

Benchmarking Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: April 22, 2012

R. Papneja  
Huawei Technologies  
B. Parise  
Cisco Systems  
S. Hares  
Huawei Technologies  
I. Varlashkin  
Easynet Global Services  
October 20, 2011

Basic BGP Convergence Benchmarking Methodology for Data Plane  
Convergence  
draft-papneja-bgp-basic-dp-convergence-02.txt

Abstract

BGP is widely deployed and used by several service providers as the default Inter AS routing protocol. It is of utmost importance to ensure that when a BGP peer or a downstream link of a BGP peer fails, the alternate paths are rapidly used and routes via these alternate paths are installed. This document provides the basic BGP Benchmarking Methodology using existing BGP Convergence Terminology, RFC 4098.

Status of this Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of BCP 78 and BCP 79.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <http://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on April 22, 2012.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2011 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to BCP 78 and the IETF Trust's Legal

Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

This document may contain material from IETF Documents or IETF Contributions published or made publicly available before November 10, 2008. The person(s) controlling the copyright in some of this material may not have granted the IETF Trust the right to allow modifications of such material outside the IETF Standards Process. Without obtaining an adequate license from the person(s) controlling the copyright in such materials, this document may not be modified outside the IETF Standards Process, and derivative works of it may not be created outside the IETF Standards Process, except to format it for publication as an RFC or to translate it into languages other than English.

Table of Contents

- 1. Introduction . . . . . 4
  - 1.1. Precise Benchmarking Definition . . . . . 4
  - 1.2. Purpose of BGP FIB (Data Plane) Convergence . . . . . 5
  - 1.3. Control Plane Convergence . . . . . 5
  - 1.4. Benchmarking Testing . . . . . 5
- 2. Existing Definitions and Requirements . . . . . 5
- 3. Test Topologies . . . . . 6
  - 3.1. General Reference Topologies . . . . . 6
- 4. Test Considerations . . . . . 8
  - 4.1. Number of Peers . . . . . 8
  - 4.2. Number of Routes per Peer . . . . . 8
  - 4.3. Policy Processing/Reconfiguration . . . . . 9
  - 4.4. Configured Parameters (Timers, etc..) . . . . . 9
  - 4.5. Interface Types . . . . . 10
  - 4.6. Measurement Accuracy . . . . . 10
  - 4.7. Measurement Statistics . . . . . 11
  - 4.8. Authentication . . . . . 11
  - 4.9. Convergence Events . . . . . 11
  - 4.10. High Availability . . . . . 11
- 5. Test Cases . . . . . 12
  - 5.1. Basic Convergence Tests . . . . . 12
    - 5.1.1. RIB-IN Convergence . . . . . 12
    - 5.1.2. RIB-OUT Convergence . . . . . 13
    - 5.1.3. eBGP Convergence . . . . . 15
    - 5.1.4. iBGP Convergence . . . . . 15
    - 5.1.5. eBGP Multihop Convergence . . . . . 16
  - 5.2. BGP Failure/Convergence Events . . . . . 17
    - 5.2.1. Physical Link Failure on DUT End . . . . . 17
    - 5.2.2. Physical Link Failure on Remote/Emulator End . . . . . 18
    - 5.2.3. ECMP Link Failure on DUT End . . . . . 18
  - 5.3. BGP Adjacency Failure (Non-Physical Link Failure) on Emulator . . . . . 19
  - 5.4. BGP Hard Reset Test Cases . . . . . 20
    - 5.4.1. BGP Non-Recovering Hard Reset Event on DUT . . . . . 20
  - 5.5. BGP Soft Reset . . . . . 21
  - 5.6. BGP Route Withdrawal Convergence Time . . . . . 22
  - 5.7. BGP Path Attribute Change Convergence Time . . . . . 24
  - 5.8. BGP Graceful Restart Convergence Time . . . . . 26
- 6. Reporting Format . . . . . 27
- 7. IANA Considerations . . . . . 30
- 8. Security Considerations . . . . . 30
- 9. Acknowledgments . . . . . 30
- 10. References . . . . . 30
  - 10.1. Normative References . . . . . 30
  - 10.2. Informative References . . . . . 31
- Authors' Addresses . . . . . 31

## 1. Introduction

This document defines the methodology for benchmarking data plane FIB convergence performance of BGP in router and switches for simple topologies of 3 or 4 nodes. The methodology proposed in this document applies to both IPv4 and IPv6 and if a particular test is unique to one version, it is marked accordingly. For IPv6 benchmarking the device under test will require the support of Multi-Protocol BGP (MP-BGP) [RFC4760, RFC2545].

The scope of this companion document is limited to basic BGP protocol FIB convergence measurements. BGP extensions outside of carrying IPv6 in (MP-BGP) [RFC4760, RFC2545] are outside the scope of this document. Interaction with IGPs (IGP interworking) is outside the scope of this document.

This document makes assumption that ability of a router to forward packets implies that BGP has converged. Some modern routers may have an optimisation which results in forwarding ability is restored before BGP converges. Such optimisation MUST be disabled before applying benchmarking methodology described here. If that is not possible or if it's not known whether or not router has such optimisation alternative approach described in [draft-varlashkin-router-conv-bench] should be used instead.

