

Performance Measurement Using STAMP for Segment Routing Networks

draft-gandhi-spring-stamp-srpm-01

(previously part of *draft-gandhi-spring-twamp-srpm-07*)

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

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

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

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

Bart Janssens - Colt (Bart.Janssens@colt.net)

Agenda

- Requirements and Scope
- History of the Draft
- Updates Since IETF-106
- Summary
- Next Steps

Requirements and Scope

Requirements:

- Delay and Loss Performance Measurement (PM)
 - ✓ Links and End-to-end P2P/P2MP SR Paths
 - ✓ Links include physical, virtual, LAG (bundles) and LAG member links
 - ✓ Applicable to SR-MPLS/SRv6 data planes
- Handle ECMP for SR Paths
- Support stand-alone direct-mode loss measurement

Scope:

- STAMP [RFC 8762]
- STAMP TLVs [draft-ietf-ippm-stamp-option-tlv]

History of the Draft

- Feb 2019
 - Draft was published - *draft-gandhi-spring-twamp-srpm-00*
- Mar 2019
 - Presented *draft-gandhi-spring-twamp-srpm-00* at IETF 104 Prague in SPRING WG
- May 2019
 - Added STAMP TLV for Return Path
- July 2019
 - Presented *draft-gandhi-spring-twamp-srpm-01* at IETF 105 Montreal in IPPM WG
 - Slide 9 Titled - Applicability of STAMP
- Nov 2019
 - **SPRING Chairs announced in the meeting the agreement with IPPM chairs to progress the draft in SPRING WG**
 - Presented *draft-gandhi-spring-twamp-srpm-04* at IETF 106 Singapore in SPRING WG
- Mar 2020
 - Moved STAMP support to *draft-gandhi-spring-**stamp**-srpm-00*
 - Keep TWAMP Light support as informational in *draft-gandhi-spring-**twamp**-srpm-08*

Updates Since IETF-106 (Version-04)

Updates:

1. Defined Control Code for “In-band Response Requested” for STAMP
 - ✓ Updated Two-way mode procedure using the Control Code
2. Added Return Address Sub-TLV in the STAMP Return Path TLV to send response to a specific node
3. Defined Destination Address in STAMP Node Address TLV to identify the intended Destination node
4. Updated IANA registry action
5. Various editorial changes

Open Items:

- Align with the latest STAMP TLV draft.

STAMP Control Code Field

In a Query: **Sender Control Code**

0x0: Out-of-band Response Requested.
This is also the default behavior.

0x1: In-band Response Requested.
Indicates that this query has been sent over a bidirectional path and the probe response is required over the same path in reverse direction.

0x2: No Response Requested.

Also applicable to non-SR paths.




Figure: Sender Control Code in STAMP DM Message

Return Address in STAMP Return Path TLV

Return Path (value TBA2):

Sub-TLVs Types:

- Type (value 0): Return Address. Target node address of the response; different than the Source Address in the query
- Type (value 1): SR-MPLS Label Stack of the Reverse SR Path
- Type (value 2): SR-MPLS Binding SID [draft-ietf-pce-binding-label-sid] of the Reverse SR Policy
- Type (value 3): SRv6 Segment List of the Reverse SR Path
- Type (value 4): SRv6 Binding SID [draft-ietf-pce-binding-label-sid] of the Reverse SR Policy




Figure: Return Path TLV




Figure: Segment List Sub-TLV in Return Path TLV


Performance Measurement Modes

- One-way Measurement Mode
 - Reply sent “out of band” on IP/UDP path by default
- Two-way Measurement Mode
 - Reply sent “in-band” on reverse SR path
 - Based on Control Code from the probe query message
 - **Use Return Path TLV for STAMP from the probe query message**

Destination Address in STAMP Node Address TLV

Destination Node Address (value TBA1):

- Indicates the address of the intended recipient node of the query message.
- The reflector node **MUST NOT** send response if it is not the intended destination node of the query.
- Useful when query is sent with 127/8 destination address.




Stand-alone LM Message Format for STAMP

- Loss Measurement (LM) message defined
 - Hardware efficient counter-stamping
 - Well-known locations for transmit and receive traffic counters
 - Stand-alone LM message, not tied to DM
- LM message format is also defined for authenticated mode
- User-configured destination UDP **Port2** is used for identifying LM probe packets
- Does not modify existing STAMP (which is for DM) procedure as different destination UDP is used for LM



Example Provisioning Model



Probe Query for Links

- User-configured destination UDP **port1** is used for DM probe messages and **port2** is used for LM probe messages (unauthenticated mode).
- Applicable to physical, virtual, LAG and LAG member links

```
+-----+
| IP Header |
. Source IP Address = Sender IPv4 or IPv6 Address .
. Destination IP Address = Reflector IPv4 or IPv6 Address .
. Protocol = UDP .
. .
+-----+
| UDP Header |
. Source Port = As chosen by Sender .
. Destination Port = User-configured Port .
. .
+-----+
| Payload = DM Message as specified in Section 4.2 of RFC 8762 | |
. Payload = LM Message as specified in this document .
. .
+-----+
```

