert such packets.

4.1 HBH Timestamps In and Out

The timestamp fields will contain the 16 high-order or most significant bits of the delta between a fixed starting value of January 1, 2019 00:00:00.0000000000 and the current time at the middlebox.

For more on truncation of timestamp values, please see [TCPM].

5 Security Considerations

M-PDM may introduce some new security weaknesses.

5.1 Resource Consumption and Resource Consumption Attacks

M-PDM needs to calculate the deltas for time and keep track of the sequence numbers. This means that control blocks which reside in memory may be kept at the end hosts per 5-tuple.

A limit on how much memory is being used SHOULD be implemented. Without a memory limit, any time a control block is kept in memory, an attacker can try to misuse the control blocks to cause excessive resource consumption. This could be used to compromise the end host.

M-PDM as a Destination is used at the end hosts and memory is used only at the end host M-PDM as an HBH header is used at routers or middle boxes.

5.2 Pervasive monitoring

Since M-PDM passes in the clear, a concern arises as to whether the data can be used to fingerprint the system or somehow obtain information about the contents of the payload.

Let us discuss fingerprinting of the end host first. It is possible that seeing the pattern of deltas or the absolute values could give some information as to the speed of the end host – that is, if it is a very fast system or an older, slow device. This may be useful to the attacker. However, if the attacker has access to PDM, the attacker also has access to the entire packet and could make such a deduction based merely on the time frames elapsed between packets WITHOUT PDM.

As far as deducing the content of the payload, in terms of the
application level information such as web page, user name, user password and so on, it appears to us that PDM is quite unhelpful in this regard. Having said that, the ability to separate wire-time from processing time may potentially provide an attacker with additional information. It is conceivable that an attacker could attempt to deduce the type of application in use by noting the server time and payload length. Some encryption algorithms attempt to obfuscate the packet length to avoid just such vulnerabilities. In the future, encryption algorithms may wish to obfuscate the server time as well.

5.3 M-PDM as a Covert Channel

PDM provides a set of fields in the packet which could be used to leak data. But, there is no real reason to suspect that PDM would be chosen rather than another part of the payload or another Extension Header.

A firewall or another device could sanity check the fields within the PDM but randomly assigned sequence numbers and delta times might be expected to vary widely. The biggest problem though is how an attacker would get access to PDM in the first place to leak data. The attacker would have to either compromise the end host or have Man in the Middle (MitM). It is possible that either one could change the fields. But, then the other end host would get sequence numbers and deltas that don’t make any sense.

It is conceivable that someone could compromise an end host and make it start sending packets with PDM without the knowledge of the host. But, again, the bigger problem is the compromise of the end host. Once that is done, the attacker probably has better ways to leak data.

Having said that, if a PDM aware middle box or an implementation (destination host) detects some number of "nonsensical" sequence numbers or timing information, it could take action to block, discard, or alert on this traffic.

5.4 Timing Attacks

The fact that PDM can help in the separation of node processing time from network latency brings value to performance monitoring. Yet, it is this very characteristic of PDM which may be misused to make certain new type of timing attacks against protocols and implementations possible.

Depending on the nature of the cryptographic protocol used, it may be possible to leak the credentials of the device. For example, if an
attacker can see that PDM is being used, then the attacker might use PDM to launch a timing attack against the keying material used by the cryptographic protocol.

An implementation may want to be sure that PDM is enabled only for certain IP addresses, or only for some ports. Additionally, the implementation SHOULD require an explicit restart of monitoring after a certain time period (for example for 1 hour), to make sure that PDM is not accidentally left on after debugging has been done etc.

Even so, if using PDM, a user "Consent to be Measured" SHOULD be a pre-requisite for using PDM. Consent is common in enterprises and with some subscription services. The actual content of "Consent to be Measured" will differ by site but it SHOULD make clear that the traffic is being measured for quality of service and to assist in diagnostics as well as to make clear that there may be potential risks of certain vulnerabilities if the traffic is captured during a diagnostic session.

6 IANA Considerations

This draft requests an Destination Option Type assignment with the act bits set to 00 and the chg bit set to 0 from the Destination Options and Hop-by-Hop Options sub-registry of Internet Protocol Version 6 (IPv6) Parameters [ref to RFCs and URL below.

http://www.iana.org/assignments/ipv6-parameters/ipv6-parameters.xhtml#ipv6-parameters-2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hex Value</th>
<th>Binary Value</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Performance and Diagnostic Metrics (M-PDM)</td>
<td>[This draft]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Abstract

The Alternate Marking method, as presented in RFC 8321 [RFC8321], can be applied only to point-to-point flows because it assumes that all the packets of the flow measured on one node are measured again by a single second node. This document aims to generalize and expand this methodology to measure any kind of unicast flows, whose packets can follow several different paths in the network, in wider terms a multipoint-to-multipoint network. For this reason the technique here described is called Multipoint Alternate Marking. Some definitions here introduced extend the scope of RFC 5644 [RFC5644] in the context of alternate marking schema.

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].

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 31, 2018.
1. Introduction

The alternate marking method, as presented until now, is applicable to a point-to-point path; so the extension proposed in this document explains the most general case of multipoint-to-multipoint path and
enables flexible and adaptive performance measurements in a managed network.

The Alternate Marking methodology described in RFC 8321 [RFC8321] has the property to synchronize measurements in different points maintaining the coherence of the counters. So it is possible to show what is happening in every marking period for each monitored flow. The monitoring parameters are the packet counter and timestamps of a flow for each marking period.

There are some applications of the alternate marking method where there are a lot of monitored flows and nodes. Multipoint Alternate Marking aims to reduce these values and makes the performance monitoring more flexible in case a detailed analysis is not needed. For instance, by considering n measurement points and m monitored flows, the order of magnitude of the packet counters for each time interval is n*m*2 (1 per color). If both n and m are high values the packet counters increase a lot and Multipoint Alternate Marking offers a tool to control these parameters.

The approach presented in this document is applied only to unicast flows and not to multicast. BUM (Boradcast Unkown Unicast Multicast) traffic is not considered here, because traffic replication is not covered by the Multipoint Alternate Marking method.

Alternate Marking method works by definition for multipoint to multipoint paths but the network clustering approach presented in this document is the formalization of how to implement this property and it allows a flexible and optimized performance measurement support.

Without network clustering, it is possible to apply alternate marking only for all the network or per single flow. Instead, with network clustering, it is possible to use the network clusters partition at different levels to perform the needed degree of detail. In some circumstances it is possible to monitor a Multipoint Network by analyzing the Network Clustering, without examining in depth. In case of problems (packet loss is measured or the delay is too high) the filtering criteria could be specified more in order to perform a detailed analysis by using a different combination of clusters up to a per-flow measurement as described in RFC 8321 [RFC8321].

An application could be the Software Defined Network (SDN) paradigm where the SDN Controllers are the brains of the network and can manage flow control to the switches and routers and, in the same way, can calibrate the performance measurements depending on the necessity. An SDN Controller Application can orchestrate how deep the network performance monitoring is setup.
2. Correlation with RFC5644

RFC 5644 [RFC5644] is limited to active measurements using a single source packet or stream, and observations of corresponding packets along the path (spatial), at one or more destinations (one-to-group), or both. Instead, the scope of this memo is to define multiparty metrics for passive and hybrid measurements in a group-to-group topology with multiple sources and destinations.

RFC 5644 [RFC5644] introduces metric names that can be reused also here but have to be extended and rephrased to be applied to the alternate marking schema:

a. the multiparty metrics are not only one-to-group metrics but can be also group-to-group metrics;

b. the spatial metrics, used for measuring the performance of segments of a source to destination path, are applied here to group-to-group segments (called Clusters).

3. Flow classification

An unicast flow is identified by all the packets having a set of common characteristics. This definition is inspired by RFC 7011 [RFC7011].

As an example, by considering a flow as all the packets sharing the same source IP address or the same destination IP address, it is easy to understand that the resulting pattern will not be a point-to-point connection, but a point-to-multipoint or multipoint-to-point connection.

In general a flow can be defined by a set of selection rules used to match a subset of the packets processed by the network device. These rules specify a set of headers fields (Identification Fields) and the relative values that must be found in matching packets.

The choice of the identification fields directly affects the type of paths that the flow would follow in the network. In fact, it is possible to relate a set of identification fields with the pattern of the resulting graphs, as listed in Figure 1.

A TCP 5-tuple usually identifies flows following either a single path or a point-to-point multipath (in case of load balancing). On the contrary, a single source address selects flows following a point-to-multipoint, while a multipoint-to-point can be the result of a matching on a single destination address. In case a selection rule and its reverse are used for bidirectional measurements, they can
correspond to a point-to-multipoint in one direction and a multipoint-to-point in the opposite direction.

In this way the flows to be monitored are selected into the monitoring points using packet selection rules, that can also change the pattern of the monitored network.

The alternate marking method is applicable only to a single path (and partially to a one-to-one multipath), so the extension proposed in this document is suitable also for the most general case of multipoint-to-multipoint, which embraces all the other patterns of Figure 1.

```
point-to-point single path
+-------+      +-------+      +-------+
---<>  R1  <>----<>  R2  <>----<>  R3  <>---
     +-------+      +-------+      +-------+

point-to-point multipath
     +-------+
     <>  R2  <>
     / +-------+  /
     +-------+  \
---<>  R1  <>    <>  R4  <>---
     +-------+
     / +-------+  /
     \ +-------+  /
     <>  R3  <>
     +-------+

point-to-multipoint
     +-------+
     <>  R4  <>---
     / +-------+
     +-------+
     <>  R2  <>
     / +-------+  /
     +-------+  \
---<>  R1  <>    <>  R5  <>---
     +-------+  /
     \ +-------+  /
     <>  R3  <>
     +-------+
     <>  R6  <>---
     +-------+
```
4. Multipoint Performance Measurement

By using the "traditional" alternate marking method only point-to-point paths can be monitored. To have an IP (TCP/UDP) flow that follows a point-to-point path we have to define, with a specific value, 5 identification fields (IP Source, IP Destination, Transport Protocol, Source Port, Destination Port).

Multipoint Alternate Marking enables the performance measurement for multipoint flows selected by identification fields without any
constraints (even the entire network production traffic). It is also possible to use multiple marking points for the same monitored flow.

4.1. Monitoring Network

The Monitoring Network is deduced from the Production Network, by identifying the nodes of the graph that are the measurement points, and the links that are the connections between measurement points.

There are some techniques that can help with the building of the monitoring network (as an example it is possible to mention [I-D.amf-ippm-route]). In general there are different options: the monitoring network can be obtained by considering all the possible paths for the traffic or also by checking the traffic sometimes and update the graph consequently.

So a graph model of the monitoring network can be built according to the alternate marking method: the monitored interfaces and links are identified. Only the measurement points and links where the traffic has flowed have to be represented in the graph.

The following figure shows a simple example of a Monitoring Network graph:
Figure 2: Monitoring Network Graph

Each monitoring point is characterized by the packet counter that refers only to a marking period of the monitored flow.

The same is applicable also for the delay but it will be described in the following sections.

5. Multipoint Packet Loss

Since all the packets of the considered flow leaving the network have previously entered the network, the number of packets counted by all the input nodes is always greater or equal than the number of packets counted by all the output nodes.

And in case of no packet loss occurring in the marking period, if all the input and output points of the network domain to be monitored are measurement points, the sum of the number of packets on all the ingress interfaces and on all the egress interfaces is the same. In this circumstance, if no packet loss occurs, the intermediate measurement points have only the task to split the measurement.

It is possible to define the Network Packet Loss (for 1 flow, for 1 period): <<In a packet network, the number of lost packets is the
number of packets counted by the input nodes minus the number of packets counted by the output nodes. This is true for every packet flow in each marking period.

The Monitored Network Packet Loss with n input nodes and m output nodes is given by:

$$PL = (P_{I1} + P_{I2} +...+ P_{In}) - (P_{O1} + P_{O2} +...+ P_{Om})$$

where:

- **PL** is the Network Packet Loss (number of lost packets)
- **P_{Ii}** is the Number of packets flowed through the i-th Input node in this period
- **P_{Oj}** is the Number of packets flowed through the j-th Output node in this period

The equation is applied on a per-time-interval basis.

6. Network Clustering

The previous Equation can determine the number of packets lost globally in the monitored network, exploiting only the data provided by the counters in the input and output nodes.

In addition it is also possible to leverage the data provided by the other counters in the network to converge on the smallest identifiable subnetworks where the losses occur. These subnetworks are named Clusters.

A Cluster graph is a subnetwork of the entire Monitoring Network graph that still satisfies the packet loss equation where PL in this case is the number of packets lost in the Cluster.

For this reason a Cluster should contain all the arcs emanating from its input nodes and all the arcs terminating at its output nodes. This ensures that we can count all the packets (and only those) exiting an input node again at the output node, whatever path they follow.

In a completely monitored network (a network where every network interface is monitored), each network device corresponds to a Cluster and each physical link corresponds to two Clusters (one for each direction).
Clusters can have different sizes depending on flow filtering criteria adopted.

Moreover, sometimes Clusters can be optionally simplified. For example when two monitored interfaces are divided by a single router (one is the input interface and the other is the output interface and the router has only these two interfaces), instead of counting exactly twice, upon entering and leaving, it is possible to consider a single measurement point (in this case we do not care of the internal packet loss of the router).

6.1. Algorithm for Cluster partition

A simple algorithm can be applied in order to split our monitoring network into Clusters. It is a two-step algorithm:

- Group the links where there is the same starting node;
- Join the grouped links with at least one ending node in common.

In our monitoring network graph example it is possible to identify the Clusters partition by applying this two-step algorithm.

The first step identifies the following groups:

1. Group 1: (R1-R2), (R1-R3), (R1-R10)
2. Group 2: (R2-R4), (R2-R5)
3. Group 3: (R3-R4), (R3-R9)
4. Group 4: (R4-R6), (R4-R7)
5. Group 5: (R5-R8)

And then, the second step builds the Clusters partition (in particular we can underline that Group 2 and Group 3 connect together, since R5 is in common):

1. Cluster 1: (R1-R2), (R1-R3), (R1-R10)
2. Cluster 2: (R2-R4), (R2-R5), (R3-R5), (R3-R9)
3. Cluster 3: (R4-R6), (R4-R7)
4. Cluster 4: (R5-R8)

In the end the following 4 Clusters are obtained:
Cluster 1

+------+
<>  R2  <>---
/ +------+

+------+
---<>  R1  <>----<>  R3  <>----
   +------+

\ +------+
<>  R10  <>---
+------+

Cluster 2

+------+
+------+

----<>  R2  <>----<>  R4  <>----
   +------+

   +------+
---<>  R3  <>----<>  R5  <>----
   +------+

   \ +------+
<>  R9  <>---
+------+

Cluster 3

+------+
<>  R6  <>---
/ +------+

+------+
----<>  R4  <>
   +------+

   \ +------+
<>  R7  <>---
+------+
There are Clusters with more than 2 nodes and two-nodes Clusters. In the two-nodes Clusters the loss is on the link (Cluster 4). In more-than-2-nodes Clusters the loss is on the Cluster but we cannot know in which link (Cluster 1, 2, 3).

In this way the calculation of packet loss can be made on Cluster basis. Note that CIR(Committed Information Rate) and EIR(Excess Information Rate) can also be deduced on Cluster basis.

Obviously, by combining some Clusters in a new connected subnetwork (called Super Cluster) the Packet Loss Rule is still true.

In this way in a very large network there is no need to configure detailed filter criteria to inspect the traffic. You can check multipoint network and only in case of problems you can go deep with a step-by-step cluster analysis, but only for the cluster or combination of clusters where the problem happens.

7. Timing Aspects

The mark switching approach based on a fixed timer is considered in this document.

So, if we analyze a multipoint-to-multipoint path with more than one marking node, it is important to recognize the reference measurement interval. In general the measurement interval for describing the results is the interval of the marking node that is more aligned with the start of the measurement, as reported in the following figure.
T(R1) is the measurement interval and this is essential in order to be compatible and make comparison with other active/passive/hybrid Packet Loss metrics.

That is why, when we expand to multipoint-to-multipoint flows, we have to consider that all source nodes mark the traffic.

Regarding the timing aspects of the methodology, RFC 8321 [RFC8321] already describes two contributions that are taken into account: the clock error between network devices and the network delay between measurement points.

But we should now consider an additional contribution. Since all source nodes mark the traffic, the source measurement intervals can be of different lengths and with different offsets and this mismatch $m$ can be added to $d$, as shown in figure.

So the misalignment between the marking source routers gives an additional constraint and the value of $m$ is added to $d$ (that already includes clock error and network delay).

In the end, the condition that must be satisfied to enable the method to function properly is that the available counting interval must be $> 0$, and that means: $L - 2m - 2d > 0$ for each measurement point on the multipoint path. Therefore, the mismatch between measurement intervals must satisfy this condition.
8. Multipoint Delay and Delay Variation

The same line of reasoning can be applied to Delay and Delay Variation. It is important to highlight that both delay and delay variation measurements make sense in a multipoint path. The Delay Variation is calculated by considering the same packets selected for measuring the Delay.

In general, it is possible to perform delay and delay variation measurements on multipoint paths basis or on single packets basis:

- Delay measurements on multipoint paths basis means that the delay value is representative of an entire multipoint path (e.g. whole multipoint network, a cluster or a combination of clusters).

- Delay measurements on single packets basis means that you can use multipoint path just to easily couple packets between inputs and output nodes of a multipoint path, as it is described in the following sections.

8.1. Delay measurements on multipoint paths basis

8.1.1. Single Marking measurement

Mean delay and mean delay variation measurements can also be generalized to the case of multipoint flows. It is possible to compute the average one-way delay of packets, in one block, in a cluster or in the entire monitored network.

The average latency can be measured as the difference between the weighted averages of the mean timestamps of the sets of output and input nodes.

8.2. Delay measurements on single packets basis

8.2.1. Single and Double Marking measurement

Delay and delay variation measurements relative to only one picked packet per period (both single and double marked) can be performed in the Multipoint scenario with some limitations:

- Single marking based on the first/last packet of the interval would not work, because it would not be possible to agree on the first packet of the interval.

- Double marking or multiplexed marking would work, but each measurement would only give information about the delay of a single path. However, by repeating the measurement multiple
times, it is possible to get information about all the paths in the multipoint flow. This can be done in case of point-to-multipoint path but it is more difficult to achieve in case of multipoint-to-multipoint path because of the multiple source routers.

if we would perform a delay measurement for more than one picked packet in the same marking period and, especially, if we want to get delay measurements on multipoint-to-multipoint basis, both single and double marking method are not useful in the Multipoint scenario, since they would not be representative of the entire flow. The packets can follow different paths with various delays and in general it can be very difficult to recognize marked packets in a multipoint-to-multipoint path especially in case they are more than one per period.

A desirable option is to monitor simultaneously all the paths of a multipoint path in the same marking period and, for this purpose, hashing can be used as reported in the next Section.

8.2.2. Hashing selection method


The hash-based selection methodologies for delay measurement can work in a multipoint-to-multipoint path and can be used both coupled to mean delay or stand alone.

[I-D.mizrahi-ippm-compact-alternate-marking] introduces how to use the Hash method combined with alternate marking method for point-to-point flows. It is also called Mixed Hashed Marking: the coupling of marking method and hashing technique is very useful because the marking batches anchor the samples selected with hashing and this simplifies the correlation of the hashing packets along the path.

It is possible to use a basic hash or a dynamic hash method. One of the challenges of the basic approach is that the frequency of the sampled packets may vary considerably. For this reason the dynamic approach has been introduced for point-to-point flow in order to have the desired and almost fixed number of samples for each measurement period. In the hash-based sampling, alternate marking is used to create periods, so that hash-based samples are divided into batches, allowing to anchor the selected samples to their period. Moreover in the dynamic hash-based sampling, by dynamically adapting the length of the hash value, the number of samples is bounded in each marking period. This can be realized by choosing the maximum number of samples (NMAX) to be caught in a marking period. The algorithm
starts with only few hash bits, that permit to select a greater percentage of packets (e.g. with 0 bit of hash all the packets are sampled, with 1 bit of hash half of the packets are sampled, and so on). When the number of selected packets reaches NMAX, a hashing bit is added. As a consequence, the sampling proceeds at half of the original rate and also the packets already selected that don’t match the new hash are discarded. This step can be repeated iteratively. It is assumed that each sample includes the timestamp (used for delay measurement) and the hash value, allowing the management system to match the samples received from the two measurement points. The dynamic process statistically converges at the end of a marking period and the final number of selected samples is between NMAX/2 and NMAX. Therefore, the dynamic approach paces the sampling rate, allowing to bound the number of sampled packets per sampling period.

In a multipoint environment the behaviour is similar to point-to-point flow. In particular, in the context of multipoint-to-multipoint flow, the dynamic hash could be the solution to perform delay measurements on specific packets and to overcome the single and double marking limitations.

The management system receives the samples including the timestamps and the hash value from all the MPs, and this happens both for point-to-point and for multipoint-to-multipoint flow. Then the longest hash used by MPs is deduced and it is applied to couple timestamps of same packets of 2 MPs of a point-to-point path or of input and output MPs of a Cluster (or a Super Cluster or the entire network). But some considerations are needed: if there isn’t packet loss the set of input samples is always equal to the set of output samples. In case of packet loss the set of output samples can be a subset of input samples but the method still works because, at the end, it is easy to couple the input and output timestamps of each caught packet using the hash (in particular the "unused part of the hash" that should be different for each packet).

In summary, the basic hash is logically similar to the double marking method, and in case of point-to-point path double marking and basic hash selection are equivalent. The dynamic approach scales the number of measurements per interval, and it would seem that double marking would also work well if we reduced the interval length, but this can be done only for point-to-point path and not for multipoint path, where we cannot couple the picked packets in a multipoint paths. So, in general, if we want to get delay mesurements on multipoint-to-multipoint path basis and want to select more than one packet per period, double marking cannot be used because we could not be able to couple the picked packets between input and output nodes. On the other hand we can do that by using hashing selection.
9. An SDN enabled Performance Management

The Multipoint Alternate Marking framework that is introduced in this document adds flexibility to PM because it can reduce the order of magnitude of the packet counters. This allows an SDN Orchestrator to supervise, control and manage PM in large networks.

The monitoring network can be considered as a whole or can be split in Clusters, that are the smallest subnetworks (group-to-group segments), maintaining the packet loss property for each subnetwork. They can also be combined in new connected subnetworks at different levels depending on the detail we want to achieve.

An SDN Controller can calibrate Performance Measurements. It can start without examining in depth. In case of necessity (packet loss is measured or the delay is too high), the filtering criteria could be immediately specified more in order to perform a partition of the network by using Clusters and/or different combinations of Clusters. In this way the problem can be localized in a specific Cluster or in a single combination of Clusters and a more detailed analysis can be performed step-by-step by successive approximation up to a point-to-point flow detailed analysis.

In addition an SDN Controller could also collect the measurement history.

10. Examples of application

There are three application fields where it may be useful to take into consideration the Multipoint Alternate Marking:

- **VPN**: The IP traffic is selected on IP source basis in both directions. At the end point WAN interface all the output traffic is counted in a single flow. The input traffic is composed by all the other flows aggregated for source address. So, by considering n end-points, the monitored flows are n (each flow with 1 ingress point and (n-1) egress points) instead of n*(n-1) flows (each flow, with 1 ingress point and 1 egress point);

- **Mobile Backhaul**: LTE traffic is selected, in the Up direction, by the EnodeB source address and, in Down direction, by the EnodeB destination address because the packets are sent from the Mobile Packet Core to the EnodeB. So the monitored flow is only one per EnodeB in both directions;

- **OTT (Over The Top) services**: The traffic is selected, in the Down direction by the source addresses of the packets sent by OTT Servers. In the opposite direction (Up) by the destination IP
addresses of the same Servers. So the monitoring is based on a single flow per OTT Servers in both directions.

11. Security Considerations

This document specifies a method to perform measurements that does not directly affect Internet security nor applications that run on the Internet. However, implementation of this method must be mindful of security and privacy concerns, as explained in RFC 8321 [RFC8321].
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1. Introduction

Service provider’s ability to satisfy Service Level Agreements (SLAs) depend on the ability to measure and monitor performance metrics for packet loss and one-way and two-way delay, as well as related metrics such as delay variation. The ability to monitor these performance metrics also provides operators with greater visibility into the performance characteristics of their networks, thereby facilitating planning, troubleshooting, and network performance evaluation.

[RFC6374] specifies protocol mechanisms to enable the efficient and accurate measurement of performance metrics in MPLS networks using probe messages. The One-Way Active Measurement Protocol (OWAMP) defined in [RFC4656] and Two-Way Active Measurement Protocol (TWAMP) defined in [RFC5357] provide capabilities for the measurement of various performance metrics in IP networks. However, mechanisms defined in [RFC6374] are more suitable for Segment Routing (SR) when using MPLS data plane (SR-MPLS). The [RFC6374] also supports IEEE 1588 timestamps [IEEE1588] and "direct mode" Loss Measurement (LM), which are required in SR networks.

[RFC7876] specifies the procedures to be used when sending and processing out-of-band performance measurement probe replies over an UDP return path when receiving RFC 6374 based probe queries. These procedures can be used to send out-of-band PM replies for both SR links and SR Policies [I-D.spring-segment-routing-policy] for one-way measurement.

This document reviews how probe based mechanisms defined in [RFC6374] can be used for Delay and Loss Performance Measurements (PM) in SR networks with MPLS data plane, for both SR links and end-to-end SR Policies. The performance measurements for SR links are used to compute extended Traffic Engineering (TE) metrics for delay and loss and are advertised in the network using routing protocol extensions.

2. Conventions Used in This Document

2.1. Abbreviations

ACH: Associated Channel Header.

DFlag: Data Format Flag.

DM: Delay Measurement.

ECMP: Equal Cost Multi-Path.
2.2. Reference Topology

In the reference topology shown in Figure 1, the querier node R1 initiates a performance measurement probe query and the responder node R5 sends a probe response for the query message received. The probe response is typically sent to the querier node R1. The nodes R1 and R5 may be directly connected via a link enabled with Segment Routing or there exists a Point-to-Point (P2P) SR Policy [I-D.spring-segment-routing-policy] on node R1 with destination to node R5. In case of Point-to-Multipoint (P2MP), SR Policy originating from source node R1 may terminate on multiple destination leaf nodes [I-D.spring-sr-p2mp-policy].

+-------+        Query        +-------+
|       | - - - - - - - - - ->|       |
|   R1  |---------------------|   R5  |
|       |<- - - - - - - - - - |       |
+-------+       Response      +-------+
Both delay and loss performance measurement is performed in-band for the traffic traversing between node R1 and node R5. One-way delay and two-way delay measurements are defined in Section 2.4 of [RFC6374]. Transmit and Receive packet loss measurements are defined in Section 2.2 and Section 2.6 of [RFC6374]. One-way loss measurement provides receive packet loss whereas two-way loss measurement provides both transmit and receive packet loss.

3. Probe Query and Response Packets

3.1. Probe Packet Header for SR-MPLS Policies

As described in Section 2.9.1 of [RFC6374], MPLS PM probe query and response messages flow over the MPLS Generic Associated Channel (G-ACh). A probe packet for an end-to-end measurement for SR Policy contains SR-MPLS label stack [I-D.spring-segment-routing-policy], with the G-ACh Label (GAL) at the bottom of the stack. The GAL is followed by an Associated Channel Header (ACH), which identifies the message type and the message payload following the ACH as shown in Figure 2.

```
  0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| Label(0) | EXP | S | TTL |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| Label(n) | EXP | S | TTL |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| GAL | EXP | S | TTL |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| 0 0 0 1 | Version | Reserved | GAL Channel Type |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

Figure 2: Probe Packet Header for an End-to-end SR-MPLS Policy

The SR-MPLS label stack can be empty to indicate Implicit NULL label case.

3.2. Probe Packet Header for SR-MPLS Links

As described in Section 2.9.1 of [RFC6374], MPLS PM probe query and...
response messages flow over the MPLS Generic Associated Channel (G-ACh). A probe packet for SR-MPLS links contains G-ACh Label (GAL). The GAL is followed by an Associated Channel Header (ACH), which identifies the message type, and the message payload following the ACH as shown in Figure 3.

```
0                   1                   2                   3
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                  GAL                  | EXP |S|      TTL      |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|0 0 0 1|Version|  Reserved     | GAL Channel Type              |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

Figure 3: Probe Packet Header for an SR-MPLS Link

3.3. Probe Response Message for SR-MPLS Links and Policies

3.3.1. One-way Measurement Probe Response Message

For one-way performance measurement [RFC7679], the PM querier node can receive "out-of-band" probe replies by properly setting the UDP Return Object (URO) TLV in the probe query message. The URO TLV (Type=131) is defined in [RFC7876] and includes the UDP-Destination-Port and IP Address. In particular, if the querier sets its own IP address in the URO TLV, the probe response is sent back by the responder node to the querier node. In addition, the "control code" in the probe query message is set to "out-of-band response requested". The "Source Address" TLV (Type 130), and "Return Address" TLV (Type 1), if present in the probe query message, are not used to send probe response message.

3.3.2. Two-way Measurement Probe Response Message

For two-way performance measurement [RFC6374], when using a bidirectional channel, the probe response message is sent back to the querier node in-band on the reverse direction SR Link or SR Policy using a message with format similar to their probe query message. In this case, the "control code" in the probe query message is set to "in-band response requested".

A path segment identifier [I-D.spring-mpls-path-segment] [I-D.pce-sr-path-segment] of the forward SR Policy can be used to find the reverse SR Policy to send the probe response message.

4. Performance Delay Measurement
4.1. Delay Measurement Message Format

As defined in [RFC6374], MPLS DM probe query and response messages use Associated Channel Header (ACH) (value 0x000C for delay measurement) [RFC6374], which identifies the message type, and the message payload following the ACH. For both SR links and end-to-end measurement for SR Policies, the same MPLS DM ACH value is used.

The DM message payload as defined in [RFC6374] is used for SR-MPLS delay measurement, for both SR links and end-to-end SR Policies. The DM message payload format is defined as following in [RFC6374]:

```
0                   1                   2                   3
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+------------------------------------------+
| Version| Flags | Control Code | Message Length |
+------------------------------------------+
| QTF   | RTF   | RPTF | Reserved |
+------------------------------------------+
| Session Identifier | DS |
+-----------------------------+
| Timestamp 1 |
+-------------+
+--------------------------+
| Timestamp 2 |
+---------------+
+--------------------------+
| Timestamp 3 |
+---------------+
+--------------------------+
| Timestamp 4 |
+-------------+
+-----------------------------+
| TLV Block |
+-------------+
```

Figure 4: Delay Measurement Message Payload Format

The meanings of the fields are summarized in the following table, see [RFC6374] for details.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Version</td>
<td>Protocol version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flags</td>
<td>Message control flags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Code</td>
<td>Code identifying the query or response type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QTF</td>
<td>Querier timestamp format</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2. Timestamps

The Section 3.4 of [RFC6374] defines timestamp format that can be used for delay measurement. The IEEE 1588 Precision Time Protocol (PTP) timestamp format [IEEE1588] is used by default as described in Appendix A of [RFC6374], but it may require hardware support. As an alternative, Network Time Protocol (NTP) timestamp format can also be used [RFC6374].

Note that for one-way delay measurement, clock synchronization between the querier and responder nodes using the methods detailed in [RFC6374] is required. The two-way delay measurement does not require clock synchronization between the querier and responder nodes.

5. Performance Loss Measurement

The LM protocol can perform two distinct kinds of loss measurement as described in Section 2.9.8 of [RFC6374].

- In inferred mode, LM will measure the loss of specially generated test messages in order to infer the approximate data plane loss level. Inferred mode LM provides only approximate loss accounting.

- In direct mode, LM will directly measure data plane packet loss. Direct mode LM provides perfect loss accounting, but may require
hardware support.

For both of these modes of LM, path segment identifier [I-D.spring-mpls-path-segment] [I-D.pce-sr-path-segment] is required for accounting received traffic on the egress node of the SR-MPLS Policy.

5.1. Loss Measurement Message Format

As defined in [RFC6374], MPLS LM probe query and response messages use Associated Channel Header (ACH) (value 0x000A for direct loss measurement or value 0x000B for inferred loss measurement), which identifies the message type, and the message payload following the ACH. For both SR links and end-to-end measurement for SR Policies, the same MPLS LM ACH value is used.

The LM message payload as defined in [RFC6374] is used for SR-MPLS loss measurement, for both SR links and end-to-end SR Policies. The LM message payload format is defined as following in [RFC6374]:

```
 0                   1                   2                   3
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|Version| Flags |  Control Code |        Message Length         |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| DFlags|  OTF  |                   Reserved                    |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                       Session Identifier          |    DS     |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                        Origin Timestamp                       |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                           Counter 1                           |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                           .                                |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                           Counter 4                           |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                        - TLV Block                        |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

Figure 5: Loss Measurement Message Payload Format

The meanings of the fields are summarized in the following table, see...
Field                 Meaning
--------------------  ----------------------------------------------
Version               Protocol version
Flags                 Message control flags
Control Code          Code identifying the query or response type
Message Length        Total length of this message in bytes
Data Format Flags     Flags specifying the format of message data
(DFlags)
Origin Timestamp      Format of the Origin Timestamp field
Format (OTF)
Reserved              Reserved for future specification
Session Identifier    Set arbitrarily by the querier
Differentiated       Differentiated Services Code Point (DSCP)
Services (DS) Field   being measured
Origin Timestamp      64-bit field for query message transmission
timestamp
Counter 1-4           64-bit fields for LM counter values
TLV Block             Optional block of Type-Length-Value fields

6. Performance Measurement for P2MP SR Policies

The procedures for delay and loss measurement described in this document for Point-to-Point (P2P) SR-MPLS Policies are also equally applicable to the Point-to-Multipoint (P2MP) SR Policies.

The responder node may add the "Source Address" TLV (Type 130) [RFC6374] in the probe response message. This TLV allows the querier node to identify the responder node for the SR Policy.

7. SR Link Extended TE Metrics Advertisements

The extended TE metrics for SR link delay and loss computed using the performance measurement procedures reviewed in this document can be
advertised in the routing domain as follows:

- For OSPF, ISIS, and BGP-LS, protocol extensions defined in [RFC7471], [RFC7810], [I-D.lsr-isis-rfc7810bis], and [I-D.idr-te-pm-bgp] are used, respectively for advertising the extended TE link metrics in the network.

- The extended TE link delay metrics advertised are minimum-delay, maximum-delay, average-delay, and delay-variance for one-way.

- The delay-variance metric is computed as specified in Section 4.2 of [RFC5481].

- The one-way delay metrics can be computed using two-way measurement by dividing the measured delay values by 2.

- The extended TE link loss metric advertised is one-way percentage packet loss.

8. Security Considerations

This document reviews the procedures for performance delay and loss measurement for SR-MPLS networks, for both links and end-to-end SR Policies using the mechanisms defined in [RFC6374]. This document does not introduce any additional security considerations other than those covered in [RFC6374], [RFC7471], [RFC7810], and [RFC7876].

9. IANA Considerations

This document does not require any IANA actions.
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Abstract

Segment Routing (SR) is applicable to both Multiprotocol Label Switching (SR-MPLS) and IPv6 (SRv6) data planes. This document specifies procedures for using UDP path for sending and processing in-band probe query and response messages for Performance Measurement. The procedure uses the RFC 6374 defined mechanisms for Delay and Loss performance measurement. The procedure specified is applicable to SR-MPLS and SRv6 data planes for both links and end-to-end measurement for SR Policies. This document also defines mechanisms for handling Equal Cost Multipaths (ECMPs) for SR Policies. In addition, this document defines Return Path Segment List TLV for two-way performance measurement and Block Number TLV for loss measurement.

Status of This Memo
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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 http://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."
1. Introduction

Segment Routing (SR) technology greatly simplifies network operations for Software Defined Networks (SDNs). SR is applicable to both Multiprotocol Label Switching (SR-MPLS) and IPv6 (SRv6) data planes. SR takes advantage of the Equal-Cost Multipaths (ECMPs) between source, transit and destination nodes. SR Policies as defined in [I-D.spring-segment-routing-policy] are used to steer traffic through a specific, user-defined path using a stack of Segments. Built-in SR Performance Measurement (PM) is one of the essential requirements to provide Service Level Agreements (SLAs).

The One-Way Active Measurement Protocol (OWAMP) defined in [RFC4656] and Two-Way Active Measurement Protocol (TWAMP) defined in [RFC5357] provide capabilities for the measurement of various performance metrics in IP networks. These protocols rely on control channel signaling to establish a test channel over an UDP path. These protocols lack support for IEEE 1588 timestamp [IEEE1588] format and direct-mode Loss Measurement (LM), which are required in SR networks [RFC6374]. The Simple Two-way Active Measurement Protocol (STAMP) [I-D.ippm-stamp] alleviates the control channel signaling by using configuration data model to provision test channels. In addition, the STAMP supports IEEE 1588 timestamp format for Delay Measurement (DM). The TWAMP Light from broadband forum [BBF.TR-390] provides simplified mechanisms for active performance measurement in Customer Edge IP networks.

[RFC6374] specifies protocol mechanisms to enable the efficient and accurate measurement of performance metrics and can be used in SR networks with MPLS data plane [I-D.spring-sr-mpls-pm]. [RFC6374] addresses the limitations of the IP based performance measurement protocols as specified in Section 1 of [RFC6374]. The [RFC6374] requires data plane to support MPLS Generic Associated Channel Label (GAL) and Generic Associated Channel (G-Ach), which may not be supported on all nodes in the network.

[RFC7876] specifies the procedures to be used when sending and processing out-of-band performance measurement probe response messages over an UDP return path for RFC 6374 based probe queries.
[RFC7876] can be used to send out-of-band PM probe responses in both SR-MPLS and SRv6 networks for one-way performance measurement.

For SR Policies, there are ECMPs between the source and transit nodes, between transit nodes and between transit and destination nodes. Existing PM protocols (e.g. RFC 6374) do not define handling for ECMP forwarding paths in SR networks.

For two-way measurements for SR Policies, there is a need to specify a return path in the form of a Segment List in PM probe query messages without requiring any SR Policy state on the destination node. Existing protocols do not have such mechanisms to specify return path in the PM probe query messages.

This document specifies a procedure for using UDP path for sending and processing in-band probe query and response messages for Performance Measurement that does not require to bootstrap PM sessions. The procedure uses RFC 6374 defined mechanisms for Delay and Loss PM and unless otherwise specified, the procedures from RFC 6374 are not modified. The procedure specified is applicable to both SR-MPLS and SRv6 data planes. The procedure does not require to bootstrap PM sessions and can be used for both SR links and end-to-end performance measurement for SR Policies. This document also defines mechanisms for handling Equal Cost Multipaths (ECMPs) for SR Policies. In addition, this document defines Return Path Segment List (RPSL) TLV for two-way performance measurement and Block Number TLV for loss measurement.

2. Conventions Used in This Document

2.1. Requirements Language

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

2.2. Abbreviations

ACH: Associated Channel Header.

BSID: Binding Segment ID.

DFlag: Data Format Flag.

DM: Delay Measurement.
2.3. Reference Topology

In the reference topology, the querier node R1 initiates a probe query for performance measurement and the responder node R5 sends a probe response for the query message received. The probe response may be sent to the querier node R1 or to a controller node R100. The nodes R1 and R5 may be directly connected via a link enabled with Segment Routing or there exists a Point-to-Point (P2P) SR Policy [I-D.spring-segment-routing-policy] on node R1 with destination to
node R5. In case of Point-to-Multipoint (P2MP), SR Policy originating from source node R1 may terminate on multiple destination leaf nodes [I-D.spring-sr-p2mp-policy].

Reference Topology

Both Delay and Loss performance measurement is performed in-band for the traffic traversing between node R1 and node R5. One-way delay and two-way delay measurements are defined in Section 2.4 of [RFC6374]. Transmit and Receive packet loss measurements are defined in Section 2.2 and Section 2.6 of [RFC6374]. One-way loss measurement provides receive packet loss whereas two-way loss measurement provides both transmit and receive packet loss.

3.  Probe Messages

3.1.  Probe Query Message

In this document, UDP path is defined for sending and processing PM probe query messages for Delay and Loss measurements for SR links and end-to-end SR Policies as described in the following Sections. As well-known UDP port is used for identifying PM probe packets, bootstrapping of the PM session [RFC5357] is not required. The TTL / Hop Limit field of the IP header MUST be set to 1.

3.1.1.  Delay Measurement Probe Query Message

The message content for Delay Measurement probe query message using UDP header [RFC768] is shown in Figure 1. As shown, the DM probe query message is sent with Destination UDP port number TBA1 defined in this document. The Source UDP port may optionally be set to TBA1 for two-way delay measurement. The DM probe query message contains the payload for delay measurement defined in Section 3.2 of [RFC6374].
3.1.2. Loss Measurement Probe Query Message

The message content for Loss measurement probe query message using UDP header [RFC768] is shown in Figure 2. As shown, the LM probe query message is sent with Destination UDP port number TBA2 defined in this document. The Source UDP port may optionally be set to TBA2 for two-way loss measurement. The LM probe query message contains the payload for loss measurement defined in Section 3.1 of [RFC6374].

```plaintext
+---------------------------------------------+
| IP Header                                  |
| . Source IP Address = Querier IPv4 or IPv6 Address |
| . Destination IP Address = Responder IPv4 or IPv6 Address |
| . Protocol = UDP                            |
| . IP TTL = 1                                |
| . Router Alert Option Not Set               |

+---------------------------------------------+
| UDP Header                                  |
| . Source Port = As chosen by Querier        |
| . Destination Port = TBA2 by IANA for Loss Measurement |
+---------------------------------------------+
| Payload = Message as specified in Section 3.1 of RFC 6374 |
+---------------------------------------------+
```

Figure 1: DM Probe Query Message
3.1.2.1. Block Number TLV

The Loss Measurement using Alternate-Marking method defined in [RFC8321] requires to identify the Block Number (color) of the traffic counters carried by the probe query and response messages. Probe query and response messages specified in [RFC6374] for Loss Measurement do not define any means to carry the Block Number.

[RFC6374] defines probe query and response messages that can include one or more optional TLVs. New TLV Type (value TBA8) is defined in this document to carry Block Number (32-bit) for the traffic counters in the probe query and response messages for loss measurement. The format of the Block Number TLV is shown in Figure 11:

```
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|   Type TBA8   |    Length     |      Reserved                 |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                       Block Number                            |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

Figure 11: Block Number TLV

The Block Number TLV is optional. The PM querier node MUST only insert one Block Number TLV in the probe query message and the responder node in the probe response message MUST return the first Block Number TLV from the probe query messages and ignore other Block Number TLVs if present. In both probe query and response messages, the counters MUST belong to the same Block Number.

3.1.3. In-band Probe Query for SR Links

The probe query message as defined in Figure 1 is sent in-band for Delay measurement. The probe query message as defined in Figure 2 is sent in-band for Loss measurement.

3.1.4. In-band Probe Query for End-to-end Measurement of SR Policy

3.1.4.1. In-band Probe Query Message for SR-MPLS Policy

The message content for in-band probe query message using UDP header
for end-to-end performance measurement of SR-MPLS Policy is shown in Figure 3.

```
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                Segment List(0)        | EXP |S|      TTL      |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
.                                                               .
.                                                               .
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                Segment List(n)        | EXP |S|      TTL      |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| Message as shown in Figure 1 for DM or Figure 2 for LM         |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

Figure 3: In-band Probe Query Message for SR-MPLS Policy

The Segment List (SL) can be empty to indicate Implicit NULL label case.

3.1.4.2. In-band Probe Query Message for SRv6 Policy

The in-band probe query messages using UDP header for end-to-end performance measurement of an SRv6 Policy is sent using SRv6 Segment Routing Header (SRH) and Segment List of the SRv6 Policy as defined in [I-D.6man-segment-routing-header] and is shown in Figure 4.

```
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                           SRH                                 |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| Message as shown in Figure 1 for DM or Figure 2 for LM        |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

Figure 4: In-band Probe Query Message for SRv6 Policy

3.2. Probe Response Message

When the received probe query message does not contain any UDP Return Object (URO) TLV [RFC7876], the probe response message is sent using the IP/UDP information from the probe query message. The content of
the probe response message is shown in Figure 5.

```
+---------------------------------------------------------------+       |
| IP Header                                                      |
| . Source IP Address = Responder IPv4 or IPv6 Address          . |
| . Destination IP Address = Source IP Address from Query       . |
| . Protocol = UDP                                              . |
| . Router Alert Option Not Set                                 . |
+---------------------------------------------------------------+       |
| UDP Header                                                    |
| . Source Port = As chosen by Responder                        . |
| . Destination Port = Source Port from Query                   . |
+---------------------------------------------------------------+       |
| Message as specified in Section 3.2 of RFC 6374 for DM, or    |
| . Message as specified in Section 3.1 of RFC 6374 for LM       |
+---------------------------------------------------------------+       |
```

Figure 5: Probe Response Message

When the received probe query message contains UDP Return Object (URO) TLV [RFC7876], the probe response message the message uses the IP/UDP information from the URO in the probe query message. The content of the probe response message is shown in Figure 6.

```
+---------------------------------------------------------------+       |
| IP Header                                                      |
| . Source IP Address = Responder IPv4 or IPv6 Address          . |
| . Destination IP Address = URO.Address                        . |
| . Protocol = UDP                                              . |
| . Router Alert Option Not Set                                 . |
+---------------------------------------------------------------+       |
| UDP Header                                                    |
| . Source Port = As chosen by Responder                        . |
| . Destination Port = URO.UDP-Destination-Port                 . |
+---------------------------------------------------------------+       |
| Message as specified in Section 3.2 of RFC 6374 for DM, or    |
| . Message as specified in Section 3.1 of RFC 6374 for LM       |
+---------------------------------------------------------------+       |
```

Figure 6: Probe Response Message Using URO from Probe Query Message

3.2.1. One-way Measurement for SR Link and end-to-end SR Policy
For one-way performance measurement, the probe response message as defined in Figure 5 or Figure 6 is sent out-of-band for both SR links and SR Policies.

The PM querier node can receive probe response message back by properly setting its own IP address as Source Address of the header or by adding URO TLV in the probe query message and setting its own IP address in the IP Address in the URO TLV (Type=131) [RFC7876]. In addition, the "control code" in the probe query message is set to "out-of-band response requested". The "Source Address" TLV (Type 130), and "Return Address" TLV (Type 1), if present in the probe query message, are not used to send probe response message.

3.2.1.1. Probe Response Message to Controller

As shown in the Reference Topology, if the querier node requires the probe response message to be sent to the controller R100, it adds URO TLV in the probe query message and sets the IP address of R100 in the IP Address field and UDP port TBA1 for DM and TBA2 for LM in the UDP-Destination-Port field of the URO TLV (Type=131) [RFC7876].

3.2.2. Two-way Measurement for SR Links

For two-way performance measurement, when using a bidirectional channel, the probe response message as defined in Figure 5 or Figure 6 is sent back in-band to the querier node for SR links. In this case, the "control code" in the probe query message is set to "in-band response requested" [RFC6374].

3.2.3. Two-way End-to-end Measurement of SR Policy

For two-way performance measurement, when using a bidirectional channel, the probe response message is sent back in-band to the querier node for end-to-end measurement of SR Policies. In this case, the "control code" in the probe query message is set to "in-band response requested" [RFC6374].

The path segment identifier [I-D.spring-mpls-path-segment] [I-D.pce-sr-path-segment] of the forward SR Policy can be used to find the reverse SR Policy to send the probe response message in the absence of RPSL TLV defined in the following Section.

3.2.3.1. Return Path Segment List TLV

For two-way performance measurement, the responder node needs to send the probe response message in-band on a specific reverse SR path. This way the destination node does not require any additional SR Policy state. The querier node can request in the probe query...
message to the responder node to send a response back on a given reverse path (typically co-routed path for two-way measurement).

[RFC6374] defines DM and LM probe query messages that can include one or more optional TLVs. New TLV Types are defined in this document for Return Path Segment List (RPSL) to carry reverse SR path for probe response messages. The format of the RPSL TLV is shown in Figure 7:

```
0                   1                   2                   3
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|   RPSL Type   |    Length     |      Reserved                 |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                     Segment List(0)                           |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                     Segment List(n)                           |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

Figure 7: Return Path Segment List TLV

The RPSL can be one of following Types:

- RPSL Type (value TBA3): SR-MPLS Label Stack of the Reverse SR Policy
- RPSL Type (value TBA4): SRv6 Segment List of the Reverse SR Policy
- RPSL Type (value TBA5): SR-MPLS Binding SID [I-D.pce-binding-label-sid] of the Reverse SR Policy
- RPSL Type (value TBA6): SRv6 Binding SID [I-D.pce-binding-label-sid] of the Reverse SR Policy

The Segment List(0) can be used by the responder node to compute the next-hop IP address and outgoing interface to send the probe response messages.

The RPSL TLV is optional. The PM querier node MUST only insert one RPSL TLV in the probe query message and the responder node MUST only process the first RPSL TLV in the probe query message and ignore
other RPSL TLVs if present. The responder node MUST send probe
response message back on the reverse path specified in the RPSL TLV
and MUST NOT add RPSL TLV in the probe response message.

3.2.3.2. In-band Probe Response Message for SR-MPLS Policy

The message content for sending probe response message in-band using
UDP header for two-way end-to-end performance measurement of an
SR-MPLS Policy is shown in Figure 8. The SR-MPLS label stack in the
packet header is built using the Segment List received in the RPSL
TLV in the probe query message.

```
0                   1                   2                   3
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                Segment List(0)        | EXP |S|      TTL      |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
                          .
                          .
                          .
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                Segment List(n)        | EXP |S|      TTL      |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| Message as shown in Figure 5 or 6                             |
| . IP TTL = 1                                                    |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

Figure 8: In-band Probe Response Message for SR-MPLS Policy

3.2.3.3. In-band Probe Response Message for SRv6 Policy

The message content for sending probe response message in-band using
UDP header for two-way end-to-end performance measurement of an SRv6
Policy is shown in Figure 9. For SRv6 Policy, the SRv6 SID list in
the SRH of the probe response message is built using the SRv6 Segment
List received in the RPSL TLV in the probe query message.

```
0                   1                   2                   3
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                          SRH                                  |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
                          .
                          .
                          .
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| Message as shown in Figure 5 or 6                             |
| . IP TTL = 1                                                    |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

4. Performance Measurement for P2MP SR Policies

The procedures for delay and loss measurement described in this document for Point-to-Point (P2P) SR-MPLS Policies are also equally applicable to the Point-to-Multipoint (P2MP) SR Policies.

5. ECMP Support

An SR Policy can have ECMPs between the source and transit nodes, between transit nodes and between transit and destination nodes. The PM probe messages can be sent to traverse different ECMP paths to measure performance of an SR Policy.

Forwarding plane has various hashing functions available to forward packets on specific ECMP paths. Following mechanisms can be used in PM probe messages to take advantage of the hashing function in forwarding plane to influence the path taken by them.

- The mechanisms described in [RFC8029] [RFC5884] for handling ECMPs are also applicable to the performance measurement. In the IP/UDP header of the PM probe messages, Destination Addresses in 127/8 range for IPv4 or 0:0:0:0:0:FFFF:7F00/104 range for IPv6 can be used to exercise a particular ECMP path. In addition, different Source Addresses or different Source UDP ports can be used for this purpose. As specified in [RFC6437], 3-tuple of Flow Label, Source Address and Destination Address fields in the IPv6 header can also be used.

- For SR-MPLS, entropy label [RFC6790] in the PM probe messages can be used.

- For SRv6, Flow Label in SRH [I-D.6man-segment-routing-header] of the PM probe messages can be used.

6. Sequence Number TLV

The message formats for DM and LM [RFC6374] do not contain sequence number for probe query packets. Sequence numbers can be useful when some probe query messages are lost or they arrive out of order.

[RFC6374] defines DM and LM probe query and response messages that can include one or more optional TLVs. New TLV Type (value TBA?) is defined in this document to carry sequence number for probe query and response messages for delay and loss measurement. The format of the
Sequence Number TLV is shown in Figure 10:

```
  0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|   Type TBA7  |    Length     |      Reserved                 |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                     Sequence Number                           |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

Figure 10: Sequence Number TLV

The sequence numbers start with 0 and are incremented by one for each subsequent probe query packet. The sequence number can be of any length determined by the querier node. The Sequence Number TLV is optional. The PM querier node SHOULD only insert one Sequence Number TLV in the probe query message and the responder node in the probe response message SHOULD return the first Sequence Number TLV from the probe query message and ignore other Sequence Number TLVs if present.

7. Security Considerations

The performance measurement is intended for deployment in well-managed private and service provider networks. The security considerations described in Section 8 of [RFC6374] are applicable to this specification, and particular attention should be paid to the last two paragraphs. Cryptographic measures may be enhanced by the correct configuration of access-control lists and firewalls.

8. IANA Considerations

IANA is requested to allocate following UDP ports for performance measurements:

- UDP Port TBA1: Delay Performance Measurement
- UDP Port TBA2: Loss Performance Measurement

IANA is also requested to allocate values for the following Return Path Segment List TLV Types for RFC 6374 to be carried in PM probe query messages:

- Type TBA3: SR-MPLS Label Stack of the Reverse SR Policy
o Type TBA4: SRv6 Segment List of the Reverse SR Policy
o Type TBA5: SR-MPLS Binding SID of the Reverse SR Policy
o Type TBA6: SRv6 Binding SID of the Reverse SR Policy

IANA is also requested to allocate a value for the following Sequence Number TLV Type for RFC 6374 to be carried in the PM probe query and response messages for delay and loss measurement:

o Type TBA7: Sequence Number TLV

IANA is also requested to allocate a value for the following Block Number TLV Type for RFC 6374 to be carried in the PM probe query and response messages for loss measurement:

o Type TBA8: Block Number TLV
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Abstract

This memo defines the set of Initial Entries for the IANA Performance Metrics Registry. The set includes: UDP Round-trip Latency and Loss, Packet Delay Variation, DNS Response Latency and Loss, UDP Poisson One-way Delay and Loss, UDP Periodic One-way Delay and Loss, ICMP Round-trip Latency and Loss, and TCP round-trip Latency and Loss.
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1. Introduction

This memo proposes an initial set of entries for the Performance Metrics Registry. It uses terms and definitions from the IPPM literature, primarily [RFC2330].

Although there are several standard templates for organizing specifications of performance metrics (see [RFC7679] for an example of the traditional IPPM template, based to large extent on the Benchmarking Methodology Working Group’s traditional template in [RFC1242], and see [RFC6390] for a similar template), none of these templates were intended to become the basis for the columns of an IETF-wide registry of metrics. While examining aspects of metric
specifications which need to be registered, it became clear that none of the existing metric templates fully satisfies the particular needs of a registry.

Therefore, [I-D.ietf-ippm-metric-registry] defines the overall format for a Performance Metrics Registry. Section 5 of [I-D.ietf-ippm-metric-registry] also gives guidelines for those requesting registration of a Metric, that is the creation of entry(s) in the Performance Metrics Registry: "In essence, there needs to be evidence that a candidate Registered Performance Metric has significant industry interest, or has seen deployment, and there is agreement that the candidate Registered Performance Metric serves its intended purpose." The process in [I-D.ietf-ippm-metric-registry] also requires that new entries are administered by IANA through Specification Required policy, which will ensure that the metrics are tightly defined.

2. Scope

This document defines a set of initial Performance Metrics Registry entries. Most are Active Performance Metrics, which are based on RFCs prepared in the IPPM working group of the IETF, according to their framework [RFC2330] and its updates.

3. Registry Categories and Columns

This memo uses the terminology defined in [I-D.ietf-ippm-metric-registry].

This section provides the categories and columns of the registry, for easy reference. An entry (row) therefore gives a complete description of a Registered Metric.
Legend:
Registry Categories and Columns, shown as

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Column</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identifier</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>URI</th>
<th>Desc.</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Change Controller</th>
<th>Ver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Metric Definition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Definition</th>
<th>Fixed Parameters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Method of Measurement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Method</th>
<th>Packet Generation</th>
<th>Traffic Stream Filter</th>
<th>Sampling Distribution</th>
<th>Run-time Parameters</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference Definition</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Calibration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Administrative Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Requester</th>
<th>Rev</th>
<th>Rev.Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments and Remarks

|------------------|

4. UDP Round-trip Latency and Loss Registry Entries

This section specifies an initial registry entry for the UDP Round-trip Latency, and another entry for UDP Round-trip Loss Ratio.

Note: Each Registry entry only produces a "raw" output or a statistical summary. To describe both "raw" and one or more statistics efficiently, the Identifier, Name, and Output Categories can be split and a single section can specify two or more closely-related metrics. For example, this section specifies two Registry entries with many common columns. See Section 7 for an example specifying multiple Registry entries with many common columns.

All column entries beside the ID, Name, Description, and Output Reference Method categories are the same, thus this section proposes...
two closely-related registry entries. As a result, IANA is also asked to assign a corresponding URL to each Named Metric.

4.1. Summary

This category includes multiple indexes to the registry entry: the element ID and metric name.

4.1.1. ID (Identifier)

IANA is asked to assign different numeric identifiers to each of the two Named Metrics.

4.1.2. Name

- RTDelay_Active_IP-UDP-Periodic_RFCXXXXsec4_Seconds_95Percentile
- RTLoss_Active_IP-UDP-Periodic_RFCXXXXsec4_Percent_LossRatio

4.1.3. URI

URL: https://www.iana.org/ ... <name>

4.1.4. Description

RTDelay: This metric assesses the delay of a stream of packets exchanged between two hosts (which are the two measurement points), and the Output is the Round-trip delay for all successfully exchanged packets expressed as the 95th percentile of their conditional delay distribution.

RTLoss: This metric assesses the loss ratio of a stream of packets exchanged between two hosts (which are the two measurement points), and the Output is the Round-trip loss ratio for all successfully exchanged packets expressed as a percentage.

4.1.5. Change Controller

IETF

4.1.6. Version (of Registry Format)

1.0
4.2. Metric Definition

This category includes columns to prompt the entry of all necessary details related to the metric definition, including the RFC reference and values of input factors, called fixed parameters.

4.2.1. Reference Definition


Section 2.4 of [RFC2681] provides the reference definition of the singleton (single value) Round-trip delay metric. Section 3.4 of [RFC2681] provides the reference definition expanded to cover a multi-singleton sample. Note that terms such as singleton and sample are defined in Section 11 of [RFC2330].

Note that although the [RFC2681] definition of "Round-trip-Delay between Src and Dst" is directionally ambiguous in the text, this metric tightens the definition further to recognize that the host in the "Src" role will send the first packet to "Dst", and ultimately receive the corresponding return packet from "Dst" (when neither are lost).

Finally, note that the variable "dT" is used in [RFC2681] to refer to the value of Round-trip delay in metric definitions and methods. The variable "dT" has been re-used in other IPPM literature to refer to different quantities, and cannot be used as a global variable name.


Both delay and loss metrics employ a maximum waiting time for received packets, so the count of lost packets to total packets sent is the basis for the loss ratio calculation as per Section 6.1 of [RFC6673].

4.2.2. Fixed Parameters

Type-P as defined in Section 13 of [RFC2330]:

- IPv4 header values:
  * DSCP: set to 0
* TTL: set to 255
* Protocol: set to 17 (UDP)

IPv6 header values:
* DSCP: set to 0
* Hop Count: set to 255
* Next Header: set to 17 (UDP)
* Flow Label: set to zero
* Extension Headers: none

UDP header values:
* Checksum: the checksum MUST be calculated and the non-zero checksum included in the header

UDP Payload
* total of 100 bytes

Other measurement parameters:
* Tmax: a loss threshold waiting time

  * 3.0, expressed in units of seconds, as a positive value of type decimal64 with fraction digits = 4 (see section 9.3 of [RFC6020]) and with resolution of 0.0001 seconds (0.1 ms), with lossless conversion to/from the 32-bit NTP timestamp as per section 6 of [RFC5905].

4.3. Method of Measurement

This category includes columns for references to relevant sections of the RFC(s) and any supplemental information needed to ensure an unambiguous methods for implementations.

4.3.1. Reference Method

The methodology for this metric is defined as Type-P-Round-trip-Delay-Poisson-Stream in section 2.6 of RFC 2681 [RFC2681] and section 3.6 of RFC 2681 [RFC2681] using the Type-P and Tmax defined under Fixed Parameters. However, the Periodic stream will be generated according to [RFC3432].
The reference method distinguishes between long-delayed packets and lost packets by implementing a maximum waiting time for packet arrival. Tmax is the waiting time used as the threshold to declare a packet lost. Lost packets SHALL be designated as having undefined delay, and counted for the RTLoss metric.

The calculations on the delay (RTT) SHALL be performed on the conditional distribution, conditioned on successful packet arrival within Tmax. Also, when all packet delays are stored, the process which calculates the RTT value MUST enforce the Tmax threshold on stored values before calculations. See section 4.1 of [RFC3393] for details on the conditional distribution to exclude undefined values of delay, and Section 5 of [RFC6703] for background on this analysis choice.

The reference method requires some way to distinguish between different packets in a stream to establish correspondence between sending times and receiving times for each successfully-arriving packet. Sequence numbers or other send-order identification MUST be retained at the Src or included with each packet to disambiguate packet reordering if it occurs.

If a standard measurement protocol is employed, then the measurement process will determine the sequence numbers or timestamps applied to test packets after the Fixed and Runtime parameters are passed to that process. The chosen measurement protocol will dictate the format of sequence numbers and time-stamps, if they are conveyed in the packet payload.

Refer to Section 4.4 of [RFC6673] for expanded discussion of the instruction to "send a Type-P packet back to the Src as quickly as possible" in Section 2.6 of RFC 2681 [RFC2681]. Section 8 of [RFC6673] presents additional requirements which MUST be included in the method of measurement for this metric.

4.3.2. Packet Stream Generation

This section gives the details of the packet traffic which is the basis for measurement. In IPPM metrics, this is called the Stream, and can easily be described by providing the list of stream parameters.

Section 3 of [RFC3432] prescribes the method for generating Periodic streams using associated parameters.

incT  the nominal duration of inter-packet interval, first bit to first bit, with value 0.0200, expressed in units of seconds, as a positive value of type decimal64 with fraction digits = 4 (see
section 9.3 of [RFC6020]) and with resolution of 0.0001 seconds (0.1 ms).

dT the duration of the interval for allowed sample start times, with value 1.0, expressed in units of seconds, as a positive value of type decimal64 with fraction digits = 4 (see section 9.3 of [RFC6020]) and with resolution of 0.0001 seconds (0.1 ms).

NOTE: an initiation process with a number of control exchanges resulting in unpredictable start times (within a time interval) may be sufficient to avoid synchronization of periodic streams, and therefore a valid replacement for selecting a start time at random from a fixed interval.

The T0 parameter will be reported as a measured parameter. Parameters incT and dT are Fixed Parameters.

4.3.3. Traffic Filtering (observation) Details

NA

4.3.4. Sampling Distribution

NA

4.3.5. Run-time Parameters and Data Format

Run-time Parameters are input factors that must be determined, configured into the measurement system, and reported with the results for the context to be complete.

Src the IP address of the host in the Src Role (format ipv4-address-no-zone value for IPv4, or ipv6-address-no-zone value for IPv6, see Section 4 of [RFC6991])

Dst the IP address of the host in the Dst Role (format ipv4-address-no-zone value for IPv4, or ipv6-address-no-zone value for IPv6, see section 4 of [RFC6991])

T0 a time, the start of a measurement interval, (format "date-and-time" as specified in Section 5.6 of [RFC3339], see also Section 3 of [RFC6991]). The UTC Time Zone is required by Section 6.1 of [RFC2330]. When T0 is "all-zeros", a start time is unspecified and Tf is to be interpreted as the Duration of the measurement interval. The start time is controlled through other means.

Tf a time, the end of a measurement interval, (format "date-and-time" as specified in Section 5.6 of [RFC3339], see also Section 3 of...
4.3.6. Roles

Src launches each packet and waits for return transmissions from Dst.

Dst waits for each packet from Src and sends a return packet to Src.

4.4. Output

This category specifies all details of the Output of measurements using the metric.

4.4.1. Type

Percentile -- for the conditional distribution of all packets with a valid value of Round-trip delay (undefined delays are excluded), a single value corresponding to the 95th percentile, as follows:

See section 4.1 of [RFC3393] for details on the conditional distribution to exclude undefined values of delay, and Section 5 of [RFC6703] for background on this analysis choice.

The percentile = 95, meaning that the reported delay, "95Percentile", is the smallest value of Round-trip delay for which the Empirical Distribution Function (EDF), F(95Percentile) >= 95% of the singleton Round-trip delay values in the conditional distribution. See section 11.3 of [RFC2330] for the definition of the percentile statistic using the EDF.

LossRatio -- the count of lost packets to total packets sent is the basis for the loss ratio calculation as per Section 6.1 of [RFC6673].

4.4.2. Reference Definition

For all outputs ---

T0 the start of a measurement interval, (format "date-and-time" as specified in Section 5.6 of [RFC3339], see also Section 3 of [RFC6991]). The UTC Time Zone is required by Section 6.1 of [RFC2330].

Tf the end of a measurement interval, (format "date-and-time" as specified in Section 5.6 of [RFC3339], see also Section 3 of [RFC2330]).
The UTC Time Zone is required by Section 6.1 of [RFC2330].

TotalPkts the count of packets sent by the Src to Dst during the measurement interval.

For

RTDelay_Active_IP-UDP-PeriodicRFCXXXXsec4_Seconds_95Percentile:

95Percentile The time value of the result is expressed in units of seconds, as a positive value of type decimal64 with fraction digits = 9 (see section 9.3 of [RFC6020]) with resolution of 0.000000001 seconds (1.0 ns).

For

RTLoss_Active_IP-UDP-PeriodicRFCXXXXsec4_Percent_LossRatio:

Percentile The numeric value of the result is expressed in units of lost packets to total packets times 100%, as a positive value of type decimal64 with fraction digits = 9 (see section 9.3 of [RFC6020]) with resolution of 0.0000000001.

4.4.3. Metric Units

The 95th Percentile of Round-trip Delay is expressed in seconds.

The Round-trip Loss Ratio is expressed as a percentage of lost packets to total packets sent.

4.4.4. Calibration

Section 3.7.3 of [RFC7679] provides a means to quantify the systematic and random errors of a time measurement. In-situ calibration could be enabled with an internal loopback at the Source host that includes as much of the measurement system as possible, performs address manipulation as needed, and provides some form of isolation (e.g., deterministic delay) to avoid send-receive interface contention. Some portion of the random and systematic error can be characterized this way.

When a measurement controller requests a calibration measurement, the loopback is applied and the result is output in the same format as a normal measurement with additional indication that it is a calibration result.
Both internal loopback calibration and clock synchronization can be used to estimate the available accuracy of the Output Metric Units. For example, repeated loopback delay measurements will reveal the portion of the Output result resolution which is the result of system noise, and thus inaccurate.

4.5. Administrative items

4.5.1. Status

Current

4.5.2. Requester

This RFC number

4.5.3. Revision

1.0

4.5.4. Revision Date

YYYY-MM-DD

4.6. Comments and Remarks

None.

5. Packet Delay Variation Registry Entry

This section gives an initial registry entry for a Packet Delay Variation metric.

5.1. Summary

This category includes multiple indexes to the registry entries, the element ID and metric name.

5.1.1. ID (Identifier)

<insert numeric identifier, an integer>

5.1.2. Name

OWPDV_Active_IP-UDP-Periodic_RFCXXXXsec5_Seconds_95Percentile
5.1.3. URI

URL: https://www.iana.org/ ... <name>

5.1.4. Description

An assessment of packet delay variation with respect to the minimum delay observed on the periodic stream, and the Output is expressed as the 95th percentile of the packet delay variation distribution.

5.1.5. Change Controller

IETF

5.1.6. Version (of Registry Format)

1.0

5.2. Metric Definition

This category includes columns to prompt the entry of all necessary details related to the metric definition, including the RFC reference and values of input factors, called fixed parameters.

5.2.1. Reference Definition


See sections 2.4 and 3.4 of [RFC3393]. Singleton delay differences measured are referred to by the variable name "ddT" (applicable to all forms of delay variation). However, this metric entry specifies the PDV form defined in section 4.2 of [RFC5481], where the singleton PDV for packet i is referred to by the variable name "PDV(i)".
5.2.2. Fixed Parameters

- IPv4 header values:
  - DSCP: set to 0
  - TTL: set to 255
  - Protocol: set to 17 (UDP)

- IPv6 header values:
  - DSCP: set to 0
  - Hop Count: set to 255
  - Next Header: set to 17 (UDP)
  - Flow Label: set to zero
  - Extension Headers: none

- UDP header values:
  - Checksum: the checksum MUST be calculated and the non-zero checksum included in the header

- UDP Payload
  - total of 200 bytes

Other measurement parameters:

Tmax: a loss threshold waiting time with value 3.0, expressed in units of seconds, as a positive value of type decimal64 with fraction digits = 4 (see section 9.3 of [RFC6020]) and with resolution of 0.0001 seconds (0.1 ms), with lossless conversion to/from the 32-bit NTP timestamp as per section 6 of [RFC5905].

F a selection function unambiguously defining the packets from the stream selected for the metric. See section 4.2 of [RFC5481] for the PDV form.

See the Packet Stream generation category for two additional Fixed Parameters.
5.3. Method of Measurement

This category includes columns for references to relevant sections of the RFC(s) and any supplemental information needed to ensure an unambiguous methods for implementations.

5.3.1. Reference Method

See section 2.6 and 3.6 of [RFC3393] for general singleton element calculations. This metric entry requires implementation of the PDV form defined in section 4.2 of [RFC5481]. Also see measurement considerations in section 8 of [RFC5481].

The reference method distinguishes between long-delayed packets and lost packets by implementing a maximum waiting time for packet arrival. Tmax is the waiting time used as the threshold to declare a packet lost. Lost packets SHALL be designated as having undefined delay.

The calculations on the one-way delay SHALL be performed on the conditional distribution, conditioned on successful packet arrival within Tmax. Also, when all packet delays are stored, the process which calculates the one-way delay value MUST enforce the Tmax threshold on stored values before calculations. See section 4.1 of [RFC3393] for details on the conditional distribution to exclude undefined values of delay, and Section 5 of [RFC6703] for background on this analysis choice.

The reference method requires some way to distinguish between different packets in a stream to establish correspondence between sending times and receiving times for each successfully-arriving packet. Sequence numbers or other send-order identification MUST be retained at the Src or included with each packet to disambiguate packet reordering if it occurs.

If a standard measurement protocol is employed, then the measurement process will determine the sequence numbers or timestamps applied to test packets after the Fixed and Runtime parameters are passed to that process. The chosen measurement protocol will dictate the format of sequence numbers and time-stamps, if they are conveyed in the packet payload.

5.3.2. Packet Stream Generation

This section gives the details of the packet traffic which is the basis for measurement. In IPPM metrics, this is called the Stream, and can easily be described by providing the list of stream parameters.
Section 3 of [RFC3432] prescribes the method for generating Periodic streams using associated parameters.

incT the nominal duration of inter-packet interval, first bit to first bit, with value 0.0200, expressed in units of seconds, as a positive value of type decimal64 with fraction digits = 4 (see section 9.3 of [RFC6020]) and with resolution of 0.0001 seconds (0.1 ms).

dT the duration of the interval for allowed sample start times, with value 1.0, expressed in units of seconds, as a positive value of type decimal64 with fraction digits = 4 (see section 9.3 of [RFC6020]) and with resolution of 0.0001 seconds (0.1 ms).

NOTE: an initiation process with a number of control exchanges resulting in unpredictable start times (within a time interval) may be sufficient to avoid synchronization of periodic streams, and therefore a valid replacement for selecting a start time at random from a fixed interval.

The T0 parameter will be reported as a measured parameter. Parameters incT and dT are Fixed Parameters.

5.3.3. Traffic Filtering (observation) Details

NA

5.3.4. Sampling Distribution

NA

5.3.5. Run-time Parameters and Data Format

Src the IP address of the host in the Src Role (format ipv4-address-no-zone value for IPv4, or ipv6-address-no-zone value for IPv6, see Section 4 of [RFC6991])

Dst the IP address of the host in the Dst Role (format ipv4-address-no-zone value for IPv4, or ipv6-address-no-zone value for IPv6, see section 4 of [RFC6991])

T0 a time, the start of a measurement interval, (format "date-and-time" as specified in Section 5.6 of [RFC3339], see also Section 3 of [RFC6991]). The UTC Time Zone is required by Section 6.1 of [RFC2330]. When T0 is "all-zeros", a start time is unspecified and Tf is to be interpreted as the Duration of the measurement interval. The start time is controlled through other means.
If a time, the end of a measurement interval, (format "date-and-time" as specified in Section 5.6 of [RFC3339], see also Section 3 of [RFC6991]). The UTC Time Zone is required by Section 6.1 of [RFC2330]. When T0 is "all-zeros", an end-time date is ignored and Tf is interpreted as the Duration of the measurement interval.

5.3.6. Roles

Src launches each packet and waits for return transmissions from Dst.

Dst waits for each packet from Src and sends a return packet to Src.

5.4. Output

This category specifies all details of the Output of measurements using the metric.

5.4.1. Type

Percentile -- for the conditional distribution of all packets with a valid value of one-way delay (undefined delays are excluded), a single value corresponding to the 95th percentile, as follows:

See section 4.1 of [RFC3393] for details on the conditional distribution to exclude undefined values of delay, and Section 5 of [RFC6703] for background on this analysis choice.

The percentile = 95, meaning that the reported delay, "95Percentile", is the smallest value of one-way PDV for which the Empirical Distribution Function (EDF), F(95Percentile) >= 95% of the singleton one-way PDV values in the conditional distribution. See section 11.3 of [RFC2330] for the definition of the percentile statistic using the EDF.

5.4.2. Reference Definition

T0 the start of a measurement interval, (format "date-and-time" as specified in Section 5.6 of [RFC3339], see also Section 3 of [RFC6991]). The UTC Time Zone is required by Section 6.1 of [RFC2330].

Tf the end of a measurement interval, (format "date-and-time" as specified in Section 5.6 of [RFC3339], see also Section 3 of [RFC6991]). The UTC Time Zone is required by Section 6.1 of [RFC2330].
95Percentile  The time value of the result is expressed in units of seconds, as a positive value of type decimal64 with fraction digits = 9 (see section 9.3 of [RFC6020]) with resolution of 0.000000001 seconds (1.0 ns), and with lossless conversion to/from the 64-bit NTP timestamp as per section 6 of RFC [RFC5905]

5.4.3. Metric Units

The 95th Percentile of one-way PDV is expressed in seconds.

5.4.4. Calibration

Section 3.7.3 of [RFC7679] provides a means to quantify the systematic and random errors of a time measurement. In-situ calibration could be enabled with an internal loopback that includes as much of the measurement system as possible, performs address manipulation as needed, and provides some form of isolation (e.g., deterministic delay) to avoid send-receive interface contention. Some portion of the random and systematic error can be characterized this way.

For one-way delay measurements, the error calibration must include an assessment of the internal clock synchronization with its external reference (this internal clock is supplying timestamps for measurement). In practice, the time offsets [RFC5905] of clocks at both the source and destination are needed to estimate the systematic error due to imperfect clock synchronization (the time offsets are smoothed, thus the random variation is not usually represented in the results).

time_offset  The time value of the result is expressed in units of seconds, as a signed value of type decimal64 with fraction digits = 9 (see section 9.3 of [RFC6020]) with resolution of 0.000000001 seconds (1.0 ns), and with lossless conversion to/from the 64-bit NTP timestamp as per section 6 of RFC [RFC5905]

When a measurement controller requests a calibration measurement, the loopback is applied and the result is output in the same format as a normal measurement with additional indication that it is a calibration result. In any measurement, the measurement function SHOULD report its current estimate of time offset [RFC5905] as an indicator of the degree of synchronization.

Both internal loopback calibration and clock synchronization can be used to estimate the available accuracy of the Output Metric Units. For example, repeated loopback delay measurements will reveal the portion of the Output result resolution which is the result of system noise, and thus inaccurate.

5.5. Administrative items

5.5.1. Status

Current

5.5.2. Requester

This RFC number

5.5.3. Revision

1.0

5.5.4. Revision Date

YYYY-MM-DD

5.6. Comments and Remarks

Lost packets represent a challenge for delay variation metrics. See section 4.1 of [RFC3393] and the delay variation applicability statement[RFC5481] for extensive analysis and comparison of PDV and an alternate metric, IPDV.

6. DNS Response Latency and Loss Registry Entries

This section gives initial registry entries for DNS Response Latency and Loss from a network user’s perspective, for a specific named resource. The metric can be measured repeatedly using different names. RFC 2681 [RFC2681] defines a Round-trip delay metric. We build on that metric by specifying several of the input parameters to precisely define two metrics for measuring DNS latency and loss.

Note to IANA: Each Registry "Name" below specifies a single registry entry, whose output format varies in accordance with the name.

All column entries beside the ID, Name, Description, and Output Reference Method categories are the same, thus this section proposes two closely-related registry entries. As a result, IANA is also asked to assign corresponding URLs to each Named Metric.

6.1. Summary

This category includes multiple indexes to the registry entries, the element ID and metric name.
6.1.1. ID (Identifier)

<insert numeric identifier, an integer>

IANA is asked to assign different numeric identifiers to each of the two Named Metrics.

6.1.2. Name

RTDNS_Active_IP-UDP-Poisson_RFCXXXXsec6_Seconds_Raw
RDNNS_Active_IP-UDP-Poisson_RFCXXXXsec6_Logical_Raw

6.1.3. URI

URL: https://www.iana.org/ ... <name>

6.1.4. Description

This is a metric for DNS Response performance from a network user’s perspective, for a specific named resource. The metric can be measured repeatedly using different resource names.

RTDNS: This metric assesses the response time, the interval from the query transmission to the response.

RDNNS: This metric indicates that the response was deemed lost. In other words, the response time exceeded the maximum waiting time.

6.1.5. Change Controller

IETF

6.1.6. Version (of Registry Format)

1.0

6.2. Metric Definition

This category includes columns to prompt the entry of all necessary details related to the metric definition, including the RFC reference and values of input factors, called fixed parameters.

6.2.1. Reference Definition


Section 2.4 of [RFC2681] provides the reference definition of the singleton (single value) Round-trip delay metric. Section 3.4 of [RFC2681] provides the reference definition expanded to cover a multi-singleton sample. Note that terms such as singleton and sample are defined in Section 11 of [RFC2330].

For DNS Response Latency, the entities in [RFC1035] must be mapped to [RFC2681]. The Local Host with its User Program and Resolver take the role of "Src", and the Foreign Name Server takes the role of "Dst".

Note that although the [RFC2681] definition of "Round-trip-Delay between Src and Dst at T" is directionally ambiguous in the text, this metric tightens the definition further to recognize that the host in the "Src" role will send the first packet to "Dst", and ultimately receive the corresponding return packet from "Dst" (when neither are lost).


Both response time and loss metrics employ a maximum waiting time for received responses, so the count of lost packets to total packets sent is the basis for the loss determination as per Section 4.3 of [RFC6673].

6.2.2. Fixed Parameters

Type-P as defined in Section 13 of [RFC2330]:

- IPv4 header values:
  - DSCP: set to 0
  - TTL set to 255
  - Protocol: set to 17 (UDP)

- IPv6 header values:
* DSCP: set to 0
* Hop Count: set to 255
* Next Header: set to 17 (UDP)
* Flow Label: set to zero
* Extension Headers: none

- **UDP header values:**
  - Source port: 53
  - Destination port: 53
  - Checksum: the checksum must be calculated and the non-zero checksum included in the header

- **Payload:** The payload contains a DNS message as defined in RFC 1035 [RFC1035] with the following values:
  - The DNS header section contains:
    + Identification (see the Run-time column)
    + QR: set to 0 (Query)
    + Opcode: set to 0 (standard query)
    + AA: not set
    + TC: not set
    + RD: set to one (recursion desired)
    + RA: not set
    + RCODE: not set
    + QDCOUNT: set to one (only one entry)
    + ANCOUNT: not set
    + NSCOUNT: not set
    + ARCOUNT: not set
* The Question section contains:
  + QNAME: the Fully Qualified Domain Name (FQDN) provided as input for the test, see the Run-time column
  + QTYPE: the query type provided as input for the test, see the Run-time column
  + QCLASS: set to 1 for IN

* The other sections do not contain any Resource Records.

Other measurement parameters:

- Tmax: a loss threshold waiting time (and to help disambiguate queries)
  
  * 5.0, expressed in units of seconds, as a positive value of type decimal64 with fraction digits = 4 (see section 9.3 of [RFC6020]) and with resolution of 0.0001 seconds (0.1 ms), with lossless conversion to/from the 32-bit NTP timestamp as per section 6 of [RFC5905].

Observation: reply packets will contain a DNS response and may contain RRs.

6.3. Method of Measurement

This category includes columns for references to relevant sections of the RFC(s) and any supplemental information needed to ensure an unambiguous methods for implementations.

6.3.1. Reference Method

The methodology for this metric is defined as Type-P-Round-trip-Delay-Poisson-Stream in section 2.6 of RFC 2681 [RFC2681] and section 3.6 of RFC 2681 [RFC2681] using the Type-P and Timeout defined under Fixed Parameters.

The reference method distinguishes between long-delayed packets and lost packets by implementing a maximum waiting time for packet arrival. Tmax is the waiting time used as the threshold to declare a response packet lost. Lost packets SHALL be designated as having undefined delay and counted for the RLDNS metric.

The calculations on the delay (RTT) SHALL be performed on the conditional distribution, conditioned on successful packet arrival within Tmax. Also, when all packet delays are stored, the process...
which calculates the RTT value MUST enforce the Tmax threshold on stored values before calculations. See section 4.1 of [RFC3393] for details on the conditional distribution to exclude undefined values of delay, and Section 5 of [RFC6703] for background on this analysis choice.

The reference method requires some way to distinguish between different packets in a stream to establish correspondence between sending times and receiving times for each successfully-arriving reply.

DNS Messages bearing Queries provide for random ID Numbers in the Identification header field, so more than one query may be launched while a previous request is outstanding when the ID Number is used. Therefore, the ID Number MUST be retained at the Src and included with each response packet to disambiguate packet reordering if it occurs.

IF a DNS response does not arrive within Tmax, the response time RTDNS is undefined, and RLDNS = 1. The Message ID SHALL be used to disambiguate the successive queries that are otherwise identical.

Since the ID Number field is only 16 bits in length, it places a limit on the number of simultaneous outstanding DNS queries during a stress test from a single Src address.

Refer to Section 4.4 of [RFC6673] for expanded discussion of the instruction to "send a Type-P packet back to the Src as quickly as possible" in Section 2.6 of RFC 2681 [RFC2681]. However, the DNS Server is expected to perform all required functions to prepare and send a response, so the response time will include processing time and network delay. Section 8 of [RFC6673] presents additional requirements which SHALL be included in the method of measurement for this metric.

In addition to operations described in [RFC2681], the Src MUST parse the DNS headers of the reply and prepare the query response information for subsequent reporting as a measured result, along with the Round-Trip Delay.

6.3.2. Packet Stream Generation

This section gives the details of the packet traffic which is the basis for measurement. In IPPM metrics, this is called the Stream, and can easily be described by providing the list of stream parameters.
Section 11.1.3 of RFC 2681 [RFC2330] provides three methods to generate Poisson sampling intervals. The reciprocal of lambda is the average packet spacing, thus the Run-time Parameter is Reciprocal\_lambda = 1/\lambda, in seconds.

Method 3 is used, where given a start time (Run-time Parameter), the subsequent send times are all computed prior to measurement by computing the pseudo-random distribution of inter-packet send times, (truncating the distribution as specified in the Run-time Parameters), and the Src sends each packet at the computed times.

Note that Trunc is the upper limit on inter-packet times in the Poisson distribution. A random value greater than Trunc is set equal to Trunc instead.

6.3.3. Traffic Filtering (observation) Details

NA

6.3.4. Sampling Distribution

NA

6.3.5. Run-time Parameters and Data Format

Run-time Parameters are input factors that must be determined, configured into the measurement system, and reported with the results for the context to be complete.

Src the IP address of the host in the Src Role (format ipv4-address-no-zone value for IPv4, or ipv6-address-no-zone value for IPv6, see Section 4 of [RFC6991])

Dst the IP address of the host in the Dst Role (format ipv4-address-no-zone value for IPv4, or ipv6-address-no-zone value for IPv6, see section 4 of [RFC6991])

T0 a time, the start of a measurement interval, (format "date-and-time" as specified in Section 5.6 of [RFC3339], see also Section 3 of [RFC6991]). The UTC Time Zone is required by Section 6.1 of [RFC2330]. When T0 is "all-zeros", a start time is unspecified and Tf is to be interpreted as the Duration of the measurement interval. The start time is controlled through other means.

Tf a time, the end of a measurement interval, (format "date-and-time" as specified in Section 5.6 of [RFC3339], see also Section 3 of [RFC6991]). The UTC Time Zone is required by Section 6.1 of
When $T_0$ is "all-zeros", a end time date is ignored and $T_f$ is interpreted as the Duration of the measurement interval.

Reciprocal\_lambda average packet interval for Poisson Streams expressed in units of seconds, as a positive value of type decimal64 with fraction digits = 4 (see section 9.3 of [RFC6020]) with resolution of 0.0001 seconds (0.1 ms), and with lossless conversion to/from the 32-bit NTP timestamp as per section 6 of [RFC5905].

Trunc Upper limit on Poisson distribution expressed in units of seconds, as a positive value of type decimal64 with fraction digits = 4 (see section 9.3 of [RFC6020]) with resolution of 0.0001 seconds (0.1 ms), and with lossless conversion to/from the 32-bit NTP timestamp as per section 6 of [RFC5905] (values above this limit will be clipped and set to the limit value).

ID The 16-bit identifier assigned by the program that generates the query, and which must vary in successive queries (a list of IDs is needed), see Section 4.1.1 of [RFC1035]. This identifier is copied into the corresponding reply and can be used by the requester (Src) to match-up replies to outstanding queries.

QNAME The domain name of the Query, formatted as specified in section 4 of [RFC6991].

QTYPE The Query Type, which will correspond to the IP address family of the query (decimal 1 for IPv4 or 28 for IPv6, formatted as a uint16, as per section 9.2 of [RFC6020]).

6.3.6. Roles

Src launches each packet and waits for return transmissions from Dst.

Dst waits for each packet from Src and sends a return packet to Src.

6.4. Output

This category specifies all details of the Output of measurements using the metric.

6.4.1. Type

Raw -- for each DNS Query packet sent, sets of values as defined in the next column, including the status of the response, only assigning delay values to successful query-response pairs.
6.4.2. Reference Definition

For all outputs:

\( T \)  the time the DNS Query was sent during the measurement interval,  
(format "date-and-time" as specified in Section 5.6 of [RFC3339],  
see also Section 3 of [RFC6991]). The UTC Time Zone is required  
by Section 6.1 of [RFC2330].

\( dT \)  The time value of the round-trip delay to receive the DNS  
response, expressed in units of seconds, as a positive value of  
type decimal64 with fraction digits = 9 (see section 9.3 of  
[RFC6020]) with resolution of 0.000000001 seconds (1.0 ns), and  
with lossless conversion to/from the 64-bit NTP timestamp as per  
section 6 of RFC [RFC5905]. This value is undefined when the  
response packet is not received at Src within waiting time Tmax  
seconds.

\( Rcode \)  The value of the Rcode field in the DNS response header,  
expressed as a uint64 as specified in section 9.2 of [RFC6020].  
Non-zero values convey errors in the response, and such replies  
must be analyzed separately from successful requests.

6.4.3. Metric Units

\( RTDNS: \)  Round-trip Delay, \( dT \), is expressed in seconds.

\( RTLDNS: \)  the Logical value, where 1 = Lost and 0 = Received.

6.4.4. Calibration

Section 3.7.3 of [RFC7679] provides a means to quantify the  
systematic and random errors of a time measurement. In-situ  
calibration could be enabled with an internal loopback at the Source  
host that includes as much of the measurement system as possible,  
performs address and payload manipulation as needed, and provides  
some form of isolation (e.g., deterministic delay) to avoid send-  
receive interface contention. Some portion of the random and  
systematic error can be characterized this way.

When a measurement controller requests a calibration measurement, the  
loopback is applied and the result is output in the same format as a  
normal measurement with additional indication that it is a  
calibration result.

Both internal loopback calibration and clock synchronization can be  
used to estimate the available accuracy of the Output Metric Units.  
For example, repeated loopback delay measurements will reveal the
portion of the Output result resolution which is the result of system noise, and thus inaccurate.

6.5. Administrative items

6.5.1. Status

Current

6.5.2. Requester

This RFC number

6.5.3. Revision

1.0

6.5.4. Revision Date

YYYY-MM-DD

6.6. Comments and Remarks

None

7. UDP Poisson One-way Delay and Loss Registry Entries

This section specifies five initial registry entries for the UDP Poisson One-way Delay, and one for UDP Poisson One-way Loss.

IANA Note: Registry "Name" below specifies multiple registry entries, whose output format varies according to the <statistic> element of the name that specifies one form of statistical summary. There is an additional metric name for the Loss metric.

All column entries beside the ID, Name, Description, and Output Reference Method categories are the same, thus this section proposes six closely-related registry entries. As a result, IANA is also asked to assign corresponding URLs to each Named Metric.

7.1. Summary

This category includes multiple indexes to the registry entries, the element ID and metric name.
7.1.1. ID (Identifier)

IANA is asked to assign different numeric identifiers to each of the six Metrics.

7.1.2. Name

OWDelay_Active_IP-UDP-Poisson-
Payload250B_RFCXXXXsec7_Seconds_<statistic>

where <statistic> is one of:

- 95Percentile
- Mean
- Min
- Max
- StdDev

OWLoss_Active_IP-UDP-Poisson-
Payload250B_RFCXXXXsec7_Percent_LossRatio

7.1.3. URI

URL: https://www.iana.org/ ... <name>

7.1.4. Description

OWDelay: This metric assesses the delay of a stream of packets exchanged between two hosts (or measurement points), and reports the <statistic> One-way delay for all successfully exchanged packets based on their conditional delay distribution.

where <statistic> is one of:

- 95Percentile
- Mean
- Min
- Max
- StdDev
OWLoss: This metric assesses the loss ratio of a stream of packets exchanged between two hosts (which are the two measurement points), and the output is the One-way loss ratio for all successfully received packets expressed as a percentage.

7.2. Metric Definition

This category includes columns to prompt the entry of all necessary details related to the metric definition, including the RFC reference and values of input factors, called fixed parameters.

7.2.1. Reference Definition

For Delay:


[RFC7679]


[RFC6049]

Section 3.4 of [RFC7679] provides the reference definition of the singleton (single value) One-way delay metric. Section 4.4 of [RFC7679] provides the reference definition expanded to cover a multi-value sample. Note that terms such as singleton and sample are defined in Section 11 of [RFC2330].

Only successful packet transfers with finite delay are included in the sample, as prescribed in section 4.1.2 of [RFC6049].

For loss:


Section 2.4 of [RFC7680] provides the reference definition of the singleton (single value) one-way loss metric. Section 3.4 of [RFC7680] provides the reference definition expanded to cover a multi-singleton sample. Note that terms such as singleton and sample are defined in Section 11 of [RFC2330].
7.2.2. Fixed Parameters

Type-P:

- IPv4 header values:
  * DSCP: set to 0
  * TTL: set to 255
  * Protocol: Set to 17 (UDP)

- IPv6 header values:
  * DSCP: set to 0
  * Hop Count: set to 255
  * Next Header: set to 17 (UDP)
  * Flow Label: set to zero
  * Extension Headers: none

- UDP header values:
  * Checksum: the checksum MUST be calculated and the non-zero checksum included in the header

- UDP Payload: TWAMP Test Packet Formats, Section 4.1.2 of [RFC5357]
  * Security features in use influence the number of Padding octets.
  * 250 octets total, including the TWAMP format type, which MUST be reported.

Other measurement parameters:

Tmax: a loss threshold waiting time with value 3.0, expressed in units of seconds, as a positive value of type decimal64 with fraction digits = 4 (see section 9.3 of [RFC6020]) and with resolution of 0.0001 seconds (0.1 ms), with lossless conversion to/from the 32-bit NTP timestamp as per section 6 of [RFC5905].

See the Packet Stream generation category for two additional Fixed Parameters.
7.3. Method of Measurement

This category includes columns for references to relevant sections of the RFC(s) and any supplemental information needed to ensure an unambiguous methods for implementations.

7.3.1. Reference Method

The methodology for this metric is defined as Type-P-One-way-Delay-Poisson-Stream in section 3.6 of [RFC7679] and section 4.6 of [RFC7679] using the Type-P and Tmax defined under Fixed Parameters.

The reference method distinguishes between long-delayed packets and lost packets by implementing a maximum waiting time for packet arrival. Tmax is the waiting time used as the threshold to declare a packet lost. Lost packets SHALL be designated as having undefined delay, and counted for the OWLoss metric.

The calculations on the one-way delay SHALL be performed on the conditional distribution, conditioned on successful packet arrival within Tmax. Also, when all packet delays are stored, the process which calculates the one-way delay value MUST enforce the Tmax threshold on stored values before calculations. See section 4.1 of [RFC3393] for details on the conditional distribution to exclude undefined values of delay, and Section 5 of [RFC6703] for background on this analysis choice.

The reference method requires some way to distinguish between different packets in a stream to establish correspondence between sending times and receiving times for each successfully-arriving packet.

Since a standard measurement protocol is employed [RFC5357], then the measurement process will determine the sequence numbers or timestamps applied to test packets after the Fixed and Runtime parameters are passed to that process. The measurement protocol dictates the format of sequence numbers and time-stamps conveyed in the TWAMP-Test packet payload.

7.3.2. Packet Stream Generation

This section gives the details of the packet traffic which is the basis for measurement. In IPPM metrics, this is called the Stream, and can easily be described by providing the list of stream parameters.

Section 11.1.3 of RFC 2681 [RFC2330] provides three methods to generate Poisson sampling intervals. The reciprocal of lambda is the
average packet spacing, thus the Run-time Parameter is
Reciprocal_lambda = 1/lambda, in seconds.

Method 3 SHALL be used, where given a start time (Run-time
Parameter), the subsequent send times are all computed prior to
measurement by computing the pseudo-random distribution of inter-
packet send times, (truncating the distribution as specified in the
Parameter Trunc), and the Src sends each packet at the computed
times.

Note that Trunc is the upper limit on inter-packet times in the
Poisson distribution. A random value greater than Trunc is set equal
to Trunc instead.

Reciprocal_lambda  average packet interval for Poisson Streams
expressed in units of seconds, as a positive value of type
decimal64 with fraction digits = 4 (see section 9.3 of [RFC6020])
with resolution of 0.0001 seconds (0.1 ms), and with lossless
conversion to/from the 32-bit NTP timestamp as per section 6 of
[RFC5905].  Reciprocal_lambda = 1 second.

Trunc  Upper limit on Poisson distribution expressed in units of
seconds, as a positive value of type decimal64 with fraction
digits = 4 (see section 9.3 of [RFC6020]) with resolution of
0.0001 seconds (0.1 ms), and with lossless conversion to/from the
32-bit NTP timestamp as per section 6 of [RFC5905] (values above
this limit will be clipped and set to the limit value).  Trunc =
30.0000 seconds.

7.3.3. Traffic Filtering (observation) Details

NA

7.3.4. Sampling Distribution

NA

7.3.5. Run-time Parameters and Data Format

Run-time Parameters are input factors that must be determined,
configured into the measurement system, and reported with the results
for the context to be complete.

Src  the IP address of the host in the Src Role (format ipv4-address-
no-zone value for IPv4, or ipv6-address-no-zone value for IPv6,
see Section 4 of [RFC6991])

Dst  the IP address of the host in the Dst Role (format ipv4-address-no-zone value for IPv4, or ipv6-address-no-zone value for IPv6, see section 4 of [RFC6991])

T0 a time, the start of a measurement interval, (format "date-and-time" as specified in Section 5.6 of [RFC3339], see also Section 3 of [RFC6991]). The UTC Time Zone is required by Section 6.1 of [RFC2330]. When T0 is "all-zeros", a start time is unspecified and Tf is to be interpreted as the Duration of the measurement interval. The start time is controlled through other means.

Tf a time, the end of a measurement interval, (format "date-and-time" as specified in Section 5.6 of [RFC3339], see also Section 3 of [RFC6991]). The UTC Time Zone is required by Section 6.1 of [RFC2330]. When T0 is "all-zeros", a end time date is ignored and Tf is interpreted as the Duration of the measurement interval.

7.3.6. Roles

Src  launches each packet and waits for return transmissions from Dst. This is the TWAMP Session-Sender.

Dst  waits for each packet from Src and sends a return packet to Src. This is the TWAMP Session-Reflector.

7.4. Output

This category specifies all details of the Output of measurements using the metric.

7.4.1. Type

See subsection titles below for Types.

7.4.2. Reference Definition

For all output types ---

T0 the start of a measurement interval, (format "date-and-time" as specified in Section 5.6 of [RFC3339], see also Section 3 of [RFC6991]). The UTC Time Zone is required by Section 6.1 of [RFC2330].

Tf the end of a measurement interval, (format "date-and-time" as specified in Section 5.6 of [RFC3339], see also Section 3 of [RFC6991]). The UTC Time Zone is required by Section 6.1 of [RFC2330].
For LossRatio -- the count of lost packets to total packets sent is the basis for the loss ratio calculation as per Section 4.1 of [RFC7680].

For each <statistic>, one of the following sub-sections apply:

7.4.2.1. Percentile95

The 95th percentile SHALL be calculated using the conditional distribution of all packets with a finite value of One-way delay (undefined delays are excluded), a single value as follows:

See section 4.1 of [RFC3393] for details on the conditional distribution to exclude undefined values of delay, and Section 5 of [RFC6703] for background on this analysis choice.

See section 4.3 of [RFC3393] for details on the percentile statistic (where Round-trip delay should be substituted for "ipdv").

The percentile = 95, meaning that the reported delay, "95Percentile", is the smallest value of one-way delay for which the Empirical Distribution Function (EDF), $F(95\text{Percentile}) \geq 95\%$ of the singleton one-way delay values in the conditional distribution. See section 11.3 of [RFC2330] for the definition of the percentile statistic using the EDF.

95Percentile The time value of the result is expressed in units of seconds, as a positive value of type decimal64 with fraction digits = 9 (see section 9.3 of [RFC6020]) with resolution of 0.000000001 seconds (1.0 ns), and with lossless conversion to/from the 64-bit NTP timestamp as per section 6 of RFC [RFC5905]

7.4.2.2. Mean

The mean SHALL be calculated using the conditional distribution of all packets with a finite value of One-way delay (undefined delays are excluded), a single value as follows:

See section 4.1 of [RFC3393] for details on the conditional distribution to exclude undefined values of delay, and Section 5 of [RFC6703] for background on this analysis choice.

See section 4.2.2 of [RFC6049] for details on calculating this statistic, and 4.2.3 of [RFC6049].

Mean The time value of the result is expressed in units of seconds, as a positive value of type decimal64 with fraction digits = 9 (see section 9.3 of [RFC6020]) with resolution of 0.000000001
7.4.2.3. Min

The minimum SHALL be calculated using the conditional distribution of all packets with a finite value of One-way delay (undefined delays are excluded), a single value as follows:

See section 4.1 of [RFC3393] for details on the conditional distribution to exclude undefined values of delay, and Section 5 of [RFC6703] for background on this analysis choice.

See section 4.3.2 of [RFC6049] for details on calculating this statistic, and 4.3.3 of [RFC6049].

Min  The time value of the result is expressed in units of seconds, as a positive value of type decimal64 with fraction digits = 9 (see section 9.3 of [RFC6020]) with resolution of 0.000000001 seconds (1.0 ns), and with lossless conversion to/from the 64-bit NTP timestamp as per section 6 of RFC [RFC5905]

7.4.2.4. Max

The maximum SHALL be calculated using the conditional distribution of all packets with a finite value of One-way delay (undefined delays are excluded), a single value as follows:

See section 4.1 of [RFC3393] for details on the conditional distribution to exclude undefined values of delay, and Section 5 of [RFC6703] for background on this analysis choice.

See section 4.3.2 of [RFC6049] for a closely related method for calculating this statistic, and 4.3.3 of [RFC6049]. The formula is as follows:

\[
\text{Max} = (\text{FiniteDelay}[j])
\]

such that for some index, \( j \), where \( 1 \leq j \leq N \)
\[
\text{FiniteDelay}[j] \geq \text{FiniteDelay}[n] \text{ for all } n
\]

Max  The time value of the result is expressed in units of seconds, as a positive value of type decimal64 with fraction digits = 9 (see section 9.3 of [RFC6020]) with resolution of 0.000000001 seconds (1.0 ns), and with lossless conversion to/from the 64-bit NTP timestamp as per section 6 of RFC [RFC5905]
7.4.2.5. Std_Dev

The Std_Dev SHALL be calculated using the conditional distribution of all packets with a finite value of One-way delay (undefined delays are excluded), a single value as follows:

See section 4.1 of [RFC3393] for details on the conditional distribution to exclude undefined values of delay, and Section 5 of [RFC6703] for background on this analysis choice.

See section 6.1.4 of [RFC6049] for a closely related method for calculating this statistic. The formula is the classic calculation for standard deviation of a population.

Define Population Std_Dev_Delay as follows:
(\text{where all packets } n = 1 \text{ through } N \text{ have a value for } \text{Delay}[n], \text{and MeanDelay calculated as in 7.4.2.2}), \text{and } \text{SQRT}[] \text{ is the Square Root function:}

\[
\text{Std}_\text{Dev} = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N} \left(\text{Delay}[n] - \text{MeanDelay}\right)^2}{N}}
\]

\text{Std}_\text{Dev} \text{ The time value of the result is expressed in units of seconds, as a positive value of type decimal64 with fraction digits = 9 (see section 9.3 of [RFC6020]) with resolution of 0.000000001 seconds (1.0 ns), and with lossless conversion to/from the 64-bit NTP timestamp as per section 6 of RFC [RFC5905]\text{.}

7.4.3. Metric Units

The <statistic> of One-way Delay is expressed in seconds.

The One-way Loss Ratio is expressed as a percentage of lost packets to total packets sent.

7.4.4. Calibration

Section 3.7.3 of [RFC7679] provides a means to quantify the systematic and random errors of a time measurement. In-situ calibration could be enabled with an internal loopback that includes as much of the measurement system as possible, performs address manipulation as needed, and provides some form of isolation (e.g.,
deterministic delay) to avoid send-receive interface contention. Some portion of the random and systematic error can be characterized this way.

For one-way delay measurements, the error calibration must include an assessment of the internal clock synchronization with its external reference (this internal clock is supplying timestamps for measurement). In practice, the time offsets [RFC5905] of clocks at both the source and destination are needed to estimate the systematic error due to imperfect clock synchronization (the time offsets [RFC5905] are smoothed, thus the random variation is not usually represented in the results).

time_offset  The time value of the result is expressed in units of seconds, as a signed value of type decimal64 with fraction digits = 9 (see section 9.3 of [RFC6020]) with resolution of 0.000000001 seconds (1.0 ns), and with lossless conversion to/from the 64-bit NTP timestamp as per section 6 of RFC [RFC5905]

When a measurement controller requests a calibration measurement, the loopback is applied and the result is output in the same format as a normal measurement with additional indication that it is a calibration result. In any measurement, the measurement function SHOULD report its current estimate of time offset [RFC5905] as an indicator of the degree of synchronization.

Both internal loopback calibration and clock synchronization can be used to estimate the available accuracy of the Output Metric Units. For example, repeated loopback delay measurements will reveal the portion of the Output result resolution which is the result of system noise, and thus inaccurate.

7.5. Administrative items

7.5.1. Status

Current

7.5.2. Requester

This RFC number

7.5.3. Revision

1.0
7.5.4. Revision Date

YYYY-MM-DD

7.6. Comments and Remarks

None

8. UDP Periodic One-way Delay and Loss Registry Entries

This section specifies five initial registry entries for the UDP Periodic One-way Delay, and one for UDP Periodic One-way Loss.

IANA Note: Registry "Name" below specifies multiple registry entries, whose output format varies according to the <statistic> element of the name that specifies one form of statistical summary. There is an additional metric name for the Loss metric.

All column entries beside the ID, Name, Description, and Output Reference Method categories are the same, thus this section proposes six closely-related registry entries. As a result, IANA is also asked to assign corresponding URLs to each Named Metric.

8.1. Summary

This category includes multiple indexes to the registry entries, the element ID and metric name.

8.1.1. ID (Identifier)

IANA is asked to assign a different numeric identifiers to each of the six Metrics.

8.1.2. Name

OWDelay_Active_IP-UDP-Periodic20m-Payload142B_RFCXXXXsec8_Seconds_<statistic>

where <statistic> is one of:

- 95Percentile
- Mean
- Min
- Max
8.1.3. URI
URL: https://www.iana.org/...<name>

8.1.4. Description

OWDelay: This metric assesses the delay of a stream of packets exchanged between two hosts (or measurement points), and reports the <statistic> One-way delay for all successfully exchanged packets based on their conditional delay distribution.

where <statistic> is one of:
- 95Percentile
- Mean
- Min
- Max
- StdDev

OWLoss: This metric assesses the loss ratio of a stream of packets exchanged between two hosts (which are the two measurement points), and the Output is the One-way loss ratio for all successfully received packets expressed as a percentage.

8.2. Metric Definition

This category includes columns to prompt the entry of all necessary details related to the metric definition, including the RFC reference and values of input factors, called fixed parameters.

8.2.1. Reference Definition

For Delay:

Section 3.4 of [RFC7679] provides the reference definition of the singleton (single value) One-way delay metric. Section 4.4 of [RFC7679] provides the reference definition expanded to cover a multi-value sample. Note that terms such as singleton and sample are defined in Section 11 of [RFC2330].

Only successful packet transfers with finite delay are included in the sample, as prescribed in section 4.1.2 of [RFC6049].

For loss:


Section 2.4 of [RFC7680] provides the reference definition of the singleton (single value) one-way loss metric. Section 3.4 of [RFC7680] provides the reference definition expanded to cover a multi-singleton sample. Note that terms such as singleton and sample are defined in Section 11 of [RFC2330].

8.2.2. Fixed Parameters

Type-P:

o IPv4 header values:
  * DSCP: set to 0
  * TTL: set to 255
  * Protocol: Set to 17 (UDP)

o IPv6 header values:
  * DSCP: set to 0
  * Hop Count: set to 255
  * Next Header: set to 17 (UDP)
* Flow Label: set to zero
* Extension Headers: none

- UDP header values:
  * Checksum: the checksum MUST be calculated and the non-zero checksum included in the header

- UDP Payload: TWAMP Test Packet Formats, Section 4.1.2 of [RFC5357]
  * Security features in use influence the number of Padding octets.
  * 142 octets total, including the TWAMP format (and format type MUST be reported, if used)

Other measurement parameters:

Tmax: a loss threshold waiting time with value 3.0, expressed in units of seconds, as a positive value of type decimal64 with fraction digits = 4 (see section 9.3 of [RFC6020]) and with resolution of 0.0001 seconds (0.1 ms), with lossless conversion to/from the 32-bit NTP timestamp as per section 6 of [RFC5905].

See the Packet Stream generation category for two additional Fixed Parameters.

8.3. Method of Measurement

This category includes columns for references to relevant sections of the RFC(s) and any supplemental information needed to ensure an unambiguous methods for implementations.

8.3.1. Reference Method

The methodology for this metric is defined as Type-P-One-way-Delay-Poisson-Stream in section 3.6 of [RFC7679] and section 4.6 of [RFC7679] using the Type-P and Tmax defined under Fixed Parameters. However, a Periodic stream is used, as defined in [RFC3432].

The reference method distinguishes between long-delayed packets and lost packets by implementing a maximum waiting time for packet arrival. Tmax is the waiting time used as the threshold to declare a packet lost. Lost packets SHALL be designated as having undefined delay, and counted for the OWLoss metric.
The calculations on the one-way delay SHALL be performed on the conditional distribution, conditioned on successful packet arrival within Tmax. Also, when all packet delays are stored, the process which calculates the one-way delay value MUST enforce the Tmax threshold on stored values before calculations. See section 4.1 of [RFC3393] for details on the conditional distribution to exclude undefined values of delay, and Section 5 of [RFC6703] for background on this analysis choice.

The reference method requires some way to distinguish between different packets in a stream to establish correspondence between sending times and receiving times for each successfully-arriving packet.

Since a standard measurement protocol is employed [RFC5357], then the measurement process will determine the sequence numbers or timestamps applied to test packets after the Fixed and Runtime parameters are passed to that process. The measurement protocol dictates the format of sequence numbers and time-stamps conveyed in the TWAMP-Test packet payload.

8.3.2. Packet Stream Generation

This section gives the details of the packet traffic which is the basis for measurement. In IPPM metrics, this is called the Stream, and can easily be described by providing the list of stream parameters.

Section 3 of [RFC3432] prescribes the method for generating Periodic streams using associated parameters.

incT the nominal duration of inter-packet interval, first bit to first bit, with value 0.0200 expressed in units of seconds, as a positive value of type decimal64 with fraction digits = 4 (see section 9.3 of [RFC6020]) and with resolution of 0.0001 seconds (0.1 ms), with lossless conversion to/from the 32-bit NTP timestamp as per section 6 of [RFC5905].

dT the duration of the interval for allowed sample start times, with value 1.0000, expressed in units of seconds, as a positive value of type decimal64 with fraction digits = 4 (see section 9.3 of [RFC6020]) and with resolution of 0.0001 seconds (0.1 ms), with lossless conversion to/from the 32-bit NTP timestamp as per section 6 of [RFC5905].

T0 the actual start time of the periodic stream, determined from T0 and dT.
NOTE: an initiation process with a number of control exchanges resulting in unpredictable start times (within a time interval) may be sufficient to avoid synchronization of periodic streams, and therefore a valid replacement for selecting a start time at random from a fixed interval.

These stream parameters will be specified as Run-time parameters.

8.3.3. Traffic Filtering (observation) Details

NA

8.3.4. Sampling Distribution

NA

8.3.5. Run-time Parameters and Data Format

Run-time Parameters are input factors that must be determined, configured into the measurement system, and reported with the results for the context to be complete.

Src  the IP address of the host in the Src Role (format ipv4-address-no-zone value for IPv4, or ipv6-address-no-zone value for IPv6, see Section 4 of [RFC6991])

Dst  the IP address of the host in the Dst Role (format ipv4-address-no-zone value for IPv4, or ipv6-address-no-zone value for IPv6, see section 4 of [RFC6991])

T0  a time, the start of a measurement interval, (format "date-and-time" as specified in Section 5.6 of [RFC3339], see also Section 3 of [RFC6991]). The UTC Time Zone is required by Section 6.1 of [RFC2330]. When T0 is "all-zeros", a start time is unspecified and Tf is to be interpreted as the Duration of the measurement interval. The start time is controlled through other means.

Tf  a time, the end of a measurement interval, (format "date-and-time" as specified in Section 5.6 of [RFC3339], see also Section 3 of [RFC6991]). The UTC Time Zone is required by Section 6.1 of [RFC2330]. When T0 is "all-zeros", a end time date is ignored and Tf is interpreted as the Duration of the measurement interval.

8.3.6. Roles

Src  launches each packet and waits for return transmissions from Dst. This is the TWAMP Session-Sender.
Dst waits for each packet from Src and sends a return packet to Src. This is the TWAMP Session-Reflector.

8.4. Output

This category specifies all details of the Output of measurements using the metric.

8.4.1. Type

See subsection titles in Reference Definition for Latency Types.

8.4.2. Reference Definition

For all output types ---

T0 the start of a measurement interval, (format "date-and-time" as specified in Section 5.6 of [RFC3339], see also Section 3 of [RFC6991]). The UTC Time Zone is required by Section 6.1 of [RFC2330].

Tf the end of a measurement interval, (format "date-and-time" as specified in Section 5.6 of [RFC3339], see also Section 3 of [RFC6991]). The UTC Time Zone is required by Section 6.1 of [RFC2330].

For LossRatio -- the count of lost packets to total packets sent is the basis for the loss ratio calculation as per Section 4.1 of [RFC7680].

For each <statistic>, one of the following sub-sections apply:

8.4.2.1. Percentile95

The 95th percentile SHALL be calculated using the conditional distribution of all packets with a finite value of One-way delay (undefined delays are excluded), a single value as follows:

See section 4.1 of [RFC3393] for details on the conditional distribution to exclude undefined values of delay, and Section 5 of [RFC6703] for background on this analysis choice.

See section 4.3 of [RFC3393] for details on the percentile statistic (where Round-trip delay should be substituted for "ipdv").

The percentile = 95, meaning that the reported delay, "95Percentile", is the smallest value of one-way delay for which the Empirical Distribution Function (EDF), $F(95\text{Percentile}) \geq 95\%$ of the singleton
one-way delay values in the conditional distribution. See section 11.3 of [RFC2330] for the definition of the percentile statistic using the EDF.

95Percentile The time value of the result is expressed in units of seconds, as a positive value of type decimal64 with fraction digits = 9 (see section 9.3 of [RFC6020]) with resolution of 0.000000001 seconds (1.0 ns), and with lossless conversion to/from the 64-bit NTP timestamp as per section 6 of RFC [RFC5905]

8.4.2.2. Mean

The mean SHALL be calculated using the conditional distribution of all packets with a finite value of One-way delay (undefined delays are excluded), a single value as follows:

Mean The time value of the result is expressed in units of seconds, as a positive value of type decimal64 with fraction digits = 9 (see section 9.3 of [RFC6020]) with resolution of 0.000000001 seconds (1.0 ns), and with lossless conversion to/from the 64-bit NTP timestamp as per section 6 of RFC [RFC5905]

8.4.2.3. Min

The minimum SHALL be calculated using the conditional distribution of all packets with a finite value of One-way delay (undefined delays are excluded), a single value as follows:

Min The time value of the result is expressed in units of seconds, as a positive value of type decimal64 with fraction digits = 9 (see section 9.3 of [RFC6020]) with resolution of 0.000000001 seconds (1.0 ns), and with lossless conversion to/from the 64-bit NTP timestamp as per section 6 of RFC [RFC5905]
8.4.2.4. Max

The maximum SHALL be calculated using the conditional distribution of all packets with a finite value of One-way delay (undefined delays are excluded), a single value as follows:

See section 4.1 of [RFC3393] for details on the conditional distribution to exclude undefined values of delay, and Section 5 of [RFC6703] for background on this analysis choice.

See section 4.3.2 of [RFC6049] for a closely related method for calculating this statistic, and 4.3.3 of [RFC6049]. The formula is as follows:

\[ \text{Max} = \text{FiniteDelay}[j] \]

such that for some index, \( j \), where \( 1 \leq j \leq N \)
\[ \text{FiniteDelay}[j] \geq \text{FiniteDelay}[n] \text{ for all } n \]

Max  The time value of the result is expressed in units of seconds, as a positive value of type decimal64 with fraction digits = 9 (see section 9.3 of [RFC6020]) with resolution of 0.000000001 seconds (1.0 ns), and with lossless conversion to/from the 64-bit NTP timestamp as per section 6 of RFC [RFC5905]

8.4.2.5. Std_Dev

The Std_Dev SHALL be calculated using the conditional distribution of all packets with a finite value of One-way delay (undefined delays are excluded), a single value as follows:

See section 4.1 of [RFC3393] for details on the conditional distribution to exclude undefined values of delay, and Section 5 of [RFC6703] for background on this analysis choice.

See section 4.3.2 of [RFC6049] for a closely related method for calculating this statistic, and 4.3.3 of [RFC6049]. The formula is the classic calculation for standard deviation of a population.
Define Population Std_Dev_Delay as follows:
(where all packets n = 1 through N have a value for Delay[n],
and MeanDelay calculated as in 7.4.2.2), and SQRT[] is the
Square Root function:

\[
\text{Std}_\text{Dev} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N} (\text{Delay}[n] - \text{Mean Delay})^2}
\]

Std_Dev  The time value of the result is expressed in units of
seconds, as a positive value of type decimal64 with fraction
digits = 9 (see section 9.3 of [RFC6020]) with resolution of
0.000000001 seconds (1.0 ns), and with lossless conversion to/from
the 64-bit NTP timestamp as per section 6 of RFC [RFC5905]

8.4.3. Metric Units

The \(<\text{statistic}>\) of One-way Delay is expressed in seconds, where
\(<\text{statistic}>\) is one of:

- 95Percentile
- Mean
- Min
- Max
- StdDev

The One-way Loss Ratio is expressed as a percentage of lost packets
to total packets sent.

8.4.4. Calibration

Section 3.7.3 of [RFC7679] provides a means to quantify the
systematic and random errors of a time measurement. In-situ
calibration could be enabled with an internal loopback that includes
as much of the measurement system as possible, performs address
manipulation as needed, and provides some form of isolation (e.g.,
deterministic delay) to avoid send-receive interface contention.
Some portion of the random and systematic error can be characterized
this way.
For one-way delay measurements, the error calibration must include an assessment of the internal clock synchronization with its external reference (this internal clock is supplying timestamps for measurement). In practice, the time offsets [RFC5905] of clocks at both the source and destination are needed to estimate the systematic error due to imperfect clock synchronization (the time offsets [RFC5905] are smoothed, thus the random variation is not usually represented in the results).

time_offset The time value of the result is expressed in units of seconds, as a signed value of type decimal64 with fraction digits = 9 (see section 9.3 of [RFC6020]) with resolution of 0.000000001 seconds (1.0 ns), and with lossless conversion to/from the 64-bit NTP timestamp as per section 6 of RFC [RFC5905]

When a measurement controller requests a calibration measurement, the loopback is applied and the result is output in the same format as a normal measurement with additional indication that it is a calibration result. In any measurement, the measurement function SHOULD report its current estimate of time offset [RFC5905] as an indicator of the degree of synchronization.

Both internal loopback calibration and clock synchronization can be used to estimate the available accuracy of the Output Metric Units. For example, repeated loopback delay measurements will reveal the portion of the Output result resolution which is the result of system noise, and thus inaccurate.

8.5. Administrative items

8.5.1. Status

Current

8.5.2. Requester

This RFC number

8.5.3. Revision

1.0

8.5.4. Revision Date

YYYY-MM-DD
8.6. Comments and Remarks

None.

9. ICMP Round-trip Latency and Loss Registry Entries

This section specifies three initial registry entries for the ICMP Round-trip Latency, and another entry for ICMP Round-trip Loss Ratio.