### 1.1. Precise Benchmarking Definition

Since benchmarking is science of precision, let us restate the purpose of this document in benchmarking terms. This document defines methodology to test

- data plane convergence on a single BGP device that supports the BGP [RFC4271] functionality
- in test topology of 3 or 4 nodes
- using Basic BGP

Data plane convergence is defined as the completion of all FIB changes so that all forwarded traffic now takes the new proposed route. RFC 4098 defines the terms BGP device, FIB and the forwarded traffic. Data plane convergence is different than control plane convergence within a node.

Basic BGP is defined as RFC 4271 functional with Multi-Protocol BGP (MP-BGP) [RFC4760, RFC2545] for IPv6. The use of other extensions of BGP to support layer-2, layer-3 virtual private networks (VPN) are out of scope of this document.

The terminology used in this document is defined in [RFC4098]. One additional term is defined in this draft: FIB (Data plane) BGP Convergence.

### 1.2. Purpose of BGP FIB (Data Plane) Convergence

In the current Internet architecture the Inter-Autonomous System (inter-AS) transit is primarily available through BGP. To maintain a reliable connectivity within intra-domains or across inter-domains, fast recovery from failures remains most critical. To ensure minimal traffic losses, many service providers are requiring BGP implementations to converge the entire Internet routing table within sub-seconds at FIB level.

Furthermore, to compare these numbers amongst various devices, service providers are also looking at ways to standardize the convergence measurement methods. This document offers test methods for simple topologies. These simple tests will provide a quick high-level check, of the BGP data plane convergence across multiple implementations.

### 1.3. Control Plane Convergence

The convergence of BGP occurs at two levels: RIB and FIB convergence. RFC 4098 defines terms for BGP control plane convergence. Methodologies which test control plane convergence are out of scope for this draft.

### 1.4. Benchmarking Testing

In order to ensure that the results obtained in tests are repeatable, careful setup of initial conditions and exact steps are required.

This document proposes these initial conditions, test steps, and result checking. To ensure uniformity of the results all optional parameters SHOULD be disabled and all settings SHOULD be changed to default, these may include BGP timers as well.

## 2. Existing Definitions and Requirements

RFC 1242, "Benchmarking Terminology for Network Interconnect Devices" [RFC1242] and RFC 2285, "Benchmarking Terminology for LAN Switching Devices" [RFC2285] SHOULD be reviewed in conjunction with this document. WLAN-specific terms and definitions are also provided in Clauses 3 and 4 of the IEEE 802.11 standard [802.11]. Commonly used terms may also be found in RFC 1983 [RFC1983].

For the sake of clarity and continuity, this document adopts the general template for benchmarking terminology set out in Section 2 of RFC 1242. Definitions are organized in alphabetical order, and grouped into sections for ease of reference. The following terms are assumed to be taken as defined in RFC 1242 [RFC1242]: Throughput, Latency, Constant Load, Frame Loss Rate, and Overhead Behavior. In addition, the following terms are taken as defined in [RFC2285]: Forwarding Rates, Maximum Forwarding Rate, Loads, Device Under Test (DUT), and System Under Test (SUT).

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in RFC 2119 [RFC2119].

### 3. Test Topologies

This section describes simple test setups for use in BGP benchmarking tests measuring convergence of the FIB (data plane) after the BGP updates has been received.

These simple test nodes have 3 or 4 nodes with the following configuration:

1. Basic Test Setup
2. Three node setup for iBGP or eBGP convergence
3. Setup for eBGP multihop test scenario
4. Four node setup for iBGP or eBGP convergence

Individual tests refer to these topologies.

Figures 1-4 use the following conventions

- o AS-X: Autonomous System X
- o Loopback Int: Loopback interface on the BGP enabled device
- o R2: Helper router

#### 3.1. General Reference Topologies

Emulator acts as 1 or more BGP peers for different testcases.




Figure 1 Basic Test Setup




Figure 2 Three Node Setup for eBGP and iBGP Convergence




Figure 3 BGP Convergence for eBGP Multihop Scenario




Figure 4 Four Node Setup for EBGP and IBGP Convergence

#### 4. Test Considerations

The test cases for measuring convergence for iBGP and eBGP are different. Both iBGP and eBGP use different mechanisms to advertise, install and learn the routes. Typically, an iBGP route on the DUT is installed and exported only when the next-hop is reachable. For eBGP the route is installed on the DUT with the remote interface address as the next-hop with the exception of the multihop case.

##### 4.1. Number of Peers

Number of Peers is defined as the number of BGP neighbors or sessions the DUT has at the beginning of the test. The peers are established before the tests begin. The relationship could be either, iBGP or eBGP peering depending upon the test case requirement.

The DUT establishes one or more BGP sessions with one more emulated routers or helper nodes. Additional peers can be added based on the testing requirements. The number of peers enabled during the testing should be well documented in the report matrix.

##### 4.2. Number of Routes per Peer

It Number of Routes per Peer is defined as the number of routes advertized or learnt by the DUT per session or through neighbor relationship with an emulator or helper node. The tester, emulating as neighbor MUST advertise at least one route per peer.