Figure: Probe Query Message

Probe Query for SR-MPLS and SRv6 Policy

For performance delay/loss measurement of **end-to-end** SR Policy, the probe query message is sent on the SR Policy with:

1. MPLS label stack of SR-MPLS Policy
2. SRv6 SRH [RFC 8754] with Segment List of SRv6 Policy




Figure: Example Probe Query Message for SR-MPLS Policy




Figure: Example Probe Query Message for SRv6 Policy

Probe Response Message

- The probe response message is sent using the IP/UDP information from the probe query message.
- Based on Control Code from the probe query message
- **Use Segment List from Return Path TLV if present in probe query message.**




Figure: Probe Response Message

ECMP Support for SR Path

- SR Path can have ECMP between the ingress and transit nodes, between transit nodes and between transit and egress nodes.
- Sending PM probe queries that can take advantage of the hashing function in forwarding plane.
- Existing forwarding mechanisms are applicable to PM probe messages. Examples are:
 - For IPv4
 - Sweeping destination address in IPv4 header (e.g. 127/8)
 - For IPv6
 - Sweeping flow label in IPv6 header

Next Steps

- Welcome your comments and suggestions
- Implementation exists
- Request SPRING WG adoption
- Keep IPPM WG in the loop about the milestones

Thank you

Backup

Thank you

Performance Measurement Using TWAMP Light for Segment Routing Networks

draft-gandhi-spring-twamp-srpm-09

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

Clarence Filselfil - Cisco Systems (cfilselfil@cisco.com)

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

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

Bart Janssens - Colt (Bart.Janssens@colt.net)

Agenda

- Requirements and Scope
- History of the Draft
- Updates Since IETF-106
- Summary
- Next Steps

Requirements and Scope

Requirements:

- Delay and Loss Performance Measurement (PM)
 - ✓ Links and End-to-end P2P/P2MP SR Paths
 - ✓ Links include physical, virtual, LAG (bundles) and LAG member links
 - ✓ Applicable to SR-MPLS/SRv6 data planes
- No need to negotiate UDP port to bootstrap PM session - spirit of SR
 - ✓ Stateless on egress node - spirit of SR
- Handle ECMP for SR Paths
- Support stand-alone direct-mode loss measurement

Scope:

- RFC 5357 (TWAMP Light) defined probe messages
- User-configured IP/UDP path for probe messages

Updates Since IETF-106 (Version-04)

Updates:

1. Defined Control Code for “In-band Response Requested” for TWAMP Light
 - ✓ Updated Two-way mode procedure using the Control Code
2. Moved STAMP support to a new draft - *draft-gandhi-spring-stamp-srpm*
3. Informational draft - as TWAMP Light is informational, see Appendix I in RFC 5357 and Appendix A in RFC 8545
4. Various editorial changes

Open Items:

- None

TWAMP Light Control Code Field


In a Query: **Sender Control Code**

0x0: Out-of-band Response Requested.
This is also the default behavior.

0x1: In-band Response Requested.
Indicates that this query has been sent over a bidirectional path and the probe response is required over the same path in the reverse direction.

0x2: No Response Requested.

Also applicable to non-SR paths.



Performance Measurement Modes

- One-way Measurement Mode
 - Reply sent “out of band” on IP/UDP path - default
- Two-way Measurement Mode
 - Reply sent “in-band” on reverse SR path
 - Based on Control Code from the probe query message

Probe Query for Links

- User-configured destination UDP **port1** is used for DM probe messages and **port2** is used for LM probe messages, both in unauthenticated mode.
- Applicable to physical, virtual, LAG and LAG member links

```
+-----+
| IP Header |
. Source IP Address = Sender IPv4 or IPv6 Address .
. Destination IP Address = Reflector IPv4 or IPv6 Address .
. Protocol = UDP .
. .
+-----+
| UDP Header |
. Source Port = As chosen by Sender .
. Destination Port = User-configured Port .
. .
+-----+
| Payload = DM Message as specified in Section 4.2.1 of RFC 5357 |
. Payload = DM Message as specified in Section 4.1.2 of RFC 5357.
. Payload = LM Message as specified in this document .
. .
+-----+
```

Figure: Probe Query Message

Probe Query for SR-MPLS and SRv6 Policy

For performance delay/loss measurement of **end-to-end** SR Policy, the probe query message is sent on the SR Policy with:

1. MPLS label stack of SR-MPLS Policy
2. SRv6 SRH [RFC 8754] with Segment List of SRv6 Policy




Figure: Example Probe Query Message for SR-MPLS Policy





Figure: Example Probe Query Message for SRv6 Policy

Stand-alone LM Message Format for TWAMP Light

- Loss Measurement (LM) message defined
 - Hardware efficient counter-stamping
 - Well-known locations for transmit and receive traffic counters
 - Stand-alone LM message, not tied to DM
- LM message format is also defined for authenticated mode
- User-configured destination UDP **Port2** is used for identifying LM probe packets
- Does not modify existing TWAMP Light (which is for DM) procedure as different destination UDP is used for LM



Next Steps

- Welcome your comments and suggestions
- Implementation exists
- Request SPRING WG adoption
- Keep IPPM WG in the loop about the milestones

Thank you