IANA Note: Registry "Name" below specifies multiple registry entries, whose output format varies according to the <statistic> element of the name that specifies one form of statistical summary. There is an additional metric name for the Loss metric.

All column entries beside the ID, Name, Description, and Output Reference Method categories are the same, thus this section proposes two closely-related registry entries. As a result, IANA is also asked to assign corresponding URLs to each Named Metric.

9.1. Summary

This category includes multiple indexes to the registry entry: the element ID and metric name.

9.1.1. ID (Identifier)

IANA is asked to assign different numeric identifiers to each of the four Named Metrics.

9.1.2. Name

RTDelay_Active_IP-ICMP-SendOnRcv_RFCXXXXsec9_Seconds_<statistic>

where <statistic> is one of:

- Mean
- Min
- Max

RTLoss_Active_IP-ICMP-SendOnRcv_RFCXXXXsec9_Percent_LossRatio

9.1.3. URI

URL: https://www.iana.org/ ... <name>
9.1.4. Description

RTDelay: This metric assesses the delay of a stream of ICMP packets exchanged between two hosts (which are the two measurement points), and the Output is the Round-trip delay for all successfully exchanged packets expressed as the <statistic> of their conditional delay distribution, where <statistic> is one of:

- Mean
- Min
- Max

RTLoss: This metric assesses the loss ratio of a stream of ICMP packets exchanged between two hosts (which are the two measurement points), and the Output is the Round-trip loss ratio for all successfully exchanged packets expressed as a percentage.

9.1.5. Change Controller

IETF

9.1.6. Version (of Registry Format)

1.0

9.2. Metric Definition

This category includes columns to prompt the entry of all necessary details related to the metric definition, including the RFC reference and values of input factors, called fixed parameters.

9.2.1. Reference Definition


[RFC2681]

Section 2.4 of [RFC2681] provides the reference definition of the singleton (single value) Round-trip delay metric. Section 3.4 of [RFC2681] provides the reference definition expanded to cover a multi-singleton sample. Note that terms such as singleton and sample are defined in Section 11 of [RFC2330].

Note that although the [RFC2681] definition of "Round-trip-Delay between Src and Dst" is directionally ambiguous in the text, this
metric tightens the definition further to recognize that the host in
the "Src" role will send the first packet to "Dst", and ultimately
receive the corresponding return packet from "Dst" (when neither are
lost).

Finally, note that the variable "dT" is used in [RFC2681] to refer to
the value of Round-trip delay in metric definitions and methods. The
variable "dT" has been re-used in other IPPM literature to refer to
different quantities, and cannot be used as a global variable name.

[RFC6673]

Both delay and loss metrics employ a maximum waiting time for
received packets, so the count of lost packets to total packets sent
is the basis for the loss ratio calculation as per Section 6.1 of
[RFC6673].

9.2.2. Fixed Parameters

Type-P as defined in Section 13 of [RFC2330]:

- IPv4 header values:
  * DSCP: set to 0
  * TTL: set to 255
  * Protocol: Set to 01 (ICMP)

- IPv6 header values:
  * DSCP: set to 0
  * Hop Count: set to 255
  * Next Header: set to 128 decimal (ICMP)
  * Flow Label: set to zero
  * Extension Headers: none

- ICMP header values:
  * Type: 8 (Echo Request)
  * Code: 0
* Checksum: the checksum MUST be calculated and the non-zero checksum included in the header

* (Identifier and Sequence Number set at Run-Time)

  o ICMP Payload

    * total of 32 bytes of random info, constant per test.

Other measurement parameters:

  o Tmax: a loss threshold waiting time

    * 3.0, expressed in units of seconds, as a positive value of type decimal64 with fraction digits = 4 (see section 9.3 of [RFC6020]) and with resolution of 0.0001 seconds (0.1 ms), with lossless conversion to/from the 32-bit NTP timestamp as per section 6 of [RFC5905].

9.3. Method of Measurement

This category includes columns for references to relevant sections of the RFC(s) and any supplemental information needed to ensure an unambiguous methods for implementations.

9.3.1. Reference Method

The methodology for this metric is defined as Type-P-Round-trip-Delay-Poisson-Stream in section 2.6 of RFC 2681 [RFC2681] and section 3.6 of RFC 2681 [RFC2681] using the Type-P and Tmax defined under Fixed Parameters.

The reference method distinguishes between long-delayed packets and lost packets by implementing a maximum waiting time for packet arrival. Tmax is the waiting time used as the threshold to declare a packet lost. Lost packets SHALL be designated as having undefined delay, and counted for the RTLoss metric.

The calculations on the delay (RTD) SHALL be performed on the conditional distribution, conditioned on successful packet arrival within Tmax. Also, when all packet delays are stored, the process which calculates the RTD value MUST enforce the Tmax threshold on stored values before calculations. See section 4.1 of [RFC3393] for details on the conditional distribution to exclude undefined values of delay, and Section 5 of [RFC6703] for background on this analysis choice.
The reference method requires some way to distinguish between different packets in a stream to establish correspondence between sending times and receiving times for each successfully-arriving packet. Sequence numbers or other send-order identification MUST be retained at the Src or included with each packet to disambiguate packet reordering if it occurs.

The measurement process will determine the sequence numbers applied to test packets after the Fixed and Runtime parameters are passed to that process. The ICMP measurement process and protocol will dictate the format of sequence numbers and other identifiers.

Refer to Section 4.4 of [RFC6673] for expanded discussion of the instruction to "send a Type-P packet back to the Src as quickly as possible" in Section 2.6 of RFC 2681 [RFC2681]. Section 8 of [RFC6673] presents additional requirements which MUST be included in the method of measurement for this metric.

9.3.2. Packet Stream Generation

This section gives the details of the packet traffic which is the basis for measurement. In IPPM metrics, this is called the Stream, and can easily be described by providing the list of stream parameters.

The ICMP metrics use a sending discipline called "SendOnRcv" or Send On Receive. This is a modification of Section 3 of [RFC3432], which prescribes the method for generating Periodic streams using associated parameters as defined below for this description:

incT  the nominal duration of inter-packet interval, first bit to first bit

dT the duration of the interval for allowed sample start times

The incT stream parameter will be specified as a Run-time parameter, and dT is not used in SendOnRcv.

A SendOnRcv sender behaves exactly like a Periodic stream generator while all reply packets arrive with RTD < incT, and the inter-packet interval will be constant.

If a reply packet arrives with RTD >= incT, then the inter-packet interval for the next sending time is nominally RTD.

If a reply packet fails to arrive within Tmax, then the inter-packet interval for the next sending time is nominally Tmax.
If an immediate send on reply arrival is desired, then set incT=0.

9.3.3. Traffic Filtering (observation) Details

NA

9.3.4. Sampling Distribution

NA

9.3.5. Run-time Parameters and Data Format

Run-time Parameters are input factors that must be determined, configured into the measurement system, and reported with the results for the context to be complete.

Src  the IP address of the host in the Src Role (format ipv4-address-no-zone value for IPv4, or ipv6-address-no-zone value for IPv6, see Section 4 of [RFC6991])

Dst  the IP address of the host in the Dst Role (format ipv4-address-no-zone value for IPv4, or ipv6-address-no-zone value for IPv6, see section 4 of [RFC6991])

incT  the nominal duration of inter-packet interval, first bit to first bit, expressed in units of seconds, as a positive value of type decimal64 with fraction digits = 4 (see section 9.3 of [RFC6020]) and with resolution of 0.0001 seconds (0.1 ms).

T0  a time, the start of a measurement interval, (format "date-and-time" as specified in Section 5.6 of [RFC3339], see also Section 3 of [RFC6991]). The UTC Time Zone is required by Section 6.1 of [RFC2330]. When T0 is "all-zeros", a start time is unspecified and Tf is to be interpreted as the Duration of the measurement interval. The start time is controlled through other means.

Count  The total count of ICMP Echo Requests to send, formatted as a uint16, as per section 9.2 of [RFC6020].

(see the Packet Stream Generation section for additional Run-time parameters)

9.3.6. Roles

Src  launches each packet and waits for return transmissions from Dst.

Dst  waits for each packet from Src and sends a return packet to Src.
9.4. Output

This category specifies all details of the Output of measurements using the metric.

9.4.1. Type

See subsection titles in Reference Definition for Latency Types.

LossRatio -- the count of lost packets to total packets sent is the basis for the loss ratio calculation as per Section 6.1 of [RFC6673].

9.4.2. Reference Definition

For all output types ---

T0 the start of a measurement interval, (format "date-and-time" as specified in Section 5.6 of [RFC3339], see also Section 3 of [RFC6991]). The UTC Time Zone is required by Section 6.1 of [RFC2330].

Tf the end of a measurement interval, (format "date-and-time" as specified in Section 5.6 of [RFC3339], see also Section 3 of [RFC6991]). The UTC Time Zone is required by Section 6.1 of [RFC2330].

TotalCount the count of packets actually sent by the Src to Dst during the measurement interval.

For LossRatio -- the count of lost packets to total packets sent is the basis for the loss ratio calculation as per Section 4.1 of [RFC7680].

For each <statistic>, one of the following sub-sections apply:

9.4.2.1. Mean

The mean SHALL be calculated using the conditional distribution of all packets with a finite value of Round-trip delay (undefined delays are excluded), a single value as follows:

See section 4.1 of [RFC3393] for details on the conditional distribution to exclude undefined values of delay, and Section 5 of [RFC6703] for background on this analysis choice.

See section 4.2.2 of [RFC6049] for details on calculating this statistic, and 4.2.3 of [RFC6049].
Mean  The time value of the result is expressed in units of seconds, as a positive value of type decimal64 with fraction digits = 9 (see section 9.3 of [RFC6020]) with resolution of 0.000000001 seconds (1.0 ns), and with lossless conversion to/from the 64-bit NTP timestamp as per section 6 of RFC [RFC5905]

9.4.2.2. Min

The minimum SHALL be calculated using the conditional distribution of all packets with a finite value of Round-trip delay (undefined delays are excluded), a single value as follows:

See section 4.1 of [RFC3393] for details on the conditional distribution to exclude undefined values of delay, and Section 5 of [RFC6703] for background on this analysis choice.

See section 4.3.2 of [RFC6049] for details on calculating this statistic, and 4.3.3 of [RFC6049].

Min  The time value of the result is expressed in units of seconds, as a positive value of type decimal64 with fraction digits = 9 (see section 9.3 of [RFC6020]) with resolution of 0.000000001 seconds (1.0 ns), and with lossless conversion to/from the 64-bit NTP timestamp as per section 6 of RFC [RFC5905]

9.4.2.3. Max

The maximum SHALL be calculated using the conditional distribution of all packets with a finite value of Round-trip delay (undefined delays are excluded), a single value as follows:

See section 4.1 of [RFC3393] for details on the conditional distribution to exclude undefined values of delay, and Section 5 of [RFC6703] for background on this analysis choice.

See section 4.3.2 of [RFC6049] for a closely related method for calculating this statistic, and 4.3.3 of [RFC6049]. The formula is as follows:

\[
\text{Max} = (\text{FiniteDelay}[j])
\]

such that for some index, \( j \), where \( 1 \leq j \leq N \)
\[
\text{FiniteDelay}[j] \geq \text{FiniteDelay}[n] \text{ for all } n
\]

Max  The time value of the result is expressed in units of seconds, as a positive value of type decimal64 with fraction digits = 9 (see section 9.3 of [RFC6020]) with resolution of 0.000000001 seconds (1.0 ns), and with lossless conversion to/from the 64-bit NTP timestamp as per section 6 of RFC [RFC5905]
9.4.3. Metric Units

The `<statistic>` of Round-trip Delay is expressed in seconds, where `<statistic>` is one of:

- Mean
- Min
- Max

The Round-trip Loss Ratio is expressed as a percentage of lost packets to total packets sent.

9.4.4. Calibration

Section 3.7.3 of [RFC7679] provides a means to quantify the systematic and random errors of a time measurement. In-situ calibration could be enabled with an internal loopback at the Source host that includes as much of the measurement system as possible, performs address manipulation as needed, and provides some form of isolation (e.g., deterministic delay) to avoid send-receive interface contention. Some portion of the random and systematic error can be characterized this way.

When a measurement controller requests a calibration measurement, the loopback is applied and the result is output in the same format as a normal measurement with additional indication that it is a calibration result.

Both internal loopback calibration and clock synchronization can be used to estimate the available accuracy of the Output Metric Units. For example, repeated loopback delay measurements will reveal the portion of the Output result resolution which is the result of system noise, and thus inaccurate.

9.5. Administrative items

9.5.1. Status

Current
9.5.2. Requester

This RFC number

9.5.3. Revision

1.0

9.5.4. Revision Date

YYYY-MM-DD

9.6. Comments and Remarks

None

10. TCP Round-Trip Delay and Loss Registry Entries

This section specifies three initial registry entries for the Passive assessment of TCP Round-Trip Delay (RTD) and another entry for TCP Round-trip Loss Count.

IANA Note: Registry "Name" below specifies multiple registry entries, whose output format varies according to the <statistic> element of the name that specifies one form of statistical summary. There are two additional metric names for Singleton RT Delay and Packet Count metrics.

All column entries beside the ID, Name, Description, and Output Reference Method categories are the same, thus this section proposes four closely-related registry entries. As a result, IANA is also asked to assign corresponding URLs to each Named Metric.

10.1. Summary

This category includes multiple indexes to the registry entry: the element ID and metric name.

10.1.1. ID (Identifier)

IANA is asked to assign different numeric identifiers to each of the four Named Metrics.

10.1.2. Name

RTDelay_Passive_IP-TCP_RFCXXXXsec10_Seconds_<statistic>

where <statistic> is one of:
RTDelay: This metric assesses the round-trip delay of TCP packets constituting a single connection, exchanged between two hosts. We consider the measurement of round-trip delay based on a single Observation Point [RFC7011] somewhere in the network. The Output is the Round-trip delay for all successfully exchanged packets expressed as the <statistic> of their conditional delay distribution, where <statistic> is one of:

- Mean
- Min
- Max

RTLoss: This metric assesses the estimated loss count for TCP packets constituting a single connection, exchanged between two hosts. We consider the measurement of round-trip delay based on a single Observation Point [RFC7011] somewhere in the network. The Output is the estimated Loss Count for the measurement interval.
10.2. Metric Definition

This category includes columns to prompt the entry of all necessary details related to the metric definition, including the RFC reference and values of input factors, called fixed parameters.

10.2.1. Reference Definitions

Although there is no RFC that describes passive measurement of Round-Trip Delay, the parallel definition for Active measurement is:


[RFC2681]

This metric definition uses the terms singleton and sample as defined in Section 11 of [RFC2330]. (Section 2.4 of [RFC2681] provides the reference definition of the singleton (single value) Round-trip delay metric. Section 3.4 of [RFC2681] provides the reference definition expanded to cover a multi-singleton sample.)

With the Observation Point [RFC7011] (OP) typically located between the hosts participating in the TCP connection, the Round-trip Delay metric requires two individual measurements between the OP and each host, such that the Spatial Composition [RFC6049] of the measurements yields a Round-trip Delay singleton (we are extending the composition of one-way subpath delays to subpath round-trip delay).

Using the direction of TCP SYN transmission to anchor the nomenclature, host A sends the SYN and host B replies with SYN-ACK during connection establishment. The direction of SYN transfer is considered the Forward direction of transmission, from A through OP to B (Reverse is B through OP to A).

Traffic filters reduce the packet stream at the OP to a Qualified bidirectional flow of packets.

In the definitions below, Corresponding Packets are transferred in different directions and convey a common value in a TCP header field that establishes correspondence (to the extent possible). Examples may be found in the TCP timestamp fields.

For a real number, RTD_fwd, >> the Round-trip Delay in the Forward direction from OP to host B at time T’ is RTD_fwd << it is REQUIRED that OP observed a Qualified Packet to host B at wire-time T’, that host B received that packet and sent a Corresponding Packet back to
host A, and OP observed the Corresponding Packet at wire-time T’ + RTD_fwd.

For a real number, RTD_rev, >> the Round-trip Delay in the Reverse direction from OP to host A at time T’’ is RTD_rev << it is REQUIRED that OP observed a Qualified Packet to host A at wire-time T’’, that host A received that packet and sent a Corresponding Packet back to host B, and that OP observed the Corresponding Packet at wire-time T’’ + RTD_rev.

Ideally, the packet sent from host B to host A in both definitions above SHOULD be the same packet (or, when measuring RTD_rev first, the packet from host A to host B in both definitions should be the same).

The REQUIRED Composition Function for a singleton of Round-trip Delay at time T (where T is the earliest of T’ and T’’ above) is:

$$RTDelay = RTD_fwd + RTD_rev$$

Note that when OP is located at host A or host B, one of the terms composing RTDelay will be zero or negligible.

When the Qualified and Corresponding Packets are a TCP-SYN and a TCP-SYN-ACK, then RTD_fwd == RTD_HS_fwd.

When the Qualified and Corresponding Packets are a TCP-SYN-ACK and a TCP-ACK, then RTD_rev == RTD_HS_rev.

The REQUIRED Composition Function for a singleton of Round-trip Delay for the connection Hand Shake:

$$RTDelay_HS = RTD_HS_fwd + RTD_HS_rev$$

The definition of Round-trip Loss Count uses the nomenclature developed above, based on observation of the TCP header sequence numbers and storing the sequence number gaps observed. Packet Losses can be inferred from:

- Out-of-order segments: TCP segments are transmitted with monotonically increasing sequence numbers, but these segments may be received out of order. Section 3 of [RFC4737] describes the notion of "next expected" sequence numbers which can be adapted to TCP segments (for the purpose of detecting reordered packets). Observation of out-of-order segments indicates loss on the path prior to the OP, and creates a gap.
Duplicate segments: Section 2 of [RFC5560] defines identical packets and is suitable for evaluation of TCP packets to detect duplication. Observation of duplicate segments *without a corresponding gap* indicates loss on the path following the OP (because they overlap part of the delivered sequence numbers already observed at OP).

Each observation of an out-of-order or duplicate infers a singleton of loss, but composition of Round-trip Loss Counts will be conducted over a measurement interval which is synonymous with a single TCP connection.

With the above observations in the Forward direction over a measurement interval, the count of out-of-order and duplicate segments is defined as RTL_fwd. Comparable observations in the Reverse direction are defined as RTL_rev.

For a measurement interval (corresponding to a single TCP connection), T0 to Tf, the REQUIRED Composition Function for the two single-direction counts of inferred loss is:

\[
\text{RTLoss} = \text{RTL}_\text{fwd} + \text{RTL}_\text{rev}
\]

10.2.2. Fixed Parameters

Traffic Filters:

o IPv4 header values:
  * DSCP: set to 0
  * Protocol: Set to 06 (TCP)

o IPv6 header values:
  * DSCP: set to 0
  * Hop Count: set to 255
  * Next Header: set to 6 (TCP)
  * Flow Label: set to zero
  * Extension Headers: none

o TCP header values:
  * Flags: ACK, SYN, FIN, set as required
* Timestamp Option (TSopt): Set
  + Section 3.2 of [RFC7323]

10.3. Method of Measurement

This category includes columns for references to relevant sections of the RFC(s) and any supplemental information needed to ensure unambiguous methods for implementations.

10.3.1. Reference Methods

The foundation methodology for this metric is defined in Section 4 of [RFC7323] using the Timestamp Option with modifications that allow application at a mid-path Observation Point (OP) [RFC7011]. Further details and applicable heuristics were derived from [Strowes] and [Trammell-14].

The Traffic Filter at the OP is configured to observe a single TCP connection. When the SYN, SYN-ACK, ACK handshake occurs, it offers the first opportunity to measure both RTD_fwd (on the SYN to SYN-ACK pair) and RTD_rev (on the SYN-ACK to ACK pair). Label this singleton of RTDelay as RTDelay_HS (composed using the forward and reverse measurement pair). RTDelay_HS SHALL be treated separately from other RTDelays on data-bearing packets and their ACKs. The RTDelay_HS value MAY be used as a sanity check on other Composed values of RTDelay.

For payload bearing packets, the OP measures the time interval between observation of a packet with Sequence Number s, and the corresponding ACK with same Sequence number. When the payload is transferred from host A to host B, the observed interval is RTD_fwd.

Because many data transfers are unidirectional (say, in the Forward direction from host A to host B), it is necessary to use pure ACK packets with Timestamp (TSval) and their Timestamp value echo to perform a RTD_rev measurement. The time interval between observation of the ACK from B to A, and the corresponding packet with Timestamp echo (TSecr) is the RTD_rev.

Delay Measurement Filtering Heuristics:

If Data payloads were transferred in both Forward and Reverse directions, then the Round-Trip Time Measurement Rule in Section 4.1 of [RFC7323] could be applied. This rule essentially excludes any measurement using a packet unless it makes progress in the transfer (advances the left edge of the send window, consistent with [Strowes]).
A different heuristic from [Trammell-14] is to exclude any RTD_rev that is larger than previously observed values. This would tend to exclude Reverse measurements taken when the Application has no data ready to send, because considerable time could be added to RTD_rev from this source of error.

Note that the above Heuristic assumes that host A is sending data. Host A expecting a download would mean that this heuristic should be applied to RTD_fwd.

The statistic calculations to summarize the delay (RTDelay) SHALL be performed on the conditional distribution, conditioned on successful Forward and Reverse measurements which follow the Heuristics.

Method for Inferring Loss:

The OP tracks sequence numbers and stores gaps for each direction of transmission, as well as the next-expected sequence number as in [Trammell-14] and [RFC4737]. Loss is inferred from Out-of-order segments and Duplicate segments.

Loss Measurement Filtering Heuristics:

[Trammell-14] adds a window of evaluation based on the RTDelay.

Distinguish Re-ordered from OOO due to loss, because sequence number gap is filled during the same RTDelay window. Segments detected as re-ordered according to [RFC4737] MUST reduce the Loss Count inferred from Out-of-order segments.

Spurious (unneeded) retransmissions (observed as duplicates) can also be reduced this way, as described in [Trammell-14].

Sources of Error:

The principal source of RTDelay error is the host processing time to return a packet that defines the termination of a time interval. The heuristics above intend to mitigate these errors by excluding measurements where host processing time is a significant part of RTD_fwd or RTD_rev.

A key source of RTLoss error is observation loss, described in section 3 of [Trammell-14].
10.3.2. Packet Stream Generation

NA

10.3.3. Traffic Filtering (observation) Details

The Fixed Parameters above give a portion of the Traffic Filter. Other aspects will be supplied as Run-time Parameters (below).

10.3.4. Sampling Distribution

This metric requires a complete sample of all packets that qualify according to the Traffic Filter criteria.

10.3.5. Run-time Parameters and Data Format

Run-time Parameters are input factors that must be determined, configured into the measurement system, and reported with the results for the context to be complete.

Src the IP address of the host in the host A Role (format ipv4-address-no-zone value for IPv4, or ipv6-address-no-zone value for IPv6, see Section 4 of [RFC6991])

Dst the IP address of the host in the host B (format ipv4-address-no-zone value for IPv4, or ipv6-address-no-zone value for IPv6, see section 4 of [RFC6991])

T0 a time, the start of a measurement interval, (format "date-and-time" as specified in Section 5.6 of [RFC3339], see also Section 3 of [RFC6991]). The UTC Time Zone is required by Section 6.1 of [RFC2330]. When T0 is "all-zeros", a start time is unspecified and Td is to be interpreted as the Duration of the measurement interval. The start time is controlled through other means.

Td Optionally, the end of a measurement interval, (format "date-and-time" as specified in Section 5.6 of [RFC3339], see also Section 3 of [RFC6991]), or the duration (see T0). The UTC Time Zone is required by Section 6.1 of [RFC2330]. Alternatively, the end of the measurement interval MAY be controlled by the measured connection, where the second pair of FIN and ACK packets exchanged between host A and B effectively ends the interval.

TTL or Hop Limit Set at desired value.
10.3.6. Roles

host A launches the SYN packet to open the connection, and synonymous with an IP address.

host B replies with the SYN-ACK packet to open the connection, and synonymous with an IP address.

10.4. Output

This category specifies all details of the Output of measurements using the metric.

10.4.1. Type

See subsection titles in Reference Definition for RTDelay Types.

For RTLoss -- the count of lost packets.

10.4.2. Reference Definition

For all output types ---

T0 the start of a measurement interval, (format "date-and-time" as specified in Section 5.6 of [RFC3339], see also Section 3 of [RFC6991]). The UTC Time Zone is required by Section 6.1 of [RFC2330].

Tf the end of a measurement interval, (format "date-and-time" as specified in Section 5.6 of [RFC3339], see also Section 3 of [RFC6991]). The UTC Time Zone is required by Section 6.1 of [RFC2330]. The end of the measurement interval MAY be controlled by the measured connection, where the second pair of FIN and ACK packets exchanged between host A and B effectively ends the interval.

... ...

For RTDelay_HS -- the Round trip delay of the Handshake.

For RTLoss -- the count of lost packets.

For each <statistic>, one of the following sub-sections apply:
10.4.2.1. Mean

The mean SHALL be calculated using the conditional distribution of all packets with a finite value of Round-trip delay (undefined delays are excluded), a single value as follows:

See section 4.1 of [RFC3393] for details on the conditional distribution to exclude undefined values of delay, and Section 5 of [RFC6703] for background on this analysis choice.

See section 4.2.2 of [RFC6049] for details on calculating this statistic, and 4.2.3 of [RFC6049].

Mean The time value of the result is expressed in units of seconds, as a positive value of type decimal64 with fraction digits = 9 (see section 9.3 of [RFC6020]) with resolution of 0.000000001 seconds (1.0 ns), and with lossless conversion to/from the 64-bit NTP timestamp as per section 6 of RFC [RFC5905]

10.4.2.2. Min

The minimum SHALL be calculated using the conditional distribution of all packets with a finite value of Round-trip delay (undefined delays are excluded), a single value as follows:

See section 4.1 of [RFC3393] for details on the conditional distribution to exclude undefined values of delay, and Section 5 of [RFC6703] for background on this analysis choice.

See section 4.3.2 of [RFC6049] for details on calculating this statistic, and 4.3.3 of [RFC6049].

Min The time value of the result is expressed in units of seconds, as a positive value of type decimal64 with fraction digits = 9 (see section 9.3 of [RFC6020]) with resolution of 0.000000001 seconds (1.0 ns), and with lossless conversion to/from the 64-bit NTP timestamp as per section 6 of RFC [RFC5905]

10.4.2.3. Max

The maximum SHALL be calculated using the conditional distribution of all packets with a finite value of Round-trip delay (undefined delays are excluded), a single value as follows:

See section 4.1 of [RFC3393] for details on the conditional distribution to exclude undefined values of delay, and Section 5 of [RFC6703] for background on this analysis choice.
See section 4.3.2 of [RFC6049] for a closely related method for calculating this statistic, and 4.3.3 of [RFC6049]. The formula is as follows:

\[
\text{Max} = (\text{FiniteDelay}[j])
\]

such that for some index, \( j \), where \( 1 \leq j \leq N \)

\[\text{FiniteDelay}[j] \geq \text{FiniteDelay}[n] \text{ for all } n\]

\( \text{Max} \)  The time value of the result is expressed in units of seconds, as a positive value of type decimal64 with fraction digits = 9 (see section 9.3 of [RFC6020]) with resolution of 0.000000001 seconds (1.0 ns), and with lossless conversion to/from the 64-bit NTP timestamp as per section 6 of RFC [RFC5905]

10.4.3. Metric Units

The <statistic> of Round-trip Delay is expressed in seconds, where <statistic> is one of:

- Mean
- Min
- Max

The Round-trip Delay of the Hand Shake is expressed in seconds.

The Round-trip Loss Count is expressed as a number of packets.

10.4.4. Calibration

Passive measurements at an OP could be calibrated against an active measurement (with loss emulation) at host A or B, where the active measurement represents the ground-truth.

10.5. Administrative items

10.5.1. Status

Current

10.5.2. Requester

This RFC number
10.5.3. Revision

1.0

10.5.4. Revision Date

YYYY-MM-DD

10.6. Comments and Remarks

None.

11. Security Considerations

These registry entries represent no known implications for Internet Security. Each RFC referenced above contains a Security Considerations section. Further, the LMAP Framework [RFC7594] provides both security and privacy considerations for measurements.

There are potential privacy considerations for observed traffic, particularly for passive metrics in section 10. An attacker that knows that its TCP connection is being measured can modify its behavior to skew the measurement results.

12. IANA Considerations

IANA is requested to populate The Performance Metrics Registry defined in [I-D.ietf-ippm-metric-registry] with the values defined in sections 4 through 10.

See the IANA Considerations section of [I-D.ietf-ippm-metric-registry] for additional requests and considerations.
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1. Introduction

This document defines data fields for "in-situ" Operations, Administration, and Maintenance (IOAM). In-situ OAM records OAM information within the packet while the packet traverses a particular network domain. The term "in-situ" refers to the fact that the OAM data is added to the data packets rather than being sent within packets specifically dedicated to OAM. IOAM is to complement mechanisms such as Ping or Traceroute. In terms of "active" or "passive" OAM, "in-situ" OAM can be considered a hybrid OAM type. "In-situ" mechanisms do not require extra packets to be sent. IOAM adds information to the already available data packets and therefore cannot be considered passive. In terms of the classification given in [RFC7799], IOAM could be portrayed as Hybrid Type I. IOAM mechanisms can be leveraged where mechanisms using, e.g., ICMP do not apply or do not offer the desired results, such as proving that a certain traffic flow takes a pre-defined path, SLA verification for the data traffic, detailed statistics on traffic distribution paths in networks that distribute traffic across multiple paths, or scenarios in which probe traffic is potentially handled differently from regular data traffic by the network devices.

The term "in situ OAM" was originally motivated by the use of OAM related mechanisms that add information into a packet. This document uses IOAM as a term defining the IOAM technology. IOAM includes "in-situ" mechanisms, but also mechanisms that could trigger the creation of additional packets dedicated to OAM.

2. Contributors

This document was the collective effort of several authors. The text and content were contributed by the editors and the co-authors listed below. The contact information of the co-authors appears at the end of this document.

o Carlos Pignataro
3. Conventions

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.

Abbreviations and definitions used in this document:

E2E:       Edge to Edge
Geneve:    Generic Network Virtualization Encapsulation [RFC8926]
IOAM:      In-situ Operations, Administration, and Maintenance
MTU:       Maximum Transmit Unit
NSH:       Network Service Header [RFC8300]
OAM:       Operations, Administration, and Maintenance
PMTU:      Path MTU
POT:       Proof of Transit
Short format: "Short format" refers to an IOAM-Data-Field which comprises 4 octets.
4. Scope, Applicability, and Assumptions

IOAM assumes a set of constraints as well as guiding principles and concepts that go hand in hand with the definition of the IOAM data fields. These constraints, guiding principles, and concepts are described in this section. A discussion of how IOAM data fields and the associated concepts are applied to an IOAM deployment are out of scope for this document. Please refer to [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-deployment] for IOAM deployment considerations.

Scope: This document defines the data fields and associated data types for in-situ OAM. The in-situ OAM data fields can be encapsulated in a variety of protocols, including NSH, Segment Routing, Geneve, and IPv6. Specification details for these different protocols are outside the scope of this document. It is expected that each such encapsulation would be specified by an RFC, jointly designed by the working group that develops or maintains the encapsulation protocol and the IETF IPPM working group.

Deployment domain (or scope) of in-situ OAM deployment: IOAM is focused on "limited domains" as defined in [RFC8799]. For IOAM, a limited domain could for example be an enterprise campus using physical connections between devices or an overlay network using virtual connections / tunnels for connectivity between said devices. A limited domain which uses IOAM may constitute one or multiple "IOAM-domains", each disambiguated through separate namespace identifiers. An IOAM-domain is bounded by its perimeter or edge. IOAM-domains may overlap inside the limited domain. Designers of protocol encapsulations for IOAM specify mechanisms to ensure that IOAM data stays within an IOAM-domain. In addition, the operator of such a domain is expected to put provisions in place to ensure that IOAM data does not leak beyond the edge of an IOAM-domain using, for example, packet filtering methods. The operator SHOULD consider the potential operational impact of IOAM to mechanisms such as ECMP processing (e.g., load-balancing schemes based on packet length could be impacted by the increased packet size due to IOAM), path MTU (i.e., ensure that the MTU of all links within a domain is sufficiently large to support the increased packet size due to IOAM)
and ICMP message handling (i.e., in case of IPv6, IOAM support for ICMPv6 Echo Request/Reply is desired which would translate into ICMPv6 extensions to enable IOAM-Data-Fields to be copied from an Echo Request message to an Echo Reply message).

IOAM control points: IOAM-Data-Fields are added to or removed from the user traffic by the devices which form the edge of a domain. Devices which form an IOAM-Domain can add, update or remove IOAM-Data-Fields. Edge devices of an IOAM-Domain can be hosts or network devices.

Traffic-sets that IOAM is applied to: IOAM can be deployed on all or only on subsets of the user traffic. Using IOAM on a selected set of traffic (e.g., per interface, based on an access control list or flow specification defining a specific set of traffic, etc.) could be useful in deployments where the cost of processing IOAM-Data-Fields by encapsulating, transit, or decapsulating node(s) might be a concern from a performance or operational perspective. Thus limiting the amount of traffic IOAM is applied to could be beneficial in some deployments.

Encapsulation independence: The definition of IOAM-Data-Fields is independent from the protocols the IOAM-Data-Fields are encapsulated into. IOAM-Data-Fields can be encapsulated into several encapsulating protocols.

Layering: If several encapsulation protocols (e.g., in case of tunneling) are stacked on top of each other, IOAM-Data-Fields could be present at multiple layers. The behavior follows the ships-in-the-night model, i.e., IOAM-Data-Fields in one layer are independent from IOAM-Data-Fields in another layer. Layering allows operators to instrument the protocol layer they want to measure. The different layers could, but do not have to, share the same IOAM encapsulation mechanisms.

IOAM implementation: The definition of the IOAM-Data-Fields take the specifics of devices with hardware data planes and software data planes into account.

5. IOAM Data-Fields, Types, Nodes

This section details IOAM-related nomenclature and describes data types such as IOAM-Data-Fields, IOAM-Types, IOAM-Namespaces as well as the different types of IOAM nodes.
5.1. IOAM Data-Fields and Option-Types

An IOAM-Data-Field is a set of bits with a defined format and meaning, which can be stored at a certain place in a packet for the purpose of IOAM.

To accommodate the different uses of IOAM, IOAM-Data-Fields fall into different categories. In IOAM, these categories are referred to as IOAM-Option-Types. A common registry is maintained for IOAM-Option-Types, see Section 8.1 for details. Corresponding to these IOAM-Option-Types, different IOAM-Data-Fields are defined.

This document defines four IOAM-Option-Types:

- Pre-allocated Trace Option-Type
- Incremental Trace Option-Type
- Proof of Transit (POT) Option-Type
- Edge-to-Edge (E2E) Option-Type

Future IOAM-Option-Types can be allocated by IANA, as described in Section 8.1.

5.2. IOAM-Domains and types of IOAM Nodes

Section 4 already mentioned that IOAM is expected to be deployed in a limited domain [RFC8799]. One or more IOAM-Option-Types are added to a packet upon entering an IOAM-Domain and are removed from the packet when exiting the domain. Within the IOAM-Domain, the IOAM-Data-Fields MAY be updated by network nodes that the packet traverses. An IOAM-Domain consists of "IOAM encapsulating nodes", "IOAM decapsulating nodes" and "IOAM transit nodes". The role of a node (i.e., encapsulating, transit, decapsulating) is defined within an IOAM-Namespace (see below). A node can have different roles in different IOAM-Namespace.

A device which adds at least one IOAM-Option-Type to the packet is called an "IOAM encapsulating node", whereas a device which removes an IOAM-Option-Type is referred to as an "IOAM decapsulating node". Nodes within the domain which are aware of IOAM data and read and/or write and/or process IOAM data are called "IOAM transit nodes". IOAM nodes which add or remove the IOAM-Data-Fields can also update the IOAM-Data-Fields at the same time. Or in other words, IOAM encapsulating or decapsulating nodes can also serve as IOAM transit nodes at the same time. Note that not every node in an IOAM-domain needs to be an IOAM transit node. For example, a deployment might
require that packets traverse a set of firewalls which support IOAM. In that case, only the set of firewall nodes would be IOAM transit nodes rather than all nodes.

An "IOAM encapsulating node" incorporates one or more IOAM-Option-Types (from the list of IOAM-Types, see Section 8.1) into packets that IOAM is enabled for. If IOAM is enabled for a selected subset of the traffic, the IOAM encapsulating node is responsible for applying the IOAM functionality to the selected subset.

An "IOAM transit node" reads and/or writes and/or processes one or more of the IOAM-Data-Fields. If both the Pre-allocated and the Incremental Trace Option-Types are present in the packet, each IOAM transit node based on configuration and available implementation of IOAM might populate IOAM trace data in either Pre-allocated or Incremental Trace Option-Type but not both. Note that not populating any of the Trace Option-Types is also valid behavior for an IOAM transit node. A transit node MUST ignore IOAM-Option-Types that it does not understand. A transit node MUST NOT add new IOAM-Option-Types to a packet, MUST NOT remove IOAM-Option-Types from a packet, and MUST NOT change the IOAM-Data-Fields of an IOAM Edge-to-Edge Option-Type.

An "IOAM decapsulating node" removes IOAM-Option-Type(s) from packets.

The role of an IOAM-encapsulating, IOAM-transit or IOAM-decapsulating node is always performed within a specific IOAM-Namespace. This means that an IOAM node which is, e.g., an IOAM-decapsulating node for IOAM-Namespace "A" but not for IOAM-Namespace "B" will only remove the IOAM-Option-Types for IOAM-Namespace "A" from the packet. Note that this applies even for IOAM-Option-Types that the node does not understand, for example an IOAM-Option-Type other than the four described above, that is added in a future revision.

IOAM-Namespace allow for a namespace-specific definition and interpretation of IOAM-Data-Fields. An interface-id could for example point to a physical interface (e.g., to understand which physical interface of an aggregated link is used when receiving or transmitting a packet) whereas in another case it could refer to a logical interface (e.g., in case of tunnels). Please refer to Section 5.3 for details on IOAM-Namespaces.

5.3. IOAM-Namespace

IOAM-Namespace add further context to IOAM-Option-Types and associated IOAM-Data-Fields. The IOAM-Option-Types and associated IOAM-Data-Fields are interpreted as defined in this document,
regardless of the value of the IOAM-Namespace. However, IOAM-Namespaces provide a way to group nodes to support different deployment approaches of IOAM (see a few example use-cases below). IOAM-Namespaces also help to resolve potential issues which can occur due to IOAM-Data-Fields not being globally unique (e.g., IOAM node identifiers do not have to be globally unique). IOAM-Data-Fields significance is always within a particular IOAM-Namespace. Given that IOAM-Data-Fields are always interpreted the context of a specific namespace, the namespace-id field always needs to be carried along with the IOAM data-fields themselves.

An IOAM-Namespace is identified by a 16-bit namespace identifier (Namespace-ID). The IOAM-Namespace field is included in all the IOAM-Option-Types defined in this document, and MUST be included in all future IOAM-Option-Types. The Namespace-ID value is divided into two sub-ranges:

- An operator-assigned range from 0x0001 to 0x7FFF
- An IANA-assigned range from 0x8000 to 0xFFFF

The IANA-assigned range is intended to allow future extensions to have new and interoperable IOAM functionality, while the operator-assigned range is intended to be domain-specific, and managed by the network operator. The Namespace-ID value of 0x0000 is the "Default-Namespace-ID". The Default-Namespace-ID indicates that no specific namespace is associated with the IOAM data fields in the packet. The Default-Namespace-ID MUST be supported by all nodes implementing IOAM. A use-case for the Default-Namespace-ID are deployments which do not leverage specific namespaces for some or all of their packets that carry IOAM data fields.

Namespace identifiers allow devices which are IOAM capable to determine:

- whether IOAM-Option-Type(s) need to be processed by a device: If the Namespace-ID contained in a packet does not match any Namespace-ID the node is configured to operate on, then the node MUST NOT change the contents of the IOAM-Data-Fields.

- which IOAM-Option-Type needs to be processed/upated in case there are multiple IOAM-Option-Types present in the packet. Multiple IOAM-Option-Types can be present in a packet in case of overlapping IOAM-Domains or in case of a layered IOAM deployment.

- whether IOAM-Option-Type(s) have to be removed from the packet, e.g., at a domain edge or domain boundary.
IOAM-Namespaces support several different uses:

- IOAM-Namespaces can be used by an operator to distinguish different IOAM-domains. Devices at edges of an IOAM-domain can filter on Namespace-IDs to provide for proper IOAM-domain isolation.

- IOAM-Namespaces provide additional context for IOAM-Data-Fields and thus can be used to ensure that IOAM-Data-Fields are unique and are interpreted properly by management stations or network controllers. The node identifier field (node_id, see below) does not need to be unique in a deployment. This could be the case if an operator wishes to use different node identifiers for different IOAM layers, even within the same device or node identifiers might not be unique for other organizational reasons, such as after a merger of two formerly separated organizations. The Namespace-ID can be used as a context identifier, such that the combination of node_id and Namespace-ID will always be unique.

- Similarly, IOAM-Namespaces can be used to define how certain IOAM-Data-Fields are interpreted: IOAM offers three different timestamp format options. The Namespace-ID can be used to determine the timestamp format. IOAM-Data-Fields (e.g., buffer occupancy) which do not have a unit associated are to be interpreted within the context of a IOAM-Namespace.

- IOAM-Namespaces can be used to identify different sets of devices (e.g., different types of devices) in a deployment: If an operator desires to insert different IOAM-Data-Fields based on the device, the devices could be grouped into multiple IOAM-Namespaces. This could be due to the fact that the IOAM feature set differs between different sets of devices, or it could be for reasons of optimized space usage in the packet header. It could also stem from hardware or operational limitations on the size of the trace data that can be added and processed, preventing collection of a full trace for a flow.

- By assigning different IOAM Namespace-IDs to different sets of nodes or network partitions and using a separate instance of an IOAM-Option-Type for each Namespace-ID, a full trace for a flow could be collected and constructed via partial traces from each IOAM-Option-Type in each of the packets in the flow. Example: An operator could choose to group the devices of a domain into two IOAM-Namespaces, in a way that each IOAM-Namespace is represented by one of two IOAM-Option-Types in the packet. Each node would record data only for the IOAM-Namespace that it belongs to, ignoring the other IOAM-Option-Type with a IOAM-Namespace to which it doesn’t belong. To retrieve a full view of the deployment, the
captured IOAM-Data-Fields of the two IOAM-Namespaces need to be correlated.

5.4. IOAM Trace Option-Types

In a typical deployment, all nodes in an IOAM-Domain would participate in IOAM and thus be IOAM transit nodes, IOAM encapsulating or IOAM decapsulating nodes. If not all nodes within a domain support IOAM functionality as defined in this document, IOAM tracing information (i.e., node data, see below) can only be collected on those nodes which support IOAM functionality as defined in this document. Nodes which do not support IOAM functionality as defined in this document will forward the packet without any changes to the IOAM-Data-Fields. The maximum number of hops and the minimum path MTU of the IOAM-domain is assumed to be known. An overflow indicator (O-bit) is defined as one of the ways to deal with situations where the PMTU was underestimated, i.e., where the number of hops which are IOAM capable exceeds the available space in the packet.

To optimize hardware and software implementations, IOAM tracing is defined as two separate options. A deployment can choose to configure and support one or both of the following options.

Pre-allocated Trace-Option: This trace option is defined as a container of node data fields (see below) with pre-allocated space for each node to populate its information. This option is useful for implementations where it is efficient to allocate the space once and index into the array to populate the data during transit (e.g., software forwarders often fall into this class). The IOAM encapsulating node allocates space for Pre-allocated Trace Option-Type in the packet and sets corresponding fields in this IOAM-Option-Type. The IOAM encapsulating node allocates an array which is used to store operational data retrieved from every node while the packet traverses the domain. IOAM transit nodes update the content of the array, and possibly update the checksums of outer headers. A pointer which is part of the IOAM trace data, points to the next empty slot in the array. An IOAM transit node that updates the content of the pre-allocated option also updates the value of the pointer, which specifies where the next IOAM transit node fills in its data. The "node data list" array (see below) in the packet is populated iteratively as the packet traverses the network, starting with the last entry of the array, i.e., "node data list [n]" is the first entry to be populated, "node data list [n-1]" is the second one, etc.

Incremental Trace-Option: This trace option is defined as a container of node data fields where each node allocates and pushes
its node data immediately following the option header. This type of trace recording is useful for some of the hardware implementations as it eliminates the need for the transit network elements to read the full array in the option and allows for arbitrarily long packets as the MTU allows. The IOAM encapsulating node allocates space for the Incremental Trace Option-Type. Based on operational state and configuration, the IOAM encapsulating node sets the fields in the Option-Type that control what IOAM-Data-Fields have to be collected and how large the node data list can grow. IOAM transit nodes push their node data to the node data list subject to any protocol constraints of the encapsulating layer. They then decrease the remaining length available to subsequent nodes and adjust the lengths and possibly checksums in outer headers.

IOAM encapsulating nodes and IOAM decapsulating nodes which support tracing MUST support both Trace-Option-Types. For IOAM transit nodes it is sufficient to support one of the Trace-Option-Types. In the event that both options are utilized in a deployment at the same time, the Incremental Trace-Option MUST be placed before the Pre-allocated Trace-Option. Deployments which mix devices with either the Incremental Trace-Option or the Pre-allocated Trace-Option could result in both Option-Types being present in a packet. Given that the operator knows which equipment is deployed in a particular IOAM-domain, the operator will decide by means of configuration which type(s) of trace options will be used for a particular domain.

Every node data entry holds information for a particular IOAM transit node that is traversed by a packet. The IOAM decapsulating node removes the IOAM-Option-Type(s) and processes and/or exports the associated data. Like all IOAM-Data-Fields, the IOAM-Data-Fields of the IOAM-Trace-Option-Types are defined in the context of an IOAM-Namespace.

IOAM tracing can collect the following types of information:

- Identification of the IOAM node. An IOAM node identifier can match to a device identifier or a particular control point or subsystem within a device.

- Identification of the interface that a packet was received on, i.e., ingress interface.

- Identification of the interface that a packet was sent out on, i.e., egress interface.

- Time of day when the packet was processed by the node as well as the transit delay. Different definitions of processing time are
feasible and expected, though it is important that all devices of an IOAM-domain follow the same definition.

- Generic data: Format-free information where syntax and semantic of the information is defined by the operator in a specific deployment. For a specific IOAM-Namespace, all IOAM nodes have to interpret the generic data the same way. Examples for generic IOAM data include geo-location information (location of the node at the time the packet was processed), buffer queue fill level or cache fill level at the time the packet was processed, or even a battery charge level.

- Information to detect whether IOAM trace data was added at every hop or whether certain hops in the domain weren’t IOAM transit nodes.

It should be noted that the semantics of some of the node data fields that are defined below, such as the queue depth and buffer occupancy, are implementation specific. This approach is intended to allow IOAM nodes with various different architectures.

5.4.1. Pre-allocated and Incremental Trace Option-Types

The IOAM Pre-allocated Trace-Option and the IOAM Incremental Trace-Option have similar formats. Except where noted below, the internal formats and fields of the two trace options are identical. Both Trace-Options consist of a fixed size "trace option header" and a variable data space to store gathered data, the "node data list". An IOAM transit node (that is not an IOAM encapsulating node or IOAM decapsulating node) MUST NOT modify any of the fields in the fixed size "trace option header", other than "flags" and "RemainingLen", i.e., an IOAM transit node MUST NOT modify the Namespace-ID, NodeLen, IOAM-Trace-Type, or Reserved fields.
Pre-allocated and incremental trace option headers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namespace-ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOAM-Trace-Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The trace option data MUST be 4-octet aligned:

```
  +----------------------------------------<+  
  | node data list [0]                    |  |
  +----------------------------------------  |
  | node data list [1]                    |  |
  +----------------------------------------  |
  | ...                                    |  |
  +----------------------------------------  |
  | node data list [n-1]                   |  |
  +----------------------------------------  |
  | node data list [n]                     |  |
  +----------------------------------------  |
  +----------------------------------------<+  
```

Namespace-ID: 16-bit identifier of an IOAM-Namespace. The Namespace-ID value of 0x0000 is defined as the "Default-Namespace-ID" (see Section 5.3) and MUST be known to all the nodes implementing IOAM. For any other Namespace-ID value that does not match any Namespace-ID the node is configured to operate on, the node MUST NOT change the contents of the IOAM-Data-Fields.

NodeLen: 5-bit unsigned integer. This field specifies the length of data added by each node in multiples of 4-octets, excluding the length of the "Opaque State Snapshot" field.

If IOAM-Trace-Type bit 22 is not set, then NodeLen specifies the actual length added by each node. If IOAM-Trace-Type bit 22 is
set, then the actual length added by a node would be (NodeLen +
length of the "Opaque State Snapshot" field) in 4 octet units.

For example, if 3 IOAM-Trace-Type bits are set and none of them
are in wide format, then NodeLen would be 3. If 3 IOAM-Trace-Type
bits are set and 2 of them are wide, then NodeLen would be 5.

An IOAM encapsulating node MUST set NodeLen.

A node receiving an IOAM Pre-allocated or Incremental Trace-Option
relies on the NodeLen value.

Flags 4-bit field. Flags are allocated by IANA, as specified in
Section 8.3. This document allocates a single flag as follows:

Bit 0 "Overflow" (O-bit) (most significant bit). In case a
network element is supposed to add node data to a packet, but
detects that there are not enough octets left to record the
node data, the network element MUST NOT add any fields and MUST
set the overflow "O-bit" to "1" in the IOAM-Trace-Option
header. This is useful for transit nodes to ignore further
processing of the option.

RemainingLen: 7-bit unsigned integer. This field specifies the data
space in multiples of 4-octets remaining for recording the node
data, before the node data list is considered to have overflowed.
The sender MUST assign the initial value of the RemainingLen
field. The sender MAY calculate the value of the RemainingLen
field by computing the number of node data bytes allowed before
exceeding the path MTU (PMTU), given that the PMTU is known to the
sender. Subsequent nodes can carry out a simple comparison
between RemainingLen and NodeLen, along with the length of the
"Opaque State Snapshot" if applicable, to determine whether or not
data can be added by this node. When node data is added, the node
MUST decrease RemainingLen by the amount of data added. In the
pre-allocated trace option, RemainingLen is used to derive the
offset in data space to record the node data element.
Specifically, the recording of the node data element would start
from RemainingLen - NodeLen - sizeof(opaque snapshot) in 4 octet
units. If RemainingLen in a pre-allocated trace option exceeds
the length of the option, as specified in the lower layer header
(which is not within the scope of this document), then the node
MUST NOT add any fields.

IOAM-Trace-Type: A 24-bit identifier which specifies which data
types are used in this node data list.
The IOAM-Trace-Type value is a bit field. The following bits are defined in this document, with details on each bit described in the Section 5.4.2. The order of packing the data fields in each node data element follows the bit order of the IOAM-Trace-Type field, as follows:

Bit 0 (Most significant bit) When set, indicates presence of Hop_Lim and node_id (short format) in the node data.

Bit 1 When set, indicates presence of ingress_if_id and egress_if_id (short format) in the node data.

Bit 2 When set, indicates presence of timestamp seconds in the node data.

Bit 3 When set, indicates presence of timestamp fraction in the node data.

Bit 4 When set, indicates presence of transit delay in the node data.

Bit 5 When set, indicates presence of IOAM-Namespace specific data (short format) in the node data.

Bit 6 When set, indicates presence of queue depth in the node data.

Bit 7 When set, indicates presence of the Checksum Complement node data.

Bit 8 When set, indicates presence of Hop_Lim and node_id in wide format in the node data.

Bit 9 When set, indicates presence of ingress_if_id and egress_if_id in wide format in the node data.

Bit 10 When set, indicates presence of IOAM-Namespace specific data in wide format in the node data.

Bit 11 When set, indicates presence of buffer occupancy in the node data.

Bit 12-21 Undefined. These values are available for future assignment in the IOAM Trace-Type Registry (Section 8.2). Every future node data field corresponding to one of these bits MUST be 4-octets long. An IOAM encapsulating node MUST set the value of each undefined bit to 0. If
an IOAM transit node receives a packet with one or more of these bits set to 1, it MUST either:

1. Add corresponding node data filled with the reserved value 0xFFFFFFFF, after the node data fields for the IOAM-Trace-Type bits defined above, such that the total node data added by this node in units of 4-octets is equal to NodeLen, or

2. Not add any node data fields to the packet, even for the IOAM-Trace-Type bits defined above.

Bit 22 When set, indicates presence of variable length Opaque State Snapshot field.

Bit 23 Reserved: MUST be set to zero upon transmission and ignored upon receipt. This bit is reserved to allow for future extensions of the IOAM-Trace-Type bit field.

Section 5.4.2 describes the IOAM-Data-Types and their formats. Within an IOAM-Domain possible combinations of these bits making the IOAM-Trace-Type can be restricted by configuration knobs.

Reserved: 8-bits. An IOAM encapsulating node MUST set the value to zero upon transmission. IOAM transit nodes MUST ignore the received value.

Node data List [n]: Variable-length field. This is a list of node data elements where the content of each node data element is determined by the IOAM-Trace-Type. The order of packing the data fields in each node data element follows the bit order of the IOAM-Trace-Type field. Each node MUST prepend its node data element in front of the node data elements that it received, such that the transmitted node data list begins with this node’s data element as the first populated element in the list. The last node data element in this list is the node data of the first IOAM capable node in the path. Populating the node data list in this way ensures that the order of node data list is the same for incremental and pre-allocated trace options. In the pre-allocated trace option, the index contained in RemainingLen identifies the offset for current active node data to be populated.

5.4.2. IOAM node data fields and associated formats

All the IOAM-Data-Fields MUST be 4-octet aligned. If a node which is supposed to update an IOAM-Data-Field is not capable of populating the value of a field set in the IOAM-Trace-Type, the field value MUST be set to 0xFFFFFFFF for 4-octet fields or 0xFFFFFFFFFFFFFFFF for
8-octet fields, indicating that the value is not populated, except when explicitly specified in the field description below.

Some IOAM-Data-Fields defined below, such as interface identifiers or IOAM-Namespace specific data, are defined in both "short format" as well as "wide format". The use of "short format" or "wide format" is not mutually exclusive. A deployment could choose to leverage both. For example, ingress_if_id_(short format) could be an identifier for the physical interface, whereas ingress_if_id_(wide format) could be an identifier for a logical sub-interface of that physical interface.

Data fields and associated data types for each of the IOAM-Data-Fields are specified in the following sections. The definition of IOAM-Data-Fields focuses on the syntax of the data-fields and avoids specifying the semantics where feasible. This is why no units are defined for data-fields like e.g., "buffer occupancy" or "queue depth". With this approach, nodes can supply the information in their native format and are not required to perform unit or format conversions. Systems that further process IOAM information, like e.g., a network management system are assumed to also handle unit conversions as part of their IOAM data-fields processing. The combination of a particular data-field and the namespace-id provides for the context to interpret the provided data appropriately.

5.4.2.1. Hop_Lim and node_id short format

The "Hop_Lim and node_id short format" field is a 4-octet field that is defined as follows:

```
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|   Hop_Lim     |              node_id                          |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

Hop_Lim: 1-octet unsigned integer. It is set to the Hop Limit value in the packet at egress from the node that records this data. Hop Limit information is used to identify the location of the node in the communication path. This is copied from the lower layer, e.g., TTL value in IPv4 header or hop limit field from IPv6 header of the packet when the packet is ready for transmission. The semantics of the Hop_Lim field depend on the lower layer protocol that IOAM is encapsulated into, and therefore its specific semantics are outside the scope of this memo. The value of this field MUST be set to 0xff when the lower level does not have a TTL/Hop limit equivalent field.

node_id: 3-octet unsigned integer. Node identifier field to uniquely identify a node within the IOAM-Namespace and associated
IOAM-Domain. The procedure to allocate, manage and map the node_ids is beyond the scope of this document. See [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-deployment] for a discussion of deployment related aspects of the node_id.

5.4.2.2. ingress_if_id and egress_if_id

The "ingress_if_id and egress_if_id" field is a 4-octet field that is defined as follows:

```
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+------------------------------------------+
|    ingress_if_id                        |    egress_if_id                       |
+------------------------------------------+
```

- ingress_if_id: 2-octet unsigned integer. Interface identifier to record the ingress interface the packet was received on.
- egress_if_id: 2-octet unsigned integer. Interface identifier to record the egress interface the packet is forwarded out of.

Note that due to the fact that IOAM uses its own IOAM-Namespaces for IOAM-Data-Fields, data fields like interface identifiers can be used in a flexible way to represent system resources that are associated with ingressing or egressing packets, i.e., ingress_if_id could represent a physical interface, a virtual or logical interface, or even a queue.

5.4.2.3. timestamp seconds

The "timestamp seconds" field is a 4-octet unsigned integer field. It contains the absolute timestamp in seconds that specifies the time at which the packet was received by the node. This field has three possible formats; based on either PTP (see e.g., [RFC8877]), NTP [RFC5905], or POSIX [POSIX]. The three timestamp formats are specified in Section 6. In all three cases, the Timestamp Seconds field contains the 32 most significant bits of the timestamp format that is specified in Section 6. If a node is not capable of populating this field, it assigns the value 0xFFFFFFFF. Note that this is a legitimate value that is valid for 1 second in approximately 136 years; the analyzer has to correlate several packets or compare the timestamp value to its own time-of-day in order to detect the error indication.
5.4.2.4. timestamp fraction

The "timestamp fraction" field is a 4-octet unsigned integer field. Fraction specifies the fractional portion of the number of seconds since the NTP epoch [RFC8877]. The field specifies the time at which the packet was received by the node. This field has three possible formats; based on either PTP (see e.g., [RFC8877]), NTP [RFC5905], or POSIX [POSIX]. The three timestamp formats are specified in Section 6. In all three cases, the Timestamp fraction field contains the 32 least significant bits of the timestamp format that is specified in Section 6. If a node is not capable of populating this field, it assigns the value 0xFFFFFFFF. Note that this is a legitimate value in the NTP format, valid for approximately 233 picoseconds in every second. If the NTP format is used the analyzer has to correlate several packets in order to detect the error indication.

5.4.2.5. transit delay

The "transit delay" field is a 4-octet unsigned integer in the range 0 to 2^31-1. It is the time in nanoseconds the packet spent in the transit node. This can serve as an indication of the queuing delay at the node. If the transit delay exceeds 2^31-1 nanoseconds then the top bit ‘O’ is set to indicate overflow and value set to 0x80000000. When this field is part of the data field but a node populating the field is not able to fill it, the field position in the field MUST be filled with value 0xFFFFFFFF to mean not populated.