Each test must run must identify the route stream in terms of route packing, route mixture, and number of routes. This route stream must be well documented in the reporting stream. RFC 4098 defines these terms.

It is RECOMMENDED that the user may consider advertizing the entire current Internet routing table per peering session using an Internet route mixture with unique or non-unique routes. If multiple peers are used, it is important to precisely document the timing sequence between the peer sending routes (as defined in RFC 4098).

#### 4.3. Policy Processing/Reconfiguration

The DUT MUST run one baseline test where policy is Minimum policy as defined in RFC 4098. Additional runs may be done with policy set-up before the tests begin. Exact policy settings should be documented as part of the test.

#### 4.4. Configured Parameters (Timers, etc..)

There are configured parameters and timers that may impact the measured BGP convergence times.

The benchmark metrics MAY be measured at any fixed values for these configured parameters.

It is RECOMMENDED these configure parameters have two settings: a) basic-test, and b) values as expected in the operational network. All optional BGP settings MUST be kept consistent across iterations of any specific tests

Examples of the configured parameters that may impact measured BGP convergence time include, but are not limited to:

1. Interface failure detection timer
2. BGP Keepalive timer
3. BGP Holdtime
4. BGP update delay timer
5. ConnectRetry timer
6. TCP Segment Size

7. Minimum Route Advertisement Interval (MRAI)
8. MinASOriginationInterval (MAOI)
9. Route Flap Dampening parameters
10. TCP MD5

The basic-test settings for the parameters should be:

1. Interface failure detection timer (0 ms)
2. BGP Keepalive timer (1 min)
3. BGP Holdtime (3 min)
4. BGP update delay timer (0 s)
5. ConnectRetry timer (1 s)
6. TCP Segment Size (4096)
7. Minimum Route Advertisement Interval (MRAI) (0 s)
8. MinASOriginationInterval (MAOI)(0 s)
9. Route Flap Dampening parameters (off)
10. TCP MD5 (off)

#### 4.5. Interface Types

The type of media dictate which test cases may be executed, each interface type has unique mechanism for detecting link failures and the speed at which that mechanism operates will influence the measurement results. All interfaces MUST be of the same media and throughput for each test case.

#### 4.6. Measurement Accuracy

Since observed packet loss is used to measure the route convergence time, the time between two successive packets offered to each individual route is the highest possible accuracy of any packet-loss based measurement. When packet jitter is much less than the convergence time, it is a negligible source of error and hence it will be treated as within tolerance.

An exterior measurement on the input media (such Ethernet) is defined by this specification.

#### 4.7. Measurement Statistics

The benchmark measurements may vary for each trial, due to the statistical nature of timer expirations, CPU scheduling, etc. It is recommended to repeat the test multiple times. Evaluation of the test data must be done with an understanding of generally accepted testing practices regarding repeatability, variance and statistical significance of a small number of trials.

For any repeated tests that are averaged to remove variance, all parameters MUST remain the same.

#### 4.8. Authentication

Authentication in BGP is done using the TCP MD5 Signature Option [RFC5925]. The processing of the MD5 hash, particularly in devices with a large number of BGP peers and a large amount of update traffic, can have an impact on the control plane of the device. If authentication is enabled, it SHOULD be documented correctly in the reporting format

#### 4.9. Convergence Events

Convergence events or triggers are defined as abnormal occurrences in the network, which initiate route flapping in the network, and hence forces the re-convergence of a steady state network. In a real network, a series of convergence events may cause convergence latency operators desire to test.

These convergence events must be defined in terms of the sequences defined in RFC 4098. This basic document begins all tests with a router initial set-up. Additional documents will define BGP data plane convergence based on peer initialization.

The convergence events may or may not be tied to the actual failure A Soft Reset (RFC 4098) does not clear the RIB or FIB tables. A Hard reset clears the BGP peer sessions, the RIB tables, and FIB tables.

#### 4.10. High Availability

Due to the different Non-Stop-Routing (sometimes referred to High-Availability) solutions available from different vendors, it is RECOMMENDED that any redundancy available in the routing processors should be disabled during the convergence measurements.

## 5. Test Cases

All tests defined under this section assume the following:

- a. BGP peers should be brought to BGP Peer established state
- b. Furthermore the traffic generation and routing should be verified in the topology

### 5.1. Basic Convergence Tests

These test cases measure characteristics of a BGP implementation in non-failure scenarios like:

1. RIB-IN Convergence
2. RIB-OUT Convergence
3. eBGP Convergence
4. iBGP Convergence

#### 5.1.1. RIB-IN Convergence

Objective:

This test measures the convergence time taken to receive and install a route in RIB using BGP

Reference Test Setup:

This test uses the setup as shown in figure 1

Procedure:

- A. All variables affecting Convergence should be set to a basic test state (as defined in section 4-4).
- B. Establish BGP adjacency between DUT and peer x of Emulator.
- C. To ensure adjacency establishment, wait for 3 KeepAlives from the DUT or a configurable delay before proceeding with the

rest of the test.

