Registry Design Team Discussion and Conclusions

Bill Cerveny & Brian Trammell, IPPM
• Two registry design proposals presented to IPPM in Berlin, driven by LMAP requirement for a metric registry
  – One registry for active monitoring (IPPM like type of metrics) for which there is a well defined list of fixed parameters
  – One registry common to active and passive, which is open, because the semantic depends on the flow keys
Background (2 of 2)

• Design team convened by IPPM chairs to combine the two registry efforts into one.
  – Aamer Akhter (not present), Marcelo Bagnulo, Benoit Claise, Phil Eardley, and Al Morton
  – Met Monday with Bill Cerveny, Brian Trammell (IPPM chairs), Jason Weil (LMAP chair), and Andrea Soppera (LMAP contributor)
Why do we need a registry?

• Reference for implementers of known operationally useful performance metrics
  – implementable + deployable
  – understandable + accurate
• Common vocabulary for LMAP tests
• Central reference for performance metrics developed across the IETF (Performance Metrics Directorate).
Conclusion: Three documents to be produced

• (1) **Core registry definition** document that defines an extensible registry of performance metrics, and guidelines for registry entry authors and reviewers.

• Sub-registries of the core registry (additional columns) for (2) **active metrics** and (3) **passive metrics**.

• Identifiers in the core registry will be **unique** across all sub-registries.
Why a “split” registry?

• Difference between columns for active measurements (derived from 2330) and passive measurements hard to reconcile.
  – Active: control over conditions for comparability, question known in advance of measurement. Requires a superset of 6390 columns.
  – Passive: flexibility in definition to conform to available traffic, question can be chosen after measurement.

• 6390 points to a third type of metric: “internal”
  – generated by a protocol implementation at an endpoint (e.g. XRBLOCK)
  – Definition is future work
Core registry definition

• Basic columns taken from subset of 6390 template (identifier, description, others?)
• Sub-registries must contain additional information
• Guidelines to provide reference for expert reviewers in evaluating new registry entries (see 7013 for an IPFIX example)
Next Steps

• Rework present drafts into new form shortly after Vancouver meeting.
• Single call for adoption of new drafts as WG items on the ippm@ietf.org list thereafter.

• Many thanks to the design team for all the hard work since Orlando!