```
  0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|O|                     transit delay                           |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

5.4.2.6. namespace specific data

The "namespace specific data" field is a 4-octet field which can be used by the node to add IOAM-Namespace specific data. This represents a "free-format" 4-octet bit field with its semantics defined in the context of a specific IOAM-Namespace.

```
  0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                    namespace specific data                    |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```
5.4.2.7. queue depth

The "queue depth" field is a 4-octet unsigned integer field. This field indicates the current length of the egress interface queue of the interface from where the packet is forwarded out. The queue depth is expressed as the current amount of memory buffers used by the queue (a packet could consume one or more memory buffers, depending on its size).

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                       queue depth                             |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+

5.4.2.8. Checksum Complement

The "Checksum Complement" field is a 4-octet node data which contains a 4-octet Checksum Complement field. The Checksum Complement is useful when IOAM is transported over encapsulations that make use of a UDP transport, such as VXLAN-GPE or Geneve. Without the Checksum Complement, nodes adding IOAM node data update the UDP Checksum field following the recommendation of the encapsulation protocols. When the Checksum Complement is present, an IOAM encapsulating node or IOAM transit node adding node data MUST carry out one of the following two alternatives in order to maintain the correctness of the UDP Checksum value:

1. Recompute the UDP Checksum field.

2. Use the Checksum Complement to make a checksum-neutral update in the UDP payload; the Checksum Complement is assigned a value that complements the rest of the node data fields that were added by the current node, causing the existing UDP Checksum field to remain correct.

IOAM decapsulating nodes MUST recompute the UDP Checksum field, since they do not know whether previous hops modified the UDP Checksum field or the Checksum Complement field.

Checksum Complement fields are used in a similar manner in [RFC7820] and [RFC7821].
5.4.2.9. Hop_Lim and node_id wide

The "Hop_Lim and node_id wide" field is an 8-octet field defined as follows:

```
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| Hop_Lim | node_id |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
~ node_id (contd) |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

Hop_Lim: 1-octet unsigned integer. See Section 5.4.2.1 for the definition of the field.

node_id: 7-octet unsigned integer. Node identifier field to uniquely identify a node within the IOAM-Namespace and associated IOAM-Domain. The procedure to allocate, manage and map the node_ids is beyond the scope of this document.

5.4.2.10. ingress_if_id and egress_if_id wide

The "ingress_if_id and egress_if_id wide" field is an 8-octet field which is defined as follows:

```
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| ingress_if_id |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| egress_if_id |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

ingress_if_id: 4-octet unsigned integer. Interface identifier to record the ingress interface the packet was received on.

egress_if_id: 4-octet unsigned integer. Interface identifier to record the egress interface the packet is forwarded out of.

5.4.2.11. namespace specific data wide

The "namespace specific data wide" field is an 8-octet field which can be used by the node to add IOAM-Namespace specific data. This represents a "free-format" 8-octet bit field with its semantics defined in the context of a specific IOAM-Namespace.
5.4.2.12. buffer occupancy

The "buffer occupancy" field is a 4-octet unsigned integer field. This field indicates the current status of the occupancy of the common buffer pool used by a set of queues. The units of this field are implementation specific. Hence, the units are interpreted within the context of an IOAM-Namespace and/or node-id if used. The authors acknowledge that in some operational cases there is a need for the units to be consistent across a packet path through the network, hence it is recommended for implementations to use standard units such as Bytes.

5.4.2.13. Opaque State Snapshot

The "Opaque State Snapshot" is a variable length field and follows the fixed length IOAM-Data-Fields defined above. It allows the network element to store an arbitrary state in the node data field, without a pre-defined schema. The schema is to be defined within the context of an IOAM-Namespace. The schema needs to be made known to the analyzer by some out-of-band mechanism. The specification of this mechanism is beyond the scope of this document. A 24-bit "Schema Id" field, interpreted within the context of an IOAM-Namespace, indicates which particular schema is used, and has to be configured on the network element by the operator.
Length: 1-octet unsigned integer. It is the length in multiples of 4-octets of the Opaque data field that follows Schema Id.

Schema ID: 3-octet unsigned integer identifying the schema of Opaque data.

Opaque data: Variable length field. This field is interpreted as specified by the schema identified by the Schema ID.

When this field is part of the data field but a node populating the field has no opaque state data to report, the Length MUST be set to 0 and the Schema ID MUST be set to 0xFFFFFFFF to mean no schema.

5.4.3. Examples of IOAM node data

The format used for the entries in a packet’s "node data list" array can vary from packet to packet and deployment to deployment”. Some deployments might only be interested in recording the node identifiers, whereas others might be interested in recording node identifiers and timestamps. This section provides example entries of the "node data list".

0xD40000: IOAM-Trace-Type is 0xD40000 (0b110101000000000000000000000000) then the format of node data is:
0xC00000: IOAM-Trace-Type is 0xC00000 (0b110000000000000000000000)
then the format is:

```
 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|   Hop_Lim     |              node_id                          |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|     ingress_if_id             |         egress_if_id          |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                     timestamp fraction                        |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                    namespace specific data                    |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

0x900000: IOAM-Trace-Type is 0x900000 (0b100100000000000000000000)
then the format is:

```
 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|   Hop_Lim     |              node_id                          |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                   timestamp fraction                          |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

0x840000: IOAM-Trace-Type is 0x840000 (0b100001000000000000000000)
then the format is:

```
 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|   Hop_Lim     |              node_id                          |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                    namespace specific data                    |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

0x940000: IOAM-Trace-Type is 0x940000 (0b100101000000000000000000)
then the format is:
5.5. IOAM Proof of Transit Option-Type

IOAM Proof of Transit Option-Type is used to support path or service function chain [RFC7665] verification use cases, i.e., prove that traffic transited a defined path. While details on how the IOAM data for the Proof-of-transit option is processed at IOAM encapsulating, decapsulating and transit nodes are outside the scope of the document, proof of transit approaches share the need to uniquely identify a packet as well as iteratively operate on a set of information that is handed from node to node. Correspondingly, two pieces of information are added as IOAM-Data-Fields to the packet:

- PktID: Unique identifier for the packet.
Cumulative: Information which is handed from node to node and updated by every node according to a verification algorithm.

The IOAM Proof-of-Transit Option-Type consist of a fixed size "IOAM proof of transit option header" and "IOAM proof of transit option data fields":

**IOAM proof of transit option header:**

```
0                   1                   2                   3
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|       Namespace-ID            |IOAM POT Type  | IOAM POT flags|
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

**IOAM proof of transit Option-Type IOAM-Data-Fields MUST be 4-octet aligned:**

```
0                   1                   2                   3
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|       POT Option data field determined by IOAM-POT-Type       |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

**Namespace-ID:** 16-bit identifier of an IOAM-Namespace. The Namespace-ID value of 0x0000 is defined as the "Default-Namespace-ID" (see Section 5.3) and MUST be known to all the nodes implementing IOAM. For any other Namespace-ID value that does not match any Namespace-ID the node is configured to operate on, the node MUST NOT change the contents of the IOAM-Data-Fields.

**IOAM POT Type:** 8-bit identifier of a particular POT variant that specifies the POT data that is included. This document defines POT Type 0:

0: POT data is a 16 Octet field to carry data associated to POT procedures.

If a node receives an IOAM POT Type value that it does not understand, the node MUST NOT change, add to, or remove the contents of the OAM-Data-Fields.

**IOAM POT flags:** 8-bit. This document does not define any flags. Bits 0-7 These bits are available for assignment, see Section 8.5. Bits which have not been assigned MUST be set to zero upon transmission and ignored upon receipt.
POT Option data: Variable-length field. The type of which is determined by the IOAM-POT-Type.

5.5.1. IOAM Proof of Transit Type 0

IOAM proof of transit option of IOAM POT Type 0:

```
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| Namespace-ID | IOAM POT Type=0 | P | O | T |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

Namespace-ID: 16-bit identifier of an IOAM-Namespace (see Section 5.5 above).

IOAM POT Type: 8-bit identifier of a particular POT variant that specifies the POT data that is included (see Section 5.5 above). For this case here, IOAM POT Type is set to the value 0.

Bit 0-7: Undefined (see Section 5.5 above).

PktID: 64-bit packet identifier.

Cumulative: 64-bit Cumulative that is updated at specific nodes by processing per packet PktID field and configured parameters.

Note: Larger or smaller sizes of "PktID" and "Cumulative" data are feasible and could be required for certain deployments, e.g., in case of space constraints in the encapsulation protocols used. Future documents could introduce different sizes of data for "proof of transit".

5.6. IOAM Edge-to-Edge Option-Type

The IOAM Edge-to-Edge Option-Type is to carry data that is added by the IOAM encapsulating node and interpreted by IOAM decapsulating
node. The IOAM transit nodes MAY process the data but MUST NOT modify it.

The IOAM Edge-to-Edge Option-Type consist of a fixed size "IOAM Edge-to-Edge Option-Type header" and "IOAM Edge-to-Edge Option-Type data fields":

IOAM Edge-to-Edge Option-Type header:

```
+-----------------+-----------------+
| Namespace-ID | IOAM-E2E-Type |
+-----------------+-----------------+
```

IOAM Edge-to-Edge Option-Type IOAM-Data-Fields MUST be 4-octet aligned:

```
+-----------------+-----------------+
| E2E Option data field determined by IOAM-E2E-Type |
+-----------------+-----------------+
```

Namespace-ID: 16-bit identifier of an IOAM-Namespace. The Namespace-ID value of 0x0000 is defined as the "Default-Namespace-ID" (see Section 5.3) and MUST be known to all the nodes implementing IOAM. For any other Namespace-ID value that does not match any Namespace-ID the node is configured to operate on, then the node MUST NOT change the contents of the IOAM-Data-Fields.

IOAM-E2E-Type: A 16-bit identifier which specifies which data types are used in the E2E option data. The IOAM-E2E-Type value is a bit field. The order of packing the E2E option data field elements follows the bit order of the IOAM-E2E-Type field, as follows:

- **Bit 0** (Most significant bit) When set indicates presence of a 64-bit sequence number added to a specific "packet group" which is used to detect packet loss, packet reordering, or packet duplication within the group. The "packet group" is deployment dependent and defined at the IOAM encapsulating node, e.g., by n-tuple based classification of packets. When this bit is set, "Bit 1" (for 32-bit sequence number, see below) MUST be zero.

- **Bit 1** When set indicates presence of a 32-bit sequence number added to a specific "packet group" which is used to
detect packet loss, packet reordering, or packet duplication within that group. The "packet group" is deployment dependent and defined at the IOAM encapsulating node, e.g., by n-tuple based classification of packets. When this bit is set, "Bit 0" (for 64-bit sequence number, see above) MUST be zero.

Bit 2
When set indicates presence of timestamp seconds, representing the time at which the packet entered the IOAM-domain. Within the IOAM encapsulating node, the time that the timestamp is retrieved can depend on the implementation. Some possibilities are: 1) the time at which the packet was received by the node, 2) the time at which the packet was transmitted by the node, 3) when a tunnel encapsulation is used, the point at which the packet is encapsulated into the tunnel. Each implementation has to document when the E2E timestamp that is going to be put in the packet is retrieved. This 4-octet field has three possible formats; based on either PTP (see e.g., [RFC8877]), NTP [RFC5905], or POSIX [POSIX]. The three timestamp formats are specified in Section 6. In all three cases, the Timestamp Seconds field contains the 32 most significant bits of the timestamp format that is specified in Section 6. If a node is not capable of populating this field, it assigns the value 0xFFFFFFFF. Note that this is a legitimate value that is valid for 1 second in approximately 136 years; the analyzer has to correlate several packets or compare the timestamp value to its own time-of-day in order to detect the error indication.

Bit 3
When set indicates presence of timestamp fraction, representing the time at which the packet entered the IOAM-domain. This 4-octet field has three possible formats; based on either PTP (see e.g., [RFC8877]), NTP [RFC5905], or POSIX [POSIX]. The three timestamp formats are specified in Section 6. In all three cases, the Timestamp fraction field contains the 32 least significant bits of the timestamp format that is specified in Section 6. If a node is not capable of populating this field, it assigns the value 0xFFFFFFFF. Note that this is a legitimate value in the NTP format, valid for approximately 233 picoseconds in every second. If the NTP format is used the analyzer has to correlate several packets in order to detect the error indication.
Bit 4-15 Undefined. An IOAM encapsulating node MUST set the value of these bits to zero upon transmission and ignore upon receipt.

E2E Option data: Variable-length field. The type of which is determined by the IOAM-E2E-Type.

6. Timestamp Formats

The IOAM-Data-Fields include a timestamp field which is represented in one of three possible timestamp formats. It is assumed that the management plane is responsible for determining which timestamp format is used.

6.1. PTP Truncated Timestamp Format

The Precision Time Protocol (PTP) 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. The PTP truncated format is specified in Section 4.3 of [RFC8877], and the details are presented below for the sake of completeness.

0                   1                   2                   3
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                            Seconds                            |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                          Nanoseconds                          |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+

Figure 1: PTP Truncated Timestamp Format

Timestamp field format:

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

+ Size: 32 bits.

+ Units: seconds.

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

+ Size: 32 bits.
+ Units: nanoseconds. The value of this field is in the range 0 to \((10^9)-1\).

Epoch:

PTP epoch. For details see e.g., [RFC8877].

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.

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 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.

6.2. NTP 64-bit Timestamp Format

The Network Time Protocol (NTP) [RFC5905] timestamp format is 64 bits long. This specification uses the NTP timestamp format that is specified in Section 4.2.1 of [RFC8877], and the details are presented below for the sake of completeness.

```
0                   1                   2                   3
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                            Seconds                            |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                            Fraction                           |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

Figure 2: NTP [RFC5905] 64-bit Timestamp Format

Timestamp field format:

Seconds: specifies the integer portion of the number of seconds since the NTP epoch.
+ Size: 32 bits.
+ Units: seconds.

Fraction: specifies the fractional portion of the number of seconds since the NTP epoch.
+ Size: 32 bits.
+ Units: the unit is $2^{(-32)}$ seconds, which is roughly equal to 233 picoseconds.

Epoch:

NTP Epoch. For details see [RFC5905].

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.

Synchronization Aspects:

Nodes that use this timestamp format will typically be synchronized to UTC using NTP [RFC5905]. 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.

6.3. POSIX-based Timestamp Format

This timestamp format is based on the POSIX time format [POSIX]. The detailed specification of the timestamp format used in this document is presented below.

```
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-
|                            Seconds                            |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-
|                          Microseconds                         |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-
```

Figure 3: POSIX-based Timestamp Format
Timestamp field format:

Seconds: specifies the integer portion of the number of seconds since the POSIX epoch.
+ Size: 32 bits.
+ Units: seconds.

Microseconds: specifies the fractional portion of the number of seconds since the POSIX epoch.
+ Size: 32 bits.
+ Units: the unit is microseconds. The value of this field is in the range 0 to \((10^6)-1\).

Epoch:

POSIX epoch. For details, see [POSIX], appendix A.4.16.

Resolution:

The resolution is 1 microsecond.

Wraparound:

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

Synchronization Aspects:

It is assumed that nodes that use this timestamp format run the Linux operating system, and hence use the POSIX time. In some cases nodes MAY be synchronized to UTC using a synchronization mechanism that is outside the scope of this document, such as NTP [RFC5905]. 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.

7. IOAM Data Export

IOAM nodes collect information for packets traversing a domain that supports IOAM. IOAM decapsulating nodes as well as IOAM transit nodes can choose to retrieve IOAM information from the packet, process the information further and export the information using e.g., IPFIX. The mechanisms and associated data formats for exporting IOAM data is outside the scope of this document.
A way to perform raw data export of IOAM data using IPFIX is discussed in [I-D.spiegel-ippm-ioam-rawexport].

8. IANA Considerations

This document requests the following IANA Actions.

IANA is requested to define a registry group named "In-Situ OAM (IOAM) Protocol Parameters".

This group will include the following registries:

- IOAM Option-Type
- IOAM Trace-Type
- IOAM Trace-Flags
- IOAM POT-Type
- IOAM POT-Flags
- IOAM E2E-Type
- IOAM Namespace-ID

The subsequent sub-sections detail the registries herein contained.

8.1. IOAM Option-Type Registry

This registry defines 128 code points for the IOAM Option-Type field for identifying IOAM Option-Types as explained in Section 5. The following code points are defined in this draft:

0  IOAM Pre-allocated Trace Option-Type
1  IOAM Incremental Trace Option-Type
2  IOAM POT Option-Type
3  IOAM E2E Option-Type
4 - 127 are available for assignment via "IETF Review" process as per [RFC8126].

New registration requests MUST use the following template:

Name:  Name of the newly registered Option-Type.
Code point: Desired value of the requested code point.

Description: Brief description of the newly registered Option-Type.

Reference: Reference to the document that defines the new Option-Type.

The evaluation of a new registration request MUST also include checking whether the new IOAM Option-Type includes an IOAM-Namespace field and that the IOAM-Namespace field is the first field in the newly defined header of the new Option-Type.

8.2. IOAM Trace-Type Registry

This registry defines code point for each bit in the 24-bit IOAM-Trace-Type field for Pre-allocated Trace-Option-Type and Incremental Trace-Option-Type defined in Section 5.4. The meaning of Bits 0 - 11 is defined in this document in Paragraph 5 of Section 5.4.1:

- Bit 0 hop_Lim and node_id in short format
- Bit 1 ingress_if_id and egress_if_id in short format
- Bit 2 timestamp seconds
- Bit 3 timestamp fraction
- Bit 4 transit delay
- Bit 5 namespace specific data in short format
- Bit 6 queue depth
- Bit 7 checksum complement
- Bit 8 hop_Lim and node_id in wide format
- Bit 9 ingress_if_id and egress_if_id in wide format
- Bit 10 namespace specific data in wide format
- Bit 11 buffer occupancy
- Bit 22 variable length Opaque State Snapshot
- Bit 23 reserved
The meaning for Bits 12 - 21 are available for assignment via "IETF Review" process as per [RFC8126].

New registration requests MUST use the following template:

Bit: Desired bit to be allocated in the 24-bit IOAM Trace-Option-Type field for Pre-allocated Trace-Option-Type and Incremental Trace-Option-Type.

Description: Brief description of the newly registered bit.

Reference: Reference to the document that defines the new bit.

8.3. IOAM Trace-Flags Registry

This registry defines code points for each bit in the 4 bit flags for the Pre-allocated trace option and for the Incremental trace option defined in Section 5.4. The meaning of Bit 0 (the most significant bit) for trace flags is defined in this document in Paragraph 3 of Section 5.4.1:

Bit 0  "Overflow" (O-bit)

Bit 1 - 3 are available for assignment via "IETF Review" process as per [RFC8126].

New registration requests MUST use the following template:

Bit: Desired bit to be allocated in the 8 bit flags field of the Pre-allocated Trace-Option-Type and for the Incremental Trace-Option-Type.

Description: Brief description of the newly registered bit.

Reference: Reference to the document that defines the new bit.

8.4. IOAM POT-Type Registry

This registry defines 256 code points to define IOAM POT Type for IOAM proof of transit option Section 5.5. The code point value 0 is defined in this document:

0: 16 Octet POT data

1 - 255 are available for assignment via "IETF Review" process as per [RFC8126].

New registration requests MUST use the following template:
Name: Name of the newly registered POT-Type.

Code point: Desired value of the requested code point.

Description: Brief description of the newly registered POT-Type.

Reference: Reference to the document that defines the new POT-Type.

8.5. IOAM POT-Flags Registry

This registry defines code points for each bit in the 8 bit flags for IOAM POT Option-Type defined in Section 5.5.

The meaning for Bits 0 - 7 are available for assignment via "IETF Review" process as per [RFC8126].

New registration requests MUST use the following template:

Bit: Desired bit to be allocated in the 8 bit flags field of the IOAM POT Option-Type.

Description: Brief description of the newly registered bit.

Reference: Reference to the document that defines the new bit.

8.6. IOAM E2E-Type Registry

This registry defines code points for each bit in the 16 bit IOAM-E2E-Type field for IOAM E2E option Section 5.6. The meaning of Bit 0 - 3 are defined in this document:

Bit 0 64-bit sequence number
Bit 1 32-bit sequence number
Bit 2 timestamp seconds
Bit 3 timestamp fraction

The meaning of Bits 4 - 15 are available for assignment via "IETF Review" process as per [RFC8126].

New registration requests MUST use the following template:

Bit: Desired bit to be allocated in the 16 bit IOAM-E2E-Type field.

Description: Brief description of the newly registered bit.
8.7.  IOAM Namespace-ID Registry

IANA is requested to set up an "IOAM Namespace-ID Registry", containing 16-bit values and following the template for requests shown below. The meaning of 0x0000 is defined in this document. IANA is requested to reserve the values 0x0001 to 0x7FFF for private use (managed by operators), as specified in Section 5.3 of the current document. Registry entries for the values 0x8000 to 0xFFFF are to be assigned via the "Expert Review" policy defined in [RFC8126].

Upon receiving a new allocation request, a designated expert will perform the following:

- Review whether the request is complete, i.e., the registration template has been filled in. The expert will send incomplete requests back to the requestor.

- Check whether the request is neither a duplicate of nor conflicting with either an already existing allocation or a pending allocation. In case of duplicates or conflicts, the expert will ask the requestor to update the allocation request accordingly.

- Solicit feedback from relevant working groups and communities to ensure that the new allocation request has been properly reviewed and that rough consensus on the request exists. At a minimum, the expert will solicit feedback from the IPPM working group in the IETF by posting the request to the ippm@ietf.org mailing list. The expert will allow for a 3-week review period on the mailing lists. If the feedback received from the relevant working groups and communities within the review period indicates rough consensus on the request, the expert will approve the request and ask IANA for allocating the new Namespace-ID. In case the expert senses a lack of consensus from the feedback received, the expert will ask the requestor to engage with the corresponding working groups and communities to further review and refine the request.

It is intended that any allocation will be accompanied by a published RFC. In order to allow for the allocation of code points prior to the RFC being approved for publication, the designated expert can approve allocations once it seems clear that an RFC will be published.

0x0000: default namespace (known to all IOAM nodes)
0x0001 - 0x7FFF: reserved for private use

0x8000 - 0xFFFF: unassigned

New registration requests MUST use the following template:

Name: Name of the newly registered Namespace-ID.

Code point: Desired value of the requested Namespace-ID.

Description: Brief description of the newly registered Namespace-ID.

Reference: Reference to the document that defines the new Namespace-ID.

Status of the registration: Status can be either "permanent" or "provisional". Namespace-ID registrations following a successful expert review will have the status "provisional". Once the RFC, which defines the new Namespace-ID is published, the status is changed to "permanent".

9. Management and Deployment Considerations

This document defines the structure and use of IOAM data fields. This document does not define the encapsulation of IOAM data fields into different protocols. Management and deployment aspects for IOAM have to be considered within the context of the protocol IOAM data fields are encapsulated into and as such, are out of scope for this document. For a discussion of IOAM deployment, please also refer to [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-deployment], which outlines a framework for IOAM deployment and provides best current practices.

10. Security Considerations

As discussed in [RFC7276], a successful attack on an OAM protocol in general, and specifically on IOAM, can prevent the detection of failures or anomalies, or create a false illusion of nonexistent ones. In particular, these threats are applicable by compromising the integrity of IOAM data, either by maliciously modifying IOAM options in transit, or by injecting packets with maliciously generated IOAM options. All nodes in the path of a IOAM carrying packet can perform such an attack.

The Proof of Transit Option-Type (see Section 5.5) is used for verifying the path of data packets, i.e., proving that packets transited through a defined set of nodes.
In case an attacker gains access to several nodes in a network and would be able to change the system software of these nodes, IOAM data fields could be misused and repurposed for a use different from what is specified in this document. One type of misuse is the implementation of a covert channel between network nodes.

From a confidentiality perspective, although IOAM options are not expected to contain user data, they can be used for network reconnaissance, allowing attackers to collect information about network paths, performance, queue states, buffer occupancy and other information. Moreover, if IOAM data leaks from the IOAM-domain it could enable reconnaissance beyond the scope of the IOAM-domain. One possible application of such reconnaissance is to gauge the effectiveness of an ongoing attack, e.g., if buffers and queues are overflowing.

IOAM can be used as a means for implementing Denial of Service (DoS) attacks, or for amplifying them. For example, a malicious attacker can add an IOAM header to packets in order to consume the resources of network devices that take part in IOAM or entities that receive, collect or analyze the IOAM data. Another example is a packet length attack, in which an attacker pushes headers associated with IOAM Option-Types into data packets, causing these packets to be increased beyond the MTU size, resulting in fragmentation or in packet drops. In case POT is used, an attacker could corrupt the POT data fields in the packet, resulting in a verification failure of the POT data, even if the packet followed the correct path.

Since IOAM options can include timestamps, if network devices use synchronization protocols then any attack on the time protocol [RFC7384] can compromise the integrity of the timestamp-related data fields.

At the management plane, attacks can be set up by misconfiguring or by maliciously configuring IOAM-enabled nodes in a way that enables other attacks. IOAM configuration should only managed by authorized processes or users.

IETF protocols require features to ensure their security. While IOAM data fields don’t represent a protocol by themselves, the IOAM data fields add to the protocol that the IOAM data fields are encapsulated into. Any specification that defines how IOAM data fields carried in an encapsulating protocol MUST provide for a mechanism for cryptographic integrity protection of the IOAM data fields. Cryptographic integrity protection could be either achieved through a mechanism of the encapsulating protocol or it could incorporate the mechanisms specified in [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data-integrity].
The current document does not define a specific IOAM encapsulation. It has to be noted that some IOAM encapsulation types can introduce specific security considerations. A specification that defines an IOAM encapsulation is expected to address the respective encapsulation-specific security considerations.

Notably, IOAM is expected to be deployed in limited domains, thus confining the potential attack vectors to within the limited domain. A limited administrative domain provides the operator with the means to select, monitor, and control the access of all the network devices, making these devices trusted by the operator. Indeed, in order to limit the scope of threats mentioned above to within the current limited domain the network operator is expected to enforce policies that prevent IOAM traffic from leaking outside of the IOAM domain, and prevent IOAM data from outside the domain to be processed and used within the domain.

This document does not define the data contents of custom fields like "Opaque State Snapshot" and "namespace specific data" IOAM data fields. These custom data fields will have security considerations corresponding to their defined data contents that need to be described where those formats are defined.

IOAM deployments which leverage both IOAM Trace Option-Types, i.e., the Pre-allocated Trace Option-Type and Incremental Trace Option-Type can suffer from incomplete visibility if the information gathered via the two Trace Option-Types is not correlated and aggregated appropriately. If IOAM transit nodes leverage the IOAM data fields in the packet for further actions or insights, then IOAM transit nodes which only support one IOAM Trace Option-Type in an IOAM deployment which leverages both Trace Option-Types, have limited visibility and thus can draw inappropriate conclusions or take wrong actions.

The security considerations of a system that deploys IOAM, much like any system, has to be reviewed on a per-deployment-scenario basis, based on a systems-specific threat analysis, which can lead to specific security solutions that are beyond the scope of the current document. Specifically, in an IOAM deployment that is not confined to a single LAN, but spans multiple inter-connected sites (for example, using an overlay network), the inter-site links can be secured (e.g., by IPsec) in order to avoid external threats.

IOAM deployment considerations, including approaches to mitigate the above discussed threats and potential attacks are outside the scope of this document. IOAM deployment considerations are discussed in [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-deployment].
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1. Introduction

The IETF specifies and uses Performance Metrics of protocols and applications transported over its protocols. Performance metrics are an important part of network operations using IETF protocols, and [RFC6390] specifies guidelines for their development.

The definition and use of Performance Metrics in the IETF has been fostered in various working groups (WG), most notably:

The "IP Performance Metrics" (IPPM) WG is the WG primarily focusing on Performance Metrics definition at the IETF.

The "Benchmarking Methodology" WG (BMWG) defines many Performance Metrics for use in laboratory benchmarking of inter-networking technologies.

The "Metric Blocks for use with RTCP’s Extended Report Framework" (XRBLOCK) WG (concluded) specified many Performance Metrics related to "RTP Control Protocol Extended Reports (RTCP XR)" [RFC3611], which establishes a framework to allow new information to be conveyed in RTCP, supplementing the original report blocks defined in "RTP: A Transport Protocol for Real-Time Applications", [RFC3550].

The "IP Flow Information eXport" (IPFIX) concluded WG specified an IANA process for new Information Elements. Some Performance Metrics related Information Elements are proposed on regular basis.

The "Performance Metrics for Other Layers" (PMOL) a concluded WG defined some Performance Metrics related to Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) voice quality [RFC6035].

It is expected that more Performance Metrics will be defined in the future, not only IP-based metrics, but also metrics which are protocol-specific and application-specific.

Despite the importance of Performance Metrics, there are two related problems for the industry. First, ensuring that when one party requests another party to measure (or report or in some way act on) a particular Performance Metric, then both parties have exactly the same understanding of what Performance Metric is being referred to. Second, discovering which Performance Metrics have been specified, to avoid developing a new Performance Metric that is very similar, but not quite inter-operable. These problems can be addressed by creating a registry of performance metrics. The usual way in which the IETF organizes registries is with Internet Assigned Numbers.
Authority (IANA), and there is currently no Performance Metrics Registry maintained by the IANA.

This document requests that IANA create and maintain a Performance Metrics Registry, according to the maintenance procedures and the Performance Metrics Registry format defined in this memo. The resulting Performance Metrics Registry is for use by the IETF and others. Although the Registry formatting specifications herein are primarily for registry creation by IANA, any other organization that wishes to create a performance metrics registry may use the same formatting specifications for their purposes. The authors make no guarantee of the registry format's applicability to any possible set of Performance Metrics envisaged by other organizations, but encourage others to apply it. In the remainder of this document, unless we explicitly say otherwise, we will refer to the IANA-maintained Performance Metrics Registry as simply the Performance Metrics Registry.

2. Terminology

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.

Performance Metric: A Performance Metric is a quantitative measure of performance, targeted to an IETF-specified protocol or targeted to an application transported over an IETF-specified protocol. Examples of Performance Metrics are the FTP response time for a complete file download, the DNS response time to resolve the IP address(es), a database logging time, etc. This definition is consistent with the definition of metric in [RFC2330] and broader than the definition of performance metric in [RFC6390].

Registered Performance Metric: A Registered Performance Metric is a Performance Metric expressed as an entry in the Performance Metrics Registry, administered by IANA. Such a performance metric has met all the registry review criteria defined in this document in order to be included in the registry.

Performance Metrics Registry: The IANA registry containing Registered Performance Metrics.

Proprietary Registry: A set of metrics that are registered in a proprietary registry, as opposed to Performance Metrics Registry.
Performance Metrics Experts: The Performance Metrics Experts is a group of designated experts [RFC8126] selected by the IESG to validate the Performance Metrics before updating the Performance Metrics Registry. The Performance Metrics Experts work closely with IANA.

Parameter: A Parameter is an input factor defined as a variable in the definition of a Performance Metric. A Parameter is a numerical or other specified factor forming one of a set that defines a metric or sets the conditions of its operation. All Parameters must be known in order to make a measurement using a metric and interpret the results. There are two types of Parameters: Fixed and Run-time parameters. For the Fixed Parameters, the value of the variable is specified in the Performance Metrics Registry entry and different Fixed Parameter values result in different Registered Performance Metrics. For the Run-time Parameters, the value of the variable is defined when the metric measurement method is executed and a given Registered Performance Metric supports multiple values for the parameter. Although Run-time Parameters do not change the fundamental nature of the Performance Metric’s definition, some have substantial influence on the network property being assessed and interpretation of the results.

Note: Consider the case of packet loss in the following two Active Measurement Method cases. The first case is packet loss as background loss where the Run-time Parameter set includes a very sparse Poisson stream, and only characterizes the times when packets were lost. Actual user streams likely see much higher loss at these times, due to tail drop or radio errors. The second case is packet loss as inverse of throughput where the Run-time Parameter set includes a very dense, bursty stream, and characterizes the loss experienced by a stream that approximates a user stream. These are both "loss metrics", but the difference in interpretation of the results is highly dependent on the Run-time Parameters (at least), to the extreme where we are actually using loss to infer its compliment: delivered throughput.

Active Measurement Method: Methods of Measurement conducted on traffic which serves only the purpose of measurement and is generated for that reason alone, and whose traffic characteristics are known a priori. The complete definition of Active Methods is specified in section 3.4 of [RFC7799]. Examples of Active Measurement Methods are the measurement methods for the One way delay metric defined in [RFC7679] and the one for round trip delay defined in [RFC2681].
Passive Measurement Method: Methods of Measurement conducted on network traffic, generated either from the end users or from network elements that would exist regardless whether the measurement was being conducted or not. The complete definition of Passive Methods is specified in section 3.6 of [RFC7799]. One characteristic of Passive Measurement Methods is that sensitive information may be observed, and as a consequence, stored in the measurement system.

Hybrid Measurement Method: Hybrid Methods are Methods of Measurement that use a combination of Active Methods and Passive Methods, to assess Active Metrics, Passive Metrics, or new metrics derived from the a priori knowledge and observations of the stream of interest. The complete definition of Hybrid Methods is specified in section 3.8 of [RFC7799].

3. Scope

This document is intended for two different audiences:

1. For those defining new Registered Performance Metrics, it provides specifications and best practices to be used in deciding which Registered Performance Metrics are useful for a measurement study, instructions for writing the text for each column of the Registered Performance Metrics, and information on the supporting documentation required for the new Performance Metrics Registry entry (up to and including the publication of one or more immutable documents such as an RFC).

2. For the appointed Performance Metrics Experts and for IANA personnel administering the new IANA Performance Metrics Registry, it defines a set of acceptance criteria against which these proposed Registered Performance Metrics should be evaluated.

In addition, this document may be useful for other organizations who are defining a Performance Metric registry of their own, and may re-use the features of the Performance Metrics Registry defined in this document.

This Performance Metrics Registry is applicable to Performance Metrics issued from Active Measurement, Passive Measurement, and any other form of Performance Metric. This registry is designed to encompass Performance Metrics developed throughout the IETF and especially for the technologies specified in the following working groups: IPPM, XRBLOCK, IPFIX, and BMWG. This document analyzes a prior attempt to set up a Performance Metrics Registry, and the reasons why this design was inadequate [RFC6248]. Finally, this
document gives a set of guidelines for requesters and expert reviewers of candidate Registered Performance Metrics.

This document makes no attempt to populate the Performance Metrics Registry with initial entries; the related memo [I-D.ietf-ippm-initial-registry] proposes the initial set of registry entries.

4. Motivation for a Performance Metrics Registry

In this section, we detail several motivations for the Performance Metrics Registry.

4.1. Interoperability

As with any IETF registry, the primary intention is to manage registration of identifiers for use within one or more protocols. In the particular case of the Performance Metrics Registry, there are two types of protocols that will use the Performance Metrics in the Performance Metrics Registry during their operation (by referring to the Index values):

- Control protocol: This type of protocol used to allow one entity to request another entity to perform a measurement using a specific metric defined by the Performance Metrics Registry. One particular example is the LMAP framework [RFC7594]. Using the LMAP terminology, the Performance Metrics Registry is used in the LMAP Control protocol to allow a Controller to schedule a measurement task for one or more Measurement Agents. In order to enable this use case, the entries of the Performance Metrics Registry must be sufficiently defined to allow a Measurement Agent implementation to trigger a specific measurement task upon the reception of a control protocol message. This requirement heavily constrains the type of entries that are acceptable for the Performance Metrics Registry.

- Report protocol: This type of protocol is used to allow an entity to report measurement results to another entity. By referencing to a specific Performance Metrics Registry, it is possible to properly characterize the measurement result data being reported. Using the LMAP terminology, the Performance Metrics Registry is used in the Report protocol to allow a Measurement Agent to report measurement results to a Collector.

It should be noted that the LMAP framework explicitly allows for using not only the IANA-maintained Performance Metrics Registry but also other registries containing Performance Metrics, either defined by other organizations or private ones. However, others who are
creating Registries to be used in the context of an LMAP framework are encouraged to use the Registry format defined in this document, because this makes it easier for developers of LMAP Measurement Agents (MAs) to programmatically use information found in those other Registries' entries.

4.2. Single point of reference for Performance Metrics

A Performance Metrics Registry serves as a single point of reference for Performance Metrics defined in different working groups in the IETF. As we mentioned earlier, there are several WGs that define Performance Metrics in the IETF and it is hard to keep track of all them. This results in multiple definitions of similar Performance Metrics that attempt to measure the same phenomena but in slightly different (and incompatible) ways. Having a registry would allow the IETF community and others to have a single list of relevant Performance Metrics defined by the IETF (and others, where appropriate). The single list is also an essential aspect of communication about Performance Metrics, where different entities that request measurements, execute measurements, and report the results can benefit from a common understanding of the referenced Performance Metric.

4.3. Side benefits

There are a couple of side benefits of having such a registry. First, the Performance Metrics Registry could serve as an inventory of useful and used Performance Metrics, that are normally supported by different implementations of measurement agents. Second, the results of measurements using the Performance Metrics should be comparable even if they are performed by different implementations and in different networks, as the Performance Metric is properly defined. BCP 176 [RFC6576] examines whether the results produced by independent implementations are equivalent in the context of evaluating the completeness and clarity of metric specifications. This BCP defines the standards track advancement testing for (active) IPPM metrics, and the same process will likely suffice to determine whether Registered Performance Metrics are sufficiently well specified to result in comparable (or equivalent) results. Registered Performance Metrics which have undergone such testing SHOULD be noted, with a reference to the test results.

5. Criteria for Performance Metrics Registration

It is neither possible nor desirable to populate the Performance Metrics Registry with all combinations of Parameters of all Performance Metrics. The Registered Performance Metrics SHOULD be:
1. interpretable by the user.
2. implementable by the software or hardware designer,
3. deployable by network operators,
4. accurate in terms of producing equivalent results, and for interoperability and deployment across vendors,
5. Operationally useful, so that it has significant industry interest and/or has seen deployment,
6. Sufficiently tightly defined, so that different values for the Run-time Parameters does not change the fundamental nature of the measurement, nor change the practicality of its implementation.

In essence, there needs to be evidence that a candidate Registered Performance Metric has significant industry interest, or has seen deployment, and there is agreement that the candidate Registered Performance Metric serves its intended purpose.

6. Performance Metric Registry: Prior attempt

There was a previous attempt to define a metric registry RFC 4148 [RFC4148]. However, it was obsoleted by RFC 6248 [RFC6248] because it was "found to be insufficiently detailed to uniquely identify IPPM metrics... [there was too much] variability possible when characterizing a metric exactly" which led to the RFC4148 registry having "very few users, if any".

A couple of interesting additional quotes from RFC 6248 [RFC6248] might help to understand the issues related to that registry.

1. "It is not believed to be feasible or even useful to register every possible combination of Type P, metric parameters, and Stream parameters using the current structure of the IPPM Metrics Registry."
2. "The registry structure has been found to be insufficiently detailed to uniquely identify IPPM metrics."
3. "Despite apparent efforts to find current or even future users, no one responded to the call for interest in the RFC 4148 registry during the second half of 2010."

The current approach learns from this by tightly defining each Registered Performance Metric with only a few variable (Run-time) Parameters to be specified by the measurement designer, if any. The
idea is that entries in the Performance Metrics Registry stem from
different measurement methods which require input (Run-time)
parameters to set factors like source and destination addresses
(which do not change the fundamental nature of the measurement). The
downside of this approach is that it could result in a large number
of entries in the Performance Metrics Registry. There is agreement
that less is more in this context – it is better to have a reduced
set of useful metrics rather than a large set of metrics, some with
with questionable usefulness.

6.1. Why this Attempt Should Succeed

As mentioned in the previous section, one of the main issues with the
previous registry was that the metrics contained in the registry were
too generic to be useful. This document specifies stricter criteria
for performance metric registration (see section 5), and imposes a
group of Performance Metrics Experts that will provide guidelines to
assess if a Performance Metric is properly specified.

Another key difference between this attempt and the previous one is
that in this case there is at least one clear user for the
Performance Metrics Registry: the LMAP framework and protocol.
Because the LMAP protocol will use the Performance Metrics Registry
values in its operation, this actually helps to determine if a metric
is properly defined. In particular, since we expect that the LMAP
control protocol will enable a controller to request a measurement
agent to perform a measurement using a given metric by embedding the
Performance Metrics Registry identifier in the protocol. Such a
metric and method are properly specified if they are defined well-
ough so that it is possible (and practical) to implement them in
the measurement agent. This was the failure of the previous attempt:
a registry entry with an undefined Type-P (section 13 of RFC 2330
[RFC2330]) allows implementation to be ambiguous.

7. Definition of the Performance Metric Registry

This Performance Metrics Registry is applicable to Performance
Metrics used for Active Measurement, Passive Measurement, and any
other form of Performance Measurement. Each category of measurement
has unique properties, so some of the columns defined below are not
applicable for a given metric category. In this case, the column(s)
SHOULD be populated with the "NA" value (Non Applicable). However,
the "NA" value MUST NOT be used by any metric in the following
columns: Identifier, Name, URI, Status, Requester, Revision, Revision
Date, Description. In the future, a new category of metrics could
require additional columns, and adding new columns is a recognized
form of registry extension. The specification defining the new
The columns of the Performance Metrics Registry are defined below. The columns are grouped into "Categories" to facilitate the use of the registry. Categories are described at the 7.x heading level, and columns are at the 7.x.y heading level. The Figure below illustrates this organization. An entry (row) therefore gives a complete description of a Registered Performance Metric.

Each column serves as a check-list item and helps to avoid omissions during registration and expert review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments and Remarks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a blank template of the Registry template provided in Section 11 of this memo.
7.1. Summary Category

7.1.1. Identifier

A numeric identifier for the Registered Performance Metric. This identifier MUST be unique within the Performance Metrics Registry.

The Registered Performance Metric unique identifier is an unbounded integer (range 0 to infinity).

The Identifier 0 should be Reserved. The Identifier values from 64512 to 65536 are reserved for private or experimental use, and the user may encounter overlapping uses.

When adding newly Registered Performance Metrics to the Performance Metrics Registry, IANA SHOULD assign the lowest available identifier to the new Registered Performance Metric.

If a Performance Metrics Expert providing review determines that there is a reason to assign a specific numeric identifier, possibly leaving a temporary gap in the numbering, then the Performance Expert SHALL inform IANA of this decision.

7.1.2. Name

As the name of a Registered Performance Metric is the first thing a potential human implementor will use when determining whether it is suitable for their measurement study, it is important to be as precise and descriptive as possible. In future, users will review the names to determine if the metric they want to measure has already been registered, or if a similar entry is available as a basis for creating a new entry.

Names are composed of the following elements, separated by an underscore character "_":

MetricType_Method_SubTypeMethod... Spec_Units_Output

- MetricType: a combination of the directional properties and the metric measured, such as and not limited to:
  
  RTDelay (Round Trip Delay)
  
  RTDNS (Response Time Domain Name Service)
  
  RLDNS (Response Loss Domain Name Service)
  
  OWDelay (One Way Delay)
RTLoss (Round Trip Loss)
OWLoss (One Way Loss)
OWPDV (One Way Packet Delay Variation)
OWIPDV (One Way Inter-Packet Delay Variation)
OWReorder (One Way Packet Reordering)
OWDuplic (One Way Packet Duplication)
OWBTC (One Way Bulk Transport Capacity)
OWMBM (One Way Model Based Metric)
SPMonitor (Single Point Monitor)
MPMonitor (Multi-Point Monitor)

- **Method**: One of the methods defined in [RFC7799], such as and not limited to:
  - Active (depends on a dedicated measurement packet stream and observations of the stream)
  - Passive (depends *solely* on observation of one or more existing packet streams)
  - HybridType1 (observations on one stream that combine both active and passive methods)
  - HybridType2 (observations on two or more streams that combine both active and passive methods)
  - Spatial (Spatial Metric of RFC5644)

- **SubTypeMethod**: One or more sub-types to further describe the features of the entry, such as and not limited to:
  - ICMP (Internet Control Message Protocol)
  - IP (Internet Protocol)
  - DSCPxx (where xx is replaced by a Diffserv code point)
  - UDP (User Datagram Protocol)
TCP (Transport Control Protocol)

QUIC (QUIC transport protocol)

HS (Hand-Shake, such as TCP’s 3-way HS)

Poisson (Packet generation using Poisson distribution)

Periodic (Periodic packet generation)

SendOnRcv (Sender keeps one packet in-transit by sending when previous packet arrives)

PayloadxxxxxB (where xxxx is replaced by an integer, the number of octets in the Payload)

SustainedBurst (Capacity test, worst case)

StandingQueue (test of bottleneck queue behavior)

SubTypeMethod values are separated by a hyphen "-" character, which indicates that they belong to this element, and that their order is unimportant when considering name uniqueness.

- Spec: An immutable document identifier combined with a document section identifier. For RFCs, this consists of the RFC number and major section number that specifies this Registry entry in the form RFCXXXXsecY, such as RFC7799sec3. Note: the RFC number is not the Primary Reference specification for the metric definition, such as [RFC7679] for One-way Delay; it will contain the placeholder "RFCXXXXsecY" until the RFC number is assigned to the specifying document, and would remain blank in private registry entries without a corresponding RFC. Anticipating the "RFC10K" problem, the number of the RFC continues to replace RFCXXXX regardless of the number of digits in the RFC number. Anticipating Registry Entries from other standards bodies, the form of this Name Element MUST be proposed and reviewed for consistency and uniqueness by the Expert Reviewer.

- Units: The units of measurement for the output, such as and not limited to:
  
  Seconds
  
  Ratio (unitless)
Percent (value multiplied by 100%)
Logical (1 or 0)
Packets
BPS (Bits per Second)
PPS (Packets per Second)
EventTotal (for unit-less counts)
Multiple (more than one type of unit)
Enumerated (a list of outcomes)
Unitless

Output: The type of output resulting from measurement, such as and not limited to:
Singleton
Raw (multiple Singletons)
Count
Minimum
Maximum
Median
Mean
95Percentile (95th Percentile)
99Percentile (99th Percentile)
StdDev (Standard Deviation)
Variance
PFI (Pass, Fail, Inconclusive)
FlowRecords (descriptions of flows observed)
LossRatio (lost packets to total packets, <=1)
An example is:

RTDelay_Active_IP-UDP-Periodic_RFCXXXXsecY_Seconds_95Percentile

as described in section 4 of [I-D.ietf-ippm-initial-registry].

Note that private registries following the format described here
SHOULD use the prefix "Priv_" on any name to avoid unintended
conflicts (further considerations are described in section 10).
Private registry entries usually have no specifying RFC, thus the
Spec: element has no clear interpretation.

7.1.3. URI

The URIs column MUST contain a URL [RFC3986] that uniquely identifies
and locates the metric entry so it is accessible through the
Internet. The URL points to a file containing all the human-readable
information for one registry entry. The URL SHALL reference a target
file that is preferably HTML-formatted and contains URLs to
referenced sections of HTML-ized RFCs, or other reference
specifications. These target files for different entries can be more
easily edited and re-used when preparing new entries. The exact form
of the URL for each target file, and the target file itself, will be
determined by IANA and reside on "iana.org". The major sections of
[I-D.ietf-ippm-initial-registry] provide an example of a target file
in HTML form (sections 4 and higher).

7.1.4. Description

A Registered Performance Metric description is a written
representation of a particular Performance Metrics Registry entry.
It supplements the Registered Performance Metric name to help
Performance Metrics Registry users select relevant Registered
Performance Metrics.

7.1.5. Reference

This entry gives the specification containing the candidate registry
entry which was reviewed and agreed, if such an RFC or other
specification exists.

7.1.6. Change Controller

This entry names the entity responsible for approving revisions to
the registry entry, and SHALL provide contact information (for an
individual, where appropriate).
7.1.7. Version (of Registry Format)

This entry gives the version number for the registry format used. Formats complying with this memo MUST use 1.0. The version number SHALL NOT change unless a new RFC is published that changes the registry format. The version number of registry entries SHALL NOT change unless the registry entry is updated (following procedures in section 8).

7.2. Metric Definition Category

This category includes columns to prompt all necessary details related to the metric definition, including the immutable document reference and values of input factors, called fixed parameters, which are left open in the immutable document, but have a particular value defined by the performance metric.

7.2.1. Reference Definition

This entry provides a reference (or references) to the relevant section(s) of the document(s) that define the metric, as well as any supplemental information needed to ensure an unambiguous definition for implementations. The reference needs to be an immutable document, such as an RFC; for other standards bodies, it is likely to be necessary to reference a specific, dated version of a specification.

7.2.2. Fixed Parameters

Fixed Parameters are Parameters whose value must be specified in the Performance Metrics Registry. The measurement system uses these values.

Where referenced metrics supply a list of Parameters as part of their descriptive template, a sub-set of the Parameters will be designated as Fixed Parameters. As an example for active metrics, Fixed Parameters determine most or all of the IPPM Framework convention "packets of Type-P" as described in [RFC2330], such as transport protocol, payload length, TTL, etc. An example for passive metrics is for RTP packet loss calculation that relies on the validation of a packet as RTP which is a multi-packet validation controlled by MIN_SEQUENTIAL as defined by [RFC3550]. Varying MIN_SEQUENTIAL values can alter the loss report and this value could be set as a Fixed Parameter.

Parameters MUST have well-defined names. For human readers, the hanging indent style is preferred, and any Parameter names and
definitions that do not appear in the Reference Method Specification MUST appear in this column (or Run-time Parameters column).

Parameters MUST have a well-specified data format.

A Parameter which is a Fixed Parameter for one Performance Metrics Registry entry may be designated as a Run-time Parameter for another Performance Metrics Registry entry.

7.3. Method of Measurement Category

This category includes columns for references to relevant sections of the immutable document(s) and any supplemental information needed to ensure an unambiguous method for implementations.

7.3.1. Reference Method

This entry provides references to relevant sections of immutable documents, such as RFC(s) (for other standards bodies, it is likely to be necessary to reference a specific, dated version of a specification) describing the method of measurement, as well as any supplemental information needed to ensure unambiguous interpretation for implementations referring to the immutable document text.

Specifically, this section should include pointers to pseudocode or actual code that could be used for an unambiguous implementation.

7.3.2. Packet Stream Generation

This column applies to Performance Metrics that generate traffic as part of their Measurement Method, including but not necessarily limited to Active metrics. The generated traffic is referred as a stream and this column describes its characteristics.

Each entry for this column contains the following information:

- Value: The name of the packet stream scheduling discipline
- Reference: the specification where the parameters of the stream are defined

The packet generation stream may require parameters such as the average packet rate and distribution truncation value for streams with Poisson-distributed inter-packet sending times. In case such parameters are needed, they should be included either in the Fixed parameter column or in the run time parameter column, depending on whether they will be fixed or will be an input for the metric.
The simplest example of stream specification is Singleton scheduling (see [RFC2330]), where a single atomic measurement is conducted. Each atomic measurement could consist of sending a single packet (such as a DNS request) or sending several packets (for example, to request a webpage). Other streams support a series of atomic measurements in a "sample", with a schedule defining the timing between each transmitted packet and subsequent measurement. Principally, two different streams are used in IPPM metrics, Poisson distributed as described in [RFC2330] and Periodic as described in [RFC3432]. Both Poisson and Periodic have their own unique parameters, and the relevant set of parameters names and values should be included either in the Fixed Parameters column or in the Run-time parameter column.

7.3.3. Traffic Filter

This column applies to Performance Metrics that observe packets flowing through (the device with) the measurement agent i.e. that is not necessarily addressed to the measurement agent. This includes but is not limited to Passive Metrics. The filter specifies the traffic that is measured. This includes protocol field values/ ranges, such as address ranges, and flow or session identifiers.

The traffic filter itself depends on needs of the metric itself and a balance of an operator’s measurement needs and a user’s need for privacy. Mechanics for conveying the filter criteria might be the BPF (Berkeley Packet Filter) or PSAMP [RFC5475] Property Match Filtering which reuses IPFIX [RFC7012]. An example BPF string for matching TCP/80 traffic to remote destination net 192.0.2.0/24 would be "dst net 192.0.2.0/24 and tcp dst port 80". More complex filter engines might be supported by the implementation that might allow for matching using Deep Packet Inspection (DPI) technology.

The traffic filter includes the following information:

- Type: the type of traffic filter used, e.g. BPF, PSAMP, OpenFlow rule, etc. as defined by a normative reference
- Value: the actual set of rules expressed

7.3.4. Sampling Distribution

The sampling distribution defines out of all the packets that match the traffic filter, which one of those are actually used for the measurement. One possibility is "all" which implies that all packets matching the Traffic filter are considered, but there may be other sampling strategies. It includes the following information:
Value: the name of the sampling distribution

Reference definition: pointer to the specification where the sampling distribution is properly defined.

The sampling distribution may require parameters. In case such parameters are needed, they should be included either in the Fixed parameter column or in the run time parameter column, depending on whether they will be fixed or will be an input for the metric.

Sampling and Filtering Techniques for IP Packet Selection are documented in the PSAMP (Packet Sampling) [RFC5475], while the Framework for Packet Selection and Reporting, [RFC5474] provides more background information. The sampling distribution parameters might be expressed in terms of the Information Model for Packet Sampling Exports, [RFC5477], and the Flow Selection Techniques, [RFC7014].

7.3.5. Run-time Parameters

Run-Time Parameters are Parameters that must be determined, configured into the measurement system, and reported with the results for the context to be complete. However, the values of these parameters is not specified in the Performance Metrics Registry (like the Fixed Parameters), rather these parameters are listed as an aid to the measurement system implementer or user (they must be left as variables, and supplied on execution).

Where metrics supply a list of Parameters as part of their descriptive template, a sub-set of the Parameters will be designated as Run-Time Parameters.

Parameters MUST have well defined names. For human readers, the hanging indent style is preferred, and the names and definitions that do not appear in the Reference Method Specification MUST appear in this column.

A Data Format for each Run-time Parameter MUST be specified in this column, to simplify the control and implementation of measurement devices. For example, parameters that include an IPv4 address can be encoded as a 32 bit integer (i.e. binary base64 encoded value) or ip-address as defined in [RFC6991]. The actual encoding(s) used must be explicitly defined for each Run-time parameter. IPv6 addresses and options MUST be accommodated, allowing Registered Metrics to be used in that address family. Other address families are permissible.

Examples of Run-time Parameters include IP addresses, measurement point designations, start times and end times for measurement, and other information essential to the method of measurement.
7.3.6. Role

In some methods of measurement, there may be several roles defined, e.g., for a one-way packet delay active measurement there is one measurement agent that generates the packets and another agent that receives the packets. This column contains the name of the Role(s) for this particular entry. In the one-way delay example above, there should be two entries in the Role registry column, one for each Role (Source and Destination). When a measurement agent is instructed to perform the "Source" Role for one-way delay metric, the agent knows that it is required to generate packets. The values for this field are defined in the reference method of measurement (and this frequently results in abbreviated role names such as "Src").

When the Role column of a registry entry defines more than one Role, then the Role SHALL be treated as a Run-time Parameter and supplied for execution. It should be noted that the LMAP framework [RFC7594] distinguishes the Role from other Run-time Parameters, and defines a special parameter "Roles" inside the registry-grouping function list in the LMAP YANG model[RFC8194].

7.4. Output Category

For entries which involve a stream and many singleton measurements, a statistic may be specified in this column to summarize the results to a single value. If the complete set of measured singletons is output, this will be specified here.

Some metrics embed one specific statistic in the reference metric definition, while others allow several output types or statistics.

7.4.1. Type

This column contains the name of the output type. The output type defines a single type of result that the metric produces. It can be the raw results (packet send times and singleton metrics), or it can be a summary statistic. The specification of the output type MUST define the format of the output. In some systems, format specifications will simplify both measurement implementation and collection/storage tasks. Note that if two different statistics are required from a single measurement (for example, both "Xth percentile mean" and "Raw"), then a new output type must be defined ("Xth percentile mean AND Raw"). See the Naming section above for a list of Output Types.
7.4.2. Reference Definition

This column contains a pointer to the specification(s) where the output type and format are defined.

7.4.3. Metric Units

The measured results must be expressed using some standard dimension or units of measure. This column provides the units.

When a sample of singletons (see Section 11 of [RFC2330] for definitions of these terms) is collected, this entry will specify the units for each measured value.

7.4.4. Calibration

Some specifications for Methods of Measurement include the possibility to perform an error calibration. Section 3.7.3 of [RFC7679] is one example. In the registry entry, this field will identify a method of calibration for the metric, and when available, the measurement system SHOULD perform the calibration when requested and produce the output with an indication that it is the result of a calibration method. In-situ calibration could be enabled with an internal loopback that includes as much of the measurement system as possible, performs address manipulation as needed, and provides some form of isolation (e.g., deterministic delay) to avoid send-receive interface contention. Some portion of the random and systematic error can be characterized this way.

For one-way delay measurements, the error calibration must include an assessment of the internal clock synchronization with its external reference (this internal clock is supplying timestamps for measurement). In practice, the time offsets of clocks at both the source and destination are needed to estimate the systematic error due to imperfect clock synchronization (the time offsets are smoothed, thus the random variation is not usually represented in the results).

Both internal loopback calibration and clock synchronization can be used to estimate the *available accuracy* of the Output Metric Units. For example, repeated loopback delay measurements will reveal the portion of the Output result resolution which is the result of system noise, and thus inaccurate.
7.5. Administrative information

7.5.1. Status

The status of the specification of this Registered Performance Metric. Allowed values are 'current' and 'deprecated'. All newly defined Information Elements have 'current' status.

7.5.2. Requester

The requester for the Registered Performance Metric. The requester MAY be a document, such as RFC, or person.

7.5.3. Revision

The revision number of a Registered Performance Metric, starting at 0 for Registered Performance Metrics at time of definition and incremented by one for each revision.

7.5.4. Revision Date

The date of acceptance or the most recent revision for the Registered Performance Metric. The date SHALL be determined by IANA and the reviewing Performance Metrics Expert.

7.6. Comments and Remarks

Besides providing additional details which do not appear in other categories, this open Category (single column) allows for unforeseen issues to be addressed by simply updating this informational entry.

8. Processes for Managing the Performance Metric Registry Group

Once a Performance Metric or set of Performance Metrics has been identified for a given application, candidate Performance Metrics Registry entry specifications prepared in accordance with Section 7 should be submitted to IANA to follow the process for review by the Performance Metric Experts, as defined below. This process is also used for other changes to the Performance Metrics Registry, such as deprecation or revision, as described later in this section.

It is desirable that the author(s) of a candidate Performance Metrics Registry entry seek review in the relevant IETF working group, or offer the opportunity for review on the working group mailing list.
8.1. Adding new Performance Metrics to the Performance Metrics Registry

Requests to add Registered Performance Metrics in the Performance Metrics Registry SHALL be submitted to IANA, which forwards the request to a designated group of experts (Performance Metric Experts) appointed by the IESG; these are the reviewers called for by the Specification Required [RFC8126] policy defined for the Performance Metrics Registry. The Performance Metric Experts review the request for such things as compliance with this document, compliance with other applicable Performance Metric-related RFCs, and consistency with the currently defined set of Registered Performance Metrics. The most efficient path for submission begins with preparation of an Internet Draft containing the proposed Performance Metrics Registry entry using the template in Section 11, so that the submission formatting will benefit from the normal IETF Internet Draft submission processing (including HTML-ization).

Submission to IANA may be during IESG review (leading to IETF Standards Action), where an Internet Draft proposes one or more Registered Performance Metrics to be added to the Performance Metrics Registry, including the text of the proposed Registered Performance Metric(s).

If an RFC-to-be includes a Performance Metric and a proposed Performance Metrics Registry entry, but the Performance Metric Expert review determines that one or more of the Section 5 criteria have not been met, then the proposed Performance Metrics Registry entry MUST be removed from the text. Once evidence exists that the Performance Metric meets the criteria in section 5, the proposed Performance Metrics Registry entry SHOULD be submitted to IANA to be evaluated in consultation with the Performance Metric Experts for registration at that time.

Authors of proposed Registered Performance Metrics SHOULD review compliance with the specifications in this document to check their submissions before sending them to IANA.

At least one Performance Metric Expert should endeavor to complete referred reviews in a timely manner. If the request is acceptable, the Performance Metric Experts signify their approval to IANA, and IANA updates the Performance Metrics Registry. If the request is not acceptable, the Performance Metric Experts MAY coordinate with the requester to change the request to be compliant, otherwise IANA SHALL coordinate resolution of issues on behalf of the expert. The Performance Metric Experts MAY choose to reject clearly frivolous or inappropriate change requests outright, but such exceptional circumstances should be rare.
This process should not in any way be construed as allowing the Performance Metric Experts to overrule IETF consensus. Specifically, any Registered Performance Metrics that were added to the Performance Metrics Registry with IETF consensus require IETF consensus for revision or deprecation.

Decisions by the Performance Metric Experts may be appealed as in Section 7 of [RFC8126].

8.2. Revising Registered Performance Metrics

A request for Revision is only permitted when the requested changes maintain backward-compatibility with implementations of the prior Performance Metrics Registry entry describing a Registered Performance Metric (entries with lower revision numbers, but the same Identifier and Name).

The purpose of the Status field in the Performance Metrics Registry is to indicate whether the entry for a Registered Performance Metric is ‘current’ or ‘deprecated’.

In addition, no policy is defined for revising the Performance Metric entries in the IANA Registry or addressing errors therein. To be clear, changes and deprecations within the Performance Metrics Registry are not encouraged, and should be avoided to the extent possible. However, in recognition that change is inevitable, the provisions of this section address the need for revisions.

Revisions are initiated by sending a candidate Registered Performance Metric definition to IANA, as in Section 8.1, identifying the existing Performance Metrics Registry entry, and explaining how and why the existing entry should be revised.

The primary requirement in the definition of procedures for managing changes to existing Registered Performance Metrics is avoidance of measurement interoperability problems; the Performance Metric Experts must work to maintain interoperability above all else. Changes to Registered Performance Metrics may only be done in an interoperable way; necessary changes that cannot be done in a way to allow interoperability with unchanged implementations MUST result in the creation of a new Registered Performance Metric (with a new Name, replacing the RFCXXXXsecY portion of the name) and possibly the deprecation of the earlier metric.

A change to a Registered Performance Metric SHALL be determined to be backward-compatible when:
1. it involves the correction of an error that is obviously only editorial; or

2. it corrects an ambiguity in the Registered Performance Metric’s definition, which itself leads to issues severe enough to prevent the Registered Performance Metric’s usage as originally defined; or

3. it corrects missing information in the metric definition without changing its meaning (e.g., the explicit definition of ’quantity’ semantics for numeric fields without a Data Type Semantics value); or

4. it harmonizes with an external reference that was itself corrected.

If a Performance Metric revision is deemed permissible and backward-compatible by the Performance Metric Experts, according to the rules in this document, IANA SHOULD execute the change(s) in the Performance Metrics Registry. The requester of the change is appended to the original requester in the Performance Metrics Registry. The Name of the revised Registered Performance Metric, including the RFCXXXXsecY portion of the name, SHALL remain unchanged (even when the change is the result of IETF Standards Action; the revised registry entry SHOULD reference the new immutable document, such as an RFC or for other standards bodies, it is likely to be necessary to reference a specific, dated version of a specification, in an appropriate category and column).

Each Registered Performance Metric in the Performance Metrics Registry has a revision number, starting at zero. Each change to a Registered Performance Metric following this process increments the revision number by one.

When a revised Registered Performance Metric is accepted into the Performance Metrics Registry, the date of acceptance of the most recent revision is placed into the revision Date column of the registry for that Registered Performance Metric.

Where applicable, additions to Registered Performance Metrics in the form of text Comments or Remarks should include the date, but such additions may not constitute a revision according to this process.

Older version(s) of the updated metric entries are kept in the registry for archival purposes. The older entries are kept with all fields unmodified (version, revision date) except for the status field that SHALL be changed to "Deprecated".
8.3. Deprecating Registered Performance Metrics

Changes that are not permissible by the above criteria for Registered Performance Metric’s revision may only be handled by deprecation. A Registered Performance Metric MAY be deprecated and replaced when:

1. the Registered Performance Metric definition has an error or shortcoming that cannot be permissibly changed as in Section 8.2 Revising Registered Performance Metrics; or

2. the deprecation harmonizes with an external reference that was itself deprecated through that reference’s accepted deprecation method.

A request for deprecation is sent to IANA, which passes it to the Performance Metric Experts for review. When deprecating an Performance Metric, the Performance Metric description in the Performance Metrics Registry must be updated to explain the deprecation, as well as to refer to any new Performance Metrics created to replace the deprecated Performance Metric.

The revision number of a Registered Performance Metric is incremented upon deprecation, and the revision Date updated, as with any revision.

The intentional use of deprecated Registered Performance Metrics should result in a log entry or human-readable warning by the respective application.

Names and Metric IDs of deprecated Registered Performance Metrics must not be reused.

The deprecated entries are kept with all fields unmodified, except the version, revision date, and the status field (changed to "Deprecated").

9. Security considerations

This draft defines a registry structure, and does not itself introduce any new security considerations for the Internet. The definition of Performance Metrics for this registry may introduce some security concerns, but the mandatory references should have their own considerations for security, and such definitions should be reviewed with security in mind if the security considerations are not covered by one or more reference standards.

The aggregated results of the performance metrics described in this registry might reveal network topology information that may be
considered sensitive. If such cases are found, then access control mechanisms should be applied.

10. IANA Considerations

With the background and processes described in earlier sections, this document requests the following IANA Actions.

Editor’s Note: Mock-ups of the implementation of this set of requests have been prepared with IANA’s help during development of this memo, and have been captured in the Proceedings of IPPM working group sessions. IANA is currently preparing a mock-up. A recent version is available here: http://encrypted.net/IETFMetricsRegistry-106.html

10.1. Registry Group

The new registry group SHALL be named, "PERFORMANCE METRICS Group".

Registration Procedure: Specification Required

Reference: <This RFC>

Experts: Performance Metrics Experts

Note: TBD

10.2. Performance Metric Name Elements

This document specifies the procedure for Performance Metrics Name Element Registry setup. IANA is requested to create a new set of registries for Performance Metric Name Elements called "Registered Performance Metric Name Elements". Each Registry, whose names are listed below:

MetricType:

Method:

SubTypeMethod:

Spec:

Units:

Output:

will contain the current set of possibilities for Performance Metrics Registry Entry Names.
To populate the Registered Performance Metric Name Elements at creation, the IANA is asked to use the lists of values for each name element listed in Section 7.1.2. The Name Elements in each registry are case-sensitive.

When preparing a Metric entry for Registration, the developer SHOULD choose Name elements from among the registered elements. However, if the proposed metric is unique in a significant way, it may be necessary to propose a new Name element to properly describe the metric, as described below.

A candidate Metric Entry RFC or immutable document for IANA and Expert Review would propose one or more new element values required to describe the unique entry, and the new name element(s) would be reviewed along with the metric entry. New assignments for Registered Performance Metric Name Elements will be administered by IANA through Specification Required policy (which includes Expert Review) [RFC8126], i.e., review by one of a group of experts, the Performance Metric Experts, who are appointed by the IESG upon recommendation of the Transport Area Directors.

10.3. New Performance Metrics Registry

This document specifies the procedure for Performance Metrics Registry setup. IANA is requested to create a new registry for Performance Metrics called "Performance Metrics Registry". This Registry will contain the following Summary columns:

Identifier:
Name:
URI:
Description:
Reference:
Change Controller:
Version:

Descriptions of these columns and additional information found in the template for registry entries (categories and columns) are further defined in section Section 7.

The Identifier 0 should be Reserved. The Registered Performance Metric unique identifier is an unbounded integer (range 0 to
infinity). The Identifier values from 64512 to 65536 are reserved for private or experimental use, and the user may encounter overlapping uses. When adding newly Registered Performance Metrics to the Performance Metrics Registry, IANA SHOULD assign the lowest available identifier to the new Registered Performance Metric. If a Performance Metrics Expert providing review determines that there is a reason to assign a specific numeric identifier, possibly leaving a temporary gap in the numbering, then the Performance Expert SHALL inform IANA of this decision.

Names starting with the prefix Priv_ are reserved for private use, and are not considered for registration. The "Name" column entries are further defined in section Section 7.

The "URI" column will have a URL to the full template of each registry entry. The Registry Entry text SHALL be HTML-ized to aid the reader, with links to reference RFCs (similar to the way that Internet Drafts are HTML-ized, the same tool can perform the function) or immutable document.

The "Reference" column will include an RFC number, an approved specification designator from another standards body, or other immutable document.

New assignments for Performance Metrics Registry will be administered by IANA through Specification Required policy (which includes Expert Review) [RFC8126], i.e., review by one of a group of experts, the Performance Metric Experts, who are appointed by the IESG upon recommendation of the Transport Area Directors, or by Standards Action. The experts can be initially drawn from the Working Group Chairs, document editors, and members of the Performance Metrics Directorate, among other sources of experts.

Extensions of the Performance Metrics Registry require IETF Standards Action. Only one form of registry extension is envisaged:

1. Adding columns, or both categories and columns, to accommodate unanticipated aspects of new measurements and metric categories.

If the Performance Metrics Registry is extended in this way, the Version number of future entries complying with the extension SHALL be incremented (either in the unit or tenths digit, depending on the degree of extension.)
11. Blank Registry Template

This section provides a blank template to help IANA and registry entry writers.

11.1. Summary

This category includes multiple indexes to the registry entry: the element ID and metric name.

11.1.1. ID (Identifier)

<insert a numeric identifier, an integer, TBD>

11.1.2. Name

<insert name according to metric naming convention>

11.1.3. URI

URL: https://www.iana.org/ ... <name>

11.1.4. Description

<provide a description>

11.1.5. Change Controller

11.1.6. Version (of Registry Format)

11.2. Metric Definition

This category includes columns to prompt the entry of all necessary details related to the metric definition, including the immutable document reference and values of input factors, called fixed parameters.

11.2.1. Reference Definition

<Full bibliographic reference to an immutable doc.>

<specific section reference and additional clarifications, if needed>

11.2.2. Fixed Parameters

<list and specify Fixed Parameters, input factors that must be determined and embedded in the measurement system for use when needed>
11.3. Method of Measurement

This category includes columns for references to relevant sections of the immutable documents(s) and any supplemental information needed to ensure an unambiguous methods for implementations.

11.3.1. Reference Method

<for metric, insert relevant section references and supplemental info>

11.3.2. Packet Stream Generation

<list of generation parameters and section/spec references if needed>

11.3.3. Traffic Filtering (observation) Details

The measured results based on a filtered version of the packets observed, and this section provides the filter details (when present).

<section reference>.

11.3.4. Sampling Distribution

<insert time distribution details, or how this is diff from the filter>

11.3.5. Run-time Parameters and Data Format

Run-time Parameters are input factors that must be determined, configured into the measurement system, and reported with the results for the context to be complete.

<list of run-time parameters, and their data formats>

11.3.6. Roles

<lists the names of the different roles from the measurement method>

11.4. Output

This category specifies all details of the Output of measurements using the metric.
11.4.1. Type

<insert name of the output type, raw or a selected summary statistic>

11.4.2. Reference Definition

<describe the reference data format for each type of result>

11.4.3. Metric Units

<insert units for the measured results, and the reference specification.>

11.4.4. Calibration

<insert information on calibration>

11.5. Administrative items

11.5.1. Status

<current or deprecated>

11.5.2. Requester

<name or RFC, etc.>

11.5.3. Revision

<1.0>

11.5.4. Revision Date

<format YYYY-MM-DD>

11.6. Comments and Remarks

<Additional (Informational) details for this entry>
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1. Introduction

The IETF IP Performance Metrics (IPPM) working group first created a framework for metric development in [RFC2330]. This framework has stood the test of time and enabled development of many fundamental metrics. It has been updated in the area of metric composition
[RFC5835], and in several areas related to active stream measurement of modern networks with reactive properties [RFC7312].

The [RFC2330] framework motivated the development of "performance and reliability metrics for paths through the Internet," and Section 5 of [RFC2330] defines terms that support description of a path under test. However, metrics for assessment of paths and related performance aspects had not been attempted in IPPM when the [RFC2330] framework was written.

This memo takes up the route measurement challenge and specifies a new route metric, two practical frameworks for methods of measurement (using either active or hybrid active-passive methods [RFC7799]), and Round-Trip Delay and link information discovery using the results of measurements. All route measurements are limited by the willingness of hosts along the path to be discovered, to cooperate with the methods used, or to recognize that the measurement operation is taking place (such as when tunnels are present).

1.1. Issues with Earlier Work to Define a Route Metric

Section 7 of [RFC2330] presented a simple example of a "route" metric along with several other examples. The example is reproduced below (where the reference is to Section 5 of [RFC2330]):

"route: The path, as defined in Section 5, from A to B at a given time."

This example provides a starting point to develop a more complete definition of route. Areas needing clarification include:

Time: In practice, the route will be assessed over a time interval, because active path detection methods like Paris Traceroute [PT] rely on hop limits for their operation and cannot accomplish discovery of all hosts using a single packet.

Type-P: The legacy route definition lacks the option to cater for packet-dependent routing. In this memo, we assess the route for a specific packet of Type-P, and reflect this in the metric definition. The methods of measurement determine the specific Type-P used.

Parallel Paths: Parallel paths are a reality of the Internet and a strength of advanced route assessment methods, so the metric must acknowledge this possibility. Use of Equal Cost Multi-Path (ECMP) and Unequal Cost Multi-Path (UCMP) technologies are common sources of parallel subpaths.
Cloud Subpath: May contain hosts that do not decrement hop limit, but may have two or more exchange links connecting "discoverable" hosts or routers. Parallel subpaths contained within clouds cannot be discovered. The assessment methods only discover hosts or routers on the path that decrement hop limit, or cooperate with interrogation protocols. The presence of tunnels and nested tunnels further complicate assessment by hiding hops.

Hop: Although the [RFC2330] definition of a hop was a link-host pair, only hosts that are discoverable or have the capability to cooperate with interrogation protocols where link information may be exposed.

The refined definition of Route metrics begins in the sections that follow.

1.2. 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.

2. Scope

The purpose of this memo is to add new route metrics and methods of measurement to the existing set of IPPM metrics.

The scope is to define route metrics that can identify the path taken by a packet or a flow traversing the Internet between two hosts. Although primarily intended for hosts communicating on the Internet, the definitions and metrics are constructed to be applicable to other network domains, if desired. The methods of measurement to assess the path may not be able to discover all hosts comprising the path, but such omissions are often deterministic and explainable sources of error.

This memo also specifies a framework for active methods of measurement which uses the techniques described in [PT], as well as a framework for hybrid active-passive methods of measurement such as the Hybrid Type I method [RFC7799] described in [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data]. Methods using [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data] are intended only for single administrative domains that provide a protocol for explicit interrogation of nodes on a path. Combinations of active methods and hybrid active-passive methods are also in-scope.
Further, this memo provides additional analysis of the round-trip delay measurements made possible by the methods, in an effort to discover more details about the path, such as the link technology in use.

This memo updates Section 5 of [RFC2330] in the areas of path-related terminology and path description, primarily to include the possibility of parallel subpaths between a given Source and Destination address pair (possibly resulting from Equal Cost Multi-Path (ECMP) and Unequal Cost Multi-Path (UCMP) technologies).

There are several simple non-goals of this memo. There is no attempt to assess the reverse path from any host on the path to the host attempting the path measurement. The reverse path contribution to delay will be that experienced by ICMP packets (in active methods), and may be different from delays experienced by UDP or TCP packets. Also, the round trip delay will include an unknown contribution of processing time at the host that generates the ICMP response. Therefore, the ICMP-based active methods are not supposed to yield accurate, reproducible estimations of the Round-Trip Delay that UDP or TCP packets will experience.

3. Route Metric Specifications

This section sets requirements for the components of the Route Metric.

3.1. Terms and Definitions

Host A Host as defined in [RFC2330] (a computer capable of IP communication, includes routers), a.k.a. RFC 2330 Host.

Node A Node is any network function on the path capable of IP-layer Communication, includes RFC 2330 Hosts.

Node Identity The unique address for Nodes communicating within the network domain. For Nodes communicating on the Internet with IP, it is the globally routable IP address which the Node uses when communicating with other Nodes under normal or error conditions. The Node Identity revealed (and its connection to a Node Name through reverse DNS) determines whether interfaces to parallel links can be associated with a single Node, or appear to identify unique Nodes.

Discoverable Node Nodes that convey their Node Identity according to the requirements of their network domain, such as when error conditions are detected by that Node. For Nodes communicating with IP packets, compliance with Section 3.2.2.4 of [RFC1122] when
discarding a packet due to TTL or Hop Limit Exceeded condition, MUST result in sending the corresponding Time Exceeded message (containing a form of Node identity) to the source. This requirement is also consistent with section 5.3.1 of [RFC1812] for routers.

Cooperating Node Nodes that respond to direct queries for their Node identity as part of a previously agreed and established interrogation protocol. Nodes SHOULD also provide information such as arrival/departure interface identification, arrival timestamp, and any relevant information about the Node or specific link which delivered the query to the Node.

Hop specification A Hop specification MUST contain a Node Identity, and MAY contain arrival and/or departure interface identification, round trip delay, and an arrival timestamp.

Routing Class A route that treats equally a class of different types of packets, designated "C" (unrelated to address classes of the past) [RFC2330] [RFC8468]. Knowledge of such a class allows any one of the types of packets within that class to be used for subsequent measurement of the route. The designator "class C" is used for historical reasons, see [RFC2330].

3.2. Formal Name

The formal name of the metric is:

Type-P-Route-Ensemble-Method-Variant

abbreviated as Route Ensemble.

Note that Type-P depends heavily on the chosen method and variant.

3.3. Parameters

This section lists the REQUIRED input factors to define and measure a Route metric, as specified in this memo.

- Src, the address of a Node (such as the globally routable IP address).

- Dst, the address of a Node (such as the globally routable IP address).

- i, the limit on the number of Hops a specific packet may visit as it traverses from the Node at Src to the Node at Dst (such as the TTL or Hop Limit).
3.4. Metric Definitions

This section defines the REQUIRED measurement components of the Route metrics (unless otherwise indicated):

- M, the total number of packets sent between T0 and Tf.

- N, the smallest value of i needed for a packet to be received at Dst (sent between T0 and Tf).

- Nmax, the largest value of i needed for a packet to be received at Dst (sent between T0 and Tf). Nmax may be equal to N.
Next define a *singleton* definition for a Node on the path, with sufficient indexes to identify all Nodes identified in a measurement interval (where *singleton* is part of the IPPM Framework [RFC2330]).

A Hop Specification, designated h(i,j), the IP address and/or identity of Discoverable Nodes (or Cooperating Nodes) that are i hops away from the Node with address = Src and part of Route j during the measurement interval, T0 to Tf. As defined here, a Hop singleton measurement MUST contain a Node Identity, hid(i,j), and MAY contain one or more of the following attributes:

- a(i,j) Arrival Interface ID (e.g., when [RFC5837] is supported)
- d(i,j) Departure Interface ID (e.g., when [RFC5837] is supported)
- t(i,j) Arrival Timestamp, where t(i,j) is ideally supplied by the Hop. (Note that t(i,j) might be approximated from the sending time of the packet that revealed the Hop, e.g., when the round trip response time is available and divided by 2.)
- Measurements of Round-Trip Delay (for each packet that reveals the same Node Identity and flow attributes, then this attribute is computed, see next section)

Node Identities and related information can be ordered by their distance from the Node with address Src in Hops h(i,j). Based on this, two forms of Routes are distinguished:

A Route Ensemble is defined as the combination of all routes traversed by different flows from the Node at Src address to the Node at Dst address. A single Route traversed by a single flow (determined by an unambiguous tuple of addresses Src and Dst, and other identical flow criteria) is a member of the Route Ensemble and called a Member Route.

Using h(i,j) and components and parameters, further define:

When considering the set of Hops in the context of a single flow, a Member Route j is an ordered list \( \{h(1,j), \ldots, h(N_j, j)\} \) where \( h(i-1, j) \) and \( h(i, j) \) are 1 hop away from each other and \( N_j \) satisfying \( h(N_j, j) = \text{Dst} \) is the minimum count of Hops needed by the packet on Member Route j to reach Dst. Member Routes must be unique. The uniqueness property requires that any two Member routes j and k that are part of the same Route Ensemble differ either in terms of minimum hop count \( N_j \) and \( N_k \) to reach the destination Dst, or, in the case of identical hop count \( N_j = N_k \), they have at least one distinct Hop: \( h(i,j) \neq h(i,k) \) for at least one i (i=1..Nj).
All the optional information collected to describe a Member Route, such as the arrival interface, departure interface, and Round Trip Delay at each Hop, turns each list item into a rich structure. There may be information on the links between Hops, possibly information on the routing (arrival interface and departure interface), an estimate of distance between Hops based on Round-Trip Delay measurements and calculations, and a time stamp indicating when all these additional details were valid.

The Route Ensemble from Src to Dst, during the measurement interval T0 to Tf, is the aggregate of all m distinct Member Routes discovered between the two Nodes with Src and Dst addresses. More formally, with the Node having address Src omitted:

Route Ensemble = {
    {h(1,1), h(2,1), h(3,1), ... h(N1,1)=Dst),
    {h(1,2), h(2,2), h(3,2),... , h(N2,2)=Dst),
    ...
    {h(1,m), h(2,m), h(3,m), ....h(Nm,m)=Dst}
}

where the following conditions apply: i <= Nj <= Nmax (j=1..m)

Note that some h(i,j) may be empty (null) in the case that systems do not reply (not discoverable, or not cooperating).

h(i-1,j) and h(i,j) are the Hops on the same Member Route one hop away from each other.

Hop h(i,j) may be identical with h(k,l) for i!=k and j!=l ; which means there may be portions shared among different Member Routes (parts of Member Routes may overlap).

3.5. Related Round-Trip Delay and Loss Definitions

RTD(i,j,T) is defined as a singleton of the [RFC2681] Round-Trip Delay between the Node with address = Src and the Node at Hop h(i,j) at time T.

RTL(i,j,T) is defined as a singleton of the [RFC6673] Round-trip Loss between the Node with address = Src and the Node at Hop h(i,j) at time T.
3.6. Discussion

Depending on the way that Node Identity is revealed, it may be difficult to determine parallel subpaths between the same pair of Nodes (i.e., multiple parallel links). It is easier to detect parallel subpaths involving different Nodes.

- If a pair of discovered Nodes identify two different addresses (IP or not), then they will appear to be different Nodes. See item below.

- If a pair of discovered Nodes identify two different IP addresses, and the IP addresses resolve to the same Node name (in the DNS), then they will appear to be the same Nodes.

- If a discovered Node always replies using the same network address, regardless of the interface a packet arrives on, then multiple parallel links cannot be detected in that network domain. This condition may apply to traceroute-style methods, but may not apply to other hybrid methods based on In-situ Operations, Administration, and Maintenance (IOAM). For example, if the [RFC5837] ICMP extension mechanism is implemented, then parallel links can be detected with the discovery traceroute-style methods.

- If parallel links between routers are aggregated below the IP layer, then from Node point of view, all these links share the same pair of IP addresses. The existence of these parallel links can’t be detected at the IP layer. This applies to other network domains with layers below them, as well. This condition may apply to traceroute-style methods, but may not apply to other hybrid methods based on IOAM.

When a route assessment employs IP packets (for example), the reality of flow assignment to parallel subpaths involves layers above IP. Thus, the measured Route Ensemble is applicable to IP and higher layers (as described in the methodology’s packet of Type-P and flow parameters).

3.7. Reporting the Metric

An Information Model and an XML Data Model for Storing Traceroute Measurements is available in [RFC5388]. The measured information at each hop includes four pieces of information: a one-dimensional hop index, Node symbolic address, Node IP address, and RTD for each response.

The description of Hop information that may be collected according to this memo covers more dimensions, as defined in Section 3.4 above.
For example, the Hop index is two-dimensional to capture the
complexity of a Route Ensemble, and it contains corresponding Node
identities at a minimum. The models need to be expanded to include
these features, as well as Arrival Interface ID, Departure Interface
ID, and Arrival Timestamp, when available. The original sending
Timestamp from the Src Node anchors a particular measurement in time.

4. Route Assessment Methodologies

There are two classes of methods described in this section, active
methods relying on the reaction to TTL or Hop Limit Exceeded
condition to discover Nodes on a path, and Hybrid active-passive
methods that involve direct interrogation of cooperating Nodes
(usually within a single domain). Description of these methods
follow.

4.1. Active Methodologies

This section describes the method employed by current open source
tools, thereby providing a practical framework for further advanced
techniques to be included as method variants. This method is
applicable for use across multiple administrative domains.

Internet routing is complex because it depends on the policies of
thousands of Autonomous Systems (AS). Most routers perform load
balancing on flows using a form of Equal Cost Multiple Path (ECMP).
[RFC2991] describes a number of flow-based or hashed approaches
(e.g., Modulo-N Hash, Hash-Threshold, Highest Random Weight (HRW)),
and makes some good suggestions. Flow-based ECMP avoids increased
packet delay variation and possibly overwhelming levels of packet
reordering in flows.

A few routers still divide the workload through packet-based
techniques, such as a round-robin scheme to distribute every new
outgoing packet to multiple links, as explained in [RFC2991]. The
methods described in this section assume flow-based ECMP.

Taking into account that Internet protocol was designed under the
"end-to-end" principle, the IP payload and its header do not provide
any information about the routes or path necessary to reach some
destination. For this reason, the popular tool traceroute was
developed to gather the IP addresses of each hop along a path using
the ICMP protocol [RFC0792]. Traceroute also measures RTD from each
hop. However, the growing complexity of the Internet makes it more
challenging to develop an accurate traceroute implementation. For
instance, the early traceroute tools would be inaccurate in the
current network, mainly because they were not designed to retain a
flow state. However, evolved traceroute tools, such as Paris–
traceroute [PT] [MLB] and Scamper [SCAMPER], expect to encounter ECMP and achieve more accurate results when they do, where Scamper ensures traceroute packets will follow the same path in 98% of cases [SCAMPER].

Today's traceroute tools send Type-P of packets, either ICMP, UDP, or TCP. UDP and TCP are used when a particular characteristic needs to be verified, such as filtering or traffic shaping on specific ports (i.e., services). UDP and TCP traceroute are also used when ICMP responses are not received. [SCAMPER] supports IPv6 traceroute measurements, keeping the FlowLabel constant in all packets.

Paris-traceroute allows its users to measure the RTD to every Node of the path for a particular flow. Furthermore, either Paris-traceroute or Scamper is capable of unveiling the many available paths between a source and destination (which are visible to active methods). This task is accomplished by repeating complete traceroute measurements with different flow parameters for each measurement; Paris-traceroute provides "exhaustive" mode while scamper provides "tracelb" (stands for traceroute load balance). The Framework for IP Performance Metrics (IPPM) ([RFC2330] updated by [RFC7312]) has the flexibility to require that the Round-Trip Delay measurement ([RFC2681]) uses packets with the constraints to assure that all packets in a single measurement appear as the same flow. This flexibility covers ICMP, UDP, and TCP. The accompanying methodology of [RFC2681] needs to be expanded to report the sequential hop identifiers along with RTD measurements, but no new metric definition is needed.

The advanced route assessment methods used in Paris-traceroute [PT] keep the critical fields constant for every packet to maintain the appearance of the same flow. When considering IPv6 headers, it is necessary to ensure that the IP source and destination addresses and the FlowLabel are constant (but note that many routers ignore the FlowLabel field at this time), see [RFC6437]. Use of IPv6 Extension Headers may add critical fields, and SHOULD be avoided. In IPv4, certain fields of the IP header and the first four bytes of the IP payload should remain constant in a flow. In the IPv4 header, the IP source and destination addresses, protocol number, and Diffserv fields identify flows. The first four payload bytes include the UDP and TCP ports, and the ICMP type, code, and checksum fields.

Maintaining a constant ICMP checksum in IPv4 is most challenging, as the ICMP sequence number or identifier fields will usually change for different probes of the same path. Probes should use arbitrary bytes in the ICMP data field to offset changes to sequence number and identifier, thus keeping the checksum constant.
Finally, it is also essential to route the resulting ICMP Time Exceeded messages along a consistent path. In IPv6, the fields above are sufficient. In IPv4, the ICMP Time Exceeded message will contain the IP header and the first eight bytes of the IP payload, which affects its ICMP checksum. The TCP sequence number, UDP Length, and UDP checksum will affect this value, and should remain constant.

Formally, to maintain the same flow in the measurements to a particular hop, the Type-P-Route-Ensemble-Method-Variant packets should be:[PT]:

- **TCP case:** For IPv4, the fields Src, Dst, port-Src, port_Dst, sequence number, and Diffserv Field SHOULD be the same. For IPv6, the field FlowLabel, Src and Dst SHOULD be the same.

- **UDP case:** For IPv4, the fields Src, Dst, port-Src, port-Dst, Diffserv should be the same, and the UDP-checksum SHOULD change to keep the IP checksum of the ICMP time exceeded reply constant. Then, the data length should be fixed, and the data field is used to make it so (consider that ICMP checksum uses its data field, which contains the original IP header plus 8 bytes of UDP, where TTL, IP identification, IP checksum, and UDP checksum changes). For IPv6, the field FlowLabel, and Source and Destination addresses SHOULD be the same.

- **ICMP case:** For IPv4, the Data field SHOULD compensate variations on TTL or Hop Limit, IP identification, and IP checksum for every packet. There is no need to consider ICMPv6 because only FlowLabel of IPv6 and Source and Destination addresses are used, and all of them SHOULD be constant.

Then, the way to identify different hops and attempts of the same IPv4 flow is:

- **TCP case:** The IP identification field.
- **UDP case:** The IP identification field.
- **ICMP case:** The IP identification field, and ICMP Sequence number.

### 4.1.1. Temporal Composition for Route Metrics

The Active Route Assessment Methods described above have the ability to discover portions of a path where ECMP load balancing is present, observed as two or more unique Member Routes having one or more distinct Hops which are part of the Route Ensemble. Likewise, attempts to deliberately vary the flow characteristics to discover...
all Member Routes will reveal portions of the path which are flow-invariant.

Section 9.2 of [RFC2330] describes Temporal Composition of metrics, and introduces the possibility of a relationship between earlier measurement results and the results for measurement at the current time (for a given metric). There is value in establishing a Temporal Composition relationship for Route Metrics. However, this relationship does not represent a forecast of future route conditions in any way.

For Route Metric measurements, the value of Temporal Composition is to reduce the measurement iterations required with repeated measurements. Reduced iterations are possible by inferring that current measurements using fixed and previously measured flow characteristics:

- will have many common hops with previous measurements.
- will have relatively time-stable results at the ingress and egress portions of the path when measured from user locations, as opposed to measurements of backbone networks and across inter-domain gateways.
- may have greater potential for time-variation in path portions where ECMP load balancing is observed (because increasing or decreasing the pool of links changes the hash calculations).

Optionally, measurement systems may take advantage of the inferences above when seeking to reduce measurement iterations, after exhaustive measurements indicate that the time-stable properties are present. Repetitive Active Route measurement systems:

1. SHOULD occasionally check path portions which have exhibited stable results over time, particularly ingress and egress portions of the path (e.g., daily checks if measuring many times during a day).
2. SHOULD continue testing portions of the path that have previously exhibited ECMP load balancing.
3. SHALL trigger re-assessment of the complete path and Route Ensemble, if any change in hops is observed for a specific (and previously tested) flow.
4.1.2. Routing Class Identification

There is an opportunity to apply the [RFC2330] notion of equal treatment for a class of packets, "...very useful to know if a given Internet component treats equally a class C of different types of packets", as it applies to Route measurements. The notion of class C was examined further in [RFC8468] as it applied to load-balancing flows over parallel paths, which is the case we develop here. Knowledge of class C parameters (unrelated to address classes of the past) on a path potentially reduces the number of flows required for a given method to assess a Route Ensemble over time.

First, recognize that each Member Route of a Route Ensemble will have a corresponding class C. Class C can be discovered by testing with multiple flows, all of which traverse the unique set of hops that comprise a specific Member Route.

Second, recognize that the different classes depend primarily on the hash functions used at each instance of ECMP load balancing on the path.

Third, recognize the synergy with Temporal Composition methods (described above), where evaluation intends to discover time-stable portions of each Member Route, so that more emphasis can be placed on ECMP portions that also determine class C.

The methods to assess the various class C characteristics benefit from the following measurement capabilities:

- flows designed to determine which n-tuple header fields are considered by a given hash function and ECMP hop on the path, and which are not. This operation immediately narrows the search space, where possible, and partially defines a class C.

- a priori knowledge of the possible types of hash functions in use also helps to design the flows for testing (major router vendors publish information about these hash functions, examples are here [LOAD_BALANCE]).

- ability to direct the emphasis of current measurements on ECMP portions of the path, based on recent past measurement results (the Routing Class of some portions of the path is essentially "all packets").
4.1.3. Intermediate Observation Point Route Measurement

There are many examples where passive monitoring of a flow at an Observation Point within the network can detect unexpected Round Trip Delay or Delay Variation. But how can the cause of the anomalous delay be investigated further *from the Observation Point* possibly located at an intermediate point on the path?

In this case, knowledge that the flow of interest belongs to a specific Routing Class C will enable measurement of the route where anomalous delay has been observed. Specifically, Round-Trip Delay assessment to each Hop on the path between the Observation Point and the Destination for the flow of interest may discover high or variable delay on a specific link and Hop combination.

The determination of a Routing Class C which includes the flow of interest is as described in the section above, aided by computation of the relevant hash function output as the target.

4.2. Hybrid Methodologies

The Hybrid Type I methods provide an alternative method for Route Member assessment. As mentioned in the Scope section, [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data] provides a possible set of data fields that would support route identification.

In general, nodes in the measured domain would be equipped with specific abilities:

- Store the identity of nodes that a packet has visited in header data fields, in the order the packet visited the nodes.
- Support of a "Loopback" capability, where a copy of the packet is returned to the encapsulating node, and the packet is processed like any other IOAM packet on the return transfer.

In addition to node identity, nodes may also identify the ingress and egress interfaces utilized by the tracing packet, the absolute time when the packet was processed, and other generic data (as described in section 4 of [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data]). Interface identification isn't necessarily limited to IP, i.e. different links in a bundle (LACP) could be identified. Equally well, links without explicit IP addresses can be identified (like with unnumbered interfaces in an IGP deployment).

Note that the Type-P packet specification for this method will likely be a partial specification, because most of the packet fields are determined by the user traffic. The packet (encapsulation) header(s)
added by the Hybrid method can certainly be specified in Type-P, in
unpopulated form.

4.3. Combining Different Methods

In principle, there are advantages if the entity conducting Route
measurements can utilize both forms of advanced methods (active and
hybrid), and combine the results. For example, if there are Nodes
involved in the path that qualify as Cooperating Nodes, but not as
Discoverable Nodes, then a more complete view of Hops on the path is
possible when a hybrid method (or interrogation protocol) is applied
and the results are combined with the active method results collected
across all other domains.

In order to combine the results of active and hybrid/interrogation
methods, the network Nodes that are part of a domain supporting an
interrogation protocol have the following attributes:

1. Nodes at the ingress to the domain SHOULD be both Discoverable
   and Cooperating.

2. Any Nodes within the domain that are both Discoverable and
   Cooperating SHOULD reveal the same Node Identity in response to
   both active and hybrid methods.

3. Nodes at the egress to the domain SHOULD be both Discoverable and
   Cooperating, and SHOULD reveal the same Node Identity in response
   to both active and hybrid methods.

When Nodes follow these requirements, it becomes a simple matter to
match single domain measurements with the overlapping results from a
multidomain measurement.

In practice, Internet users do not typically have the ability to
utilize the OAM capabilities of networks that their packets traverse,
so the results from a remote domain supporting an interrogation
protocol would not normally be accessible. However, a network
operator could combine interrogation results from their access domain
with other measurements revealing the path outside their domain.

5. Background on Round-Trip Delay Measurement Goals

The aim of this method is to use packet probes to unveil the paths
between any two end-Nodes of the network. Moreover, information
derived from RTD measurements might be meaningful to identify:

1. Intercontinental submarine links
2. Satellite communications

3. Congestion

4. Inter-domain paths

This categorization is widely accepted in the literature and among operators alike, and it can be trusted with empirical data and several sources as ground of truth (e.g., [RTTSub]) but it is an inference measurement nonetheless [bdrmap][IDCong].

The first two categories correspond to the physical distance dependency on Round-Trip Delay (RTD), the next one binds RTD with queuing delay on routers, and the last one helps to identify different ASes using traceroutes. Due to the significant contribution of propagation delay in long-distance hops, RTD will be on the order of 100ms on transatlantic hops, depending on the geolocation of the vantage points. Moreover, RTD is typically higher than 480ms when two hops are connected using geostationary satellite technology (i.e., their orbit is at 36000km). Detecting congestion with latency implies deeper mathematical understanding since network traffic load is not stationary. Nonetheless, as the first approach, a link seems to be congested if observing different/varying statistical results after sending several traceroute probes (e.g., see [IDCong]). Finally, to recognize distinctive ASes in the same traceroute path is challenging, because more data is needed, like AS relationships and RIR delegations among other (for more detail, please consult [bdrmap]).

6. RTD Measurements Statistics

Several articles have shown that network traffic presents a self-similar nature [SSNT] [MLRM] which is accountable for filling the queues of the routers. Moreover, router queues are designed to handle traffic bursts, which is one of the most remarkable features of self-similarity. Naturally, while queue length increases, the delay to traverse the queue increases as well and leads to an increase on RTD. Due to traffic bursts generating short-term overflow on buffers (spiky patterns), every RTD only depicts the queueing status on the instant when that packet probe was in transit. For this reason, several RTD measurements during a time window could begin to describe the random behavior of latency. Loss must also be accounted for in the methodology.

To understand the ongoing process, examining the quartiles provides a non-parametric way of analysis. Quartiles are defined by five values: minimum RTD (m), RTD value of the 25% of the Empirical Cumulative Distribution Function (ECDF) (Q1), the median value (Q2),
the RTD value of the 75% of the ECDF (Q3) and the maximum RTD (M). Congestion can be inferred when RTD measurements are spread apart, and consequently, the Inter-Quartile Range (IQR), the distance between Q3 and Q1, increases its value.

This procedure requires the algorithm presented in [P2] to compute quartile values "on the fly".

This procedure allows us to update the quartiles value whenever a new measurement arrives, which is radically different from classic methods of computing quartiles because they need to use the whole dataset to compute the values. This way of calculus provides savings in memory and computing time.

To sum up, the proposed measurement procedure consists of performing traceroutes several times to obtain samples of the RTD in every hop from a path, during a time window (W), and compute the quartiles for every hop. This procedure could be done for a single Member Route flow, a non-exhaustive search with parameter E (defined below) set as False, or for every detected Route Ensemble flow (E=True).

The identification of a specific Hop in traceroute is based on the IP origin address of the returned ICMP Time Exceeded packet, and on the distance identified by the value set in the TTL (or Hop Limit) field inserted by traceroute. As this specific Hop can be reached by different paths, also the IP source and destination addresses of the traceroute packet need to be recorded. Finally, different return paths are distinguished by evaluating the ICMP Time Exceeded TTL (or Hop Limit) of the reply message: if this TTL (or Hop Limit) is constant for different paths containing the same Hop, the return paths have the same distance. Moreover, this distance can be estimated considering that the TTL (or Hop Limit) value is normally initialized with values 64, 128, or 255. The 5-tuple (origin IP, destination IP, reply IP, distance, response TTL or Hop Limit) unequivocally identifies every measurement.

This algorithm below runs in the origin of the traceroute. It returns the Qs quartiles for every Hop and Alt (alternative paths because of balancing). Notice that the "Alt" parameter condenses the parameters of the 5-tuple (origin IP, destination IP, reply IP, distance, response TTL), i.e., one for each possible combination.
input: W (window time of the measurement)

i_t (time between two measurements, set the i_t time long enough to avoid incomplete results)

E (True: exhaustive, False: a single path)

Dst (destination IP address)

output: Qs (quartiles for every Hop and Alt)

T := start_timer(W)

while T is not finished do:

    start_timer(i_t)

    RTD(Hop,Alt) = advanced-traceroute(Dst,E)

    for each Hop and Alt in RTD do:

        Qs[Dst,Hop,Alt] := ComputeQs(RTD(Hop,Alt))

    done

    wait until i_t timer is expired

done

return (Qs)

During the time W, lines 6 and 7 assure that the measurement loop is made. Line 8 and 13 set a timer for each cycle of measurements. A cycle comprises the tracerooutes packets, considering every possible Hop and the alternatives paths in the Alt variable (ensured in lines 9-12). In line 9, the advance-traceroute could be either Paris-traceroute or Scamper, which will use the "exhaustive" mode or "tracelb" option if E is set True, respectively. The procedure returns a list of tuples (m,Q1,Q2,Q3,M) for each intermediate hop, or "Alt" in as a function of the 5-tuple, in the path towards the Dst. Finally, lines 10 through 12 stores each measurement into the realtime quartiles computation.

Notice there are cases where the even having a unique hop at distance h from the Src to Dst, the returning path could have several possibilities, yielding in different total paths. In this situation, the algorithm will return more "Alt" for this particular hop.

7. Security Considerations

The security considerations that apply to any active measurement of live paths are relevant here as well. See [RFC4656] and [RFC5357].

The active measurement process of "changing several fields to keep the checksum of different packets identical" does not require special security considerations because it is part of synthetic traffic generation, and is designed to have minimal to zero impact on network processing (to process the packets for ECMP).
Some of the protocols used (e.g., ICMP) do not provide cryptographic protection for the requested/returned data, and there are risks of processing untrusted data in general, but these are limitations of the existing protocols where we are applying new methods.

For applicable Hybrid methods, the security considerations in [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data] apply.

When considering privacy of those involved in measurement or those whose traffic is measured, the sensitive information available to potential observers is greatly reduced when using active techniques which are within this scope of work. Passive observations of user traffic for measurement purposes raise many privacy issues. We refer the reader to the privacy considerations described in the Large Scale Measurement of Broadband Performance (LMap) Framework [RFC7594], which covers active and passive techniques.

8. IANA Considerations

This memo makes no requests of IANA. We thank the good folks at IANA for having checked this section anyway.
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10. Appendix I MPLS Methods for Route Assessment

A Node assessing an MPLS path must be part of the MPLS domain where the path is implemented. When this condition is met, RFC 8029 provides a powerful set of mechanisms to detect "correct operation of the data plane, as well as a mechanism to verify the data plane against the control plane" [RFC8029].

MPLS routing is based on the presence of a Forwarding Equivalence Class (FEC) Stack in all visited Nodes. Selecting one of several Equal Cost Multi Path (ECMP) is however based on information hidden deeper in the stack. Late deployments may support a so called "Entropy label" for this purpose. State of the art deployments base their choice of an ECMP member interface on the complete MPLS label stack and on IP addresses up to the complete 5 tuple IP header information (see Section 2.4 of [RFC7325]). Load Sharing based on IP
information decouples this function from the actual MPLS routing information. Thus, an MPLS traceroute is able to check how packets with a contiguous number of ECMP relevant IP addresses (and an identical MPLS label stack) are forwarded by a particular router. The minimum number of equivalent MPLS paths traceable at a router should be 32. Implementations supporting more paths are available.

The MPLS echo request and reply messages offering this feature must support the Downstream Detailed Mapping TLV (was Downstream Mapping initially, but the latter has been deprecated). The MPLS echo response includes the incoming interface where a router received the MPLS Echo request. The MPLS Echo reply further informs which of the n addresses relevant for the load sharing decision results in a particular next hop interface and contains the next hop’s interface address (if available). This ensures that the next hop will receive a properly coded MPLS Echo request in the next step route of assessment.

[RFC8403] explains how a central Path Monitoring System could be used to detect arbitrary MPLS paths between any routers within a single MPLS domain. The combination of MPLS forwarding, Segment Routing and MPLS traceroute offers a simple architecture and a powerful mechanism to detect and validate (segment routed) MPLS paths.
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# 1. Introduction

Development and deployment of the Two-Way Active Measurement Protocol (TWAMP) [RFC5357] and its extensions, e.g., [RFC6038] that defined Symmetrical Size for TWAMP, provided invaluable experience. Several independent implementations of both TWAMP and TWAMP Light exist, have been deployed, and provide important operational performance measurements.

At the same time, there has been noticeable interest in using a more straightforward mechanism for active performance monitoring that can provide deterministic behavior and inherent separation of control (vendor-specific configuration or orchestration) and test functions. Recent work on IP Edge to Customer Equipment using TWAMP Light from Broadband Forum [BBF.TR-390] demonstrated that interoperability among...
implementations of TWAMP Light is difficult because the composition and operation of TWAMP Light were not sufficiently specified in [RFC5357]. According to [RFC8545], TWAMP Light includes a sub-set of TWAMP-Test functions. Thus, to have a comprehensive tool to measure packet loss and delay requires support by other applications that provide, for example, control and security.

This document defines an active performance measurement test protocol, Simple Two-way Active Measurement Protocol (STAMP), that enables measurement of both one-way and round-trip performance metrics like delay, delay variation, and packet loss. Some TWAMP extensions, e.g., [RFC7750] are supported by the extensions to STAMP base specification in [I-D.ietf-ippm-stamp-option-tlv].

2. Conventions used in this document

2.1. Terminology

STAMP - Simple Two-way Active Measurement Protocol
NTP - Network Time Protocol
PTP - Precision Time Protocol
HMAC Hashed Message Authentication Code
OWAMP One-Way Active Measurement Protocol
TWAMP Two-Way Active Measurement Protocol
MBZ Must be Zero

2.2. 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.

3. Operation and Management of Performance Measurement Based on STAMP

Figure 1 presents the Simple Two-way Active Measurement Protocol (STAMP) Session-Sender, and Session-Reflector with a measurement session. In this document, a measurement session also referred to as STAMP session, is the bi-directional packet flow between one specific Session-Sender and one particular Session-Reflector for a time duration. The configuration and management of the STAMP Session-
Sender, Session-Reflector, and management of the STAMP sessions are outside the scope of this document and can be achieved through various means. A few examples are: Command Line Interface, telecommunication services’ OSS/BSS systems, SNMP, and Netconf/YANG-based SDN controllers.

```
 o----------------------------------------------------------o
          |                      Configuration and               |
          |                         Management                   |
 o----------------------------------------------------------o

```

Figure 1: STAMP Reference Model

4. Theory of Operation

STAMP Session-Sender transmits test packets over UDP transport toward STAMP Session-Reflector. STAMP Session-Reflector receives Session-Sender’s packet and acts according to the configuration. Two modes of STAMP Session-Reflector characterize the expected behavior and, consequently, performance metrics that can be measured:

- **Stateless** - STAMP Session-Reflector does not maintain test state and will use the value in the Sequence Number field in the received packet as the value for the Sequence Number field in the reflected packet. As a result, values in Sequence Number and Session-Sender Sequence Number fields are the same, and only round-trip packet loss can be calculated while the reflector is operating in stateless mode.

- **Stateful** - STAMP Session-Reflector maintains test state thus enabling the ability to determine forward loss, gaps recognized in the received sequence number. As a result, both near-end (forward) and far-end (backward) packet loss can be computed. That implies that the STAMP Session-Reflector MUST keep a state for each configured STAMP-test session, uniquely identifying STAMP-test packets to one such session instance, and enabling adding a sequence number in the test reply that is individually incremented on a per-session basis.
STAMP supports two authentication modes: unauthenticated and authenticated. Unauthenticated STAMP test packets, defined in Section 4.2.1 and Section 4.3.1, ensure interworking between STAMP and TWAMP Light as described in Section 4.6 packet formats.

By default, STAMP uses symmetrical packets, i.e., size of the packet transmitted by Session-Reflector equals the size of the packet received by the Session-Reflector.

4.1. UDP Port Numbers in STAMP Testing

A STAMP Session-Sender MUST use UDP port 862 (TWAMP-Test Receiver Port) as the default destination UDP port number. A STAMP implementation of Session-Sender MUST be able to use as the destination UDP port numbers from User, a.k.a. Registered, Ports and Dynamic, a.k.a. Private or Ephemeral, Ports ranges defined in [RFC6335]. Before using numbers from the User Ports range, the possible impact on the network MUST be carefully studied and agreed by all users of the network domain where the test has been planned.

An implementation of STAMP Session-Reflector by default MUST receive STAMP test packets on UDP port 862. An implementation of Session-Reflector that supports this specification MUST be able to define the port number to receive STAMP test packets from User Ports and Dynamic Ports ranges that are defined in [RFC6335]. STAMP defines two different test packet formats, one for packets transmitted by the STAMP-Session-Sender and one for packets transmitted by the STAMP-Session-Reflector.

4.2. Session-Sender Behavior and Packet Format

A STAMP Session-Reflector supports the symmetrical size of test packets, as defined in Section 3 [RFC6038], as the default behavior. A reflected test packet includes more information and thus is larger. Because of that, the base STAMP Session-Sender packet is padded to match the size of a reflected STAMP test packet. Hence, the base STAMP Session-Sender packet has a minimum size of 44 octets in unauthenticated mode, see Figure 2, and 112 octets in the authenticated mode, see Figure 4. The variable length of a test packet in STAMP is supported by using Extra Padding TLV defined in [I-D.ietf-ippm-stamp-option-tlv].

4.2.1. Session-Sender Packet Format in Unauthenticated Mode

STAMP Session-Sender packet format in unauthenticated mode:
where fields are defined as the following:

- **Sequence Number** is a four-octet long field. For each new session, its value starts at zero and is incremented with each transmitted packet.

- **Timestamp** is an eight-octet long field. STAMP node **MUST** support Network Time Protocol (NTP) version 4 64-bit timestamp format [RFC5905], the format used in [RFC5357]. STAMP node **MAY** support IEEE 1588v2 Precision Time Protocol (PTP) truncated 64-bit timestamp format [IEEE.1588.2008], the format used in [RFC8186]. The use of the specific format, NTP or PTP, is part of configuration of the Session-Sender or the particular test session.

- **Error Estimate** is a two-octet long field with format displayed in Figure 3.

![Figure 2: STAMP Session-Sender test packet format in unauthenticated mode](image)

![Figure 3: Error Estimate Format](image)
where S, Scale, and Multiplier fields are interpreted as they have been defined in section 4.1.2 [RFC4656]; and Z field — as has been defined in section 2.3 [RFC8186]:

* 0 - NTP 64 bit format of a timestamp;
* 1 - PTPv2 truncated format of a timestamp.

The default behavior of the STAMP Session-Sender and Session-Reflector is to use the NTP 64-bit timestamp format (Z field value of 0). An operator, using configuration/management function, MAY configure STAMP Session-Sender and Session-Reflector to using the PTPv2 truncated format of a timestamp (Z field value of 1). Note, that an implementation of a Session-Sender that supports this specification MAY be configured to use PTPv2 format of a timestamp even though the Session-Reflector is configured to use NTP format.

- Reserved field in the Session-Sender unauthenticated packet is 30 octets long. It MUST be all zeroed on the transmission and MUST be ignored on receipt.

4.2.2. Session-Sender Packet Format in Authenticated Mode

STAMP Session-Sender packet format in authenticated mode:
The field definitions are the same as the unauthenticated mode, listed in Section 4.2.1. Also, Must-Be-Zero (MBZ) fields are used to make the packet length a multiple of 16 octets. The value of the field MUST be zeroed on transmission and MUST be ignored on receipt. Note, that the MBZ field is used to calculate a key-hashed message authentication code (HMAC) ([RFC2104]) hash. Also, the packet includes HMAC hash at the end of the PDU. The detailed use of the HMAC field is described in Section 4.4.

4.3. Session-Reflector Behavior and Packet Format

The Session-Reflector receives the STAMP test packet and verifies it. If the base STAMP test packet validated, the Session-Reflector, that supports this specification, prepares and transmits the reflected test packet symmetric to the packet received from the Session-Sender copying the content beyond the size of the base STAMP packet (see Section 4.2).
4.3.1. Session-Reflector Packet Format in Unauthenticated Mode

For unauthenticated mode:

```
+----------------+-----------------+-----------------+----------------+
|    0            |      1          |      2          |      3         |
+----------------+-----------------+-----------------+----------------+
| Sequence Number | Timestamp       |                 |                 |
+----------------+-----------------+-----------------+----------------+
| Error Estimate  | MBZ             |                 |                 |
+----------------+-----------------+-----------------+----------------+
| Receive Timestamp|                |                 |                 |
+----------------+-----------------+-----------------+----------------+
| Session-Sender Sequence Number|    |                 |                 |
+----------------+-----------------+-----------------+----------------+
| Session-Sender Timestamp|       |                 |                 |
+----------------+-----------------+-----------------+----------------+
| Session-Sender Error Estimate|    | MBZ             |                 |
+----------------+-----------------+-----------------+----------------+
| Ses-Sender TTL  | MBZ             |                 | Reserved        |
+----------------+-----------------+-----------------+----------------+
```

Figure 5: STAMP Session-Reflector test packet format in unauthenticated mode

where fields are defined as the following:

- Sequence Number is four octets long field. The value of the Sequence Number field is set according to the mode of the STAMP Session-Reflector:
  - in the stateless mode, the Session-Reflector copies the value from the received STAMP test packet’s Sequence Number field;
  - in the stateful mode, the Session-Reflector counts the transmitted STAMP test packets. It starts with zero and is incremented by one for each subsequent packet for each test session. The Session-Reflector uses that counter to set the value of the Sequence Number field.

- Timestamp and Receive Timestamp fields are each eight octets long. The format of these fields, NTP or PTPv2, indicated by the Z field of the Error Estimate field as described in Section 4.2. Receive
Timestamp is the time the test packet was received by the Session-Reflector. Timestamp - the time taken by the Session-Reflector at the start of transmitting the test packet.

- Error Estimate has the same size and interpretation as described in Section 4.2. It is applicable to both Timestamp and Receive Timestamp.
- Session-Sender Sequence Number, Session-Sender Timestamp, and Session-Sender Error Estimate are copies of the corresponding fields in the STAMP test packet sent by the Session-Sender.
- Session-Sender TTL is one octet long field, and its value is the copy of the TTL field in IPv4 (or Hop Limit in IPv6) from the received STAMP test packet.
- MBZ is used to achieve alignment of fields within the packet on a four octets boundary. The value of the field MUST be zeroed on transmission and MUST be ignored on receipt.
- Reserved field in the Session-Reflector unauthenticated packet is three octets long. It MUST be all zeroed on the transmission and MUST be ignored on receipt.

4.3.2. Session-Reflector Packet Format in Authenticated Mode

For the authenticated mode:

```
0                   1                   2                   3
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                        Sequence Number                        |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                                                               |
|                                                               |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                          Timestamp                            |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|         Error Estimate        |                               |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+                               +
|                        MBZ (6 octets)                         |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                        Receive Timestamp                      |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                                                               |
|                                                               |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                                                               |
|                                                               |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                        MBZ (8 octets)                         |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```
The field definitions are the same as the unauthenticated mode, listed in Section 4.3.1. Additionally, the MBZ field is used to make the packet length a multiple of 16 octets. The value of the field MUST be zeroed on transmission and MUST be ignored on receipt. Note, that the MBZ field is used to calculate HMAC hash value. Also, STAMP Session-Reflector test packet format in authenticated mode includes HMAC ([RFC2104]) hash at the end of the PDU. The detailed use of the HMAC field is in Section 4.4.

4.4. Integrity Protection in STAMP

Authenticated mode provides integrity protection to each STAMP message by adding Hashed Message Authentication Code (HMAC). STAMP uses HMAC-SHA-256 truncated to 128 bits (similarly to the use of it in IPSec defined in [RFC4868]); hence the length of the HMAC field is 16 octets. In the Authenticated mode, HMAC covers the first six blocks (96 octets). HMAC uses its own key that may be unique for...
each STAMP test session; key management and the mechanisms to
distribute the HMAC key are outside the scope of this specification.
One example is to use an orchestrator to configure HMAC key based on
STAMP YANG data model [I-D.ietf-ippm-stamp-yang]. HMAC MUST be
verified as early as possible to avoid using or propagating corrupted
data.

Future specifications may define the use of other, more advanced
cryptographic algorithms, possibly providing an update to the STAMP
YANG data model [I-D.ietf-ippm-stamp-yang].

4.5. Confidentiality Protection in STAMP

If confidentiality protection for STAMP is required, a STAMP test
session MUST use a secured transport. For example, STAMP packets
could be transmitted in the dedicated IPsec tunnel or share the IPsec
tunnel with the monitored flow. Also, Datagram Transport Layer
Security protocol would provide the desired confidentiality
protection.

4.6. Interoperability with TWAMP Light

One of the essential requirements to STAMP is the ability to
interwork with a TWAMP Light device. Because STAMP and TWAMP use
different algorithms in Authenticated mode (HMAC-SHA-256 vs. HMAC-
SHA-1), interoperability is only considered for Unauthenticated mode.
There are two possible combinations for such use case:

- STAMP Session-Sender with TWAMP Light Session-Reflector;
- TWAMP Light Session-Sender with STAMP Session-Reflector.

In the former case, the Session-Sender might not be aware that its
Session-Reflector does not support STAMP. For example, a TWAMP Light
Session-Reflector may not support the use of UDP port 862 as
specified in [RFC8545]. Thus Section 4. permits a STAMP Session-
Sender to use alternative ports. If any of STAMP extensions are
used, the TWAMP Light Session-Reflector will view them as Packet
Padding field.

In the latter scenario, if a TWAMP Light Session-Sender does not
support the use of UDP port 862, the test management system MUST set
STAMP Session-Reflector to use UDP port number, as permitted by
Section 4. The Session-Reflector MUST be set to use the default
format for its timestamps, NTP.

A STAMP Session-Reflector that supports this specification will
transmit the base packet (Figure 5) if it receives a packet smaller
than the STAMP base packet. If the packet received from TWAMP Session-Sender is larger than the STAMP base packet, the STAMP Session-Reflector that supports this specification will copy the content of the remainder of the received packet to transmit reflected packet of symmetrical size.

5. Operational Considerations

STAMP is intended to be used on production networks to enable the operator to assess service level agreements based on packet delay, delay variation, and loss. When using STAMP over the Internet, especially when STAMP test packets are transmitted with the destination UDP port number from the User Ports range, the possible impact of the STAMP test packets MUST be thoroughly analyzed. The use of STAMP for each case MUST be agreed by users of nodes hosting the Session-Sender and Session-Reflector before starting the STAMP test session.

Also, the use of the well-known port number as the destination UDP port number in STAMP test packets transmitted by a Session-Sender would not impede the ability to measure performance in an Equal Cost Multipath environment and analysis in Section 5.3 [RFC8545] fully applies to STAMP.

6. IANA Considerations

This document doesn’t have any IANA action. This section may be removed before the publication.

7. Security Considerations

[RFC5357] does not identify security considerations specific to TWAMP-Test but refers to security considerations identified for OWAMP in [RFC4656]. Since both OWAMP and TWAMP include control plane and data plane components, only security considerations related to OWAMP-Test, discussed in Sections 6.2, 6.3 [RFC4656] apply to STAMP.

STAMP uses the well-known UDP port number allocated for the OWAMP-Test/TWAMP-Test Receiver port. Thus the security considerations and measures to mitigate the risk of the attack using the registered port number documented in Section 6 [RFC8545] equally apply to STAMP. Because of the control and management of a STAMP test being outside the scope of this specification only the more general requirement is set:

To mitigate the possible attack vector, the control, and management of a STAMP test session MUST use the secured transport.
The load of the STAMP test packets offered to a network MUST be carefully estimated, and the possible impact on the existing services MUST be thoroughly analyzed before launching the test session. [RFC8085] section 3.1.5 provides guidance on handling network load for UDP-based protocol. While the characteristic of test traffic depends on the test objective, it is highly recommended to stay in the limits as provided in [RFC8085].

Use of HMAC-SHA-256 in the authenticated mode protects the data integrity of the STAMP test packets.
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1. Introduction

The Simple Two-way Active Measurement Protocol (STAMP) [RFC8762] can be used to measure performance parameters of IP networks such as latency, jitter, and packet loss by sending test packets and monitoring their experience in the network. The STAMP protocol [RFC8762] in unauthenticated mode is on-wire compatible with TWAMP Light, discussed in Appendix I [RFC5357]. The TWAMP Light is known to have many implementations though no common management framework being defined, thus leaving some aspects of test packet processing to interpretation. As one of the goals of STAMP is to support these variations, this document presents their analysis; describes the data model of the base STAMP specification. The defined STAMP data model can be augmented to include STAMP extensions, for example, described in [RFC8972]. This document defines the STAMP data model and specifies it formally, using the YANG data modeling language [RFC7950].

This version of the interfaces data model conforms to the Network Management Datastore Architecture (NMDA) defined in [RFC8342].

1.1. Conventions used in this document
1.1.1. 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.

2. Scope, Model, and Applicability

The scope of this document includes a model of the STAMP as defined in [RFC8762] and Section 3 [RFC8972].

