# IPFIX IPv6/TCP/UDP I-Ds Set: Updates & Next Steps

IETF#118, Prague November 2023

M. Boucadair (Orange), B. Claise (Huawei), T. Reddy (Nokia)

### IETF#116 "What's Next?" Plan

- Request WGLC for draft-ietf-opsawg-rfc7125-update
- Request WG adoption for the following I-D set:
   *draft-boucla-opsawg-ipfix-fixes draft-boucadair-opsawg-ipfix-tcpo-v6eh*
  - draft-boucadair-opsawg-tsvwg-udp-ipfix
- The last two documents may be merged, but we prefer to keep them separate because of the dependency on the UDP Options spec (*tsvwg*)

### Update Since IETF#116

- draft-ietf-opsawg-rfc7125-update
  - Status: Passed the WGLC and IETF LC
- Adoption of the following I-Ds set:
  - draft-ietf-opsawg-ipfix-fixes-03
  - draft-ietf-opsawg-ipfix-tcpo-v6eh-05
  - draft-ietf-opsawg-tsvwg-udp-ipfix-03
- Seeked for cross-WGs reviews:
  - Sent messages to the following WGs
    - <u>6man</u>: draft-ietf-opsawg-ipfix-tcpo-v6eh
    - <u>tsvwg</u>: draft-ietf-opsawg-tsvwg-udp-ipfix
  - …but no follow-up unfortunately
- However, we received good reviews from IPFIX IE Doctors and Éric Vyncke

# Focus on IPv6 EH IEs (1)

- 4 IEs
- Specify how to report
  - Multiple EH chains in a Flow
  - Length of EH chains
  - Occurrences and order of Ehs
  - Non-consecutive EHs; not aggregates
  - Whether reported EHs are constrained by a HW/SW limit
  - Optimize the encoding
- Specify the dependency between the various IEs
- Add Examples

#### Focus on IPv6 EH IEs (2)



"Bit 0 corresponds to the least-significant bit in the ipv6ExtensionHeadersFull IE while bit 255 corresponds to the most-significant bit of the IE. In doing so, few octets will be needed to encode common IPv6 extension headers when observed in a Flow."

#### Focus on IPv6 EH IEs (3)

| Bit Label  | Protocol<br>Number                | Description  |   |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| 0 DST<br>1 HOP<br>2 NoNxt<br>3 UNK                                     | 60<br>0<br>59                     | Destination Options for IPv6<br>IPv6 Hop-by-Hop Options<br>No Next Header for IPv6<br>Unknown Layer 4 header   | <ul> <li>These are not EHs per se,<br/>but:</li> <li>UNK was already<br/>assigned in the existing<br/>ipv6ExtensionHeaders</li> <li>Added NoNxt as per a<br/>comment from Éric<br/>Vyncke (better<br/>observability)</li> </ul> |
| 4 FRA0<br>5 RH<br>6 FRA1<br>7 to 11<br>12 MOB<br>13 ESP<br>14 AH<br>15 | 44<br>43<br>44<br>135<br>50<br>51 | Fragment header - first fragment<br>Routing header<br>Fragmentation header - not first f<br>Unassigned<br>Mobility Header<br>Encapsulating Security Payload<br>Authentication Header<br>Unassigned |   |
| 16 HIP<br>17 SHIM6<br>18<br>19<br>20 to 255                            | 139<br>140<br>253<br>254          | Host Identity Protocol<br>Shim6 Protocol<br>Use for experimentation and testine<br>Use for experimentation and testine<br>Unassigned   | g   |

The value was selected to minimize the implications on the use of reduced-encoding (rfc7011#section-6.2) Registry created by draft-ietf-opsawg-ipfix-fixes

# Focus on IPv6 EH IEs (4)

- Exporting Destination Options and Hop-by-Hop Options and Routing Types
  - Left out of scope
  - If there is a need to export specific options/type, we suggest to follow an approach similar to
    - draft-ietf-opsawg-ipfix-srv6-srh-14 (RFC-to-be 9487)
- Are you OK with this approach?

### Focus on TCP (1)



#### draft-ietf-opsawg-ipfix-tcpo-v6eh

"TCP option kind 0 corresponds to the least-significant bit in the tcpOptionsFull IE while kind 255 corresponds to the most-significant bit of the IE. This approach allows an observer to export any observed TCP option even if it does support that option and without requiring updating a mapping table."

# Focus on TCP (2)

- TCP uses Experiments IDs (ExIDs) to disambiguate between shared TCP options
  - Two ExID flavors can be allocated: 2-byte or 4-byte ExIDs
  - A mix of ExIDs may be observed in a Flow
- Two IEs are defined to easily identify ExIDs
  - tcpSharedOptionExID16: List of 2-byte ExIDs
  - tcpSharedOptionExID32: List of 4-byte ExIDs
- We considered relaxing tcpSharedOptionExID32 to include both 2-byte and 4-byte ExIDs but this induces extra overhead
  - We decided to not include such a mention in the text

# Misc.

- Éric Vyncke raised a comment during the call for adoption and also recently in the list
  - Split draft-ietf-opsawg-ipfix-tcpo-v6eh into two I Ds: One of TCP and another one for IPv6 EHs
- The authors prefer to proceed with the current approach
- Thoughts?

#### Next Steps

- Request the WGLC for the set of I-Ds —with tcpm, tsvwg, 6man, and ipfix cced
- Consider early directorate reviews before or in // of the WGLC

-simple-fixes: genart, opsdir

-tcpo-v6eh: intdir, tsvart, opsdir

-udp: tsvart, opsdir

#### Appendix: Example of Shared TCP Option

tcpSharedOptionExID16 IE:

