

# STAMP Extensions for Reflecting STAMP Packet Headers

*draft-ietf-ippm-stamp-ext-hdr-01*

*Rakesh Gandhi - Cisco Systems ([rgandhi@cisco.com](mailto:rgandhi@cisco.com)) - Presenter*

*Tianran Zhou - Huawei ([zhoutianran@huawei.com](mailto:zhoutianran@huawei.com))*

*Zhenqiang Li - China Mobile ([lizhenqiang@chinamobile.com](mailto:lizhenqiang@chinamobile.com))*

# Agenda

- Requirements
- Next Steps

# Requirements, Goals, and Scope

## Requirements:

- STAMP Extensions to Reflect packet headers:
  - ✓ Hop-by-hop and edge-to-edge measurements
  - ✓ Two-way and one-way measurements

## Goals:

- Leverage existing implementation of extension headers on midpoint nodes
  - Note: midpoints nodes are agnostics to STAMP protocol
- Avoid IPv6 and MPLS protocol extensions

## Scope:

- STAMP [RFC8762] and STAMP Extensions [RFC8972]
- IPv6 Data plane: IPv6 Extension Headers [RFC8200]
- MPLS Data plane: MPLS Network Action Sub-Stack [draft-ietf-mpls-mna-hdr]

# Updates

- No draft update since IETF-121
- The draft covers both IPv6 and MPLS data planes
- There is some uncertainty in MPLS WG around MNA
  - For example, for carrying IOAM in PSD
- To unblock progressing of the draft, the options are:
  - a) Move MPLS data plane extensions to a separate WG draft?
  - b) Remove MPLS data plane extensions altogether and revisit in future in a new individual draft?
  - c) Any other suggestions?

# Next Steps

- Any feedback on the MPLS data plane options?
- Ready for WG LC?
- Welcome further comments and suggestions

**Thank you!**