- D. Start the traffic from the Emulator peer-x towards the DUT targeted at a routes specified in route mixture (ex. route A) Initially no traffic SHOULD be observed on the egress interface as the route A is not installed in the forwarding database of the DUT.

- E. Advertise route A from the Peer-x to the DUT and record the time.

This is  $Tup(EMx, Rt-A)$  also named 'XMT-Rt-time'.

- F. Record the time when the route-A from Peer-x is received at the DUT.

This  $Tup(DUT, Rt-A)$  also named 'RCV-Rt-time'.

- G. Record the time when the traffic targeted towards route A is received by Emulator on appropriate traffic egress interface.

This is  $TR(TDx, Rt-A)$ . This is also named DUT-XMT-Data-Time.

- H. The difference between the  $Tup(TDx, RT-A)$  and traffic received time ( $TR(TDr, Rt-A)$ ) is the FIB Convergence Time for route-A in the route mixture. A full convergence for the route update is the measurement between the 1st route (Route-A) and the last route (Rt-last)

Route update convergence is

$TR(TDr, RT-last) - Tup(DUT, Rt-A)$  or

$(DUT-XMT-Data-Time - RCV-Rt-Time)(rt-A)$

Note: It is recommended that a single test with the same route mixture be repeated several times. A report should provide the Stand Deviation of all tests and the Average.

Running tests with a varying number of routes and route mixtures is important to get a full characterization of a single peer.

#### 5.1.2. RIB-OUT Convergence

Objective:

This test measures the convergence time taken by an implementation to receive, install and advertise a route using BGP

Reference Test Setup:

This test uses the setup as shown in figure 2

Procedure:

- A. The Helper node (HLP) run same version of BGP as DUT.
- B. All devices MUST be synchronized using NTP or some local reference clock.
- C. All configuration variables for HLP, DUT, and Emulator SHOULD be set to the same values. These values MAY be basic-test or a unique set completely described in the test set-up.
- D. Establish BGP adjacency between DUT and Emulator.
- E. Establish BGP adjacency between DUT and Helper Node.
- F. To ensure adjacency establishment, wait for 3 KeepAlives from the DUT or a configurable delay before proceeding with the rest of the test
- G. Start the traffic from the Emulator towards the Helper Node targeted at a specific route say route A. Initially no traffic SHOULD be observed on the egress interface as the route-A is not installed in the forwarding database of the DUT.
- H. Advertise routeA from the Emulator to the DUT and note the time.  

This is  $T_{up}(EMx, Route-A)$ . (also named EM-XMT-Rt-Time)
- I. Record when Route-A is received by DUT.  

This is  $T_{up}(DUTr, Route-A)$ . (also named DUT-RCV-Rt-Time)
- J. Record the time when the ROUTE forward by DUT toward the Helper node.  

This is  $T_{up}(DUTx, Rt-A)$ . (also named DUT-XMT-Rt-Time)

- K. Record the time when the traffic targeted towards route-A is received on the Route Egress Interface toward peer-X. This is TR(EMr, Route-A). (also named DUT-XMT-Data Time).

FIB convergence = (DUT-RCV-Rt-Time - DUT-XMT-Data-Time)

RIB convergence = (DUT-RCV-Rt-Time - DUT-XMT-Rt-Time)

Convergence for a route stream is characterized by

a) Individual route convergence for FIB, RIB

b) All route convergence of

FIB-convergence =DUT-RCV-Rt-Time(A)-DUT-XMT-Data-Time(last)

RIB-convergence =DUT-RCV-Rt-Time(A)-DUT-XMT-Rt-Time(last)

#### 5.1.3. eBGP Convergence

Objective:

This test measures the convergence time taken by an implementation to receive, install and advertise a route in an eBGP Scenario

Reference Test Setup:

This test uses the setup as shown in figure 2 and the scenarios described in RIB-IN and RIB-OUT are applicable to this test case.

#### 5.1.4. iBGP Convergence

Objective:

This test measures the convergence time taken by an implementation to receive, install and advertise a route in an iBGP Scenario

Reference Test Setup:

This test uses the setup as shown in figure 2 and the scenarios described in RIB-IN and RIB-OUT are applicable to this test case.

#### 5.1.5. eBGP Multihop Convergence

Objective:

This test measures the convergence time taken by an implementation to receive, install and advertise a route in an eBGP Multihop Scenario

Reference Test Setup:

This test uses the setup as shown in figure 3. Two DUTs are used along with a helper node.