```
+----------------------o                o-------------------------+
|    Config server     |                |      Config server      |
|                      |                |                         |
| STAMP Session-Sender | <--- STAMP---> | STAMP Session-Reflector |
+----------------------o                o-------------------------+
```

Figure 1: STAMP Reference Model

2.1. Data Model Parameters

This section describes containers within the STAMP data model.

2.1.1. STAMP-Sender

The stamp-session-sender container holds items that are related to the configuration of the stamp Session-Sender logical entity.

The stamp-session-sender-state container holds information about the state of the particular STAMP test session.

RPCs stamp-sender-start and stamp-sender-stop respectively start and stop the referenced session by the stamp-session-id of the STAMP.
2.1.1.1. Controls for Test Session and Performance Metric Calculation

The data model supports several scenarios for a STAMP Session-Sender to execute test sessions and calculate performance metrics:

* The test mode in which the test packets are sent unbound in time as defined by the parameter ‘interval’ in the stamp-session-sender container frequency is referred to as continuous mode. Performance metrics in the continuous mode are calculated at a period defined by the parameter ‘measurement-interval’.

* The test mode that has a specific number of the test packets configured for the test session in the ‘number-of-packets’ parameter is referred to as a periodic mode. The STAMP-Sender MAY repeat the test session with the same parameters. The ‘repeat’ parameter defines the number of tests and the ‘repeat-interval’ - the interval between the consecutive tests. The performance metrics are calculated after each test session when the interval defined by the ‘session-timeout’ expires.

2.1.2. STAMP-Reflector

The stamp-session-reflector container holds items that are related to the configuration of the STAMP Session-Reflector logical entity.

The stamp-session-refl-state container holds Session-Reflector state data for the particular STAMP test session.

3. Data Model

Creating the STAMP data model presents several challenges, and among them is the identification of a test-session at Session-Reflector. A Session-Reflector MAY require only as little as the STAMP Session Identifier (SSID) and the source IP address in received STAMP-Test packet to spawn a new test session. More so, to test processing of Class-of-Service along the same route in Equal Cost Multi-Path environment Session-Sender may perform STAMP test sessions concurrently using the same source IP address, source UDP port number, destination IP address, and destination UDP port number. Thus the only parameter that can be used to differentiate these test sessions would be DSCP value. The DSCP field may get re-marked along the path, and without the use of Class of Service TLV (Section 4.4 [RFC8972]) that will go undetected, but by using SSID and the source IP address as a key, we can ensure that STAMP test packets that are considered as different test sessions follow the same path even in ECMP environments.
3.1. Tree Diagrams

This section presents a simplified graphical representation of the STAMP data model using a YANG tree diagram [RFC8340].

module: ietf-stamp
  +++rw stamp
  |   +++rw stamp-session-sender {session-sender}?
  |     +++rw sender-enable? boolean
  |     +++rw sender-test-session* [stamp-session-id]
  |     |   +++rw test-session-enable? boolean
  |     |   +++rw number-of-packets? union
  |     |   +++rw interval? uint32
  |     |   +++rw session-timeout? uint32
  |     |   +++rw measurement-interval? uint32
  |     |   +++rw repeat? union
  |     |   +++rw repeat-interval? uint32
  |     |   +++rw dscp-value? inet:dscp
  |     |   +++rw test-session-reflector-mode? session-reflector-mode
  |     +++rw sender-ip inet:ip-address
  |     +++rw session-sender-udp-port inet:port-number
  |     +++rw stamp-session-id uint32
  |     +++rw session-reflector-ip inet:ip-address
  |     +++rw session-reflector-udp-port? inet:port-number
  |     +++rw sender-timestamp-format? timestamp-format
  |     +++rw security! {stamp-security}?
  |     |   +++rw key-chain? kc:key-chain-ref
  |     |   +++rw first-percentile? percentile
  |     |   +++rw second-percentile? percentile
  |     |   +++rw third-percentile? percentile
  +++rw stamp-session-reflector {session-reflector}?
     +++rw reflector-enable? boolean
     +++rw ref-wait? uint32
     +++rw reflector-mode-state? session-reflector-mode
     +++rw reflector-test-session* [stamp-session-id]
     |   +++rw stamp-session-id union
     |   +++rw dscp-handling-mode? session-dscp-mode
     |   +++rw dscp-value? inet:dscp
     |   +++rw sender-ip? union
     |   +++rw sender-udp-port? union
     |   +++rw reflector-ip? union
     |   +++rw reflector-udp-port? inet:port-number
     |   +++rw reflector-timestamp-format? timestamp-format
     |   +++rw security! {stamp-security}?
     |     |   +++rw key-chain? kc:key-chain-ref
module: ietf-stamp
  +--ro stamp-state
    +--ro stamp-session-sender-state {session-sender}?
      +--ro test-session-state* [stamp-session-id]
        +--ro stamp-session-id              uint32
        +--ro sender-session-state?   enumeration
        +--ro current-stats
          +--ro start-time                    yang:date-and-time
          +--ro interval?                     uint32
          +--ro duplicate-packets?           uint32
          +--ro reordered-packets?           uint32
          +--ro sender-timestamp-format?      timestamp-format
          +--ro reflector-timestamp-format?   timestamp-format
          +--ro dscp?                         inet:dscp
          +--ro two-way-delay
            +--ro delay
              |   +--ro min?   yang:gauge64
              |   +--ro max?   yang:gauge64
              |   +--ro avg?   yang:gauge64
              +--ro delay-variation
                +--ro min?   yang:gauge32
                +--ro max?   yang:gauge32
                +--ro avg?   yang:gauge32
          +--ro one-way-delay-far-end
            +--ro delay
              |   +--ro min?   yang:gauge64
              |   +--ro max?   yang:gauge64
              |   +--ro avg?   yang:gauge64
              +--ro delay-variation
                +--ro min?   yang:gauge32
                +--ro max?   yang:gauge32
                +--ro avg?   yang:gauge32
          +--ro one-way-delay-near-end
            +--ro delay
              |   +--ro min?   yang:gauge64
              |   +--ro max?   yang:gauge64
              |   +--ro avg?   yang:gauge64
              +--ro delay-variation
                +--ro min?   yang:gauge32
                +--ro max?   yang:gauge32
                +--ro avg?   yang:gauge32
          +--ro low-percentile
            +--ro delay-percentile
              |   +--ro rtt-delay?        yang:gauge64
              |   +--ro near-end-delay?   yang:gauge64
---ro far-end-delay?  yang:gauge64
  +---ro delay-variation-percentile
    +---ro rtt-delay-variation?  yang:gauge32
    +---ro near-end-delay-variation?  yang:gauge32
    +---ro far-end-delay-variation?  yang:gauge32
---ro mid-percentile
  +---ro delay-percentile
    +---ro rtt-delay?  yang:gauge64
    +---ro near-end-delay?  yang:gauge64
    +---ro far-end-delay?  yang:gauge64
  +---ro delay-variation-percentile
    +---ro rtt-delay-variation?  yang:gauge32
    +---ro near-end-delay-variation?  yang:gauge32
    +---ro far-end-delay-variation?  yang:gauge32
---ro high-percentile
  +---ro delay-percentile
    +---ro rtt-delay?  yang:gauge64
    +---ro near-end-delay?  yang:gauge64
    +---ro far-end-delay?  yang:gauge64
  +---ro delay-variation-percentile
    +---ro rtt-delay-variation?  yang:gauge32
    +---ro near-end-delay-variation?  yang:gauge32
    +---ro far-end-delay-variation?  yang:gauge32
---ro two-way-loss
  +---ro loss-count?  int32
  +---ro loss-ratio?  percentage
  +---ro loss-burst-max?  int32
  +---ro loss-burst-min?  int32
  +---ro loss-burst-count?  int32
---ro one-way-loss-far-end
  +---ro loss-count?  int32
  +---ro loss-ratio?  percentage
  +---ro loss-burst-max?  int32
  +---ro loss-burst-min?  int32
  +---ro loss-burst-count?  int32
---ro one-way-loss-near-end
  +---ro loss-count?  int32
  +---ro loss-ratio?  percentage
  +---ro loss-burst-max?  int32
  +---ro loss-burst-min?  int32
  +---ro loss-burst-count?  int32
---ro sender-ip  inet:ip-address
  +---ro session-sender-udp-port  inet:port-number
---ro session-reflector-ip  inet:ip-address
  +---ro session-reflector-udp-port?  inet:port-number
---ro sent-packets?  uint32
  +---ro rcv-packets?  uint32
  +---ro sent-packets-error?  uint32
++--ro rcv-packets-error?            uint32
++--ro last-sent-seq?                uint32
++--ro last-rcv-seq?                 uint32
++--ro history-stats* [stamp-session-id]
  ++--ro stamp-session-id              uint32
  ++--ro end-time                      yang:date-and-time
  ++--ro interval?                     uint32
  ++--ro duplicate-packets?            uint32
  ++--ro reordered-packets?            uint32
  ++--ro sender-timestamp-format?      timestamp-format
  ++--ro reflector-timestamp-format?   timestamp-format
  ++--ro dscp?                         inet:dscp
++--ro two-way-delay
  ++--ro delay
    ++--ro min?   yang:gauge64
    ++--ro max?   yang:gauge64
    ++--ro avg?   yang:gauge64
  ++--ro delay-variation
    ++--ro min?   yang:gauge32
    ++--ro max?   yang:gauge32
    ++--ro avg?   yang:gauge32
++--ro one-way-delay-far-end
  ++--ro delay
    ++--ro min?   yang:gauge64
    ++--ro max?   yang:gauge64
    ++--ro avg?   yang:gauge64
  ++--ro delay-variation
    ++--ro min?   yang:gauge32
    ++--ro max?   yang:gauge32
    ++--ro avg?   yang:gauge32
++--ro one-way-delay-near-end
  ++--ro delay
    ++--ro min?   yang:gauge64
    ++--ro max?   yang:gauge64
    ++--ro avg?   yang:gauge64
  ++--ro delay-variation
    ++--ro min?   yang:gauge32
    ++--ro max?   yang:gauge32
    ++--ro avg?   yang:gauge32
++--ro low-percentile
  ++--ro delay-percentile
    ++--ro rtt-delay?                   yang:gauge64
    ++--ro near-end-delay?              yang:gauge64
    ++--ro far-end-delay?               yang:gauge64
  ++--ro delay-variation-percentile
    ++--ro rtt-delay-variation?         yang:gauge32
    ++--ro near-end-delay-variation?    yang:gauge32
    ++--ro far-end-delay-variation?     yang:gauge32
++-ro mid-percentile
  +++-ro delay-percentile
    +++-ro rtt-delay?        yang:gauge64
    +++-ro near-end-delay?   yang:gauge64
    +++-ro far-end-delay?    yang:gauge64
  +++-ro delay-variation-percentile
    +++-ro rtt-delay-variation?        yang:gauge32
    +++-ro near-end-delay-variation?   yang:gauge32
    +++-ro far-end-delay-variation?    yang:gauge32
++-ro high-percentile
  +++-ro delay-percentile
    +++-ro rtt-delay?        yang:gauge64
    +++-ro near-end-delay?   yang:gauge64
    +++-ro far-end-delay?    yang:gauge64
  +++-ro delay-variation-percentile
    +++-ro rtt-delay-variation?        yang:gauge32
    +++-ro near-end-delay-variation?   yang:gauge32
    +++-ro far-end-delay-variation?    yang:gauge32
++-ro two-way-loss
  +++-ro loss-count?         int32
  +++-ro loss-ratio?         percentage
  +++-ro loss-burst-max?     int32
  +++-ro loss-burst-min?     int32
  +++-ro loss-burst-count?   int32
++-ro one-way-loss-far-end
  +++-ro loss-count?         int32
  +++-ro loss-ratio?         percentage
  +++-ro loss-burst-max?     int32
  +++-ro loss-burst-min?     int32
  +++-ro loss-burst-count?   int32
++-ro one-way-loss-near-end
  +++-ro loss-count?         int32
  +++-ro loss-ratio?         percentage
  +++-ro loss-burst-max?     int32
  +++-ro loss-burst-min?     int32
  +++-ro loss-burst-count?   int32
++-ro sender-ip                     inet:ip-address
++-ro session-sender-udp-port       inet:port-number
++-ro session-reflector-ip                  inet:ip-address
++-ro session-reflector-udp-port?   inet:port-number
++-ro sent-packets?                 uint32
++-ro rcv-packets?                  uint32
++-ro sent-packets-error?           uint32
++-ro rcv-packets-error?            uint32
++-ro last-sent-seq?                uint32
++-ro last-rcv-seq?                 uint32
++-ro stamp-session-refl-state {session-reflector}?-
  +++-ro reflector-light-admin-status?   boolean
Figure 3: STAMP State Tree Diagram

Figure 4: STAMP RPC Tree Diagram

3.2. YANG Module

<CODE BEGINS> file "ietf-stamp@2021-07-12.yang"
module ietf-stamp {  
  yang-version 1.1;
  namespace "urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:yang:ietf-stamp";
  //namespace need to be assigned by IANA
  prefix "ietf-stamp";

  import ietf-inet-types {  
    prefix inet;
    reference "RFC 6991: Common YANG Types.";
  }
  import ietf-yang-types {  
    prefix yang;
    reference "RFC 6991: Common YANG Types.";
  }
  import ietf-key-chain {  
    prefix kc;
    reference "RFC 8177: YANG Data Model for Key Chains.";
  }

This YANG module specifies a vendor-independent model for the Simple Two-way Active Measurement Protocol (STAMP). The data model covers two STAMP logical entities – Session-Sender and Session-Reflector; characteristics of the STAMP test session, as well as measured and calculated performance metrics.

Copyright (c) 2021 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved. Redistribution and use in source and binary forms, with or without modification, is permitted pursuant to, and subject to the license terms contained in, the Simplified BSD License set forth in Section 4.c of the IETF Trust’s Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info).

This version of this YANG module is part of RFC XXXX; see the RFC itself for full legal notices.

revision "2021-07-10" {
  description
    "Initial Revision. Base STAMP specification is covered";
  reference
    "RFC XXXX: STAMP YANG Data Model.";
}

typedef session-reflector-mode {
  type enumeration {
    enum stateful {
    
    */
    * Typedefs
    */

definitions
typedef session-dscp-mode {
  type enumeration {
    enum copy-received-value {
      description
        "Use DSCP value copied from received
         STAMP test packet of the test session.";
    }
    enum use-configured-value {
      description
        "Use DSCP value configured for this
         test session on the Session-Reflector.";
    }
  }
  description
    "DSCP handling mode by Session-Reflector.";
}

typedef timestamp-format {
  type enumeration {
    enum ntp-format {
      description
        "NTP 64 bit format of a timestamp";
    }
    enum ptp-format {
      description
        "PTPv2 truncated format of a timestamp";
    }
  }
  description
    "Timestamp format used by Session-Sender
    or Session-Reflector.";
}
typedef percentage {
  type decimal64 {
    fraction-digits 5;
  }
  description "Percentage";
}

typedef percentile {
  type decimal64 {
    fraction-digits 5;
  }
  description "Percentile is a measure used in statistics indicating the value below which a given percentage of observations in a group of observations fall.";
}

/*
 * Feature definitions.
*/

feature session-sender {
  description "This feature relates to the device functions as the STAMP Session-Sender";
  reference "RFC 8762 Simple Two-way Active Measurement Protocol (STAMP) Section 4.2.";
}

feature session-reflector {
  description "This feature relates to the device functions as the STAMP Session-Reflector";
  reference "RFC 8762 Simple Two-way Active Measurement Protocol (STAMP) Section 4.3.";
}

feature stamp-security {
  description "Secure STAMP supported";
  reference "RFC 8762 Simple Two-way Active Measurement Protocol (STAMP) Section 4.2.";
}
grouping maintenance-statistics {
    description "Maintenance statistics grouping";
    leaf sent-packets {
        type uint32;
        description "Packets sent";
    }
    leaf rcv-packets {
        type uint32;
        description "Packets received";
    }
    leaf sent-packets-error {
        type uint32;
        description "Packets sent error";
    }
    leaf rcv-packets-error {
        type uint32;
        description "Packets received error";
    }
    leaf last-sent-seq {
        type uint32;
        description "Last sent sequence number";
    }
    leaf last-rcv-seq {
        type uint32;
        description "Last received sequence number";
    }
}

grouping test-session-statistics {
    description "Performance metrics calculated for a STAMP test session.";
    leaf interval {
        type uint32;
        units microseconds;
        description "Time interval between transmission of two consecutive packets in the test session";
    }
}
leaf duplicate-packets {
    type uint32;
    description "Duplicate packets";
}

leaf reordered-packets {
    type uint32;
    description "Reordered packets";
}

leaf sender-timestamp-format {
    type timestamp-format;
    description "Sender Timestamp format";
}

leaf reflector-timestamp-format {
    type timestamp-format;
    description "Reflector Timestamp format";
}

leaf dscp {
    type inet:dscp;
    description "The DSCP value that was placed in the header of
    STAMP UDP test packets by the Session-Sender.";
}

container two-way-delay {
    description "two way delay result of the test session";
    uses delay-statistics;
}

container one-way-delay-far-end {
    description "one way delay far-end of the test session";
    uses delay-statistics;
}

container one-way-delay-near-end {
    description "one way delay near-end of the test session";
    uses delay-statistics;
}

container low-percentile {
    when "/stamp/stamp-session-sender/"
    +"sender-test-session[stamp-session-id]/"
}
container mid-percentile {
  when "/stamp/stamp-session-sender/"
    +"sender-test-session[stamp-session-id]/"
      +"second-percentile != '0.00'" { 
    description
      "Only valid if the
      the first-percentile is not NULL";
  }
  description
    "Mid percentile report";
  uses time-percentile-report;
}

container high-percentile {
  when "/stamp/stamp-session-sender/"
    +"sender-test-session[stamp-session-id]/"
      +"third-percentile != '0.00'" { 
    description
      "Only valid if the
      the first-percentile is not NULL";
  }
  description
    "High percentile report";
  uses time-percentile-report;
}

container two-way-loss {
  description
    "Two way loss count and ratio result of
    the test session";
  uses packet-loss-statistics;
}

container one-way-loss-far-end {
  when "/stamp/stamp-session-sender/"
    +"sender-test-session[stamp-session-id]/"
      +"test-session-reflector-mode = 'stateful'" { 
    description
"One-way statistic is only valid if the session-reflector is in stateful mode."
}

container one-way-loss-near-end {
  when "/stamp/stamp-session-sender/"
  "+"sender-test-session[stamp-session-id]/"
  "+"test-session-reflector-mode = 'stateful'" {
    description
    "One-way statistic is only valid if the session-reflector is in stateful mode."
  }
  description
  "One way loss count and ratio near-end of the test session"
  uses packet-loss-statistics;
  uses session-parameters;
  uses maintenance-statistics;
}

grouping stamp-session-percentile {
  description "Percentile grouping"
  leaf first-percentile {
    type percentile;
    default 95.00;
    description
    "First percentile to report"
  }
  leaf second-percentile {
    type percentile;
    default 99.00;
    description
    "Second percentile to report"
  }
  leaf third-percentile {
    type percentile;
    default 99.90;
    description
    "Third percentile to report"
  }
}
grouping delay-statistics {
    description "Delay statistics grouping";
    container delay {
        description "Packets transmitted delay";
        leaf min {
            type yang:gauge64;
            units nanoseconds;
            description "Min of Packets transmitted delay";
        }
        leaf max {
            type yang:gauge64;
            units nanoseconds;
            description "Max of Packets transmitted delay";
        }
        leaf avg {
            type yang:gauge64;
            units nanoseconds;
            description "Avg of Packets transmitted delay";
        }
    }
    container delay-variation {
        description "Packets transmitted delay variation";
        leaf min {
            type yang:gauge32;
            units nanoseconds;
            description "Min of Packets transmitted delay variation";
        }
        leaf max {
            type yang:gauge32;
            units nanoseconds;
            description "Max of Packets transmitted delay variation";
        }
        leaf avg {
            type yang:gauge32;
            units nanoseconds;
            description "Avg of Packets transmitted delay variation";
        }
    }
}
grouping time-percentile-report {
  description "Delay percentile report grouping";
  container delay-percentile {
    description "Report round-trip, near- and far-end delay";
    leaf rtt-delay {
      type yang:gauge64;
      units nanoseconds;
      description "Percentile of round-trip delay";
    }
    leaf near-end-delay {
      type yang:gauge64;
      units nanoseconds;
      description "Percentile of near-end delay";
    }
    leaf far-end-delay {
      type yang:gauge64;
      units nanoseconds;
      description "Percentile of far-end delay";
    }
  }
  container delay-variation-percentile {
    description "Report round-trip, near- and far-end delay variation";
    leaf rtt-delay-variation {
      type yang:gauge32;
      units nanoseconds;
      description "Percentile of round-trip delay-variation";
    }
    leaf near-end-delay-variation {
      type yang:gauge32;
      units nanoseconds;
      description "Percentile of near-end delay variation";
    }
    leaf far-end-delay-variation {
      type yang:gauge32;
      units nanoseconds;
      description "Percentile of far-end delay-variation";
    }
  }
}
grouping packet-loss-statistics {
    description
        "Grouping for Packet Loss statistics";
    leaf loss-count {
        type int32;
        description
            "Number of lost packets
during the test interval.";
    }
    leaf loss-ratio {
        type percentage;
        description
            "Ratio of packets lost to packets
sent during the test interval.";
    }
    leaf loss-burst-max {
        type int32;
        description
            "Maximum number of consecutively
lost packets during the test interval.";
    }
    leaf loss-burst-min {
        type int32;
        description
            "Minimum number of consecutively
lost packets during the test interval.";
    }
    leaf loss-burst-count {
        type int32;
        description
            "Number of occasions with packet
loss during the test interval.";
    }
}
grouping session-parameters {
    description
        "Parameters Session-Sender";
    leaf sender-ip {
        type inet:ip-address;
        mandatory true;
        description "Sender IP address";
    }
    leaf session-sender-udp-port {

type inet:port-number {
  range "49152..65535";
}
mandatory true;
description "Sender UDP port number";
reference "RFC 8762 Simple Two-Way Active Measurement Protocol Section 4.1."
}

leaf stamp-session-id {
  type uint32;
  description "A STAMP test session identifier assigned by the Session-Sender.";
  reference "RFC 8972 Simple Two-Way Active Measurement Protocol Optional Extensions Section 3.";
}

leaf session-reflector-ip {
  type inet:ip-address;
  mandatory true;
  description "Reflector IP address";
}

leaf session-reflector-udp-port {
  type inet:port-number{
    range "862 | 1024..49151 | 49152..65535";
  }
  default 862;
  description "Reflector UDP port number";
  reference "RFC 8762 Simple Two-Way Active Measurement Protocol Section 4.1.";
}

grouping session-security {
  description "Grouping for STAMP security and related parameters";
  container security {
    if-feature stamp-security;
    presence "Enables secure STAMP";
    description "Parameters for STAMP authentication";
    leaf key-chain {
      type kc:key-chain-ref;
      description "Name of key-chain";
    }
  }
}
/* Configuration Data */

container stamp {
  description
  "Top level container for STAMP configuration";

  container stamp-session-sender {
    if-feature session-sender;
    description "STAMP Session-Sender container";

    leaf sender-enable {
      type boolean;
      default "true";
      description
        "Whether this network element is enabled to
         act as STAMP Session-Sender";
      reference
        "RFC 8762 Simple Two-Way Active
         Measurement Protocol Section 4.2.";
    }

    list sender-test-session {
      key "stamp-session-id";
      unique "stamp-session-id";
      description
        "This structure is a container of test session
         managed objects";

      leaf test-session-enable {
        type boolean;
        default "true";
        description
          "Whether this STAMP Test session is enabled";
      }

      leaf number-of-packets {
        type union {
          type uint32 {
            range 1..4294967294 {
              description
            }
          }
        }
      }
    }
  }
}
"The overall number of UDP test packet to be transmitted by the sender for this test session";


type enumeration {
  enum forever {
    description "Indicates that the test session SHALL be run *forever*.";
  }
}

default 10;
description "This value determines if the STAMP-Test session is bound by number of test packets or not."

leaf interval {
  type uint32;
  units microseconds;
  description "Time interval between transmission of two consecutive packets in the test session in microseconds";
}

leaf session-timeout {
  when "../number-of-packets != 'forever'" {
    description "Test session timeout only valid if the test mode is periodic.";
  }
  type uint32;
  units "seconds";
  default 900;
  description "The timeout value for the Session-Sender to collect outstanding reflected packets.";
}

leaf measurement-interval {
  when "../number-of-packets = 'forever'" {
    description "Valid only when the test to run forever, i.e. continuously.";
  }
}
type uint32;
units "seconds";
default 60;
description
 "Interval to calculate performance metric when
 the test mode is 'continuous'.";
}

leaf repeat {
type union {
type uint32 {
 range 0..4294967294;
}
type enumeration {
 enum forever {
 description
 "Indicates that the test session SHALL
 be repeated *forever* using the
 information in repeat-interval
 parameter, and SHALL NOT decrement
 the value.";
 }
}
}
default 0;
description
 "This value determines if the STAMP-Test session must
 be repeated. When a test session has completed, the
 repeat parameter is checked. The default value
 of 0 indicates that the session MUST NOT be repeated.
 If the repeat value is 1 through 4,294,967,294
 then the test session SHALL be repeated using the
 information in repeat-interval parameter.
 The implementation MUST decrement the value of repeat
 after determining a repeated session is expected.";
}

leaf repeat-interval {
 when ".repeat != '0'";
type uint32;
units seconds;
default 0;
description
 "This parameter determines the timing of repeated
 STAMP-Test sessions when repeat is more than 0.";
}

leaf dscp-value {
type inet:dscp;
default 0;
description
  "DSCP value to be set in the test packet.";
}

leaf test-session-reflector-mode {
type session-reflector-mode;
default "stateless";
description
  "The mode of STAMP-Reflector for the test session.";
}

uses session-parameters;
leaf sender-timestamp-format {
type timestamp-format;
default ntp-format;
description "Sender Timestamp format";
}
uses session-security;
uses stamp-session-percentile;
}

container stamp-session-reflector {
  if-feature session-reflector;
description
    "STAMP Session-Reflector container";
  leaf reflector-enable {
    type boolean;
default "true";
description
    "Whether this network element is enabled to
     act as STAMP Session-Reflector";
  }

  leaf ref-wait {
    type uint32 {
      range 1..604800;
    }
u
    units seconds;
default 900;
description
    "REFWAIT(STAMP test session timeout in seconds),
     the default value is 900";
  }

  leaf reflector-mode-state {

type session-reflector-mode;
default stateless;
description
"The state of the mode of the STAMP Session-Reflector";
}

list reflector-test-session {
  key "session-index";
  unique "sender-ip stamp-session-id";
  description
"This structure is a container of test session managed objects";
  leaf session-index {
    type uint32;
    description "Session index";
  }
  leaf stamp-session-id {
    type union {
      type uint32;
      type enumeration {
        enum any {
          description
"Indicates that the Session-Reflector accepts STAMP test packets from a Session-Sender with any SSID value";
        }
      }
    }
  }
}

description
"This value determines whether specific SSID of the Session-Sender or the wildcard, i.e. any SSID accepted";
reference
"RFC 8972 Simple Two-Way Active Measurement Protocol Optional Extensions Section 3.";

leaf dscp-handling-mode {
  type session-dscp-mode;
  default copy-received-value;
  description
"Session-Reflector handling of DSCP:
  - use value copied from received STAMP-Test packet;"
leaf dscp-value {
    when "../dscp-handling-mode = 'use-configured-value'";
    type inet:dscp;
    default 0;
    description
        "DSCP value to be set in the reflected packet
        if dscp-handling-mode is set to use-configured-value.";
}

leaf sender-ip {
    type union {
        type inet:ip-address;
        type enumeration {
            enum any {
                description
                    "Indicates that the Session-Reflector
                    accepts STAMP test packets from
                    any Session-Sender";
            }
        }
    }
    default any;
    description
        "This value determines whether specific
        IPv4/IPv6 address of the Session-Sender
        or the wildcard, i.e. any address";
}

leaf sender-udp-port {
    type union {
        type inet:port-number {
            range "49152..65535";
        }
        type enumeration {
            enum any {
                description
                    "Indicates that the Session-Reflector
                    accepts STAMP test packets from
                    any Session-Sender";
            }
        }
    }
    default any;
    description
        "This value determines whether specific
port number of the Session-Sender or the wildcard, i.e. any";
}

leaf reflector-ip {
  type union {
    type inet:ip-address;
    type enumeration {
      enum any {
        description "Indicates that the Session-Reflector accepts STAMP test packets on any of its interfaces";
      }
    }
  }
  default any;
  description "This value determines whether specific IPv4/IPv6 address of the Session-Reflector or the wildcard, i.e. any address";
}

leaf reflector-udp-port {
  type inet:port-number{
    range "862 | 1024..49151 | 49152..65535";
  }
  default 862;
  description "Reflector UDP port number";
  reference "RFC 8762 Simple Two-Way Active Measurement Protocol Section 4.1."
}

leaf reflector-timestamp-format {
  type timestamp-format;
  default ntp-format;
  description "Reflector Timestamp format";
}

uses session-security;
}
}

/*
 * Operational state data nodes
*/

container stamp-state {
    config false;
    description
        "Top level container for STAMP state data";
}

container stamp-session-sender-state {
    if-feature session-sender;
    description
        "Session-Sender container for state data";
    list test-session-state{
        key "session-index";
        description
            "This structure is a container of test session managed objects";
        leaf session-index {
            type uint32;
            description "Session index";
        }
    }

    leaf sender-session-state {
        type enumeration {
            enum active {
                description "Test session is active";
            }
            enum ready {
                description "Test session is idle";
            }
        }
        description
            "State of the particular STAMP test session at the sender";
    }
}

container current-stats {
    description
        "This container contains the results for the current Measurement Interval in a Measurement session ";
    leaf start-time {
        type yang:date-and-time;
        mandatory true;
        description
            "The time that the current Measurement Interval started";
    }

    uses test-session-statistics;
}
list history-stats {
  key session-index;
  description
    "This container contains the results for the history Measurement Interval in a Measurement session ";
  leaf session-index {
    type uint32;
    description
      "The identifier for the Measurement Interval within this session";
  }
  leaf end-time {
    type yang:date-and-time;
    mandatory true;
    description
      "The time that the Measurement Interval ended";
  }
  uses test-session-statistics;
}

container stamp-session-refl-state {
  if-feature session-reflector;
  description
    "STAMP Session-Reflector container for state data";
  leaf reflector-light-admin-status {
    type boolean;
    description
      "Whether this network element is enabled to act as STAMP Session-Reflector";
  }
  list test-session-state {
    key "session-index";
    description
      "This structure is a container of test session managed objects";
    leaf session-index {
      type uint32;
      description "Session index";
    }
    leaf reflector-timestamp-format {

type timestamp-format;
description "Reflector Timestamp format";
}
uses session-parameters;
uses maintenance-statistics;
}
}

rpc stamp-sender-start {
description "start the configured sender session";
input {
leaf stamp-session-id {
  type uint32;
  mandatory true;
  description "The STAMP session to be started";
}
}
}

rpc stamp-sender-stop {
description "stop the configured sender session";
input {
  leaf stamp-session-id {
    type uint32;
    mandatory true;
    description "The session to be stopped";
  }
}
}
</CODE ENDS>

4.  IANA Considerations

This document registers a URI in the IETF XML registry [RFC3688]. Following the format in [RFC3688], the following registration is requested to be made.


Registrant Contact: The IPPM WG of the IETF.
This document registers a YANG module in the YANG Module Names registry [RFC7950].

name: ietf-stamp
prefix: stamp
reference: RFC XXXX

5. Security Considerations

The YANG module specified in this document defines a schema for data that is designed to be accessed via network management protocols such as NETCONF [RFC6241] or RESTCONF [RFC8040]. The lowest NETCONF layer is the secure transport layer, and the mandatory-to-implement secure transport is Secure Shell (SSH) [RFC6242]. The lowest RESTCONF layer is HTTPS, and the mandatory-to-implement secure transport is TLS [RFC8446].

The NETCONF access control model [RFC8341] provides the means to restrict access for particular NETCONF or RESTCONF users to a pre-configured subset of all available NETCONF or RESTCONF protocol operations and content.

There are a number of data nodes defined in this YANG module that are writable/creatable/deletable (i.e., config true, which is the default). These data nodes may be considered sensitive or vulnerable in some network environments. Write operations (e.g., edit-config) to these data nodes without proper protection can have an adverse effect on network operations. These are the subtrees and data nodes and their sensitivity/vulnerability:

TBD

Unauthorized access to any data node of these subtrees can adversely affect the routing subsystem of both the local device and the network. This may lead to corruption of the measurement that may result in false corrective action, e.g., false negative or false positive. That could be, for example, prolonged and undetected deterioration of the quality of service or actions to improve the quality unwarranted by the real network conditions.
Some of the readable data nodes in this YANG module may be considered sensitive or vulnerable in some network environments. It is thus important to control read access (e.g., via get, get-config, or notification) to these data nodes. These are the subtrees and data nodes and their sensitivity/vulnerability:

TBD

Unauthorized access to any data node of these subtrees can disclose the operational state information of VRRP on this device.

Some of the RPC operations in this YANG module may be considered sensitive or vulnerable in some network environments. It is thus important to control access to these operations. These are the operations and their sensitivity/vulnerability:

TBD
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Appendix A. Example of STAMP Session Configuration

Figure 5 shows a configuration example of a STAMP-Sender.

```xml
<data xmlns="urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:netconf:base:1.0">
  <stamp xmlns="urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:yang:ietf-stamp">
    <stamp-session-sender>
      <session-enable>enable</session-enable>
      <stamp-session-id>10</stamp-session-id>
      <test-session-enable>enable</test-session-enable>
      <number-of-packets>forever</number-of-packets>
      <interval>10</interval> <!-- 10 microseconds -->
      <measurement-interval/> <!-- use default 60 seconds -->
      <!-- use default 0 repetitions, 
      i.e. do not repeat this session -->
      <repeat/>
      <dscp-value/> <!-- use deafult 0 (CS0) -->
      <!-- use default 'stateless' -->
      <test-session-reflector-mode/>
      <sender-ip/>
      <session-sender-udp-port/>
      <session-reflector-ip/>
      <session-reflector-udp-port/> <!-- use default 862 -->
      <sender-timestamp-format/>
      <!-- No authentication -->
      <first-percentile/> <!-- use default 95 -->
      <second-percentile/> <!-- use default 99 -->
      <third-percentile/> <!-- use default 99.9 -->
    </stamp-session-sender>
  </stamp>
</data>
```

Figure 5: XML instance of STAMP Session-Sender configuration
<?xml version="1.0" encoding="utf-8"?>
<data xmlns="urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:netconf:base:1.0">
  <stamp xmlns="urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:yang:ietf-stamp">
    <stamp-session-reflector>
      <session-enable>enable</session-enable>
      <ref-wait/> <!-- use default 900 seconds -->
      <!-- use default 'stateless' -->
      <reflector-mode-state/>
      <stamp-session-id/>   <!-- use default 'any' -->
      <!-- use default 'copy-received-value' -->
      <dscp-handling-mode/>
      <!-- not used because of dscp-handling-mode being 'copy-received-value' -->
      <dscp-value/>
      <sender-ip/> <!-- use default 'any' -->
      <sender-udp-port/> <!-- use default 'any' -->
      <reflector-ip/> <!-- use default 'any' -->
      <reflector-udp-port/> <!-- use default 862 -->
      <reflector-timestamp-format/>
      <!-- No authentication -->
    </stamp-session-reflector>
  </stamp>
</data>

Figure 6: XML instance of STAMP Session-Reflector configuration
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Abstract
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1.  Introduction

This document describes Inband Flow Analyzer (IFA) which is a mechanism to mark packets in a flow to enable the collection of metadata regarding the analyzed flow. IFA defines an IFA header to mark the flow and direct the collection of analyzed metadata per marked packet per hop across a network. The ability to mark a packet using an IFA OAM header can also be leveraged to create synthetic flows meant for network data collection. This document describes a mechanism that may be used to monitor live traffic and/or create synthetic flows. This document also describes IFA zones, IFA reports, and IFA metadata. IFA does not require changes to protocol headers in order to collect metadata or analyze flows. IFA puts minimal requirements on switching silicon.

1.1.  Terminology

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].

IFA: Inband Flow Analyzer

MTU: Maximum Transmit Unit

1.2.  Scope

This document describes IFA deployment, the type of traffic that is supported, header definitions, analytics, and data path functions.
IFA deployment involves defining an IFA zone and understanding the requirements in terms of traffic overhead and points of data collection. Given that IFA provides the ability to perform local analytics on the collected data, this document describes the scope of the analytics function as well. The scope of IFA is from an end station and/or ToR, through any/all nodes in the network, and terminating in a network switch and/or an end station.

IFA can create a synthetic stream of traffic and use it to collect metadata along the path. This sampled stream is later discarded. IFA can also insert metadata on a per packet basis in live traffic. Inband insertion of metadata can be done within the payload or via tail stamping.

This draft defines an identification mechanism using a dedicated protocol type in the IP header for identifying IFA.

1.3. Applicability

IFA is capable of providing traffic analysis in an encapsulation-agnostic manner. Simple TCP and UDP flows, as well as tunneled flows, can be monitored. IFA can be enabled on an end station, or it can be enabled just on network switches. Enabling IFA on an end station provides better scalability and visibility by monitoring intra end station or inter end station traffic. IFA performs best when there is hardware assistance for deriving the flow metadata in the data path. This document describes data path functions for IFA.

1.4. Motivation

The main motivation for IFA is to collect analyzed metadata from packets within a flow for a given application. The definition of the IFA header ensures that it works for any IP packet, and with minimal impact on hardware performance.

2. Requirements

IFA requirements are defined with operational efficiency, performance of the network, and cost of hardware in mind.

2.1. Encapsulation Requirements

IFA packets MUST be clearly marked and identifiable so that a networking element in the flow path can insert metadata or perform other IFA operations.

IFA packets need to be easily identified for performance reasons. IFA packet identification MUST be the same for all the IP packet
types. This means that expensive hardware modifications are not needed for supporting new protocol types.

Since IFA packet processing is a data path function, the IFA header MUST keep the processing overhead minimal. Simple parsing in the switch hardware with localized read/write fields in IFA header will optimize the switch performance and cost.

A single IFA encapsulation MUST support IPv4 and IPv6 protocol types for tunneled and non-tunneled packets, preserving the fields used for load balancing hash computation.

IFA MAY support a checksum for the entire IFA metadata stack instead of a checksum per metadata element.

2.2. Operational Requirements

IFA MUST preserve the flow path across the network.

IFA MUST incur minimal traffic overhead.

IFA MUST provide an option to clone and truncate a packet to avoid disrupting the PMTU discovery of a network.

Cloning SHOULD be supported. Sampling of cloned traffic MUST be at a sampled ratio to keep the network overhead to a minimum.

IFA MUST provide the ability to insert metadata on cloned traffic.

IFA MUST provide the ability to insert metadata on live traffic.

IFA MAY provide the ability to specify checksum validation on the IFA header and metadata.

IFA MUST provide the ability to define a zone using hop count.

IFA MUST provide the ability for a networking element to perform metadata insertion in the payload.

IFA MAY provide the ability for networking element to insert metadata as tail stamping.

IFA MUST be able to support an IFA zone name space, also referred to as a global name space.

IFA MUST be able to support a per hop name space, also referred to as a local name space.
IFA MAY be able to support fragmentation of metadata. Fragmentation is needed to support a large number of hops in the network path.

2.3. Cost and Performance Requirements

The IFA header and metadata MUST be treated as foreign data present in the application data. IFA SHOULD be able to insert or strip the IFA header and metadata without modifying the layer 4 headers. This will help keep the cost of hardware down with no degradation in performance.

IFA MUST support the ability to clone and/or truncate, live traffic for IFA metadata insertion. This is needed for PMTU protocols to work within the IFA zone.

The IFA header MUST provide the ability to differentiate between a cloned packet and an original packet. This is needed for hardware to be able to identify and filter the cloned traffic at the edge of an IFA zone.

IFA encapsulation MUST provide mechanism to avoid impacting the parse depth of hardware for packet processing.

IFA MUST NOT require pre-allocation for reserving the space in a packet. The overhead of managing reserved space in a packet can result in performance degradation.

3. IFA Operations

IFA performs flow analysis, and possible actions on the flow data, inband. Once a flow is enabled for analysis, a node with the role of "Initiator" makes a copy of the flow or samples the live traffic flow, or tags a live traffic flow for analysis and data collection. Copying of a flow is done by sampling or cloning the flow. These new packets are representative packets of the original flow and possess the exact same characteristics as the original flow. This means that IFA packets traverse the same path in the network and same queues in the networking element as the original packet would. Figure 1 shows the IFA based Telemetry Framework. The terminating node is responsible for terminating the IFA flow by summarizing the metadata of the entire path and sending it to a Collector.
Figure 1: IFA Zone Framework without fragmentation
3.1. IFA Zones

An IFA zone is the domain of interest where IFA monitoring is enabled. An IFA zone MUST have designated IFA function nodes. An IFA zone can be controlled by setting an appropriate TTL value in the L3 header. Initiating and Terminating function nodes are always at the edge of the IFA zone. Internal nodes in the IFA zone are always Transit function nodes.

3.2. IFA Function Nodes

There are three types of IFA functional nodes with respect to a specific or set of flows. Each node MAY perform metadata fragmentation function as well.
3.2.1. Initiating Function Node

An end station, a switch, or any other middleware can perform the IFA initiating function. It is advantageous to keep this role closest to the application to maximize flow visibility. An IFA initiating function node performs the following functions for a flow:

- Samples the flow traffic of interest based on a configuration.
- Converts the traffic into an IFA flow by adding an IFA header to each sample.
- Updates the packet with initiating function node metadata.
- MAY mandate a specific template ID metadata by all networking elements.
- MAY mandate tail stamping of metadata by all networking elements.

3.2.2. Transit Function Node

An IFA transit node is responsible for inserting transit node metadata in the IFA packets in the specified flow.

3.2.3. Terminating Function Node

An IFA terminating node is responsible for the following for a flow:
- Inserts terminating node metadata in an IFA packet.
- Performs a local analytics function on one or more segments of metadata, e.g., threshold breach for residence time, congestion notifications, and so on.
- Filters an IFA flow in case of cloned traffic.
- Sends a copy or report of the packet to collector.
- Removes the IFA headers and forwards the packet in case of live traffic.

3.2.4. Metadata Fragmentation Function

There are cases where the size of metadata may grow too big for link MTU or path MTU, or where it imposes excessive overhead for the terminating function node to remove it. This is specially true in networks with a large number of hops between initiator function node and terminating function node. This is also true where the size of per hop metadata itself is large. For such cases, IFA defines a metadata fragmentation function. Metadata fragmentation function allows, removal of metadata from the packet and send a copy/report of the packet to collector. Correlation of metadata fragments and recreation of metadata stack for the entire flow path is done by the collector.

There is no dedicated node performing the metadata fragmentation function. As an IFA packet traverses the hops in an IFA zone, any
node MAY detect the need to fragment the packet’s metadata stack and perform metadata fragmentation.

Metadata fragmentation is done if the IFA header in the packet has "MDF" bit set and the current length of the metadata would exceed the maximum length after the addition of metadata by the current node. A node MAY create a copy of the packet or create an IFA report, remove the existing metadata stack from the packet, insert its own metadata, and finally forward the packet. A node MAY also update the IFA MDF (Meta Data Fragment) header fragment identifier, current length, IP length, and IP header checksum.

The maximum length in an IFA header, if set to "0", MAY trigger the metadata fragmentation special function. This mechanism can be used to generate IFA reports at each hop and never insert metadata in the packet. If maximum length is set to "0", a node MAY ONLY create an IFA report or copy of the packet including its own metadata. A node MUST NOT update the IFA MD header current length, IP length, or insert metadata in the IFA packet. The node MUST increment the IFA MDF header fragment identifier field.

3.3. IFA Cloning, Truncation, and Drop

IFA allows cloning of live traffic. It is expected that cloned traffic will have the same network path characterization as the original traffic i.e. follow the same network path, use the same queues etc.

Cloned traffic can be truncated to accommodate the PMTU of the IFA zone.

Cloned traffic MUST be dropped by the terminating function node of the IFA zone.

3.4. IFA Header

The IFA header is described below. An experimental IP protocol number is used in the IP header to identify an IFA packet. The IP header protocol type field is copied into the IFA header NextHdr field for hardware to correctly interpret the layer 4 header.
IPv4 Header:

+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+
| Version | IHL | Type of Service |          Total Length          |
+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+
| Identification | Flags | Fragment Offset |
+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+
| Time to Live | Protocol = IFA | Header Checksum |
+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+
| Source IPv4 Address |
+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+
| Destination IPv4 Address |
+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+

IPv6 Header:

+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+
| Version | Traffic Class |           Flow Label                  |
+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+
| Payload Length | Next Hdr = IFA |   Hop Limit   |
+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+
| Source IPv6 Address |
+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+
| Destination IPv6 Address |
+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+

IFA Header:

+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+
| Ver=2 | GNS | NextHdr = IP_xx | R | R | R | M | T | I | T | C | Max Length |
+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+

Figure 2: IFA 2 Header Format

(1) Version (4 bits) - Specifies the version of IFA header.
(2) GNS (4 bits) - Global Name Space. Specifies the IFA zone scoped name space for IFA metadata.

(3) Protocol Type (8 bits) - IP Header protocol type. This is copied from the IP header.

(4) Flags (8 bits)
   0: R - Reserved. MUST be initialized to 0 on transmission and ignored on receipt.
   1: R - Reserved. MUST be initialized to 0 on transmission and ignored on receipt.
   2: R - Reserved. MUST be initialized to 0 on transmission and ignored on receipt.
   3: MF - Metadata Fragment. Indicates the presence of the optional metadata fragment header. This header is inserted and initialized by the initiator node. If the MF bit is set, nodes in the path MAY perform fragmentation of metadata stack if the current length exceeds the maximum length.
   4: TS - Tail Stamp. Indicates the IFA zone is requiring tail stamping of metadata.
   5: I - Inband. Indicates this is live traffic. Strip and forward MUST be performed by the terminator node if this bit is set.
   6: TA - Turn Around. Indicates that the IFA packet needs to be turned around at the terminating node of the IFA zone and sent back to source IP address. This bit MAY be used for probe packets where probes are collecting bidirectional information in the network. This is same as echo request and echo reply. A packet MAY be generated with TA bit set and collects metadata in one direction and after it is turned around by the terminating function node, collects metadata in the reverse direction.
   7: C - Checksum - Indicates the presence of the optional checksum header. The checksum MUST be computed and updated for the IFA header and metadata at each node that modified the header and/or metadata. A node MAY perform checksum validation before updating the checksum.

(5) Max Length (8 bits) - Specifies the maximum allowed length of the metadata stack in multiples of 4 octets. This field is initialized by the initiator node. Each node in the path MUST compare the current length with the max length, and if the current length equals
or exceeds the max length, the transit nodes MUST stop inserting metadata.

3.4.1. IFA Metadata Header

The IFA metadata header is always present.

```
  0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-----------------------------------------------+
| Request Vector | Action Vector | Hop Limit | Current Length |
+-----------------------------------------------+
```

Figure 3: IFA Metadata Header Format

Request Vector (8 bits) - This vector specifies the presence of fields as specified by GNS. Fields are always 4-octet aligned. This field can be made extensible by defining a new GNS for an IFA zone.

Action Vector (8 bits) - This vector specifies node-local or end-to-end action on the IFA packets.

0: L - Loss. Loss bit to measure packet loss.
1: C - Color. Color bit to mark the packet.
2: R - Reserved. MUST be initialized to 0 on transmission and ignored on receipt.
3: R - Reserved. MUST be initialized to 0 on transmission and ignored on receipt.
4: R - Reserved. MUST be initialized to 0 on transmission and ignored on receipt.
5: R - Reserved. MUST be initialized to 0 on transmission and ignored on receipt.
6: R - Reserved. MUST be initialized to 0 on transmission and ignored on receipt.
7: R - Reserved. MUST be initialized to 0 on transmission and ignored on receipt.

Hop Limit (8 bits) - Specifies the maximum allowed hops in an IFA zone. This field is initialized by the initiator node. The hop limit MUST be decremented at each hop. If the incoming hop limit is 0, current nodes MUST NOT insert metadata. A value of 0xFF means that the Hop limit check MUST be ignored.

Current Length (8 bits) - Specifies the current length of the metadata in multiples of 4 octets.

3.4.2. IFA Checksum Header

The IFA checksum header is optional. Presence of the checksum header is indicated by the C bit in the flags field of the IFA header.
Checksum (16 bits) - The checksum covers the IFA header and metadata stack. Initiator function node MAY compute the full checksum including IFA header and metadata. Other nodes MAY compute delta checksum for the inserted/deleted metadata.
Reserved (16 bits) - Reserved. MUST be initialized to 0 on transmission and ignored on receipt.

3.4.3. IFA Metadata Fragmentation (MF) Header

The IFA metadata fragmentation (MF) header is optional. Presence of the fragmentation header is indicated by the MF bit in the flags field of the IFA header.

```
0                   1                   2                   3
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                  Packet ID                        |   MF ID |L|
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

Figure 5: IFA MF Header Format

Packet ID (26 bits) - Packet identification value generated by the initiator node. This value is node scoped.

Metadata Fragment ID (5 bits) - The initiator MUST initialize this value to 0. A node performing metadata fragmentation function MUST increment the value by 1.

L (1 bit) - This bit is set by the node creating the last metadata fragment. This will ALWAYS be the terminating function node. If incoming hop limit is "0", terminating function node will still generate copy/report of the packet and MUST set L bit. Collector MUST implement mechanism to recover from lost packets/reports with L bit set.

The MF header is a fixed overhead of 4 octets per packet. A network operator MUST identify the need for using IFA metadata fragmentation. The following network conditions can be considered:

- If an IFA packet may exceed the link or path MTU of the flow path
- If there are large number of hops in a flow path and MAY trigger link or path MTU breach
- If the length of metadata creates excessive overhead for terminating function node to delete the metadata.
- If each hop needs to generate its own IFA report (postcard mechanism)

With 26 bits of packet id, a maximum datagram lifetime (MDL) of 3 seconds, and an average Internet mix (IMIX) packet size of 512 bytes,
we get 183.25 Gbps of IFA traffic bit rate per node before the packet identifier wraps around. The collector can use [device id, packet id, MF id, L] to rebuild the fragmented packet.

5 bits of MF id will support 32 metadata fragments.

3.5. IFA Metadata

The IFA metadata is the information inserted by each hop after the IFA header. The IFA metadata can be inserted at the following offsets:

- Payload Stamping: Immediately after the layer 4 header. This is the default setting.
- Tail Stamping: After the end of the packet. This is controlled by the TS bit in the flags field of the IFA header.

```
0                   1                   2                   3
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|  LNS  |                     Device ID                         |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                                                               |
|                                                               |
˜                LNS/GNS defined metadata (contd)               ˜
.                                                               .
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

Figure 6: IFA Metadata Format

The IFA metadata header contains a set fields as defined by the name space identifier. Two types of name space identifiers are proposed.

3.5.1. Global Name Space (GNS) Identifier

A Global Name Space (GNS) is specified in the IFA header by the initiator node. The scope of a GNS is an IFA zone. All networking elements in an IFA zone MUST insert metadata as per the GNS ID specified in the IFA header. This is defined as the "Uniform Mode" of deployment.

A GNS value of 0xF indicates that metadata in an IFA zone is defined by the LNS of each hop.

The advantage of using the uniform mode is having a simple and uniform metadata stack. This means less load on a collector for parsing.
The disadvantage is that metadata fields are supported based on the least capable networking element in the IFA zone.

3.5.2. Local Name Space (LNS) Identifier

A Local Name Space (LNS) is specified in the metadata header. A GNS value of 0xF in the IFA header indicates the presence of an LNS. This is defined as the "Non-uniform Mode" of deployment.

A switch pipeline MUST parse the GNS field in the IFA header. The parsing result will dictate the name space ID that the hop needs to comply with.

The advantage of using the non-uniform mode is having a flexible metadata stack. This allows each hop to include the most relevant data for that hop.

The disadvantage is more complex parsing by a collector.

3.5.3. Device ID

A 28-bit unique identifier for the device inserting the metadata. If a GNS other than 0xF is present, then the device ID can be expanded to a 32 bit value. This is to support including an IPv4 loopback address as a Device ID.

3.6. IFA Network Overhead

A common problem associated with inserting metadata on a per packet per flow basis is the amount of traffic overhead on the network. IFA 2 is defined to minimize the overhead on the network.

IFA Base Header : 4 octets
IFA Metadata Header : 4 octets
IFA Checksum Header : 4 octets
IFA Fragmentation Header : 4 octets

Minimum Overhead:
    IFA header : 4 octets
    IFA Metadata Header : 4 octets

Total Min Overhead : 8 octets per packet
3.7. IFA Analytics

There are two kinds of actions considered in this proposal.

1. Action Bit MAP in IFA Header - This is encoded in the IFA header. Each node in the path MAY use the action bitmap to insert or not insert the metadata based on exceeding a locally-specified threshold. Not inserting the metadata is indicated by setting the field value to -1 (all 1s).

2. Terminating Node Actions - A terminating node may decide to perform threshold or other actions on the set of metadata in the packet. This information is not encoded in the IFA header.

3.8. IFA Packet Format

The IFA header is treated as a layer 3 extension header. IFA header and metadata stack length is reflected in IP total length field. IPv6 extension headers are ordered. The IFA header MUST be the last extension header in the IPv6 extension header chain. Similarly in case of IPv4 AH/ESP/WESP extension headers, IFA header MUST be the last extension header.

```
0                   1                   2                   3
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
   |                        IP Header                              |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
   |                       IFA Header                              |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
   |                     Layer 4 Header                            |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
   |                   IFA Metadata Header                         |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
   |                    IFA Metadata Stack                         |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
   |                          Payload                              |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

Figure 8 IFA Packet Format
3.8.1. IFA Packet Format with TS Flag Set

In case the Tail Stamp flag is set in the IFA header, the IFA metadata header and metadata stack are inserted at the end of the packet just before the FCS. Each node inserts metadata at the bottom of IFA metadata stack.

One of the key advantages of using TS is to support legacy devices and/or appliances that need to look at the layer 5 data. The IP length and IP header checksum are updated at each hop inserting metadata. This is the same as without the TS flag.

