In-band Performance Measurement for Segment Routing Networks with MPLS Data Plane

<u>draft-gandhi-spring-rfc6374-srpm-mpls-00</u>

```
Rakesh Gandhi - Cisco Systems (rgandhi@cisco.com) - Presenter

Clarence Filsfils - Cisco Systems (cfilsfil@cisco.com)

Daniel Voyer - Bell Canada (daniel.voyer@bell.ca)

Stefano Salsano - Universita di Roma "Tor Vergata" (stefano.salsano@uniroma2.it)

Pier Luigi Ventre - CNIT (pierluigi.ventre@cnit.it)

Mach Chen - Huawei (mach.chen@huawei.com)
```

```
Sagar Soni - Cisco Systems (<u>sagsoni@cisco.com</u>)

Patrick Khordoc - Cisco Systems (<u>pkhordoc@cisco.com</u>)

Zafar Ali - Cisco Systems (<u>zali@cisco.com</u>)
```

Agenda

- Requirements and Scope
- Updates Since IETF-103
- Next Steps

Requirements and Scope

Requirements:

- Delay and Loss Performance Measurement (PM) for SR links and end-to-end
 P2P/ P2MP SR Policies
- Delay and Loss extended TE link metrics advertisement in the network
- One-way and two-way measurements

Scope:

- Segment Routing (SR) with MPLS data plane
- In-band PM probe messages
- Use RFC 6374 (defined for MPLS) based mechanisms
- Use RFC 7876 (UDP return path) for probe response messages
- Informational

Updates Since IETF-103

Updated:

- Rename draft from spring-sr-mpls-pm to spring-rfc6374-srpm-mpls to reflect RFC 6374 scope
- Various editorial changes to address review comments
- Elaborate on in-band performance measurement
- Add Text on "ECMP for SR-MPLS Policies"
 - ✓ RFC 6374 probe messages using GAL label lacks ECMP support

Pending:

Add Return Path (address comments from Stewart Bryant)

Next Steps

- Welcome your comments and suggestions
- Multiple implementations of RFC 6374 already exist
- Like to request for WG adoption
- Right WG: SPRING or MPLS?

Thank you