Procedure:

- A. The DUT2 is the same model as DUT and runs the same BGP implementation as DUT
- B. All devices to be synchronized using NTP
- C. All variables affecting Convergence like authentication, policies, timers should be set to basic-settings
- D. All 3 devices, DUT, Emulator and Helper Node are configured as different Autonomous Systems
- E. Loopback Interfaces configured on DUT and Helper Node and connectivity is established between them using any config options available on the DUT
- F. Establish BGP adjacency between DUT1 and Emulator
- G. Establish BGP adjacency between DUT2 and Helper Node
- H. Establish BGP adjacency between DUT 1 and DUT 2
- I. To ensure adjacency establishment, wait for 3 KeepAlives from the DUT1 and DUT2 or a configurable delay before proceeding with the rest of the test
- J. Start the traffic from the Emulator towards the Helper Node targeted at a specific route say routeA
- K. Initially no traffic SHOULD be observed on the egress interface as the routeA is not installed in the forwarding database of the DUT

- L. Advertise routeA from the Emulator to the DUT and note the time. (Tup(EMx,RouteA) - This is also named (Route-Rec-time)
- M. Record the time when the traffic targeted towards routeA is received from Egress Interface of DUT on emulator This is TR(EMr,DUT), nicknamed (Data Receive time)
- N. The following equation represents the FIB Convergence multi-node

$$\text{eBGP Multihop Convergence Time} = (\text{Rt-RecTime} - \text{Data-RcvTime})$$

Note: It is recommended that the test be repeated with varying number of routes and route mixtures. With each set route mixture, the test should be repeated multiple times. The results should record average, mean, Standard Deviation

## 5.2. BGP Failure/Convergence Events

### 5.2.1. Physical Link Failure on DUT End

Objective:

This test measures the route convergence time due to local link failure event at DUT's Local Interface

Reference Test Setup:

This test uses the setup as shown in figure 1. Shutdown event is defined as an administrative shutdown event on the DUT

Procedure:

- A. All variables affecting Convergence like authentication, policies, timers should be set to basic-test policy
- B. Establish 2 BGP adjacencies from DUT to Emulator, one over the peer interface and the other using a second peer interface
- C. Advertise the same route, route A over both the adjacencies and (Tx1)Interface to be the preferred next hop
- D. To ensure adjacency establishment, wait for 3 KeepAlives from the DUT or a configurable delay before proceeding with the rest of the test

- E. Start the traffic from the Emulator towards the DUT targeted at a specific route say route A. Initially traffic would be observed on the best egress route (Err1) instead of Trr2
- F. Trigger the shutdown event of Best Egress Interface on DUT (Drr1)
- G. Measure the Convergence Time for the event to be detected and traffic to be forwarded to Next-Best Egress Interface (rr2)  
$$\text{Time} = \text{Data-detect}(rr2) - \text{Shutdown time}$$
- H. Stop the offered load and wait for the queues to drain and Restart
- I. Bring up the link on DUT Best Egress Interface
- J. Measure the convergence time taken for the traffic to be rerouted from (rr2) to Best Interface (rr1)  
$$\text{Time} = \text{Data-detect}(rr1) - \text{Shutdown time}$$
- K. It is recommended that the test be repeated with varying number of routes and route mixtures or with number of routes and route mixtures closer to what is deployed in operational networks

#### 5.2.2. Physical Link Failure on Remote/Emulator End

Objective:

This test measures the route convergence time due to local link failure event at Tester's Local Interface

Reference Test Setup:

This test uses the setup as shown in figure 1. Shutdown event is defined as shutdown of the local interface of Tester via logical shutdown event. The procedure used in 5.2.1 is used for the termination

#### 5.2.3. ECMP Link Failure on DUT End

Objective:

This test measures the route convergence time due to local link failure event at ECMP Member. The FIB configuration and BGP is set to allow two ECMP routes to be installed. However, policy

directs the routes to be sent only over one of the paths

Reference Test Setup:

This test uses the setup as shown in figure 1 and the procedure uses 5.2.1

5.3. BGP Adjacency Failure (Non-Physical Link Failure) on Emulator

Objective:

This test measures the route convergence time due to BGP Adjacency Failure on Emulator

Reference Test Setup:

This test uses the setup as shown in figure 1

Procedure:

- A. All variables affecting Convergence like authentication, policies, timers should be basic-policy set
- B. Establish 2 BGP adjacencies from DUT to Emulator, one over the Best Egress Interface and the other using the Next-Best Egress Interface
- C. Advertise the same route, routeA over both the adjacencies and make Best Egress Interface to be the preferred next hop
- D. To ensure adjacency establishment, wait for 3 KeepAlives from the DUT or a configurable delay before proceeding with the rest of the test
- E. Start the traffic from the Emulator towards the DUT targeted at a specific route say routeA. Initially traffic would be observed on the Best Egress interface
- F. Remove BGP adjacency via a software adjacency down on the Emulator on the Best Egress Interface. This time is called BGPadj-down-time also termed BGPpeer-down
- G. Measure the Convergence Time for the event to be detected and traffic to be forwarded to Next-Best Egress Interface. This time is Tr-rr2 also called TR2-traffic-on

Convergence = TR2-traffic-on - BGPpeer-down

- H. Stop the offered load and wait for the queues to drain and Restart
- I. Bring up BGP adjacency on the Emulator over the Best Egress Interface. This time is BGP-adj-up also called BGPpeer-up
- J. Measure the convergence time taken for the traffic to be rerouted to Best Interface. This time is BGP-adj-up also called BGPpeer-up