Figure 7: IFA Packet Format with TS 3.8.1 TCP/UDP Packet

IPv4 Header:

```
+-----------------------------------------------+----+
| Version| IHL |Type of Service|          Total Length          |
|        |     |                |                            |
+-----------------------------------------------+----+
| Identification |Flags| Fragment Offset |
|                |     |                |
+-----------------------------------------------+----+
| Time to Live | Protocol = IFA| Header Checksum |
|                |     |                |
+-----------------------------------------------+----+
```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source IPv4 Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+---------------------------------------------+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination IPv4 Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+---------------------------------------------+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

or

IPv6 Header:
+---------------------------------------------+
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Traffic Class</th>
<th>Flow Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| +---------------------------------------------+
| Payload Length | Next Hdr = IFA | Hop Limit |
| +---------------------------------------------+
| Source IPv6 Address |
| +---------------------------------------------+
| +---------------------------------------------+

+---------------------------------------------+
| Destination IPv6 Address |
| +---------------------------------------------+
| +---------------------------------------------+

IFA Header:
+---------------------------------------------+
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ver=2</th>
<th>GNS</th>
<th>NextHdr = IP_xx</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Max Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| +---------------------------------------------+

TCP Header:
+---------------------------------------------+
| Source Port | Destination Port |
| +---------------------------------------------+
| +---------------------------------------------+

| Sequence Number |
| +---------------------------------------------+
| Acknowledgment Number |
| +---------------------------------------------+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Offset</th>
<th>Reserved</th>
<th>Window</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| +---------------------------------------------+
| Checksum | Urgent Pointer |
| +---------------------------------------------+
Figure 8: TCP/UDP IFA Packet Format

3.8.2. VxLAN Packet

IPv4 Header:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>IHL</th>
<th>Type of Service</th>
<th>Total Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>Flags</td>
<td>Fragment Offset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time to Live</td>
<td>Protocol = IFA</td>
<td>Header Checksum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Source IPv4 Address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Destination IPv4 Address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

or

IPv6 Header:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Traffic Class</th>
<th>Flow Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Payload Length</td>
<td>Next Hdr = IFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source IPv4 Address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination IPv6 Address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IFA Header:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ver=2</th>
<th>GNS</th>
<th>NextHdr = IP_xx</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Max Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Outer UDP Header:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Port</th>
<th>Dest Port = VXLAN Port</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UDP Length</th>
<th>UDP Checksum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### IFA Metadata Header:

### IFA Metadata Stack:

### VXLAN Header:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reserved</th>
<th>Reserved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| VXLAN Network Identifier (VNI) | Reserved |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.8.3. GRE Packet

IPv4 Header:

```
+---------------------------------------------------------------+
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>IHL</th>
<th>Type of Service</th>
<th>Total Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
+---------------------------------------------------------------+
| Identification | Flags | Fragment Offset |
+---------------------------------------------------------------+
| Time to Live | Protocol = IFA | Header Checksum |
+---------------------------------------------------------------+
| Source IPv4 Address |
+---------------------------------------------------------------+
| Destination IPv4 Address |
+---------------------------------------------------------------+
```

or

IPv6 Header:

```
+---------------------------------------------------------------+
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Traffic Class</th>
<th>Flow Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
+---------------------------------------------------------------+
| Payload Length | Next Hdr = IFA | Hop Limit |
| Source IPv6 Address |
+---------------------------------------------------------------+
| Destination IPv6 Address |
+---------------------------------------------------------------+
```

IFA Header:
Figure 12 GRE IFA Packet Format

3.8.4. Geneve Packet

IPv4 Header:

```
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>IHL</th>
<th>Type of Service</th>
<th>Total Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
+----------------+----------------+---------------|-----------------|
| Identification  |    Flags       |   Fragment Offset|
+----------------+----------------+---------------|-----------------|
|    Time to Live| Protocol = IFA|     Header Checksum|
|----------------+----------------+---------------|-----------------|
+----------------+----------------+---------------|-----------------|
| Source IPv4 Address|
+----------------+---------------|Destination IPv4 Address|
```

or
IPv6 Header:

```
+-----------------------------------------------+
| Version | Traffic Class | Flow Label                |
+-----------------------------------------------+
| Payload Length | Next Hdr = IFA | Hop Limit |
+-----------------------------------------------+
```

```
Source IPv6 Address
```

```
Destination IPv6 Address
```

IFA Header:

```
+-----------------------------------------------+
| Ver=2 | GNS | NextHdr = IP_xx | R | R | M | T | I | C | Max Length |
+-----------------------------------------------+
```

Outer UDP Header:

```
+-----------------------------------------------+
| Source Port = xxxx | Dest Port = Geneve Port |
+-----------------------------------------------+
```

```
UDP Length | UDP Checksum
```

IFA Metadata Header:

```
+-----------------------------------------------+
| IFA Metadata Header |
```

IFA Metadata Stack:

```
+-----------------------------------------------+
| IFA Metadata Stack |
```

Geneve Header:

+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+
| Ver | Opt Len | O | C | Rsvd. | Protocol Type |
|----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+
+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+
| Virtual Network Identifier (VNI) | Reserved |
+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+
| Variable Length Options |
+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+
| data |
+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+

Figure 10: Geneve IFA Packet Format

3.8.5. IPinIP Packet

```
0                   1                   2                   3
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
IPv4 Header:
+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+
| Version | IHL | Type of Service | Total Length |
|----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+
+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+
| Identification |
+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+
| Flags | Fragment Offset |
+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+
| Time to Live | Protocol = IFA | Header Checksum |
+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+
| Source IPv4 Address |
+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+
| Destination IPv4 Address |
+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+
```

or

```
0                   1                   2                   3
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
IPv6 Header:
+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+
| Version | Traffic Class | Flow Label |
|----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+
+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+
| Payload Length |
+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+
| Next Hdr = IFA | Hop Limit |
+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+
| Source IPv6 Address |
+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+
```

3.8.6. IPv6 Extension Headers with IFA

The IFA header is always the last extension header in the IPv6 extension header chain. The last extension header’s next header field is stored in the IFA next header field and is replaced by the IFA protocol value.
IPv6 Header:
+---------------------------------------------------------------+
| Version | Traffic Class | Flow Label |
+---------------------------------------------------------------+
| Payload Length | Next Hdr = 43 | Hop Limit |
+---------------------------------------------------------------+
- Source IPv6 Address
- Destination IPv6 Address
+---------------------------------------------------------------+
| Next Hdr = 60 | Extension Header |
+---------------------------------------------------------------+
| Next Hdr = 44 | Extension Header |
+---------------------------------------------------------------+
| Next Hdr = IFA | Extension Header |
+---------------------------------------------------------------+

IFA Header:
+---------------------------------------------------------------+
| Ver=2 | GNS | NextHdr = IP_xx | R | R | M | T | I | T | C |
|       |     |               | F | S | A |               |
+---------------------------------------------------------------+

Layer 4 Header:
+---------------------------------------------------------------+
| Layer 4 |
+---------------------------------------------------------------+

IFA Metadata Header:
+---------------------------------------------------------------+
| IFA Metadata Header |
+---------------------------------------------------------------+

IFA Metadata Stack:
+---------------------------------------------------------------+
| IFA Metadata Stack |
+---------------------------------------------------------------+

UDP/TCP Payload:
+---------------------------------------------------------------+
| data |
+---------------------------------------------------------------+

Figure 12: IPv6 Extension Header with IFA Packet Format
3.8.7. IP AH/ESP/WESP Packet

An AH, ESP, or WESP header is treated as a chained header in IPv4. The IPv4 protocol field is replaced by the AH/ESP/WESP protocol value and the IPv4 protocol field value is stored in the AH/ESP/WESP next header field.

The IFA header is ALWAYS placed as the last header in a header chain. In case of ESP/WESP where layer 4 and payload is encrypted, IFA metadata stack is placed immediately after IFA header.

IPv4: AH Transport Mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IP hdr</th>
<th>AH</th>
<th>IFA hdr</th>
<th>TCP</th>
<th>IFA MD hdr</th>
<th>IFA MD stack</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;------&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;------</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mutable field processing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;--&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;--------&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>immutable fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;-------- authenticated except for mutable fields --------&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IPv6: AH Transport Mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IP hdr</th>
<th>hop-by-hop, dest, routing, fragment</th>
<th>AH</th>
<th>IFA hdr</th>
<th>IFA MD hdr</th>
<th>IFA MD stack</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;--&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;----------&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mutatle field processing</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;------&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;---&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;--&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;-------- immutable fields ---------&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;------&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>authenticated except for mutable fields --------&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13: IP AH Transport Mode IFA Packet Format
IPv4: AH Tunnel Mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>new IP header</th>
<th>AH, IFA hdr</th>
<th>Orig IP hdr</th>
<th>IFA MD hdr</th>
<th>IFA MD stack</th>
<th>TCP</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;-----------&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;---------&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mutable field processing -------&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>---------- immutable fields ------------&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--authenticated except for mutable fields in the new IP hdr--&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IPv6: AH Tunnel Mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>new IP header</th>
<th>IFA hdr</th>
<th>Orig IP hdr</th>
<th>IFA MD hdr</th>
<th>IFA MD stack</th>
<th>TCP</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+extn hdrs</td>
<td>AH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;-----------&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;---------&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mutable field processing -------&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>---------- immutable fields ------------&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--authenticated except for mutable fields in the new IP hdr--&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14: IP AH Tunnel Mode IFA Packet Format

IPv4: ESP Transport Mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IP hdr</th>
<th>ESP</th>
<th>IFA hdr</th>
<th>IFA MD Hdr</th>
<th>IFA MD stack</th>
<th>TCP</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;---------&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mutable field processing -------&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---------- immutable fields ------------&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--authenticated except for mutable fields ---&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IPv6: ESP Transport Mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hop-by-hop, dest,</th>
<th>IFA</th>
<th>IFA MD</th>
<th>IFA MD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IP hdr routing, fragment</td>
<td>ESP hdr</td>
<td>hdr</td>
<td>stack TCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;-----------------&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;---------&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mutable field processing -------&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;---------&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------- immutable fields ------------&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;---------&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--encrypted except for mutable fields ---&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 15: IP ESP Transport Mode IFA Packet Format
IPv4: ESP Tunnel Mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>new IP header</th>
<th>AH</th>
<th>IFA</th>
<th>IFA MD</th>
<th>IFA MD</th>
<th>Orig IP</th>
<th></th>
<th>TCP</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;-----------------&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;----- mutable field processing -----&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--- encrypted except for mutable fields in the new IP hdr ---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IPv4: ESP Tunnel Mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>new IP header</th>
<th>AH</th>
<th>IFA</th>
<th>IFA MD</th>
<th>IFA MD</th>
<th>Orig IP</th>
<th></th>
<th>TCP</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+extn headers</td>
<td>AH</td>
<td>IFA</td>
<td>IFA MD</td>
<td>IFA MD</td>
<td>Orig IP</td>
<td></td>
<td>TCP</td>
<td>Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;-----------------&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;----- mutable field processing -----&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--- encrypted except for mutable fields in the new IP hdr ---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 16: IP AH Tunnel Mode IFA Packet Format

3.9. IFA Load Balancing

IFA changes the IP protocol field value to the IFA protocol number. The IP protocol field value is included in the hash computation. This will impact load balancing of flows.

The forwarding plane MUST support reading the IP protocol field value stored in the IFA NextHDR field for hash computation.

The layer 4 header is available at a fixed offset from the IFA header and is available for hash computation.

Hash computation based on the layer 4 payload will depend on the length of the IFA metadata stack present.

4. Interoperability Considerations

Version 2 of this protocol specification is not backward compatible with version 1.
5.  Security Considerations

A successful attack on an OAM protocol can prevent the detection of failures or anomalies, or create a false illusion of nonexistent ones.

The metadata elements of IFA can be used by attackers to collect information about the network hops.

Adding IFA headers or adding to IFA metadata can be used to consume resources within the path being monitored or by a collector.

Adding IFA headers or adding to IFA metadata can be used to force exceeding the MTU for the path being monitored resulting in fragmentation and/or packet drops.

IFA is expected to be deployed within controlled network domains, containing attacks to that controlled domain. Limiting or preventing monitoring or attacks using IFA requires limiting or preventing unauthorized access to the domain in which IFA is to be used, and preventing leaking IFA metadata beyond the controlled domain.

6.  References

6.1.  Normative References


6.2.  Informative References


Appendix A.

Appendix A is for informational purposes only. The following options were considered for the IFA protocol.

A.1. Probe Marker

One of the challenges of using probe signatures in an IFA header is a false positive.

The IFA version 2 header takes care of large header sizes and identification based on probe markers. Probe markers can cause false positives if there is a match on the first 64 bits of the layer 4 payload.

This approach is not a preferred approach, but is supported by this draft as a version 1.0 header.

A.2. DSCP

[RFC791] EXP/LU Pool 3 can be used for identifying IFA packets. CU bits can be used for identifying IFA packets.

The problem with using TOS bits is that they are pervasively used in the network deployment and are responsible for affecting the forwarding decision.

This approach is not supported or recommended by this draft.

A.3. IP Options

[RFC791] The IP options provide for control functions that are needed or useful in some situations but unnecessary for the most common communications. The IP options include provisions for timestamps, security, and special routing.

There are various problems with this approach.
(1) The IPv4 header size can become arbitrarily large with the presence of options.

(2) A switch pipeline typically handles IP option packets as exception path processing and punts them to a host CPU. (3) IP options make the construction of firewalls cumbersome, and are
typically disallowed or stripped at the perimeter of enterprise networks by firewalls.

This approach is not supported or recommended by this draft.

A.4. IPv4 Identification or Reserved Flag

[RFC6864] [RFC3514] Another suggestion is to use the IPv4 identification field or reserved flag. This suggestion is also discarded and not supported for the following reasons:

[RFC6864] prohibits usage of id field for any other purposes.

[RFC3514] prohibits using flags bit 0 for security reasons.
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Abstract

Development of, and advancements in, automation of network operations brought new requirements for measurement methodology. Among them is the ability to collect instant network state as the packet being processed by the networking elements along its path through the domain. This document introduces a new hybrid measurement method, referred to as hybrid two-step, as it separates the act of measuring and/or calculating the performance metric from the act of collecting and transporting network state.
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1. Introduction

Successful resolution of challenges of automated network operation, as part of, for example, overall service orchestration or data center operation, relies on a timely collection of accurate information that reflects the state of network elements on an unprecedented scale. Because performing the analysis and act upon the collected information requires considerable computing and storage resources, the network state information is unlikely to be processed by the network elements themselves but will be relayed into the data storage facilities, e.g., data lakes. The process of producing, collecting network state information also referred to in this document as network telemetry, and transporting it for post-processing should
work equally well with data flows or injected in the network test packets. RFC 7799 [RFC7799] describes a combination of elements of passive and active measurement as a hybrid measurement.

Several technical methods have been proposed to enable the collection of network state information instantaneous to the packet processing, among them [P4.INT] and [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data]. The instantaneous, i.e., in the data packet itself, collection of telemetry information simplifies the process of attribution of telemetry information to the particular monitored flow. On the other hand, this collection method impacts the data packets, potentially changing their treatment by the networking nodes. Also, the amount of information the instantaneous method collects might be incomplete because of the limited space it can be allotted. Other proposals defined methods to collect telemetry information in a separate packet from each node traversed by the monitored data flow. Examples of this approach to collecting telemetry information are [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-direct-export] and [I-D.song-ippm-postcard-based-telemetry]. These methods allow data collection from any arbitrary path and avoid directly impacting data packets. On the other hand, the correlation of data and the monitored flow requires that each packet with telemetry information also includes characteristic information about the monitored flow.

This document introduces Hybrid Two-Step (HTS) as a new method of telemetry collection that improves accuracy of a measurement by separating the act of measuring or calculating the performance metric from the collecting and transporting this information while minimizing the overhead of the generated load in a network. HTS method extends the two-step mode of Residence Time Measurement (RTM) defined in [RFC8169] to on-path network state collection and transport. HTS allows the collection of telemetry information from any arbitrary path, does not change data packets of the monitored flow and makes the process of attribution of telemetry to the data flow simple.

2. Conventions used in this document

2.1. Acronyms

RTM Residence Time Measurement
ECMP Equal Cost Multipath
MTU Maximum Transmission Unit
HTS Hybrid Two-Step
Network telemetry - the process of collecting and reporting of network state

2.2. 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.

3. Problem Overview

Performance measurements are meant to provide data that characterize conditions experienced by traffic flows in the network and possibly trigger operational changes (e.g., re-route of flows, or changes in resource allocations). Modifications to a network are determined based on the performance metric information available when a change is to be made. The correctness of this determination is based on the quality of the collected metrics data. The quality of collected measurement data is defined by:

* the resolution and accuracy of each measurement;
* predictability of both the time at which each measurement is made and the timeliness of measurement collection data delivery for use.

Consider the case of delay measurement that relies on collecting time of packet arrival at the ingress interface and time of the packet transmission at the egress interface. The method includes recording a local clock value on receiving the first octet of an affected message at the device ingress, and again recording the clock value on transmitting the first byte of the same message at the device egress. In this ideal case, the difference between the two recorded clock times corresponds to the time that the message spent in traversing the device. In practice, the time recorded can differ from the ideal case by any fixed amount. A correction can be applied to compute the same time difference taking into account the known fixed time associated with the actual measurement. In this way, the resulting time difference reflects any variable delay associated with queuing.

Depending on the implementation, it may be a challenge to compute the difference between message arrival and departure times and - on the fly - add the necessary residence time information to the same message. And that task may become even more challenging if the
packet is encrypted. Recording the departure of a packet time in the same packet may be decremental to the accuracy of the measurement because the departure time includes the variable time component (such as that associated with buffering and queuing of the packet). A similar problem may lower the quality of, for example, information that characterizes utilization of the egress interface. If unable to obtain the data consistently, without variable delays for additional processing, information may not accurately reflect the egress interface state. To mitigate this problem [RFC8169] defined an RTM two-step mode.

Another challenge associated with methods that collect network state information into the actual data packet is the risk to exceed the Maximum Transmission Unit (MTU) size on the path, especially if the packet traverses overlay domains or VPNs. Since the fragmentation is not available at the transport network, operators may have to reduce MTU size advertised to the client layer or risk missing network state data for the part, most probably the latter part, of the path.

In some networks, for example, wireless that are in the scope of [I-D.ietf-raw-use-cases], it is beneficial to collect the telemetry, including the calculated performance metrics, that reflects conditions experienced by the monitored flow at a node, other than the egress. For example, a head-end can optimize path selection based on the compounded information that reflects network conditions, resource utilization. This mode is referred to as the upstream collection and the other - downstream collection to differentiate between two modes of telemetry collection.

4. Theory of Operation

The HTS method consists of two phases:

* performing a measurement and/or obtaining network state information on a node;

* collecting and transporting the measurement and/or the telemetry information.

HTS may use an HTS Trigger carried in a data packet or a specially constructed test packet. For example, an HTS Trigger could be a packet that has IOAM Option-Type set to the "IOAM Hybrid Two-Step Option-Type" value (TBA1) allocated by IANA (see Section 6.1). The HTS Trigger also includes IOAM Namespace-ID and IOAM-Trace-Type information defined in Section 5.3 and Section 5.4.1 [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data] respectively (shown in Figure 1). A packet in the flow to which the Alternate-Marking method, defined in [RFC8321] and [RFC8889], is applied can be used as an HTS Trigger.
The nature of the HTS Trigger is a transport network layer-specific, and its description is outside the scope of this document. The packet that includes the HTS Trigger in this document is also referred to as the trigger packet.

![Hybrid Two-Step Trace IOAM Header](image)

Figure 1: Hybrid Two-Step Trace IOAM Header

The HTS method uses the HTS Follow-up packet, referred to as the follow-up packet, to collect measurement and network state data from the nodes. The node that creates the HTS Trigger also generates the HTS Follow-up packet. In some use cases, e.g., when HTS is used to collect the telemetry, including performance metrics, calculated based on a series of measurements, an HTS follow-up packet can be originated without using the HTS Trigger. The follow-up packet contains characteristic information sufficient for participating HTS nodes to associate it with the monitored data flow. The characteristic information can be obtained using the information of the trigger packet or constructed by a node that originates the follow-up packet. As the follow-up packet is expected to traverse the same sequence of nodes, one element of the characteristic information is the information that determines the path in the data plane. For example, in a segment routing domain [RFC8402], a list of segment identifiers of the trigger packet is applied to the follow-up packet. And in the case of the service function chain based on the Network Service Header [RFC8300], the Base Header and Service Path Header of the trigger packet will be applied to the follow-up packet. Also, when HTS is used to collect the telemetry information in an IOAM domain, the IOAM trace option header [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data] of the trigger packet is applied in the follow-up packet. The follow-up packet also uses the same network information used to load-balance flows in equal-cost multipath (ECMP) as the trigger packet, e.g., IPv6 Flow Label [RFC6437] or an entropy label [RFC6790]. The exact composition of the characteristic information is specific for each transport network, and its definition is outside the scope of this document.

Only one outstanding follow-up packet MUST be on the node for the given path. That means that if the node receives an HTS Trigger for the flow on which it still waits for the follow-up packet to the
previous HTS Trigger, the node will originate the follow-up packet to transport the former set of the network state data and transmit it before it sends the follow-up packet with the latest collection of network state information.

The following sections describe the operation of HTS nodes in the downstream mode of collecting the telemetry information. In the upstream mode, the behavior of HTS nodes, in general, identical with the exception that the HTS Trigger packet does not precede the HTS Follow-up packet.

4.1. Operation of the HTS Ingress Node

A node that originates the HTS Trigger is referred to as the HTS ingress node. As stated, the ingress node originates the follow-up packet. The follow-up packet has the transport network encapsulation identical with the trigger packet followed by the HTS shim and one or more telemetry information elements encoded as Type-Length-Value (TLV). Figure 2 displays an example of the follow-up packet format.

```
  0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+
|               |               |               |
| Ver|HTS Shim L |     Flags     |Sequence Number|   Reserved    |
+---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+
| HTS Max Length |
+---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+
| Telemetry Data Profile |
+---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+
| Telemetry Data TLVs |
+---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+---------------+
Figure 2: Follow-up Packet Format
```

Fields of the HTS shim are as follows:

Version (Ver) is the two-bits long field. It specifies the version of the HTS shim format. This document defines the format for the 0b00 value of the field.
HTS Shim Length is the six bits-long field. It defines the length of the HTS shim in octets. The minimal value of the field is eight octets.

```
0 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|F|  Reserved   |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

Figure 3: Flags Field Format

Flags is eight-bits long. The format of the Flags field displayed in Figure 3.

- Full (F) flag MUST be set to zero by the node originating the HTS follow-up packet and MUST be set to one by the node that does not add its telemetry data to avoid exceeding MTU size.

- The node originating the follow-up packet MUST zero the Reserved field and ignore it on the receipt.

Sequence Number is one octet-long field. The zero-based value of the field reflects the place of the HTS follow-up packet in the sequence of the HTS follow-up packets that originated in response to the same HTS trigger. The ingress node MUST set the value of the field to zero.

Reserved is one octet-long field. It MUST be zeroed on transmission and ignored on receipt.

HTS Max Length is four octet-long field. The value of th HTS Max Length field indicates the maximum length of the HTS Follow-up packet in octets. An operator MUST be able to configure the HTS Max Length field’s value. The value SHOULD be set equal to the path MTU.

Telemetry Data Profile is the optional variable-length field of bit-size flags. Each flag indicates the requested type of telemetry data to be collected at each HTS node. The increment of the field is four bytes with a minimum length of zero. For example, IOAM-Trace-Type information defined in [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data] can be used in the Telemetry Data Profile field.
Telemetry Data TLV is a variable-length field. Multiple TLVs MAY be placed in an HTS packet. Additional TLVs may be enclosed within a given TLV, subject to the semantics of the (outer) TLV in question. Figure 4 presents the format of a Telemetry Data TLV, where fields are defined as the following:

- **Type** - a one-octet-long field that characterizes the interpretation of the Value field.
- **Reserved** - one-octet-long field.
- **Length** - two-octet-long field equal to the length of the Value field in octets.
- **Value** - a variable-length field. The value of the Type field determines its interpretation and encoding. IOAM data fields, defined in [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data], MAY be carried in the Value field.

All multibyte fields defined in this specification are in network byte order.

### 4.2. Operation of the HTS Intermediate Node

Upon receiving the trigger packet, the HTS intermediate node MUST:

* copy the transport information;
* start the HTS Follow-up Timer for the obtained flow;
* transmit the trigger packet.

Upon receiving the follow-up packet, the HTS intermediate node MUST:

1. verify that the matching transport information exists and the Full flag is cleared, then stop the associated HTS Follow-up Timer;
2. otherwise, transmit the received packet. Proceed to Step 8;

3. collect telemetry data requested in the Telemetry Data Profile field or defined by the local HTS policy;

4. if adding the collected telemetry would not exceed HTS Max Length field’s value, then append data as a new Telemetry Data TLV and transmit the follow-up packet. Proceed to Step 8;

5. otherwise, set the value of the Full flag to one, copy the transport information from the received follow-up packet and transmit it accordingly. Proceed to Step 8;

6. originate the new follow-up packet using the transport information copied from the received follow-up packet. The value of the Sequence Number field in the HTS shim MUST be set to the value of the field in the received follow-up packet incremented by one;

7. copy collected telemetry data into the first Telemetry Data TLV’s Value field and then transmit the packet;

8. processing completed.

If the HTS Follow-up Timer expires, the intermediate node MUST:

* originate the follow-up packet using transport information associated with the expired timer;

* initialize the HTS shim by setting the Version field’s value to 0b00 and Sequence Number field to 0. Values of HTS Shim Length and Telemetry Data Profile fields MAY be set according to the local policy.

* copy telemetry information into Telemetry Data TLV’s Value field and transmit the packet.

If the intermediate node receives a "late" follow-up packet, i.e., a packet to which the node has no associated HTS Follow-up timer, the node MUST forward the "late" packet.

4.3. Operation of the HTS Egress Node

Upon receiving the trigger packet, the HTS egress node MUST:

* copy the transport information;

* start the HTS Collection timer for the obtained flow.
When the egress node receives the follow-up packet for the known flow, i.e., the flow to which the Collection timer is running, the node for each of Telemetry Data TLVs MUST:

* if HTS is used in the authenticated mode, verify the authentication of the Telemetry Data TLV using the Authentication sub-TLV (see Section 5);
* copy telemetry information from the Value field;
* restart the corresponding Collection timer.

When the Collection timer expires, the egress relays the collected telemetry information for processing and analysis to a local or remote agent.

4.4. Considerations for HTS Timers

This specification defines two timers – HTS Follow-up and HTS Collection. For the particular flow, there MUST be no more than one HTS Trigger, values of HTS timers bounded by the rate of the trigger generation for that flow.

4.5. Deploying HTS in a Multicast Network

Previous sections discussed the operation of HTS in a unicast network. Multicast services are important, and the ability to collect telemetry information is invaluable in delivering a high quality of experience. While the replication of data packets is necessary, replication of HTS follow-up packets is not. Replication of multicast data packets down a multicast tree may be set based on multicast routing information or explicit information included in the special header, as, for example, in Bit-Indexed Explicit Replication [RFC8296]. A replicating node processes the HTS packet as defined below:

* the first transmitted multicast packet MUST be followed by the received corresponding HTS packet as described in Section 4.2;
* each consecutively transmitted copy of the original multicast packet MUST be followed by the new HTS packet originated by the replicating node that acts as an intermediate HTS node when the HTS Follow-up timer expired.

As a result, there are no duplicate copies of Telemetry Data TLV for the same pair of ingress and egress interfaces. At the same time, all ingress/egress pairs traversed by the given multicast packet reflected in their respective Telemetry Data TLV. Consequently, a
centralized controller would reconstruct and analyze the state of the particular multicast distribution tree based on HTS packets collected from egress nodes.

5. Authentication in HTS

Telemetry information may be used to drive network operation, closing the control loop for self-driving, self-healing networks. Thus it is critical to provide a mechanism to protect the telemetry information collected using the HTS method. This document defines an optional authentication of a Telemetry Data TLV that protects the collected information’s integrity.

The format of the Authentication sub-TLV is displayed in Figure 5.

```
0                   1                   2                   3
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|Authentic. Type|   HMAC Type   |             Length            |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                                                               |
|                            Digest                             |
|                                                               |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+

Figure 5: HMAC sub-TLV
```

where fields are defined as follows:

* Authentication Type - is a one-octet-long field, value TBA2 allocated by IANA Section 6.2.
* Length - two-octet-long field, set equal to the length of the Digest field in octets.
* HMAC Type - is a one-octet-long field that identifies the type of the HMAC and the length of the digest and the length of the digest according to the HTS HMAC Type sub-registry (see Section 6.4).
* Digest - is a variable-length field that carries HMAC digest of the text that includes the encompassing TLV.

This specification defines the use of HMAC-SHA-256 truncated to 128 bits ([RFC4868]) in HTS. Future specifications may define the use in HTS of more advanced cryptographic algorithms or the use of digest of a different length. HMAC is calculated as defined in [RFC2104] over
text as the concatenation of the Sequence Number field of the follow-up packet (see Figure 2) and the preceding data collected in the Telemetry Data TLV. The digest then MUST be truncated to 128 bits and written into the Digest field. Distribution and management of shared keys are outside the scope of this document. In the HTS authenticated mode, the Authentication sub-TLV MUST be present in each Telemetry Data TLV. HMAC MUST be verified before using any data in the included Telemetry Data TLV. If HMAC verification fails, the system MUST stop processing corresponding Telemetry Data TLV and notify an operator. Specification of the notification mechanism is outside the scope of this document.

6. IANA Considerations

6.1. IOAM Option-Type for HTS

The IOAM Option-Type registry is requested in [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data]. IANA is requested to allocate a new code point as listed in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBA1</td>
<td>IOAM Hybrid Two-Step Option-Type</td>
<td>This document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: IOAM Option-Type for HTS

6.2. HTS TLV Registry

IANA is requested to create the HTS TLV Type registry. All code points in the range 1 through 175 in this registry shall be allocated according to the "IETF Review" procedure specified in [RFC8126]. Code points in the range 176 through 239 in this registry shall be allocated according to the "First Come First Served" procedure specified in [RFC8126]. The remaining code points are allocated according to Table 2:
6.3. HTS Sub-TLV Type Sub-registry

IANA is requested to create the HTS sub-TLV Type sub-registry as part of the HTS TLV Type registry. All code points in the range 1 through 175 in this registry shall be allocated according to the "IETF Review" procedure specified in [RFC8126]. Code points in the range 176 through 239 in this registry shall be allocated according to the "First Come First Served" procedure specified in [RFC8126]. The remaining code points are allocated according to Table 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td>This document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1- 175</td>
<td>Unassigned</td>
<td>This document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176 - 239</td>
<td>Unassigned</td>
<td>This document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240 - 251</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>This document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252 - 254</td>
<td>Private Use</td>
<td>This document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td>This document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: HTS Sub-TLV Type Sub-registry

This document defines the following new values in the IETF Review range of the HTS sub-TLV Type sub-registry:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>TLV Used</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBA2</td>
<td>HMAC</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>This document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: HTS sub-TLV Types

6.4. HMAC Type Sub-registry

IANA is requested to create the HMAC Type sub-registry as part of the HTS TLV Type registry. All code points in the range 1 through 127 in this registry shall be allocated according to the "IETF Review" procedure specified in [RFC8126]. Code points in the range 128 through 239 in this registry shall be allocated according to the "First Come First Served" procedure specified in [RFC8126]. The remaining code points are allocated according to Table 5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td>This document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-127</td>
<td>Unassigned</td>
<td>This document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128-239</td>
<td>Unassigned</td>
<td>This document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240-249</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>This document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250-254</td>
<td>Private Use</td>
<td>This document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td>This document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: HMAC Type Sub-registry

This document defines the following new values in the HMAC Type sub-registry:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>HMAC-SHA-256 16 octets long</td>
<td>This document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: HMAC Types
7. Security Considerations

Nodes that practice the HTS method are presumed to share a trust model that depends on the existence of a trusted relationship among nodes. This is necessary as these nodes are expected to correctly modify the specific content of the data in the follow-up packet, and the degree to which HTS measurement is useful for network operation depends on this ability. In practice, this means either confidentiality or integrity protection cannot cover those portions of messages that contain the network state data. Though there are methods that make it possible in theory to provide either or both such protections and still allow for intermediate nodes to make detectable yet authenticated modifications, such methods do not seem practical at present, particularly for protocols that used to measure latency and/or jitter.

This document defines the use of authentication (Section 5) to protect the integrity of the telemetry information collected using the HTS method. Privacy protection can be achieved by, for example, sharing the IPsec tunnel with a data flow that generates information that is collected using HTS.

While it is possible for a supposed compromised node to intercept and modify the network state information in the follow-up packet; this is an issue that exists for nodes in general - for all data that to be carried over the particular networking technology - and is therefore the basis for an additional presumed trust model associated with an existing network.
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Abstract
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1. Introduction

1.1. Background

Alternate marking, defined in [RFC8321], is a method for measuring packet loss, packet delay, and packet delay variation. Typical delay measurement protocols require the two measurement points (MPs) to exchange timestamped test packets. In contrast, the alternate marking method does not require control packets to be exchanged. Instead, every data packet carries a marking bit, which is used for triggering measurement events. Note that the frequency of these measurement events is dependent on the users’ application(s) and the node characteristics.

The marking bit can be used as a color indication, as defined in [RFC8321], which is toggled periodically. This approach is illustrated in Figure 1.

A: packet with color 0
B: packet with color 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Block 1</th>
<th>Block 2</th>
<th>Block 3</th>
<th>Block 4</th>
<th>Block 5 ...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Color</td>
<td>0000000000</td>
<td>1111111111</td>
<td>0000000000</td>
<td>1111111111</td>
<td>0000000000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Alternate marking: packets are monitored on a per-color basis.

Alternate marking is used between two MPs, the initiating MP, and the monitoring MP. The initiating MP incorporates the marking field into en-route packets, allowing the monitoring MP to use the marking field in order to bind each packet to the corresponding block.

Each of the MPs maintains two counters, one per color. At the end of each block the counter values can be collected by a central management system, and analyzed; the packet loss can be computed by comparing the counter values of the two MPs.

When using alternate marking delay measurement can be performed in one of three ways (as per [RFC8321]):

- Single marking using the first packet: in this method each packet uses a single marking bit, used as a color indicator. The first packet of each block is used by both MPs as a reference for delay
measurement. The timestamp of this packet is measured by the two measurement points, and can be collected by the management system from each of the measurement points, which can compute the path delay by comparing the two timestamps. The drawback of this approach is that it is not accurate when packets arrive out-of-order, as the two MPs may have a different view of which packet was the first in the block.

- Single marking using the mean delay: as in the previous method, each packet uses a single marking method, indicating the color. Each of the MPs computes the average packet timestamp of each block. The management system can then compute the delay by comparing the average times of the two MPs. The drawback of this approach is that it may be computationally heavy, or difficult to implement at the data plane.

- Double marking: each packet uses two marking bits. One bit is used as a color indicator, and one is used as a timestamping indicator. This method resolves the drawbacks raised for the two previous methods, at the expense of an extra bit in the packet header.

The double marking method is the most straightforward approach. It allows for accurate measurement without incurring expensive computational load. However, in some cases allocating two bits for passive measurement is not possible. For example, if alternate marking is implemented over IPv4, allocating 2 marking bits in the IPv4 header is challenging, as every bit in the 20-octet header is costly; one of the possible approaches discussed in [RFC8321] is to reserve one or two bits from the DSCP field for remarking. In this case every marking bit comes at the expense of reducing the DSCP range by a factor of two.

1.2. The Scope of This Document

This memo extends the marking methods of [RFC8321], and introduces methods that require a single marking bit, or zero marking bits.

Two single-bit marking methods are proposed, multiplexed marking and pulse marking. In multiplexed marking the color indicator and the timestamp indicator are multiplexed into a single bit, providing the advantages of the double marking method while using a single bit in the packet header. In pulse marking both delay and loss measurement are triggered by a 'pulse' value in a single marking field.

This document also discusses zero-bit marking methods that leverage well-known hash-based selection approaches ([RFC5474], [RFC5475]).
Alternate marking is discussed in this memo as a single-bit or a two-bit marking method. However, these methods can similarly be applied to larger fields, such as an IPv6 Flow Label or an MPLS Label; single-bit marking can be applied using two reserved values, and two-bit marking can be applied using four reserved values. Marking based on reserved values is further discussed in this document, including its application to MPLS and IPv6.

Finally, this memo summarizes the alternate marking methods, and discusses the tradeoffs among them. It is expected that different network protocols will have different constraints, and therefore may choose to use different alternate marking methods. In some cases it may be preferable to support more than one marking method; in this case the particular marking method may be signaled through the control plane.

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

The following abbreviations are used in this document:

- DSCP: Differentiated Services Code Point
- DM: Delay Measurement
- LM: Loss Measurement
- LSP: Label Switched Path
- MP: Measurement Point
- MPLS: Multiprotocol Label Switching
- SFL: Synonymous Flow Label [I-D.ietf-mpls-sfl-framework]

3. Marking Abstractions

The marking methods that were discussed in Section 1, as well as the methods introduced in this document, use two basic abstractions, pulse detection, and step detection.
The common thread along the various marking methods is that one or two marking bits are used by the MPs to signal a measurement event. The value of the marking bit indicates when the event takes place, in one of two ways:

**Pulse**  
An event is detected when the value of the marking bit is toggled in a single packet.

**Step**  
An event is detected when the value of the marking bit is toggled, and remains at the new value.

The double marking method (Section 1) uses pulse-based detection for DM, and step-based detection for LM.

Pulse-based detection affects the processing of a single packet; the packet that indicates the pulse is processed differently than the packets around it. For example, in the double marking method, the marked packet is timestamped for DM, without affecting the packets before or after it. Note that if the marked packet is lost, no pulse is detected, yielding a missing measurement (see Figure 2).

**P: indicates a packet**

|------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Marking bit  
0000010000 0000010000 0000010000 0000010000 000000 0000

^  ^  ^  ^  ^

Dropped packet:
no detection

**Figure 2: Pulse-based Detection.**

In step-based detection the event is detected by observing a value change in stream of packets. Specifically, when the step approach is used for LM (as in the double marking method), two counters are used per flow; each MP decides which counter to use based on the value of the marking bit. Thus, the step-based approach allows accurate counting even when packets arrive out-of-order (see Figure 3). When the step approach is used for DM (e.g., single marking using the first packet), out-of-order causes the delay measurement to be false, without any indication to the management system.
P: indicates a packet

Packets      PPPPPPPPPP PPPPPPPPPP PPPPPPPPPP PPPPPPPPPP PPPPPPPPPP
Time                     -------------------------------------------------------->
Marking bit  0000000000 1111111111 0000000000 10111111111 0000000000
Step-based detection ^          ^         ^          ^
out-of-order

Figure 3: Step-based Detection.

4. Double Marking

The two-bit marking method of [RFC8321] uses two marking bits: a color indicator, and a delay measurement indicator. The color bit is used for step-based LM, while the delay bit is used as a pulse-based DM trigger. This double marking approach is the most straightforward of the approaches discussed in this memo, as it allows accurate measurement, it is resilient to out-of-order delivery, and is relatively simple to implement. The main drawback is that it requires two bits, which are not always available.

Figure 4 illustrates the double marking method: each block of packets includes a packet that is marked for timestamping, and therefore has its delay bit set.

A: packet with color 0
B: packet with color 1

Packets      AAAAAAAAAA BBBBBBBBBB AAAAAAAAAA BBBBBBBBBB AAAAAAAAAA
Time                     -------------------------------------------------------->
| Block 1 | Block 2 | Block 3 | Block 4 | Block 5 ... |
Color bit  0000000000 1111111111 0000000000 1111111111 0000000000
Delay bit  0000100000 0000100000 0000100000 0000100000 0001000000
Packets marked for timestamping ^          ^         ^          ^         ^

Figure 4: The double marking method.
5. Single-bit Marking

5.1. Single Marking Using the First Packet

This method uses a single marking bit that indicates the color, as described in [RFC8321]. Both LM and DM are implemented using a step-based approach; LM is implemented using two color-based counters per flow. The first packet of every period is used by the two MPs as the reference for measuring the delay. As denoted above, the delay computed in this method may be erroneous when packets are delivered out-of-order.

\[ \text{A: packet with color 0} \]
\[ \text{B: packet with color 1} \]

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{Packets} & \text{AAAAAAAAA} & \text{BBBBBBB} & \text{AAAAAAAAA} & \text{BBBBBBB} & \text{AAAAAAAAA} \\
\text{Time} & \text{--------------------------} & \text{--------------------------} & \text{--------------------------} & \text{--------------------------} & \text{--------------------------} \\
\text{Block 1} & \text{Block 2} & \text{Block 3} & \text{Block 4} & \text{Block 5} & \text{...} \\
\text{Color bit} & 0000000000 & 1111111111 & 0000000000 & 1111111111 & 0000000000 \\
\end{array}
\]

Figure 5: Single marking using the first packet of the block.

5.2. Single Marking using the Mean Delay

As in the first-packet approach, in the mean delay approach ([RFC8321]) a single marking bit is used to indicate the color, enabling step-based loss measurement. Delay is measured in each period by averaging the measured delay over all the packets in the period. As discussed above, this approach is not sensitive to out-of-order delivery, but may be heavy from a computational perspective.

5.3. Single Marking using a Multiplexed Marking Bit

5.3.1. Overview

This section introduces a method that uses a single marking bit that serves two purposes: a color indicator, and a timestamp indicator. The double marking method that was discussed in the previous section uses two 1-bit values: a color indicator $C$, and a timestamp indicator $T$. The multiplexed marking bit, denoted by $M$, is an exclusive or between these two values: $M = C \oplus T$. 

An example of the use of the multiplexed marking bit is depicted in Figure 6. The example considers two routers, R1 and R2, that use the multiplexed bit method to measure traffic from R1 to R2. In each block R1 designates one of the packets for delay measurement. In each of these designated packets the value of the multiplexed bit is reversed compared to the other packets in the same block, allowing R2 to distinguish the designated packets from the other packets.

A: packet with color 0
B: packet with color 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Packet</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Packets marked for timestamping</th>
<th>Muxed bit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AAAAAAAAAAAAA</td>
<td>0000000000</td>
<td>^</td>
<td>0001000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BBBBBBBBBBBB</td>
<td>1111111111</td>
<td>^</td>
<td>1110111111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AAAAAAAAAAAA</td>
<td>0000000000</td>
<td>^</td>
<td>1110111111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BBBBBBBBBBBB</td>
<td>1111111111</td>
<td>^</td>
<td>1110111111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td>0000000000</td>
<td>^</td>
<td>0001000000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6: Alternate marking with multiplexed bit.

5.4. Pulse Marking

Pulse marking uses a single marking bit that is used as a trigger for both LM and DM. In this method the two MPs maintain a single per-flow counter for LM, in contrast to the color-based methods which require two counters per flow. In each block one of the packets is marked. The marked packet triggers two actions in each of MPs:

- The timestamp is captured for DM.
- The value of the counter is captured for LM.

In each period, each of the MPs exports the timestamp and counter-stamp to the management system, which can then compute the loss and delay in that period. It should be noted that as in [RFC8321], if the length of the measurement period is L time units, then all network devices must be synchronized to the same clock reference with an accuracy of +/- L/2 time units.
The pulse marking approach is illustrated in Figure 7. Since both LM and DM use a pulse-based trigger, if the marked packet is lost then no measurement is available in this period. Moreover, the LM accuracy may be affected by out-of-order delivery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Block 1</th>
<th>Block 2</th>
<th>Block 3</th>
<th>Block 4</th>
<th>Block 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P: packet - all packets have the same color</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packets</td>
<td>PPPPPPPPPP</td>
<td>PPPPPPPPPP</td>
<td>PPPPPPPPPP</td>
<td>PPPPPPPPPP</td>
<td>PPPPPPPPPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marking bit</td>
<td>0000100000</td>
<td>0000100000</td>
<td>0000100000</td>
<td>0000010000</td>
<td>0001000000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7: Pulse marking method.

6. Zero Marking Hashed

6.1. Hash-based Sampling

Hash-based selection [RFC5475] is a well-known method for sampling a subset of packets. As defined in [RFC5475]:

A Hash Function h maps the Packet Content c, or some portion of it, onto a Hash Range R. The packet is selected if h(c) is an element of S, which is a subset of R called the Hash Selection Range.

Hash-based selection can be leveraged as a marking method, allowing a zero-bit marking approach. Specifically, the pulse and step abstractions can be implemented using hashed selection:

- **Hashed pulse-based trigger**: in this approach, a packet is selected if h(c) is an element of S, which is a strict subset of the hash range R. When |S|<<|R|, the average sampling period is long, reducing the probability of ambiguity between consecutive packets. |S| and |R| denote the number of elements in S and R, respectively.

- **Hashed step-based trigger**: the hash values of a given traffic flow are said to be monotonically increasing if for two packets p1 and
p2, if p1 is sent before p2 then h(p1)\leq h(p2). If it is
guaranteed that the hash values of a flow are monotonically
increasing, then a step-based approach can be used on the range R.
For example, in an IPv4 flow the Identification field can be used
as the hash value of each packet. Since the Identification field
is monotonically increasing, the step-based trigger can be
implemented using consecutive ranges of the Identification value.
For example, the fourth bit of the Identification field is toggled
every 8 packets. Thus, a possible hash function simply takes the
fourth bit of the Identification field as the hash value. This
hash value is toggled every 8 packets, simulating the alternate
marking behavior of Section 4.

Note that as opposed to the double marking and single marking
methods, hashed sampling is not based on fixed time intervals, as the
duration between sampled packets depends only on the hash value.

It is also important to note that all methods that use hash-based
marking require the hash function and the set S to be configured
consistently across the MPs.

6.1.1. Hashed Pulse Marking

In this approach a hash is computed over the packet content, and both
LM and DM are triggered based on the pulse-based trigger
(Section 6.1). A pulse is detected when the hash value h(c) is equal
to one of the values in S. The hash function h and the set S
determine the probability (or frequency) of the pulse event.

6.1.2. Hashed Step Marking

As in the previous approach, hashed step marking also uses a hash
that is computed over the packet content. In this approach DM is
performed using a pulse-based trigger, whereas the LM trigger is
step-based (Section 6.1). The main drawback of this method is that
the step-based trigger is possible only under the assumption that the
hash function is monotonically increasing, which is not necessarily
possible in all cases. Specifically, a measured flow is not
necessarily an IPv4 5-tuple. For example, a measured flow may
include multiple IPv4 5-tuple flows, and in this case the
Identification field is not monotonically increasing.

7. Single Marking Hashed

Mixed hashed marking combines the single marking approach with hash-
based sampling. A single marking bit is used in the packet header as
a color indicator, while a hash-based pulse is used to trigger DM.
Although this method requires a single bit, it is described in this
section as it is closely related to the other hash-based methods that require zero marking bits.

The hash-based selection for DM can be applied in one of two possible approaches: the basic approach, and the dynamic approach. In the basic approach, packets forwarded between two MPs, MP1 and MP2, are selected using a hash function, as described above. One of the challenges is that the frequency of the sampled packets may vary considerably, making it difficult for the management system to correlate samples from the two MPs. Thus, the dynamic approach can be used.

In the dynamic hash-based sampling, alternate marking is used to create divide time into periods, so that hash-based samples are divided into batches, allowing to anchor the selected samples to their period. Moreover, by dynamically adapting the length of the hash value, the number of samples is bounded in each marking period. This can be realized by choosing first the maximum number of samples (NMAX) to be used with the initial hash length. The algorithm starts with only few hash bits, that permit to select a greater percentage of packets (e.g. with 1 bit of hash half of the packets are sampled). When the number of selected packets reaches NMAX, a hashing bit is added. As a consequence, the sampling proceeds at half of the original rate and the packets already selected that do not match the new hash are discarded. This step can be repeated iteratively. It is assumed that each sample includes the timestamp (used for DM) and the hash value, allowing the management system to match the samples received from the two MPs.

The dynamic process statistically converges at the end of a marking period and the number of selected samples beyond the initial NMAX samples mentioned above is between NMAX/2 and NMAX. Therefore, the dynamic approach paces the sampling rate, allowing to bound the number of sampled packets per sampling period.

8. Timing and Synchronization Aspects

As pointed out in [RFC8321], it is assumed that all MPs are synchronized to a common reference time with an accuracy of +/- L/2, where L is the periodic measurement interval. Thus, the difference between the clock values of any two MPs is bounded by L. Note that this is a relatively relaxed synchronization requirement that does not require complex means of synchronization. Clocks can be synchronized for example using NTP [RFC5905], PTP [IEEE1588], or by other means.

In the step-based approaches the common reference time is used for dividing the time domain into equal-sized measurement periods, such
that all packets forwarded during a measurement period have the same color, and consecutive periods have alternating colors. In the pulse-based approaches the synchronization helps the management system to correlate measurements from multiple measurement points without ambiguity.

8.1. Synchronization Aspects in Multiplexed Marking

The single marking bit incorporates two multiplexed values. From the monitoring MP’s perspective, the two values are Time-Division Multiplexed (TDM), as depicted in Figure 8. It is assumed that the start time of every measurement period is known to both the initiating MP and the monitoring MP. If the measurement period is L, then during the first and the last L/4 time units of each block the marking bit is interpreted by the monitoring MP as a color indicator. During the middle part of the block, the marking bit is interpreted as a timestamp indicator; if the value of this bit is different than the color value, the corresponding packet is used as a reference for delay measurement.

--- Beginning of measurement period

| v

...BBBBBBBBB | AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA |

<---------------------------><--------------------------->

L/4    L/4    L/2    L/4    L/4

<---------------------------><--------------------------->

Detect color   Detect timestamping   Detect color
change          indication              change

Figure 8: Multiplexed marking field interpretation at the receiving measurement point.

In order to prevent ambiguity in the receiver’s interpretation of the marking field, the initiating MP is permitted to set the timestamp indication only during a specific interval, as depicted in Figure 9. Since the receiver is willing to receive the timestamp indication during the middle L/2 time units of the block, the sender refrains from sending the timestamp indication during a guardband interval of d time units at the beginning and end of the L/2-period.
The guardband $d$ is given by $d = A + D_{\text{max}} - D_{\text{min}}$, where $A$ is the clock accuracy, $D_{\text{max}}$ is an upper bound on the network delay between the MPs, and $D_{\text{min}}$ is a lower bound on the delay. It is straightforward from Figure 9 that $d < L/4$ must be satisfied. The latter implies a minimal requirement on the synchronization accuracy.

All MPs must be synchronized to the same reference time with an accuracy of +/- $L/8$. Depending on the system topology, in some systems the accuracy requirement will be even more stringent, subject to $d < L/4$. Note that the accuracy requirement of the conventional alternate marking method [RFC8321] is +/- $L/2$, while the multiplexed marking method requires an accuracy of +/- $L/8$.

Note that we assume that the middle $L/2$-period is designated as the timestamp indication period, allowing a sufficiently long guardband between the transitions. However, a system may be configured to use a longer timestamp indication period or a shorter one, if it is guaranteed that the synchronization accuracy meets the guardband requirements (i.e., the constraints on $d$).

9. Multipoint Marking Methods

It should be noted that most of the marking methods that were presented in this memo are intended for point-to-point measurements, e.g., from MP1 to MP2 in Figure 10. In point-to-multipoint measurements, the mean delay method can be used to measure the loss and delay of the entire point-to-multipoint flow (which includes all the traffic from MP3 to either MP4 or MP5), while other methods such as double marking can be used to measure the point-to-point
performance, for example from MP3 to MP5. Alternate marking in multipoint scenarios is discussed in detail in [I-D.ietf-ippm-multipoint-alt-mark].
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Figure 10: Point-to-point and point-to-multipoint measurements.

10. Summary of Marking Methods

This section summarizes the marking methods described in this memo. Each row in the table of Figure 11 represents a marking method. For each method the table specifies the number of bits required in the header, the number of counters per flow for LM, the methods used for LM and DM (pulse or step), and also the resilience to disturbances.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th># of bits</th>
<th># of counters</th>
<th>LM Method</th>
<th>DM Method</th>
<th>Resilience to Reordering</th>
<th>Resilience to Packet drops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>DM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single marking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Step</td>
<td>Step</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1st packet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single marking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Step</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- mean delay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double marking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Step</td>
<td>Pulse</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single marking multiplexed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Step</td>
<td>Pulse</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulse marking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pulse</td>
<td>Pulse</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero marking hashed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Hashed pulse</td>
<td>Hashed pulse</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single marking hashed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Step</td>
<td>Hashed pulse</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ Accurate measurement.
= Invalidate only if a measured packet is lost (detectable)
- No measurement in case of disturbance (detectable).
-- False measurement in case of disturbance (not detectable).

Figure 11: Detailed Summary of Marking Methods

In the context of this comparison two possible disturbances are considered: out-of-order delivery, and packet drops. Generally speaking, pulse based methods are sensitive to packet drops, since if the marked packet is dropped no measurement is recorded in the current period. Notably, a missing measurement is detectable by the management system, and is not as severe as a false measurement. Step-based triggers are generally resilient to out-of-order delivery for LM, but are not resilient to out-of-order delivery for DM. Notably, a step-based trigger may yield a false delay measurement when packets are delivered out-of-order, and this inaccuracy is not detectable.

As mentioned above, the double marking method is the most straightforward approach, and is resilient to most of the
disturbances that were analyzed. Its obvious drawback is that it requires two marking bits.

Several single marking methods are discussed in this memo. In this case there is no clear verdict which method is the optimal one. The first packet method may be simple to implement, but may present erroneous delay measurements in case of dropped or reordered packets. Arguably, the mean delay approach and the multiplexed approach may be more difficult to implement (depending on the underlying platform), but are more resilient to the disturbances that were considered here. Note that the computational complexity of the mean delay approach can be reduced by combining it with a hashed approach, i.e., by computing the mean delay over a hash-based subset of the packets. The pulse marking method requires only a single counter per flow, while the other methods require two counters per flow.

The hash-based sampling approaches reduce the overhead to zero bits, which is a significant advantage. However, the sampling period in these approaches is not associated with a fixed time interval. Therefore, in some cases adjacent packets may be selected for the sampling, potentially causing measurement errors. Furthermore, when the traffic rate is low, measurements may become significantly infrequent.

It is clear from the previous table that packet loss measurement can be considered resilient to both reordering and packet drops if at least one bit is used with a step-based approach. Thus, since the packet loss can be considered obvious, the previous table can be simplified into Figure 12, where only the characteristics of delay measurements are highlighted. This more compact table allows room for an additional column referring to multipoint-to-multipoint (Section 9) delay measurement compatibility.
### Table: Summary of Marking Methods: focus on Delay Measurement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marking Method</th>
<th># of bits</th>
<th>LM on All Packets</th>
<th>DM Resilience to Reordering</th>
<th>DM Resilience to Packet drops</th>
<th>DM Multipoint compatible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single marking - 1st packet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single marking - mean delay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double marking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single marking multiplexed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulse marking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero marking hashed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single marking hashed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ Accurate measurement.
= Invalidate only if a measured packet is lost (detectable).
- No measurement in case of disturbance (detectable).
-- False measurement in case of disturbance (not detectable).

Figure 12: Summary of Marking Methods: focus on Delay Measurement

In the context of delay measurement, both zero marking hashed and single marking hashed are resilient to packet drops. Using double marking it could also be possible to perform an accurate measurement in case of packet drops, as long as the packet that is marked for DM is not dropped.

The single marking hashed method seems the most complete approach, especially because it is also compatible with multipoint-to-multipoint measurements.
11. Alternate Marking using Reserved Values

As mentioned in Section 1, a marking bit is not necessarily a single bit, but may be implemented by using two well-known values in one of the header fields. Similarly, two-bit marking can be implemented using four reserved values.

A notable example is MPLS Synonymous Flow Labels (SFL), as defined in [I-D.ietf-mpls-rfc6374-sfl]. Two MPLS Label values can be used to indicate the two colors of a given LSP: the original Label value, and an SFL value. A similar approach can be applied to IPv6 using the Flow Label field.

The following example illustrates how alternate marking can be implemented using reserved values. The bit multiplexing approach of Section 5.3 is applicable not only to single-bit color indicators, but also to two-value indicators; instead of using a single bit that is toggled between ‘0’ and ‘1’, two values of the indicator field, U and W, can be used in the same manner, allowing both loss and delay measurement to be performed using only two reserved values. Thus, the multiplexing approach of Figure 6 can be illustrated more generally with two values, U and W, as depicted in Figure 13.

A: packet with color 0
B: packet with color 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Packets</th>
<th>AAAAAAAAAA BBBBBBBBBB AAAAAAAAAA BBBBBBBBBB AAAAAAAAAA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block 1</td>
<td>Block 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color</td>
<td>0000000000 1111111111 0000000000 1111111111 0000000000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Packets marked for timestamping</th>
<th>^</th>
<th>^</th>
<th>^</th>
<th>^</th>
<th>^</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Muxed marking values | UUUUWUUUUU WWWWUWWWW UUUUWUUUUU WWWWUWWWW UUUWUUUUU |

Figure 13: Alternate marking with two multiplexed marking values, U and W.
12. IANA Considerations

This memo includes no requests from IANA.

13. Security Considerations

The security considerations of the alternate marking method are discussed in [RFC8321]. The analysis of Section 10 emphasizes the sensitivity of some of the alternate marking methods to packet drops and to packet reordering. Thus, a malicious attacker may attempt to tamper with the measurements by either selectively dropping packets, or by selectively reordering specific packets. The multiplexed marking method Section 5.3 that is defined in this document requires slightly more stringent synchronization than the conventional marking method, potentially making the method more vulnerable to attacks on the time synchronization protocol. A detailed discussion about the threats against time protocols and how to mitigate them is presented in [RFC7384].
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1.  Motivation

In-situ OAM (iOAM) records OAM data associated with user packets while these packets traverse a network [I-D.brockners-inband-oam-requirements]. The iOAM instruction and data are kept in an iOAM header which is defined in [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data]. The iOAM header needs to be encapsulated in a packet's transport protocol header in order to be processed by the network nodes who are capable of iOAM processing. So far, the iOAM header encapsulation methods have been defined for several protocols, including IPv6, VXLAN-GPE, NSH, SRv6 [I-D.brockners-inband-oam-transport],[I-D.ietf-sfc-ioam-nsh], GENEVE [I-D.brockners-ippm-ioam-geneve], GRE [I-D.weis-ippm-ioam-gre], and some others.

While the original scope of iOAM is purposely confined to a single network domain for simplicity, the authentic E2E data collection capability of iOAM is invaluable to network operators. In reality,
especially in carrier networks, a user packet may traverse several
network domains and pass through various tunnels for QoS, traffic
engineering, or public network traversal. To extend the scope of
iOAM’s applicability and fully realize iOAM’s potential, we need to
consider various network conditions. In this document, we describe
how iOAM should be processed in a network with tunnels.

A tunneling protocol usually needs to add another layer of protocol
header (i.e., the tunnel header) over the original packet. Within a
tunnel, only the outermost tunnel header is supposed to be processed
by a network node. Therefore, depending on the locations where the
iOAM header is encapsulated/decapsulated and the tunnel operation
mode, the iOAM processing is also different.

In general, there are two modes of tunnel operations: the Uniform
Model and the Pipe Model. The Uniform Model treats the nodes in a
tunnel uniformly as the nodes outside of the tunnel on an E2E path.
On the contrary, the Pipe Model abstracts all the nodes between the
tunnel ingress and egress as a circuit so no nodes in the tunnel is
visible to the nodes outside of the tunnel. The iOAM processing
behavior is discussed for each mode as follows.

2. Uniform Model

2.1. U1: IOAM Domain Starts and Ends outside of a Tunnel

In this case, a tunnel is fully in between the head node and the end
node of an iOAM path. This includes the situation that the tunnel
ingress coincides with the iOAM head node and/or the tunnel egress
coincides with the iOAM end node. The iOAM header handling for
different situation is described as follows:

- **iOAM head node is outside of the tunnel:** The iOAM header is
  encapsulated into the original packet and processed.

- **iOAM head node is the tunnel ingress:** The iOAM header is
  encapsulated into the original packet and processed. The iOAM
  header is copied from the original packet and encapsulated into
  the underlay protocol header.

- **iOAM end node is outside of the tunnel:** The iOAM header is
  decapsulated from the original packet after iOAM processing.

- **iOAM end node is the tunnel egress:** The iOAM header in the
  underlay protocol header is processed as usual. After the tunnel
  header is removed and the original packet is exposed, the iOAM
  header is copied to overwrite the original packet’s iOAM header.
After the iOAM processing is finished, the iOAM header is removed from the original packet.

- Other nodes in the iOAM domain: If the node is outside or inside of the tunnel, the iOAM header encapsulated in the outermost protocol header is processed. If the node is the tunnel ingress, the iOAM header in the original packet needs to be copied and encapsulated into the underlay protocol header. If the node is the tunnel egress, the iOAM header in the underlay protocol header needs to be copied to overwrite the iOAM header in the original packet.

### 2.2. U2: IOAM Domain Starts and Ends within a Tunnel

There is nothing special about this case since the transport network will not be aware of the tunnel. In this case, the iOAM is processed as usual.

### 2.3. U3: IOAM Domain Starts and Ends at any Nodes

For extra flexibility, the iOAM domain can be configured to start and end at any node (e.g., in or out of a tunnel). The iOAM header handling for different situations is described as follows:

- iOAM head node is outside of the tunnel: The iOAM header is encapsulated in the original packet.

- iOAM head node is the tunnel ingress: The iOAM header is encapsulated in the original packet first and processed. Then the iOAM header is copied from the original packet and encapsulated into the underlay protocol header. Meanwhile, the iOAM header in the original packet must be removed.

- iOAM head node is in the tunnel: The iOAM header is encapsulated in the underlay protocol header and processed.

- iOAM head node is the tunnel egress: The iOAM header is encapsulated in the underlay protocol header first and processed. When the tunnel header is removed, the iOAM header is copied from the underlay protocol header and encapsulated into the original packet.

- iOAM end node is outside of the tunnel: The iOAM header is decapsulated from the original packet.

- iOAM end node is the tunnel ingress: The iOAM header is decapsulated from the original packet.
o iOAM end node is in the tunnel: The iOAM header is decapsulated from the underlay protocol header.

o iOAM end node is the tunnel egress: The iOAM header is removed with the underlay protocol header.

o Tunnel ingress is in the IOAM domain: The iOAM header is decapsulated from the original packet and encapsulated in the underlay protocol header.

o Tunnel egress is in the IOAM domain: The iOAM header in the underlay protocol header is encapsulated into the original packet.

2.4. Discussion

U1 achieves the best implementation efficiency since it eliminates one encapsulation or decapsulation operation while U3 achieves the best flexibility and reduces the packet overhead.

Since a tunnel usually aggregates multiple flows, so U2 (or U3 when the iOAM head node is in a tunnel) can only conduct iOAM at the tunnel granularity and on aggregated flows.

3. Pipe Model

3.1. P1: IOAM Domain Starts and Ends outside of a Tunnel

This case includes the situation that the tunnel ingress coincides with the iOAM head node and/or the tunnel egress coincides with the iOAM end node.

In this mode, the iOAM header only exists in the original packet. It is not copied to the tunnel header. Within the tunnel, the iOAM header is invisible to the underlay network so it is not processed. At the tunnel ingress, the iOAM header is processed before the tunnel header is applied. At the tunnel egress, the iOAM header is processed after the tunnel header is removed. To the iOAM header, the entire tunnel appears to be just one hop.

3.2. P2: IOAM Domain Starts and Ends within a Tunnel

This mode is identical to U2.

3.3. Discussion

In P1, the hop-by-hop iOAM data is missing for the tunnel. However, this mode also provides a convenient way to pass through third party
tunnels in which either the iOAM is not supported or the tunnel operators do not participate in the iOAM service.

On the other hand, the tunnel operators can support iOAM independently to monitor the tunnel performance using the mode of P2. In this case, U1 can also be applied without any confliction, so both underlay and overlay can be monitored by different entities.

When iOAM works in the E2E operation mode as described in [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data], any tunnel on the path should be configured to the Pipe model in order to avoid the unnecessary iOAM header encapsulation/decapsulation.

4. Examples

Examples will be added in future revisions.

5. Security Considerations

TBD

6. IANA Considerations

N/A

7. Contributors

TBD.
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Abstract

The document describes a packet-marking variation of the IOAM DEX option, referred to as IOAM Marking. Similar to IOAM DEX, IOAM Marking does not carry the telemetry data in user packets but send the telemetry data through a dedicated packet. Unlike IOAM DEX, IOAM Marking does not require an extra instruction header. IOAM Marking raises some unique issues that need to be considered. This document formally describes the high level scheme and cover the common requirements and issues when applying IOAM Marking in different networks. IOAM Marking is complementary to the other on-path telemetry schemes such as IOAM trace and E2E options.

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/.
1. Motivation

To gain detailed data plane visibility to support effective network OAM, it is essential to be able to examine the trace of user packets along their forwarding paths. Such on-path flow data reflect the state and status of each user packet's real-time experience and provide valuable information for network monitoring, measurement, and diagnosis.

The telemetry data include but not limited to the detailed forwarding path, the timestamp/latency at each network node, and, in case of packet drop, the drop location, and the reason. The emerging programmable data plane devices allow user-defined data collection or conditional data collection based on trigger events. Such on-path flow data are from and about the live user traffic, which complements the data acquired through other passive and active OAM mechanisms such as IPFIX [RFC7011] and ICMP [RFC2925].

On-path telemetry was developed to cater to the need of collecting on-path flow data. There are two basic modes for on-path telemetry: the passport mode and the postcard mode. In the passport mode which is represented by IOAM trace option [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data], each node on the path adds the telemetry data to the user packets (i.e., stamp the passport). The accumulated data-trace carried by user packets are exported at a configured end node. In the postcard mode which is represented by IOAM direct export option (DEX) [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-direct-export], each node directly exports the telemetry data using an independent packet (i.e., send a postcard) to avoid carrying the data with user packets. The postcard mode is complementary to the passport mode.

IOAM DEX uses an instruction header to explicitly instruct the telemetry data to be collected. This document describes another variation of the postcard mode on-path telemetry, IOAM Marking. Unlike IOAM DEX, IOAM Marking does not require a telemetry instruction header. However, IOAM Marking has unique issues that need to be considered. This document discusses the challenges and their solutions which are common to the high-level scheme of IOAM Marking.

2. IOAM Marking: Marking-based IOAM Direct Export

As the name suggests, IOAM Marking only needs a marking-bit in the existing headers of user packets to trigger the telemetry data collection and export. The sketch of IOAM Marking is as follows. If on-path data need to be collected, the user packet is marked at the path head node. At each IOAM Marking-aware node, if the mark is detected, a postcard (i.e., the dedicated OAM packet triggered by a
marked user packet) is generated and sent to a collector. The postcard contains the data requested by the management plane. The requested data are configured by the management plane. Once the collector receives all the postcards for a single user packet, it can infer the packet’s forwarding path and analyze the data set. The path end node is configured to unmark the packets to its original format if necessary.

The overall architecture of IOAM Marking is depicted in Figure 1.

- The advantages of IOAM Marking are summarized as follows.

  * 1: IOAM Marking avoids augmenting user packets with new headers and the signaling for telemetry data collection remains in the data plane.

  * 2: IOAM Marking is extensible for collecting arbitrary new data to support possible future use cases. The data set to be collected can be configured through the management plane or control plane.
* 3: IOAM Marking can avoid interfering with the normal forwarding. The collected data are free to be transported independently through in-band or out-of-band channels. The data collecting, processing, assembly, encapsulation, and transport are, therefore, decoupled from the forwarding of the corresponding user packets and can be performed in data-plane slow-path if necessary.

* 4: For IOAM Marking, the types of data collected from each node can vary depending on application requirements and node capability.

* 5: IOAM Marking makes it easy to secure the collected data without exposing it to unnecessary entities. For example, both the configuration and the telemetry data can be encrypted and/or authenticated before being transported, so passive eavesdropping and a man-in-the-middle attack can both be deterred.

* 6: Even if a user packet under inspection is dropped at some node in the network, the postcards collected from the preceding nodes are still valid and can be used to diagnose the packet drop location and reason.

3. New Challenges

Although IOAM Marking has some unique features compared to the passport mode telemetry and the instruction-based IOAM DEX, it introduces a few new challenges.

* Challenge 1 (Packet Marking): A user packet needs to be marked to trigger the path-associated data collection. Since IOAM Marking does not augment user packets with any new header fields, it needs to reserve or reuse bits from the existing header fields. This raises a similar issue as in the Alternate Marking Scheme [RFC8321]

* Challenge 2 (Configuration): Since the packet header will not carry IOAM instructions anymore, the data plane devices need to be configured to know what data to collect. However, in general, the forwarding path of a flow packet (due to ECMP or dynamic routing) is unknown beforehand (note that there are some notable exceptions, such as segment routing). If the per-flow customized data collection is required, configuring the data set for each flow at all data plane devices might be expensive in terms of configuration load and data plane resources.

* Challenge 3 (Data Correlation): Due to the variable transport latency, the dedicated postcard packets for a single packet may arrive at the collector out of order or be dropped in networks for
some reason. In order to infer the packet forwarding path, the collector needs some information from the postcard packets to identify the user packet affiliation and the order of path node traversal.

* Challenge 4 (Load Overhead): Since each postcard packet has its header, the overall network bandwidth overhead of IOAM Marking can be high. A large number of postcards could add processing pressure on data collecting servers. That can be used as an attack vector for DoS.

4. IOAM Marking Design Considerations

To address the above challenges, we propose several design details of IOAM Marking.

4.1. Packet Marking

To trigger the path-associated data collection, usually, a single bit from some header field is sufficient. While no such bit is available, other packet-marking techniques are needed. We discuss several possible application scenarios.

* IPv4. Alternate Marking (AM) [RFC8321] is an IP flow performance measurement framework that also requires a single bit for packet coloring. The difference is that AM does in-network measurement while IOAM Marking only collects and exports data at network nodes (i.e., the data analysis is done at the collector rather than in the network nodes). AM suggests to use some reserved bit of the Flag field or some unused bit of the TOS field. Actually, AM can be considered a sub-case of IOAM Marking, so that the same bit can be used for IOAM Marking. The management plane is responsible for configuring the actual operation mode.

* SFC NSH. The OAM bit in the NSH header can be used to trigger the on-path data collection [RFC8300]. IOAM Marking does not add any other metadata to NSH.

* MPLS. Instead of choosing a header bit, we take advantage of the synonymous flow label [I-D.bryant-mpls-synonymous-flow-labels] approach to mark the packets. A synonymous flow label indicates the on-path data should be collected and forwarded through a postcard.

* SRv6: A flag bit in SRH can be reserved to trigger the on-path data collection [I-D.song-6man-srv6-pbt]. SRv6 OAM [I-D.ietf-6man-spring-srv6-oam] has adopted the O-bit in SRH flags as the marking bit to trigger the telemetry.
4.2. Flow Path Discovery

In case the path that a flow traverses is unknown in advance, all IOAM Marking-aware nodes should be configured to react to the marked packets by exporting some basic data, such as node ID and TTL before a data set template for that flow is configured. This way, the management plane can learn the flow path dynamically.

If the management plane wants to collect the on-path data for some flow, it configures the head node(s) with a probability or time interval for the flow packet marking. When the first marked packet is forwarded in the network, the IOAM Marking-aware nodes will export the basic data set to the collector. Hence, the flow path is identified. If other data types need to be collected, the management plane can further configure the data set’s template to the target nodes on the flow’s path. The IOAM Marking-aware nodes collect and export data accordingly if the packet is marked and a data set template is present.

If the flow path is changed for any reason, the new path can be quickly learned by the collector. Consequently, the management plane controller can be directed to configure the nodes on the new path. The outdated configuration can be automatically timed out or explicitly revoked by the management plane controller.

4.3. Packet Identity for Export Data Correlation

The collector needs to correlate all the postcard packets for a single user packet. Once this is done, the TTL (or the timestamp, if the network time is synchronized) can be used to infer the flow forwarding path. The key issue here is to correlate all the postcards for the same user packet.

The first possible approach includes the flow ID plus the user packet ID in the OAM packets. For example, the flow ID can be the 5-tuple IP header of the user traffic, and the user packet ID can be some unique information pertaining to a user packet (e.g., the sequence number of a TCP packet).

If the packet marking interval is large enough, the flow ID is enough to identify a user packet. As a result, it can be assumed that all the exported postcard packets for the same flow during a short time interval belong to the same user packet.

Alternatively, if the network is synchronized, then the flow ID plus the timestamp at each node can also infer the postcard affiliation. However, some errors may occur under some circumstances. For example, two consecutive user packets from the same flows are marked,
but one exported postcard from a node is lost. It is difficult for the collector to decide to which user packet the remaining postcard is related. In many cases, such a rare error has no catastrophic consequence. Therefore it is tolerable.

4.4. Control the Load

IOAM Marking should not be applied to all the packets all the time. It is better to be used in an interactive environment where the network telemetry applications dynamically decide which subset of traffic is under scrutiny. The network devices can limit the packet marking rate through sampling and metering. The postcard packets can be distributed to different servers to balance the processing load.

It is important to understand that the total amount of data exported by IOAM Marking is identical to that of IOAM trace option. The only extra overhead is the packet header of the postcards. In the case of IOAM trace option, it carries the data from each node throughout the path to the end node before exporting the aggregated data. On the other hand, IOAM Marking directly exports local data. The overall network bandwidth impact depends on the network topology and scale, and in some cases IOAM Marking could be more bandwidth efficient.

5. Implementation Recommendation

5.1. Configuration

The head node’s ACL should be configured to filter out the target flows for telemetry data collection. Optionally, a flow packet sampling rate or probability could be configured to monitor a subset of the flow packets.

The telemetry data set that should be exported by postcards at each path node could be configured using the data set templates specified, for example, in IPFIX [RFC7011]. In future revisions, we will provide more details.

The IOAM Marking-aware path nodes could be configured to respond or ignore the marked packets.

5.2. Postcard Format

The postcard should use the same data export format as that used by IOAM. [I-D.spiegel-ippm-ioam-rawexport] proposes a raw format that can be interpreted by IPFIX. In future revisions, we will provide more details.
5.3. Data Correlation

Enough information should be included to help the collector to correlate and order the postcards for a single user packet. Section 4.3 provides several possible means. The application scenario and network protocol are important factors to determine the means to use. In future revisions, we will provide details for representative applications.

6. Use Cases

The MPLS Design Team has been investigating extensibility options for the MPLS data plane.

The challenge has been to continue to support existing MPLS architecture, backwards compatibility as well as not excessively increase the depth of the MPLS label stack with a variety of functional SPL labels and NAI indicators similar in concept to the MPLS Entropy label ELI, EL added to the label stack, as well as the MPLS extension headers being in Stack or post stack.

Reference Augmented Forwarding (RAF) [I-D.raszuk-mpls-raf-fwk] utilizes In Stack Data (ISD) with parity to Entropy Label stack (TL,RFI,RFV,AL) and control plane extension to distribute special network actions and forwarding behaviors.

Reference Augmented Forwarding (RAF) keeps the ISD and PSD stack depth in check by using an alternative means of carrying the IOAM data using IGP control plane extension TLV to carry the data to provide In-Situ IOAM on path telemetry using the postcard based telemetry.

The MPLS Design Team may come up with other alternatives to carry IOAM data such as the IGP extension mentioned and maybe other solutions, which will heavily rely on the the postcard based solution.

With Segment Routing SR-MPLS and SRv6 as Maximum SID Depth (MSD) as well as PMTU in SR Policy are critical issues for SR path instantiation by a controller, postcard based telemetry will become a critical solution to ensure that IOAM telemetry can be viable for operators by eliminating IOAM data from being carried in-situ in the SR-TE policy path.
This draft provides a critical optimization that fills the gaps with IOAM DEX related to packet marking triggers using existing mechanisms as well as flow path discovery mechanisms to avoid configuration of on path data plane node complexity and helps mitigate SR MSD and PMTU issues.

7. Security Considerations

Several security issues need to be considered.

* Eavesdrop and tamper: the postcards can be encrypted and authenticated to avoid such security threats.

* DoS attack: IOAM Marking can be limited to a single administrative domain. The mark must be removed at the egress domain edge. The node can rate-limit the extra traffic incurred by postcards.

8. IANA Considerations

No requirement for IANA is identified.
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1. Introduction

In-situ Operations, Administration, and Maintenance (IOAM) records operational and telemetry information in the packet while the packet traverses a path between two points in the network. IOAM data fields are defined in [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data]. This document discusses how In-situ Operations, Administration, and Maintenance (IOAM) information can be exported in raw format, i.e. uninterpreted format, from network devices to systems, such as monitoring or analytics systems using IPFIX [RFC7011].

"Raw export of IOAM data" refers to a mode of operation where a node exports the IOAM data as it is received in the packet. The exporting node neither interprets, aggregates nor reformat the IOAM data before it is exported. Raw export of IOAM data is to support an operational model where the processing and interpretation of IOAM data is decoupled from the operation of encapsulating/updating/decapsulating IOAM data, which is also referred to as IOAM data-plane operation. The figure below shows the separation of concerns for IOAM export: Exporting IOAM data is performed by the "IOAM node" which performs IOAM data-plane operation, whereas the interpretation of IOAM data is performed by the IOAM data processing system. The separation of concerns is to off-load interpretation, aggregation and formatting of IOAM data from the node which performs data-plane operations. In other words, a node which is focused on data-plane operations, i.e. forwarding of packets and handling IOAM data will not be tasked to also interpret the IOAM data, but can leave this task to another system. Note that for scalability reasons, a single IOAM node could choose to export IOAM data to several IOAM data processing systems.
IOAM node: IOAM encapsulating, IOAM decapsulating or IOAM transit node.

IOAM data processing system: System that receives raw IOAM data and provides for formatting, aggregation and interpretation of the IOAM data.

Monitoring/Analytics system: System that receives telemetry and other operational information from a variety of sources and provides for correlation and interpretation of the data received.

Raw export of IOAM data is typically generated by network devices at the edges of the network. Deployment and use-case dependent, such as in case of direct export [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-direct-export] or in cases where the operator is interested in dropped packets, raw export of IOAM data may be generated by IOAM transit nodes.
1.1. Requirements

Requirements for raw export of IOAM data:

- Export all IOAM information contained in a packet.
- Export a specific IOAM data type - Incremental Trace type, Preallocated Trace type, Proof of Transit type, Edge to Edge type, Direct Export type.
- Export IOAM trace data associated with a packet, even if that data was never included in a transmitted or received packet in the network, for example in case of direct export.
- Support coalescing of the IOAM data from multiple packets into a single raw export packet.
- Support export of additional parts of the packet, other than the IOAM data as part of the raw export. This could be parts of the packet header and/or parts of the packet payload. This additional information provides context to the IOAM data (e.g. to be used for flow identification) and is to enable the IOAM data processing system to perform further analysis on the received data.
- Report the reason why IOAM data was exported. The "reason for export" is to complement the IOAM data retrieved from the packet. For example, if a packet was dropped by a node due to congestion, it could be helpful to export the IOAM data of this dropped packet along with an indication that the packet that the IOAM data belongs to was dropped due to congestion.

1.2. Scope

This document discusses raw export of IOAM data using IPFIX.

The following is considered out of scope for this document:

- Protocols other than IPFIX for raw export of IOAM data.
- Interpretation or aggregation of IOAM data prior to exporting.
- Configuration of network devices so that they can determine when to generate IOAM reports, and what information to include in those reports.
- Events that trigger generation of IOAM reports.
o Selection of particular destinations within distributed telemetry monitoring systems, to which IOAM reports will be sent.

o Export format for flow statistics or processed/interpreted/aggregated IOAM data.

2. Conventions

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [RFC2119].

Abbreviations used in this document:

E2E:       Edge to Edge
IOAM:      In-situ Operations, Administration, and Maintenance
MTU:       Maximum Transmit Unit
OAM:       Operations, Administration, and Maintenance
POT:       Proof of Transit

3. IPFIX for IOAM raw data export

IPFIX, being a generic export protocol, can export any Information Elements as long as they are described in the information model. The IPFIX protocol is well suited for and is defined as the protocol for exporting packet samples in [RFC5476].

IPFIX/PSAMP [RFC7011], [RFC5476] already define many of the information elements needed for exporting sections of packets needed for deriving context and raw IOAM data export. This document specifies extensions of the IPFIX information model for meeting the requirements in Section 1.1.

3.1. Key IPFIX information elements leveraged for IOAM raw data export

The existing IPFIX Information Elements that are required for IOAM raw data export are listed here. Their details are available in IANA’s IPFIX registry [IANA-IPFIX].

The existing IPFIX Information Elements used to carry the sections of the packets including IOAM data within it are as follows:

313  - ipHeaderPacketSection
315 - dataLinkFrameSection

The following Information Elements will be used to provide context to the ipHeaderPacketSection and dataLinkFrameSection as described in [IANA-IPFIX]:

408 - dataLinkFrameType
409 - sectionOffset
410 - sectionExportedOctets

The following Information Element will be used to provide forwarding status of the flow and any attached reasons.

89 - forwardingStatus

3.2. New IPFIX information elements leveraged for IOAM raw data export

IOAM data raw export using IPFIX requires a set of new information elements which are described in this section.

3.2.1. ioamReportFlags

Description:

This Information Element describes properties associated with an IOAM report.

The ioamReportFlags data type is an 8-bit field. The following bits are defined here:

Bit 0  Dropped Association - Dropped packet of interest.

Bit 1  Congested Queue Association - Indicates the presence of congestion on a monitored queue.

Bit 2  Tracked Flow Association - Matched a flow of interest.

Bit 3-7  Reserved

IANA is requested to create a new subregistry for IOAM Report Flags and fill it with the initial list from the description. New assignments for IOAM Encapsulation Types are administered by IANA through Expert Review [RFC5226] i.e., review by one of a group of experts designated by an IETF Area Director.

Abstract Data Type: unsigned8
Data Type Semantics: flags

ElementId: TBD1

Status: current

3.2.2. ioamEncapsulationType

Description:

This Information Element specifies the type of encapsulation to interpret ioamPreallocatedTraceData, ioamIncrementalTraceData, ioamE2EData, ioamPOTData, ioamDirectExportData.

The following ioamEncapsulationType values are defined here:

- 0  None : IOAM data follows format defined in [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data]
- 1  GRE : IOAM data follows format defined in [I-D.weis-ippm-ioam-eth]
- 2  IPv6 : IOAM data follows format defined in [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-ipv6-options]
- 3  VXLAN-GPE : IOAM data follows format defined in [I-D.brockners-ippm-ioam-vxlan-gpe]
- 4  GENEVE Option: IOAM data follows format defined in [I-D.brockners-ippm-ioam-geneve]
- 5  GENEVE Next Protocol: IOAM data follows format defined in [I-D.weis-ippm-ioam-eth]
- 6  NSH : IOAM data follows format defined in [I-D.ietf-sfc-ioam-nsh]

IANA is requested to create a new subregistry for IOAM Encapsulation Types and fill it with the initial list from the description. New assignments for IOAM Encapsulation Types are administered by IANA through Expert Review [RFC5226] i.e., review by one of a group of experts designated by an IETF Area Director.

Abstract Data Type: unsigned8

Data Type Semantics: identifier

ElementId: TBD2

Status: current
3.2.3. ioamPreallocatedTraceData

Description:

This Information Element carries n octets of IOAM Preallocated Trace data defined in [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data].

The format of the data is determined by the ioamEncapsulationType information element, if present. When the ioamEncapsulationType information element is present and has a value other than "None", and with sufficient length, this element may also report octets from subsequent headers and payload. If no ioamEncapsulationType information element is present, then the encapsulation type shall be assumed to be "None" and this information element only contains octets from the IOAM Preallocated Trace Option.

Abstract Data Type: octetArray

ElementId: TBD3

Status: current

3.2.4. ioamIncrementalTraceData

Description:

This Information Element carries n octets of IOAM Incremental Trace data defined in [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data].

The format of the data is determined by the ioamEncapsulationType information element, if present. When the ioamEncapsulationType information element is present and has a value other than "None", and with sufficient length, this element may also report octets from subsequent headers and payload. If no ioamEncapsulationType information element is present, then the encapsulation type shall be assumed to be "None" and this information element only contains octets from the IOAM Incremental Trace Option.

Abstract Data Type: octetArray

ElementId: TBD4

Status: current
3.2.5. ioamE2EData

Description:

This Information Element carries n octets of IOAM E2E data defined in [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data].

The format of the data is determined by the ioamEncapsulationType information element, if present. When the ioamEncapsulationType information element is present and has a value other than "None", and with sufficient length, this element may also report octets from subsequent headers and payload. If no ioamEncapsulationType information element is present, then the encapsulation type shall be assumed to be "None" and this information element only contains octets from the IOAM Edge-to-Edge Option.

Abstract Data Type: octetArray

ElementId: TBD5

Status: current

3.2.6. ioamPOTData

Description:

This Information Element carries n octets of IOAM POT data defined in [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data].

The format of the data is determined by the ioamEncapsulationType information element, if present. When the ioamEncapsulationType information element is present and has a value other than "None", and with sufficient length, this element may also report octets from subsequent headers and payload. If no ioamEncapsulationType information element is present, then the encapsulation type shall be assumed to be "None" and this information element only contains octets from the IOAM Proof of Transit Option.

Abstract Data Type: octetArray

ElementId: TBD6

Status: current
3.2.7. ioamDirectExportData

Description:

This Information Element carries n octets of IOAM Direct Export data defined in [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-direct-export].

In addition to the fields from the IOAM Direct Export Option header in the packet, this information element includes all of the trace data from the exporting node, based on the IOAM-Trace-Type value. This data is appended inside ioamDirectExportData following the bit order of the IOAM-Trace-Type field, similar to the way that IOAM encapsulating nodes append trace data in Incremental Trace Option headers.

The format of the data is determined by the ioamEncapsulationType information element, if present. When the ioamEncapsulationType information element is present and has a value other than "None", and with sufficient length, this element may also report octets from subsequent headers and payload. If no ioamEncapsulationType information element is present, then the encapsulation type shall be assumed to be "None" and this information element only contains octets from the IOAM Direct Export Option plus the corresponding trace data.

Abstract Data Type: octetArray

ElementId: TBD7

Status: current

3.2.8. ipHeaderPacketSectionWithPadding

Description:

This Information Element carries a series of n octets from the IP header of a sampled packet, starting sectionOffset octets into the IP header.

However, if no sectionOffset field corresponding to this Information Element is present, then a sectionOffset of zero applies, and the octets MUST be from the start of the IP header.

With sufficient length, this element also reports octets from the IP payload. However, full packet capture of arbitrary packet streams is explicitly out of scope per the Security Considerations sections of [RFC5477] and [RFC2804].
When this Information Element has a fixed length, this MAY include padding octets that are used to fill out that fixed length.

When this information element has a variable length, the variable length MAY include up to 3 octets of padding, used to preserve 4-octet alignment of subsequent Information Elements or subsequent records within the same set.

In either case of fixed or variable length, the amount of populated octets MAY be specified in the sectionExportedOctets field corresponding to this Information Element, in which case the remainder (if any) MUST be padding. If there is no sectionExportedOctets field corresponding to this Information Element, then all octets MUST be populated unless the total length of the IP packet is less than the fixed length of this Information Element, in which case the remainder MUST be padding.

Abstract Data Type: octetArray

ElementId: TBD8

Status: current

3.2.9. ethernetFrameSection

Description:

This Information Element carries a series of n octets from the IEEE 802.3 Ethernet frame of a sampled packet, starting after the preamble and start frame delimiter (SFD), plus sectionOffset octets into the frame if there is a sectionOffset field corresponding to this Information Element.

With sufficient length, this element also reports octets from the Ethernet payload. However, full packet capture of arbitrary packet streams is explicitly out of scope per the Security Considerations sections of [RFC5477] and [RFC2804].

When this Information Element has a fixed length, this MAY include padding octets that are used to fill out that fixed length.

When this information element has a variable length, the variable length MAY include up to 3 octets of padding, used to preserve 4-octet alignment of subsequent Information Elements or subsequent records within the same set.

In either case of fixed or variable length, the amount of populated octets MAY be specified in the sectionExportedOctets field.
corresponding to this Information Element, in which case the remainder (if any) MUST be padding. If there is no sectionExportedOctets field corresponding to this Information Element, then all octets MUST be populated unless the total length of the Ethernet frame is less than the fixed length of this Information Element, in which case the remainder MUST be padding.

Abstract Data Type: octetArray

ElementId: TBD9

Status: current

4. Examples

This section shows a set of examples of how IOAM information along with other parts of the packet can be carried using IPFIX.

4.1. Fixed Length IP Packet

This example shows a fixed length IP packet. IOAM data is part of the ipHeaderPacketSection.
### 4.2. Variable Length IP Packet (length < 255)

This example shows a variable length IP packet, with length < 255 bytes. IOAM data is part of the ipHeaderPacketSectionWithPadding.
4.3. Variable Length IP Packet (length > 255)

This example shows a variable length IP packet, with length > 255 bytes. IOAM data is part of the ipHeaderPacketSectionWithPadding.
4.4. Variable Length ETHERNET Packet (length < 255)

This example shows a variable length Ethernet packet, with length < 255 bytes. IOAM data is part of the ethernetFrameSection.
4.5. Variable Length IP Packet with Fixed Length IOAM Incremental Trace Data

This example shows a variable length IP packet with length < 255 bytes and fixed length ioamIncrementalTraceData carried separately.
### 4.6. Variable Length IP Packet with Variable Length IOAM Incremental Trace Data

This example shows a variable length IP packet with length < 255 bytes and variable length ioamIncrementalTraceData with length < 255 bytes carried separately.
5. IANA Considerations

IANA is requested to allocate code points for the following Information Elements in [IANA-IPFIX]:

TBD1  ioamReportFlags
TBD2  ioamEncapsulationType
TBD3  ioamPreallocatedTraceData
TBD4  ioamIncrementalTraceData
TBD5  ioamE2EData
TBD6  ioamPOTData
TBD7  ioamDirectExportData

TBD8  ipHeaderPacketSectionWithPadding

TBD9  ethernetFrameSection

See Section 3.2 for further details.

IANA is requested to create subregistries for ioamReportFlags defined in Section 3.2.1 and ioamEncapsulationType defined in Section 3.2.2.

6. Manageability Considerations

Manageability considerations will be addressed in a later version of this document.

7. Security Considerations

Security considerations will be addressed in a later version of this document.
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Abstract

In-situ Operations, Administration, and Maintenance (IOAM) records operational and telemetry information in the packet while the packet traverses a path between two points in the network. This document defines an EtherType that identifies IOAM data fields as being the next protocol in a packet, and a header that encapsulates the IOAM data fields.

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
1. Introduction

In-situ Operations, Administration, and Maintenance (IOAM) records operational and telemetry information in the packet while the packet traverses a particular network domain. The term "in-situ" refers to
the fact that the IOAM data fields are added to the data packets rather than being sent within packets specifically dedicated to OAM. This document proposes a new EtherType for IOAM and defines how IOAM data fields are carried as part of encapsulations where the IOAM data fields follow an encapsulation header that uses an EtherType to denote the type of protocol data unit. Examples of these protocols are GRE [RFC2784] [RFC2890] and Geneve [RFC8926]). This document outlines how IOAM data fields are encoded in these encapsulation headers.

2. Conventions

2.1. 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.

2.2. Abbreviations

Abbreviations used in this document:

- E2E: Edge-to-Edge
- Geneve: Generic Network Virtualization Encapsulation
- GRE: Generic Routing Encapsulation
- IOAM: In-situ Operations, Administration, and Maintenance
- OAM: Operations, Administration, and Maintenance
- POT: Proof of Transit

3. IOAM EtherType

When the IOAM data fields are included within an encapsulation that identifies the next protocol using an EtherType (e.g., GRE or Geneve) the presence of IOAM data fields are identified with TBD_IOAM. When this EtherType is used, an additional IOAM header is also included. This header indicates the type of IOAM data fields that follows, and the next protocol that follows the IOAM data fields.
The IOAM encapsulation is defined as follows.

**IOAM Type:** 8-bit field defining the IOAM Option type, as defined in Section 5.1 of [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data].

**IOAM HDR Len:** 8 bit Length field contains the length of the IOAM header in 4-octet units.

**Next Protocol:** 16 bits Next Protocol Type field contains the protocol type of the protocol data unit following IOAM protocol header. Protocol Type is defined to be an EtherType value from [ETYPES]. An implementation receiving a packet containing a Protocol Type which is not listed in one of those registries SHOULD discard the packet.

**IOAM Option and Data Space:** IOAM option header and data is present as specified by the IOAM-Option-Type field, and is defined in Section 5 of [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data].

Multiple IOAM options MAY be included within the encapsulation header. For example, if a GRE encapsulation contains two IOAM options before the data payload, the Next Protocol field of the first IOAM option will contain the value of TBD_IOAM, while the Next Protocol field of the second IOAM option will contain the EtherType indicating the type of the data payload.

4. Usage Examples of the IOAM EtherType

The IOAM EtherType can be used with any encapsulation that uses EtherType to denote the type of the protocol data unit. The following sections show how it can be used when GRE and Geneve are used as the encapsulation header.
4.1. Example: GRE Encapsulation of IOAM Data Fields

When IOAM data fields are carried in GRE, the IOAM encapsulation defined above follows the GRE header, as shown in Figure 1.

