Benchmarking Methodology WG (bmwg)  
IETF 113

• Wednesday, March 23, 2022

• 10:00-12:00 Local Time (Vienna, UTC+0100)
  – Alt Start Times: Chicago, US, UTC-0500 = 0400 CDT
  – San Francisco, US, UTC-0700 = 0200 PDT
  – Seoul, Korea, UTC+0900 = 1800

• Chairs:
  – Al Morton (acm(at)research.att.com)
  – Sarah Banks (sbanks(at)encrypted.net)

• If you are not subscribed to the BMWG mailing list and would like to be, please go to
  https://www.ietf.org/mailman/listinfo/bmwg
Note Well

We work as Individuals, and try to be nice to each other.

(as of March 2018)

This is a reminder of IETF policies in effect on various topics such as patents or code of conduct. It is only meant to point you in the right direction. Exceptions may apply. The IETF's patent policy and the definition of an IETF "contribution" and "participation" are set forth in BCP 79; please read it carefully.

As a reminder:

• By participating in the IETF, you agree to follow IETF processes and policies.
• If you are aware that any IETF contribution is covered by patents or patent applications that are owned or controlled by you or your sponsor, you must disclose that fact, or not participate in the discussion.
• As a participant in or attendee to any IETF activity you acknowledge that written, audio, video, and photographic records of meetings may be made public.
• Personal information that you provide to IETF will be handled in accordance with the IETF Privacy Statement.
• As a participant or attendee, you agree to work respectfully with other participants; please contact the ombudsteam (https://www.ietf.org/contact/ombudsteam/) if you have questions or concerns about this.

Definitive information is in the documents listed below and other IETF BCPs. For advice, please talk to WG chairs or ADs:

• BCP 9 (Internet Standards Process)
• BCP 25 (Working Group processes)
• BCP 25 (Anti-Harassment Procedures)
• BCP 54 (Code of Conduct)
• BCP 78 (Copyright)
• BCP 79 (Patents, Participation)
• https://www.ietf.org/privacy-policy/ (Privacy Policy)
BMWG Agenda

Note-Taker(s), Jabber, IPR,

WG Status (Chairs)
- EVPN - status: Dead

WG Drafts:
- Multiple Loss Ratio Search
- Next Generation Firewall Benchmarking

WG Adoption:
- A YANG Data Model for Network Interconnect Tester Management

Proposals:
- Benchmarking Methodology for Stateful NATxy Gateways using RFC 4814 Pseudorandom Port Numbers
  https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-lencse-bmwg-benchmarking-stateful-03
- Considerations for Benchmarking Network Performance in Containerized Infrastructures

NEW!!
- Benchmarking Methodology for MPLS Segment Routing
- Benchmarking Methodology for IPv6 Segment Routing

AOB:
Brief BMWG Status

• EVPN Draft In IESG Review
  – No one offered to finish: *Dead*-line passed
• Next Gen Firewall Benchmarking
  – IESG Review on -13 in Feb:
    • 5 DISCUSS ballots to resolve, plus Comments
    • Transport Area Review Request (again) Tommy P.
• Multiple Loss Ratio Search: Large Re-write
• WG Adoption: Objection on YANG Model
• Proposals keep coming...
BMWG Activity

• New RFCs:
  – none

• Charter Update
  – (stable)

• Supplementary BMWG Page
  – http://bmwg.encrypted.net/
Milestones (for Review)

DONE? Aug 2020 - Methodology for Next-Gen Firewall Benchmarking to IESG Review
DONE      - Update to RFC2544 Back-to-back Frame Benchmarking to IESG Review
DONE      - Methodology for EVPN Benchmarking to IESG Review
Dec 2020  - Draft on Selecting and Applying Model(s) for Benchmarking to IESG Review
Dec 2020  - Draft on General VNF Benchmarking Automation to IESG Review
Dec 2020  - Considerations for Benchmarking Network Virtualization Platforms to IESG Review
BACKUP
Benchmarks as described herein are limited to technology characterization using controlled stimuli in a laboratory environment, with dedicated address space and constraints specified above.

The benchmarking network topology will be an independent test setup and MUST NOT be connected to devices that may forward the test traffic into a production network, or misroute traffic to the test management network.

Further, benchmarking is performed on a "black-box" basis, relying solely on measurements observable external to the DUT/SUT.

Special capabilities SHOULD NOT exist in the DUT/SUT specifically for benchmarking purposes. Any implications for network security arising from the DUT/SUT SHOULD be identical in the lab and in production networks.
## Work Proposal Summary Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Area &gt; Criteria</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>VNF (was VBaaS)</th>
<th>Virtualized Platforms</th>
<th>SFC</th>
<th>Back-to-back Frame</th>
<th>Network Service Layer Abs Model</th>
<th>Next-Gen Firewalls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Scope of Charter?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(acm)</td>
<td>Draft(s)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. Support at meetings</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>IETF-98, many comments</td>
<td>Revised draft</td>
<td>Discuss @ IETF-103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. Support on List</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments &amp; Testing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependences/Notes</td>
<td>Reviewers &amp; charter</td>
<td>expired</td>
<td>expired</td>
<td>expired</td>
<td>expired</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>