#### 5.4. BGP Hard Reset Test Cases

##### 5.4.1. BGP Non-Recovering Hard Reset Event on DUT

###### Objective:

This test measures the route convergence time due to Hard Reset on the DUT

###### Reference Test Setup:

This test uses the setup as shown in figure 1

###### Procedure:

- A. The requirement for this test case is that the Hard Reset Event should be non-recovering and should affect only the adjacency between DUT and Emulator on the Best Egress Interface
- B. All variables affecting SHOULD be set to basic-test values
- C. Establish 2 BGP adjacencies from DUT to Emulator, one over the Best Egress Interface and the other using the Next-Best Egress Interface
- D. Advertise the same route, routeA over both the adjacencies and make Best Egress Interface to be the preferred next hop
- E. To ensure adjacency establishment, wait for 3 KeepAlives from the DUT or a configurable delay before proceeding with the rest of the test

- F. Start the traffic from the Emulator towards the DUT targeted at a specific route say routeA. Initially traffic would be observed on the Best Egress interface
- G. Trigger the Hard Reset event of Best Egress Interface on DUT
- H. Measure the Convergence Time for the event to be detected and traffic to be forwarded to Next-Best Egress Interface

Time of convergence = time-traffic flow - time-reset

- I. Stop the offered load and wait for the queues to drain and Restart
- J. It is recommended that the test be repeated with varying number of routes and route mixtures or with number of routes and route mixtures closer to what is deployed in operational networks
- K. When varying number of routes are used, convergence Time is measured using the Loss Derived method [IGPData]
- L. Convergence Time in this scenario is influenced by Failure detection time on Tester, BGP Keep Alive Time and routing, forwarding table update time

#### 5.5. BGP Soft Reset

##### Objective:

This test measures the route convergence time taken by an implementation to service a BGP Route Refresh message and advertise a route

##### Reference Test Setup:

This test uses the setup as shown in figure 2

##### Procedure:

- A. The BGP implementation on DUT and Helper Node needs to support BGP Route Refresh Capability [RFC2918]
- B. All devices to be synchronized using NTP

- C. All variables affecting Convergence like authentication, policies, timers should be set to basic-test defaults
- D. DUT and Helper Node are configured in the same Autonomous System whereas Emulator is configured under a different Autonomous System
- E. Establish BGP adjacency between DUT and Emulator
- F. Establish BGP adjacency between DUT and Helper Node
- G. To ensure adjacency establishment, wait for 3 KeepAlives from the DUT or a configurable delay before proceeding with the rest of the test
- H. Configure a policy under BGP on Helper Node to deny routes received from DUT
- I. Advertise routeA from the Emulator to the DUT
- J. The DUT will try to advertise the route to Helper Node will be denied
- K. Wait for 3 KeepAlives
- L. Start the traffic from the Emulator towards the Helper Node targeted at a specific route say routeA. Initially no traffic would be observed on the Egress interface, as routeA is not present
- M. Remove the policy on Helper Node and issue a Route Refresh request towards DUT. Note the timestamp of this event. This is the RefreshTime
- N. Record the time when the traffic targeted towards routeA is received on the Egress Interface. This is RecTime
- O. The following equation represents the Route Refresh Convergence Time per route

$$\text{Route Refresh Convergence Time} = (\text{RecTime} - \text{RefreshTime})$$

#### 5.6. BGP Route Withdrawal Convergence Time

Objective:

This test measures the route convergence time taken by an implementation to service a BGP Withdraw message and advertise the withdraw

Reference Test Setup:

This test uses the setup as shown in figure 2

Procedure:

- A. This test consists of 2 steps to determine the Total Withdraw Processing Time
- B. Step 1:
  - (1) All devices to be synchronized using NTP
  - (2) All variables should be set to basic-test parameters
  - (3) DUT and Helper Node are configured in the same Autonomous System whereas Emulator is configured under a different Autonomous System
  - (4) Establish BGP adjacency between DUT and Emulator
  - (5) To ensure adjacency establishment, wait for 3 KeepAlives from the DUT or a configurable delay before proceeding with the rest of the test
  - (6) Start the traffic from the Emulator towards the DUT targeted at a specific route say routeA. Initially no traffic would be observed on the Egress interface as the routeA is not present on DUT
  - (7) Advertise routeA from the Emulator to the DUT
  - (8) The traffic targeted towards routeA is received on the Egress Interface
  - (9) Now the Tester sends request to withdraw routeA to DUT, TRx(Awith) also called WdrawTime1
  - (10) Record the time when no traffic is observed on the Egress Interface. This is the RouteRemoveTime1(A)

$$WdrawConvTime1 = RouteRemoveTime1(A)$$

- (11) The difference between the RouteRemoveTime1 and WdrawTime1 is the WdrawConvTime1

C. Step 2:

- (1) Continuing from Step 1, re-advertise routeA back to DUT from Tester
- (2) The DUT will try to advertise the routeA to Helper Node (assumption there exists a session between DUT and helper node)
- (3) Start the traffic from the Emulator towards the Helper Node targeted at a specific route say routeA. Traffic would be observed on the Egress interface after routeA is received by the Helper Node