```
+-----------+-----------+-----------+-----------+
|           |           |           |           |
|   C       |   K       |   S       | Reserved0 |
|-----------+-----------+-----------+-----------|
| Ver       | Protocol Type = <TBD_IOAM> |           |
|-----------+-----------+-----------+-----------|
|           |           |           |           |
| Checksum (optional) | Reserved1 (Optional) | G         |
|-----------+-----------+-----------+-----------|
|           |           |           |           |
| Key (optional) |                   | E         |
|-----------+-----------+-----------+-----------|
|           |           |           |           |
| Sequence Number (Optional) |           |
|-----------+-----------+-----------+-----------|
|           |           |           |           |
| IOAM-Type | IOAM HDR len| Next Protocol |
|-----------+-----------+-----------+-----------|
|           |           |           |           |
| !           | !           | !           | !           |
| IOAM Option and Data Space | M         |
+-----------+-----------+-----------+-----------|
|           |           |           |           |
|           |           |           |           |
|           |           |           |           |
|           |           |           |           |
|           |           |           |           |
| Payload + Padding (L2/L3/ESP/...) |           |
+-----------+-----------+-----------+-----------|
```

Figure 1: GRE Encapsulation Example

The GRE header and fields are defined in [RFC2890]. The GRE Protocol Type value is set to TBD_IOAM.

Figure 2 shows two example protocol header stacks that use GRE along with IOAM. IOAM Option-Types (the below diagram uses "IOAM" as shorthand for IOAM Option-Types) are sequenced in behind the GRE header that follows the "outer" header of the next protocol unit.
4.2. Example: Geneve Encapsulation of IOAM Data Fields

When IOAM data fields are carried in Geneve, the IOAM encapsulation defined above follows the Geneve header, as shown in Figure 3.
Figure 3: Geneve Encapsulation Example

The Geneve header and fields are defined in [RFC8926]. The Geneve Protocol Type value is TBD_IOAM.

5. Security Considerations

This document describes the encapsulation of IOAM data fields in the encapsulation header such as GRE and Geneve that uses EtherType to denote the protocol data unit. Security considerations of the specific IOAM data fields for each case (i.e., Trace, Proof of Transit, and E2E) are described in [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data].

As this document describes new protocol fields within the existing encapsulation, any security considerations of the respective encapsulation header is applicable. When the encapsulation is GRE, the security considerations of [RFC2890] is applicable. When the encapsulation is Geneve, the security considerations of [RFC8926] is applicable.

IOAM data fields SHOULD be integrity protected (e.g., with [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data-integrity]) to detect changes made by a device between the IOAM encapsulating node and the IOAM decapsulating node.
6. IANA Considerations

A new EtherType value is requested to be added to the [ETYPES] IANA registry by IEEE Registration Authority. The description should be "In-situ OAM (IOAM)".
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Abstract

This document describes an extension to the echo request/reply mechanisms used in IPv6, MPLS, SFC and BIER environments, which can be used within an IOAM domain, allowing the IOAM encapsulating node to acquire the enabled IOAM capabilities of each IOAM transit node and/or IOAM decapsulating node.
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1. Introduction

The Data Fields for In-situ OAM (IOAM) [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data] defines data fields that record OAM information within the packet while the packet traverses a particular network domain, which is called an IOAM domain. IOAM can be used to complement OAM mechanisms based on, e.g., ICMP or other types of probe packets, and IOAM mechanisms can be leveraged where mechanisms using, e.g., ICMP do not apply or do not offer the desired results.

As specified in [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data], within the IOAM-domain, the IOAM data may be updated by network nodes that the packet traverses. The device which adds an IOAM data container to the packet to capture IOAM data is called the "IOAM encapsulating node". In contrast, the device which removes the IOAM data container is referred to as the "IOAM decapsulating node". Nodes within the domain that are aware of IOAM data and read and/or write or process the IOAM data are called "IOAM transit nodes". Both the IOAM...
encapsulating node and the decapsulating node are referred to as domain edge devices, which can be hosts or network devices.

In order to add the correct IOAM data container to the packet, the IOAM encapsulating node needs to know the enabled IOAM capabilities at the IOAM transit nodes and/or the IOAM decapsulating node as a whole, e.g., how many IOAM transit nodes will add tracing data, and what kinds of data fields will be added. A centralized controller could be used in some IOAM deployments. The IOAM encapsulating node can acquire these IOAM capabilities info from the centralized controller, through, e.g., NETCONF/YANG, PCEP, or BGP. In the IOAM deployment scenario where there is no centralized controller, NETCONF/YANG or IGP may be used for the IOAM encapsulating node to acquire these IOAM capabilities info, however, whether NETCONF/YANG or IGP has some limitations as follows.

- When NETCONF/YANG is used in this scenario, each IOAM encapsulating node (including the host when it takes the role of an IOAM encapsulating node) needs to implement a NETCONF Client, each IOAM transit node and IOAM decapsulating node (including the host when it takes the role of an IOAM decapsulating node) needs to implement a NETCONF Server, the complexity can be an issue. Furthermore, each IOAM encapsulating node needs to establish NETCONF Connection with each IOAM transit node and IOAM decapsulating node, the scalability can be an issue.

- When IGP is used in this scenario, the IGP domain and an IOAM domain don’t always have the same coverage. For example, when the IOAM encapsulating node or the IOAM decapsulating node is a host, the availability can be an issue. Furthermore, it might be too challenging to reflect IOAM capabilities at the IOAM transit node and/or the IOAM decapsulating node if these are controlled by a local policy depending on the identity of the IOAM encapsulating node.

This document describes an extension to the echo request/reply mechanisms used in IPv6, MPLS, SFC and BIER environments, which can be used within an IOAM domain where no Centralized Controller exists, allowing the IOAM encapsulating node to acquire the enabled IOAM capabilities of each IOAM transit node and/or IOAM decapsulating node.

The following documents contain references to the echo request/reply mechanisms used in IPv6, MPLS, SFC and BIER environments:

This feature described in this document is assumedly applied to explicit path (strict or loose), because the precondition for this feature to work is that the echo request reaches each IOAM transit node as live traffic traverses.

2. Conventions

2.1. 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.

2.2. Abbreviations

BIER: Bit Index Explicit Replication
BGP: Border Gateway Protocol
E2E: Edge to Edge
ICMP: Internet Control Message Protocol
IGP: Interior Gateway Protocol
IOAM: In-situ Operations, Administration, and Maintenance
LSP: Label Switched Path
MPLS: Multi-Protocol Label Switching
MBZ: Must Be Zero
MTU: Maximum Transmission Unit
3. IOAM Capabilities Formats

3.1. IOAM Capabilities Query TLV in the Echo Request

In echo request IOAM Capabilities Query uses TLV (Type-Length-Value tuple) which have the following format:

```
0                   1                   2                   3
     0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| Type = IOAM Capabilities Query |            Length             |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
   .                   .                     .
List of Namespace-IDs                  .
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+

Figure 1: IOAM Capabilities Query TLV in the Echo Request

When this TLV is present in the echo request sent by an IOAM encapsulating node, it means that the IOAM encapsulating node requests the receiving node to reply with its enabled IOAM capabilities. If there is no IOAM capability to be reported by the receiving node, then this TLV SHOULD be ignored by the receiving node, which means the receiving node SHOULD send echo reply without IOAM capabilities or no echo reply, in the light of whether the echo request includes other TLV than IOAM Capabilities Query TLV. List of Namespace-IDs MAY be included in this TLV of the echo request. In that case, the IOAM encapsulating node requests only the IOAM capabilities that match one of the Namespace-IDs. The Namespace-ID has the same definition as what’s specified in [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data].
Type is set to the value that identifies it as an IOAM Capabilities Query TLV.

Length is the length of the TLV’s Value field in octets, including a List of Namespace-IDs.

Value field of this TLV is zero-padded to align to a 4-octet boundary.

### 3.2. IOAM Capabilities Response TLV in the Echo Reply

In echo reply IOAM Capabilities Response uses TLV which have the following format:

```
  0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-----------------------------------------------+
| Type = IOAM Capabilities Resp |            Length             |
+-----------------------------------------------+
  +-----------------------------------------------+
| List of Sub-TLVs                      |
+-----------------------------------------------+
```

Figure 2: IOAM Capabilities Response TLV in the Echo Reply

When this TLV is present in the echo reply sent by an IOAM transit node and/or an IOAM decapsulating node, it means that the IOAM function is enabled at this node, and this TLV contains the enabled IOAM capabilities of the sender. A list of Sub-TLVs which contains the IOAM capabilities SHOULD be included in this TLV of the echo reply. Note that the IOAM encapsulating node or the IOAM decapsulating node can also be an IOAM transit node.

Type is set to the value that identifies it as an IOAM Capabilities Response TLV.

Length is the length of the TLV’s Value field in octets, including a List of Sub-TLVs.

Value field of this TLV or any Sub-TLV is zero-padded to align to a 4-octet boundary. Based on the data fields for IOAM, specified in [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data] and [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-direct-export], six kinds of Sub-TLVs are defined in this document. The same type of the sub-TLV MAY be in the IOAM Capabilities Response TLV more than once only if with a different Namespace-ID.
3.2.1. IOAM Pre-allocated Tracing Capabilities sub-TLV

When this sub-TLV is present in the IOAM Capabilities Response TLV, it means that the sending node is an IOAM transit node and IOAM pre-allocated tracing function is enabled at this IOAM transit node.

Sub-type is set to the value that identifies it as an IOAM Pre-allocated Tracing Capabilities sub-TLV.

Length is the length of the sub-TLV’s Value field in octets. If Egress_if_id is in the short format, which is 16 bits long, it MUST be set to 10. If Egress_if_id is in the wide format, which is 32 bits long, it MUST be set to 12.

IOAM-Trace-Type field has the same definition as what’s specified in section 5.4 of [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data].

Reserved field is reserved for future use and MUST be set to zero.

Namespace-ID field has the same definition as what’s specified in section 5.3 of [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data], it should be one of the Namespace-IDs listed in the IOAM Capabilities Query TLV of echo request.

Egress_MTU field has 16 bits and specifies the MTU of the egress direction out of which the sending node would forward the received echo request, it should be the MTU of the egress interface or the MTU between the sending node and the downstream IOAM transit node.

Egress_if_id field has 16 bits (in short format) or 32 bits (in wide format) and specifies the identifier of the egress interface out of which the sending node would forward the received echo request.
3.2.2. IOAM Incremental Tracing Capabilities sub-TLV

When this sub-TLV is present in the IOAM Capabilities Response TLV, it means that the sending node is an IOAM transit node and IOAM incremental tracing function is enabled at this IOAM transit node.

Sub-type is set to the value that identifies it as an IOAM Incremental Tracing Capabilities sub-TLV.

Length is the length of the sub-TLV’s Value field in octets. If Egress_if_id is in the short format, which is 16 bits long, it MUST be set to 10. If Egress_if_id is in the wide format, which is 32 bits long, it MUST be set to 12.

IOAM-Trace-Type field has the same definition as what’s specified in section 5.4 of [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data].

Reserved field is reserved for future use and MUST be set to zero.

Namespace-ID field has the same definition as what’s specified in section 5.3 of [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data], it should be one of the Namespace-IDs listed in the IOAM Capabilities Query TLV of echo request.

Egress_MTU field has 16 bits and specifies the MTU of the egress direction out of which the sending node would forward the received echo request, it should be the MTU of the egress interface or the MTU between the sending node and the downstream IOAM transit node.

Egress_if_id field has 16 bits (in short format) or 32 bits (in wide format) and specifies the identifier of the egress interface out of which the sending node would forward the received echo request.
3.2.3. IOAM Proof of Transit Capabilities sub-TLV

When this sub-TLV is present in the IOAM Capabilities Response TLV, it means that the sending node is an IOAM transit node and IOAM proof of transit function is enabled at this IOAM transit node.

Sub-type is set to the value that identifies it as an IOAM Proof of Transit Capabilities sub-TLV.

Length is the length of the sub-TLV’s Value field in octets and MUST be set to 4.

Namespace-ID field has the same definition as what’s specified in section 5.3 of [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data], it should be one of the Namespace-IDs listed in the IOAM Capabilities Query TLV of echo request.

IOAM-POT-Type field and P bit have the same definition as what’s specified in section 5.5 of [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data]. If the IOAM encapsulating node receives IOAM-POT-Type and/or P bit values from an IOAM transit node that are different from its own, then the IOAM encapsulating node MAY choose to abandon the proof of transit function or to select one kind of IOAM-POT-Type and P bit, it’s based on the policy applied to the IOAM encapsulating node.

SoR field has two bits, which means the size of "Random" and "Cumulative" data that are specified in section 5.5 of [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data]. This document defines SoR as follow:

0b00 means 64-bit "Random" and 64-bit "Cumulative" data.

0b01~0b11: Reserved for future standardization

Reserved field is reserved for future use and MUST be set to zero.
3.2.4. IOAM Edge-to-Edge Capabilities sub-TLV

![Figure 6: IOAM Edge-to-Edge Capabilities Sub-TLV](image)

When this sub-TLV is present in the IOAM Capabilities Response TLV, it means that the sending node is an IOAM decapsulating node and IOAM edge-to-edge function is enabled at this IOAM decapsulating node. That is to say, if the IOAM encapsulating node receives this sub-TLV, the IOAM encapsulating node can determine that the node which sends this sub-TLV is an IOAM decapsulating node.

Sub-type is set to the value that identifies it as an IOAM Edge-to-Edge Capabilities sub-TLV.

Length is the length of the sub-TLV’s Value field in octets and MUST be set to 8.

Namespace-ID field has the same definition as what’s specified in section 5.3 of [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data], it should be one of the Namespace-IDs listed in the IOAM Capabilities Query TLV of echo request.

IOAM-E2E-Type field has the same definition as what’s specified in section 5.6 of [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data].

TSF field specifies the timestamp format used by the sending node. This document defines TSF as follow:

- 0b00: PTP timestamp format
- 0b01: NTP timestamp format
- 0b10: POSIX timestamp format
- 0b11: Reserved for future standardization

TSL field specifies the timestamp length used by the sending node. This document defines TSL as follow.
When the TSF field is set to 0b00, which indicates the PTP timestamp format, the values of the TSL field are interpreted as follows:

0b00: 64-bit PTPv1 timestamp as defined in IEEE1588-2008 [IEEE1588v2]
0b01: 80-bit PTPv2 timestamp as defined in IEEE1588-2008 [IEEE1588v2]
0b10...0b11: Reserved for future standardization

When the TSF field is set to 0b01, which indicates the NTP timestamp format, the values of the TSL field are interpreted as follows:

0b00: 32-bit NTP timestamp as defined in NTPv4 [RFC5905]
0b01: 64-bit NTP timestamp as defined in NTPv4 [RFC5905]
0b10: 128-bit NTP timestamp as defined in NTPv4 [RFC5905]
0b11: Reserved for future standardization

When the TSF field is set to 0b10 or 0b11, the TSL field would be ignored.

Reserved field is reserved for future use and MUST be set to zero.

3.2.5. IOAM DEX Capabilities sub-TLV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-type = DEX Capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOAM-Trace-Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namespace-ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7: IOAM DEX Capabilities Sub-TLV

When this sub-TLV is present in the IOAM Capabilities Response TLV, it means that the sending node is an IOAM transit node and the IOAM DEX function is enabled at this IOAM transit node.
Sub-type is set to the value that identifies it as an IOAM DEX Capabilities sub-TLV.

Length is the length of the sub-TLV’s Value field in octets and MUST be set to 8.

IOAM-Trace-Type field has the same definition as what’s specified in section 3.2 of [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-direct-export].

Namespace-ID field has the same definition as what’s specified in section 3.2 of [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-direct-export], it should be one of the Namespace-IDs listed in the IOAM Capabilities Query TLV of echo request.

Reserved field is reserved for future use and MUST be set to zero.

3.2.6. IOAM End-of-Domain sub-TLV

When this sub-TLV is present in the IOAM Capabilities Response TLV, it means that the sending node is an IOAM decapsulating node. That is to say, if the IOAM encapsulating node receives this sub-TLV, the IOAM encapsulating node can determine that the node which sends this sub-TLV is an IOAM decapsulating node. When the IOAM Edge-to-Edge Capabilities sub-TLV is present in the IOAM Capabilities Response TLV sent by the IOAM decapsulating node, the IOAM End-of-Domain sub-TLV doesn’t need to be present in the same IOAM Capabilities Response TLV, otherwise the End-of-Domain sub-TLV MUST be present in the IOAM Capabilities Response TLV sent by the IOAM decapsulating node. Both the IOAM Edge-to-Edge Capabilities sub-TLV and the IOAM End-of-Domain sub-TLV can be used to indicate that the sending node is an IOAM decapsulating node. It’s recommended to include only the IOAM Edge-to-Edge Capabilities sub-TLV if IOAM edge-to-edge function is enabled at this IOAM decapsulating node.

Sub-type is set to the value that identifies it as an IOAM End of Domain sub-TLV.
Length is the length of the sub-TLV’s Value field in octets and MUST be set to 4.

Namespace-ID field has the same definition as what’s specified in section 5.3 of [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data], it should be one of the Namespace-IDs listed in the IOAM Capabilities Query TLV of echo request.

4. Operational Guide

Once the IOAM encapsulating node is triggered to acquire the enabled IOAM capabilities of each IOAM transit node and/or IOAM decapsulating node, the IOAM encapsulating node will send echo requests that include the IOAM Capabilities Query TLV. First with TTL equal to 1 to reach the nearest node, which may be an IOAM transit node or not. Then with TTL equal to 2 to reach the second nearest node, which also may be an IOAM transit node or not. And further, increasing by 1 the TTL every time the IOAM encapsulating node sends a new echo request, until the IOAM encapsulating node receives an echo reply sent by the IOAM decapsulating node, which should contain the IOAM Capabilities Response TLV including the IOAM Edge-to-Edge Capabilities sub-TLV or the IOAM End-of-Domain sub-TLV. Alternatively, if the IOAM encapsulating node knows exactly all the IOAM transit nodes and/or IOAM decapsulating node beforehand, once the IOAM encapsulating node is triggered to acquire the enabled IOAM capabilities, it can send an echo request to each IOAM transit node and/or IOAM decapsulating node directly, without TTL expiration.

The IOAM encapsulating node may be triggered by the device administrator, the network management system, the network controller, or even the live user traffic. The specific triggering mechanisms are outside the scope of this document.

Each IOAM transit node and/or IOAM decapsulating node that receives an echo request containing the IOAM Capabilities Query TLV will send an echo reply to the IOAM encapsulating node, and within the echo reply, there should be an IOAM Capabilities Response TLV containing one or more sub-TLVs. The IOAM Capabilities Query TLV contained in the echo request would be ignored by the receiving node that is unaware of IOAM.

5. Security Considerations

Queries and responses about the state of an IOAM domain should be processed only from a trusted source. An unauthorized query MUST be discarded by an implementation that supports this specification. Similarly, unsolicited echo response with the IOAM Capabilities TLV MUST be discarded. Authentication of echo request/reply that
includes the IOAM Capabilities TLV is one of methods of the integrity protection. Implementations could also provide a means of filtering based on the source address of the received echo request/reply. The integrity protection for IOAM capabilities information collection can also be achieved using mechanisms in the underlay data plane. For example, if the underlay is an IPv6 network, IP Authentication Header [RFC4302] or IP Encapsulating Security Payload Header [RFC4303] can be used to provide integrity protection.

Information about the state of the IOAM domain collected in the IAOM Capabilities TLV is confidential. An implementation can use secure transport to provide privacy protection. For example, if the underlay is an IPv6 network, confidentiality can be achieved using the IP Encapsulating Security Payload Header [RFC4303].

6. IANA Considerations

This document requests the following IANA Actions.

IANA is requested to create a registry group named "In-Situ OAM (IOAM) Capabilities Parameters".

This group will include the following registries:

- IOAM SoR Capability
- IOAM TSF+TSL Capability

New registries in this group can be created via RFC Required process as per [RFC8126].

The subsequent sub-sections detail the registries herein contained.

Considering the TLVs/sub-TLVs defined in this document would be carried in different kinds of Echo Request/Reply message, such as ICMPv6 or LSP Ping, it is intended that the registries for Type and sub-Type would be requested in subsequent documents.

6.1. IOAM SoR Capability Registry

This registry defines 4 code points for the IOAM SoR Capability field for identifying the size of "Random" and "Cumulative" data as explained in section 5.5 of [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data]. The following code points are defined in this draft:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SoR</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0b00</td>
<td>64-bit &quot;Random&quot; and 64-bit &quot;Cumulative&quot; data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0b01 - 0b11 are available for assignment via RFC Required process as per [RFC8126].

6.2. IOAM TSF+TSL Capability Registry

This registry defines 3 code points for the IOAM TSF Capability field for identifying the timestamp format as explained in section 6 of [I-D.ietf-ippm-ioam-data].

- When the code point for the IOAM TSF Capability field equals 0b00 which means PTP timestamp format, this registry defines 2 code points for the IOAM TSL Capability field for identifying the timestamp length.
- When the code point for the IOAM TSF Capability field equals 0b01 which means NTP timestamp format, this registry defines 3 code points for the IOAM TSL Capability field for identifying the timestamp length.

The following code points are defined in this draft:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TSF</th>
<th>TSL</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0b00</td>
<td>0b00</td>
<td>64-bit PTPv1 timestamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0b00</td>
<td>0b01</td>
<td>80-bit PTPv2 timestamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0b01</td>
<td>0b00</td>
<td>32-bit NTP timestamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0b01</td>
<td>0b01</td>
<td>64-bit NTP timestamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0b10</td>
<td>0b10</td>
<td>128-bit NTP timestamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0b10</td>
<td>0b10</td>
<td>POSIX Timestamp Format</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unassigned code points of TSF+TSL are available for assignment via RFC Required process as per [RFC8126].
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Abstract

This document extends the IPv6 Alternate Marking Option to provide enhanced capabilities and allow advanced functionalities. With this extension, it can be possible to perform thicker packet loss measurements and more dense delay measurements with no limitation for the number of concurrent flows under monitoring.
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1. Introduction

The Alternate Marking [RFC8321] and Multipoint Alternate Marking [RFC8889] define the Alternate Marking technique that is a hybrid performance measurement method, per [RFC7799] classification of measurement methods. This method is based on marking consecutive batches of packets and it can be used to measure packet loss, latency, and jitter on live traffic.

The IPv6 AltMark Option [I-D.ietf-6man-ipv6-alt-mark] applies the Alternate Marking Method to IPv6, and defines an Extension Header Option to encode the Alternate Marking Method for both the Hop-by-Hop Options Header and the Destination Options Header. Similarly, SRv6 AltMark [I-D.fz-spring-srv6-alt-mark] defines how Alternate Marking data is carried as a TLV in the Segment Routing Header.

While the IPv6 AltMark Option implements the basic alternate marking methodology, this document defines extended data fields for the AltMark Option and provides enhanced capabilities to overcome some challenges and enable future proof applications.

It is worth mentioning that the enhanced capabilities are intended for further use and are optional.

Some possible enhanced applications MAY be:
1. thicker packet loss measurements: the single marking method of the base AltMark Option can be extended with additional marking bits in order to get shortest marking periods under the same timing conditions.

2. more dense delay measurements: than double marking method of the base AltMark Option can be extended with additional marking bits in order to identify down to each packet as delay sample.

3. increase the number of concurrent flows under monitoring: if the 20-bit FlowMonID is set independently and pseudo randomly, there is a 50% chance of collision for 1206 flows. The size of FlowMonID can be extended to raise the entropy and therefore to increase the number of concurrent flows that can be monitored.

1.1. 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.

2. Data Fields Format

The Data Fields format is represented in Figure 1. A 4-bit NH (NextHeader) field is allocated from the Reserved field of IPv6 AltMark Option [I-D.ietf-6man-ipv6-alt-mark]. It is worth highlighting that remaining bits of the former Reserved field continue to be reserved.

```
0                   1                   2                   3
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+---------------------------------------+-----------+-------+
|           FlowMonID                   |L|D|  Reserved |  NH   |
+---------------------------------------+-----------+-------+
```

**Figure 1: Data fields indicator for enhanced capabilities**

The NH (NextHeader) field is used to indicate the extended data fields which are used for enhanced capabilities:

- NextHeader value of 0x00 is reserved for backward compatibility. It means that there is no extended data field attached.

- NextHeader values of 0x01-0x08 are reserved for private use or for experimentation.
NextHeader value of 0x09 indicates the extended data fields. The format is showed in Figure 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

```
+---------------------------------------+-------+-------+-------+
|           FlowMonID Ext               | Flag  |  Len  |   R   |
|-------------------------------+-------+-------+-------+
|           MetaInfo            |      Padding (variable)       |
|-------------------------------+-------------------------------+
//                    Padding (variable)                       //
+-------------------------------+-------------------------------+
```

Figure 2: Data fields extension for enhanced alternate marking

where:

- FlowMonID Ext - 20 bits unsigned integer. This is used to extend the FlowMonID in order to reduce the conflict when random allocation is applied. The disambiguation of the FlowMonID field is discussed in IPv6 AltMark Option [I-D.ietf-6man-ipv6-alt-mark].

- Flag - A 4-bit flag to indicate the special purpose usage (see below).

- Len - Length. It indicates the length of the enhanced alternate marking extension in bytes.

- R - Reserved for further use. These bits MUST be set to zero on transmission and ignored on receipt.

- MetaInfo - A 16-bit Bitmap to indicate more meta data attached for the enhanced function (see below).

- Padding - These bits MUST be set to zero when not being used.

The Flag is defined in Figure 3 as:

- bit 0 - Measurement mode, M bit. If M=0, it indicates that it is for hop-by-hop monitoring. If M=1, it indicates that it is for end-to-end monitoring.

- bit 2 - Flow direction identification, F bit. This flag is used in the case backward direction flow monitoring is requested to be set up automatically. If F=1, it indicates that the flow direction is forward. If F=0, it indicates that the flow direction is backward.
o others (shown as R) - Reserved. These bits MUST be set to zero and ignored on receipt.

```
  0 1 2 3
  +-------+
  |M|R|F|R|
  +-------+
```

Figure 3: Flag data field

The MetaInfo is defined in the following Figure 4 as a bit map:

```
  0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
  +----------------+
  |     MetaInfo    |
  +----------------+
```

Figure 4: MetaInfo data field

o bit 0: it indicates a 6 bytes Timestamp that is attached as Padding after the MetaInfo. Timestamp(s) stands for the number of seconds in the timestamp. It will overwrite the Padding after MetaInfo. Timestamp(ns) stands for the number of sub-seconds in the timestamp with the unit of nano second. This Timestamp is filled by the encapsulation node, and is taken all the way to the decapsulation node. So that all the intermediate nodes could compare it with its local time, and measure the one way delay.

```
  0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
  +-------------------------------+
  |    Timestamp(s)               |
  +-------------------------------+
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timestamp(ns)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
```

Figure 5: Timestamp data field

o bit 1: it indicates the control information with the following data format that is attached as Padding after the MetaInfo:

```
  0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
  +---------------+---------------+-----------+-------------------+
  |  DIP Mask     |  SIP Mask     | Control   |    Period         |
  +---------------+---------------+-----------+-------------------+
```

Figure 6: Control words for backward direction flow monitoring
This is used to set up the backward direction flow monitoring. Where:

* DIP Mask: it is the length of the destination IP prefix.
* SIP Mask: it is the length of the source IP prefix.
* Control: it indicates more match fields to set up the backward direction flow monitoring.
* Period: it indicates the alternate marking period with the unit of second.

0 bit 2: it indicates a 4 bytes Sequence number with the following data format that is attached as Padding after the MetaInfo. The unique Sequence could be used to detect the out-of-order packets, in addition to the normal loss measurement. Moreover, the Sequence can be used together with the latency measurement, so as to get the per packet timestamp.

```
 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+---------------------------------------------------------------+
|                          Sequence                             |
+---------------------------------------------------------------+
```

Figure 7: Sequence number data field

It is worth noting that the meta data information forming the Padding and specified above in Figure 5, Figure 6 and Figure 7 must be ordered according to the order of the MetaInfo bits.

3. Security Considerations

IPv6 AltMark Option [I-D.ietf-6man-ipv6-alt-mark] analyzes different security concerns and related solutions. These aspects are valid and applicable also to this document. In particular the fundamental security requirement is that Alternate Marking MUST only be applied in a specific limited domain, as also mentioned in [RFC8799].

4. IANA Considerations

This document has no request to IANA.
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