WATime=time traffic first flows

- (4) Now the Tester sends a request to withdraw routeA to DUT. This is the WdrawTime2

$$WAWtime-TRx(RouteA) = WdrawTime2$$

- (5) DUT processes the withdraw and sends it to Helper Node
- (6) Record the time when no traffic is observed on the Egress Interface of Helper Node. This is

$$TR-WAW(DUT,RouteA) = RouteRemoveTime2$$

- (7) Total withdraw processing time is

$$TotalWdrawTime = ((RouteRemoveTime2 - WdrawTime2) - WdrawConvTime1)$$

### 5.7. BGP Path Attribute Change Convergence Time

Objective:

This test measures the convergence time taken by an implementation to service a BGP Path Attribute Change

Reference Test Setup:

This test uses the setup as shown in figure 1

Procedure:

- A. This test only applies to Well-Known Mandatory Attributes like Origin, AS Path, Next Hop
- B. In each iteration of test only one of these mandatory attributes need to be varied whereas the others remain the same
- C. All devices to be synchronized using NTP
- D. All variables should be set to basic-test parameters
- E. Advertise the route, routeA over the Best Egress Interface only, making it the preferred next hop
- F. To ensure adjacency establishment, wait for 3 KeepAlives from the DUT or a configurable delay before proceeding with the rest of the test
- G. Start the traffic from the Emulator towards the DUT targeted at the specific route say routeA. Initially traffic would be observed on the Best Egress interface
- H. Now advertise the same route routeA on the Next-Best Egress Interface but by varying one of the well-known mandatory attributes to have a preferred value over that interface. The other values need to be same as what was advertised on the Best-Egress adjacency

$$TRx(\text{Path-Change}) = \text{Path Change Event Time}$$

- I. Measure the Convergence Time for the event to be detected and traffic to be forwarded to Next-Best Egress Interface

$$DUT(\text{Path-Change, RouteA}) = \text{Path-switch time}$$

$$\text{Convergence} = \text{Path-switch time} - \text{Path Change Event Time}$$

- J. Stop the offered load and wait for the queues to drain and Restart

## 5.8. BGP Graceful Restart Convergence Time

### Objective:

This test measures the route convergence time taken by an implementation during a Graceful Restart Event

### Reference Test Setup:

This test uses the setup as shown in figure 4

### Procedure:

- A. It measures the time taken by an implementation to service a BGP Graceful Restart Event and advertise a route
- B. The Helper Nodes are the same model as DUT and run the same BGP implementation as DUT
- C. The BGP implementation on DUT and Helper Node needs to support BGP Graceful Restart Mechanism [RFC4724]
- D. All devices to be synchronized using NTP
- E. All variables are set to basic-test values
- F. DUT and Helper Node-1 are configured in the same Autonomous System whereas Emulator and Helper Node-2 are configured under different Autonomous Systems
- G. Establish BGP adjacency between DUT and Helper Nodes
- H. Establish BGP adjacency between Helper Node-2 and Emulator
- I. To ensure adjacency establishment, wait for 3 KeepAlives from the DUT or a configurable delay before proceeding with the rest of the test
- J. Configure a policy under BGP on Helper Node-1 to deny routes received from DUT
- K. Advertise routeA from the Emulator to Helper Node-2
- L. Helper Node-2 advertises the route to DUT and DUT will try to advertise the route to Helper Node-1 which will be denied

- M. Wait for 3 KeepAlives
- N. Start the traffic from the Emulator towards the Helper Node-1 targeted at the specific route say routeA. Initially no traffic would be observed on the Egress interface as the routeA is not present
- O. Perform a Graceful Restart Trigger Event on DUT and note the time. This is the GREventTime
- P. Remove the policy on Helper Node-1
- Q. Record the time when the traffic targeted towards routeA is received on the Egress Interface  
  
TRr(DUT, routeA). This is also called RecTime
- R. The following equation represents the Graceful Restart Convergence Time  
  
$$\text{Graceful Restart Convergence Time} = ((\text{GREventTime} - \text{RecTime}) - \text{RIB-IN})$$
- S. It is assumed in this test case that after a Switchover is triggered on the DUT, it will not have any cycles to process BGP Refresh messages. The reason for this assumption is that there is a narrow window of time where after switchover when we remove the policy from Helper Node -1, implementations might generate Route-Refresh automatically and this request might be serviced before the DUT actually switches over and reestablishes BGP adjacencies with the peers

## 6. Reporting Format

For each test case, it is recommended that the reporting tables below are completed and all time values SHOULD be reported with resolution as specified in [RFC4098]

Parameter	Units
Test case	Test case number
Test topology	1,2,3 or 4
Parallel links	Number of parallel links
Interface type	GigE, POS, ATM, other
Convergence Event	Hard reset, Soft reset, link failure, or other defined
eBGP sessions	Number of eBGP sessions
iBGP sessions	Number of iBGP sessions
eBGP neighbor	Number of eBGP neighbors
iBGP neighbor	Number of iBGP neighbors
Routes per peer	Number of routes
Total unique routes	Number of routes
Total non-unique routes	Number of routes
IGP configured	ISIS, OSPF, static, or other
Route Mixture	Description of Route mixture
Route Packing	Number of routes in an update
Policy configured	Yes, No
Packet size offered to the DUT	Bytes
Offered load	Packets per second
Packet sampling interval on tester	Seconds
Forwarding delay threshold	Seconds
Timer Values configured on DUT	
Interface failure indication delay	Seconds
Hold time	Seconds
MinRouteAdvertisementInterval (MRAI)	Seconds
MinASOriginationInterval (MAOI)	Seconds
Keepalive Time	Seconds
ConnectRetry	Seconds
TCP Parameters for DUT and tester	
MSS	Bytes
Slow start threshold	Bytes
Maximum window size	Bytes

Test Details:

- a. If the Offered Load matches a subset of routes, describe how this subset is selected
- b. Describe how the Convergence Event is applied; does it cause instantaneous traffic loss or not

c. If there is any policy configured, describe the configured policy

Complete the table below for the initial Convergence Event and the reversion Convergence Event

Parameter	Unit
Convergence Event	Initial or reversion
Traffic Forwarding Metrics	
Total number of packets offered to DUT	Number of packets
Total number of packets forwarded by DUT	Number of packets
Connectivity Packet Loss	Number of packets
Convergence Packet Loss	Number of packets
Out-of-order packets	Number of packets
Duplicate packets	Number of packets
Convergence Benchmarks	
Rate-derived Method [IGP-Data]:	
First route convergence time	Seconds
Full convergence time	Seconds
Loss-derived Method [IGP-Data]:	
Loss-derived convergence time	Seconds
Route-Specific Loss-Derived Method:	
Minimum R-S convergence time	Seconds
Maximum R-S convergence time	Seconds
Median R-S convergence time	Seconds
Average R-S convergence time	Seconds
Loss of Connectivity Benchmarks	
Loss-derived Method:	
Loss-derived loss of connectivity period	Seconds
Route-Specific loss-derived Method:	
Minimum LoC period [n]	Array of seconds
Minimum Route LoC period	Seconds
Maximum Route LoC period	Seconds
Median Route LoC period	Seconds

Average Route LoC period                      Seconds

## 7. IANA Considerations

This draft does not require any new allocations by IANA.

## 8. Security Considerations

Benchmarking activities as described in this memo are limited to technology characterization using controlled stimuli in a laboratory environment, with dedicated address space and the constraints specified in the sections 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.

## 9. Acknowledgments

The following people made textual contributions to this document: Jay Karthik (Cisco Systems), Eric Brendel (AT&T), and Mohan Nanduri (Microsoft) The authors would like to thank them for the helpful discussions and their contributions to the document.

## 10. References

### 10.1. Normative References

[I-D.ietf-bmwg-igp-dataplane-conv-term]  
Poretsky, S., Imhoff, B., and K. Michielsen, "Terminology for Benchmarking Link-State IGP Data Plane Route Convergence", draft-ietf-bmwg-igp-dataplane-conv-term-23 (work in progress), February 2011.

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, March 1997.
- [RFC2918] Chen, E., "Route Refresh Capability for BGP-4", RFC 2918, September 2000.
- [RFC4271] Rekhter, Y., Li, T., and S. Hares, "A Border Gateway Protocol 4 (BGP-4)", RFC 4271, January 2006.

## 10.2. Informative References

- [RFC1242] Bradner, S., "Benchmarking terminology for network interconnection devices", RFC 1242, July 1991.
- [RFC1983] Malkin, G., "Internet Users' Glossary", RFC 1983, August 1996.
- [RFC2285] Mandeville, R., "Benchmarking Terminology for LAN Switching Devices", RFC 2285, February 1998.
- [RFC2545] Marques, P. and F. Dupont, "Use of BGP-4 Multiprotocol Extensions for IPv6 Inter-Domain Routing", RFC 2545, March 1999.
- [RFC4098] Berkowitz, H., Davies, E., Hares, S., Krishnaswamy, P., and M. Lepp, "Terminology for Benchmarking BGP Device Convergence in the Control Plane", RFC 4098, June 2005.
- [RFC4724] Sangli, S., Chen, E., Fernando, R., Scudder, J., and Y. Rekhter, "Graceful Restart Mechanism for BGP", RFC 4724, January 2007.
- [RFC4760] Bates, T., Chandra, R., Katz, D., and Y. Rekhter, "Multiprotocol Extensions for BGP-4", RFC 4760, January 2007.
- [RFC5925] Touch, J., Mankin, A., and R. Bonica, "The TCP Authentication Option", RFC 5925, June 2010.

## Authors' Addresses

Rajiv Papneja  
Huawei Technologies

Email: rajiv.papneja@huawei.com

Bhavani Parise  
Cisco Systems

Email: bhavani@cisco.com

Susan Hares  
Huawei Technologies

Email: shares@huawei.com

Ilya Varlashkin  
Easynet Global Services

Email: ilya.varlashkin@easynet.com

Eric Brendel  
Independent Consultant

Email: brendel@pektel.com

Mohan Nanduri  
Microsoft

Email: mnanduri@microsoft.com

Jay Karthik  
Cisco Systems

Email: jkarthik@cisco.com



