IETF 89

IPPM Session

13:00 - 15:00, 03Mar14

Time	Who	Subject	Further Action
13:00	**B Trammell**	Opening, Note well, Agenda bashing http://www.ietf.org/proceedings/89/slides/slides-89-ippm-1.pdf Status: 2680 test plan has been sent up to the IESG. We are working to complete our Spring 2013 charter before accepting new work. We will consider individual drafts from the Registry Design team for adoption today. WGLC on current drafts (except model-based-metrics) will follow directly after London. We plan to consider additional drafts for adoption via the list between London and Toronto.	
13:10	**Registry Design Team** G Mirsky M Bagnulo G Mirsky M Bagnulo G Mirsky S Dawkins G Mirsky M Bagnulo B Trammell G Mirsky B Trammell G Mirsky S Dawkins B Trammell N Elkins	Registry for Performance Metrics Presentation draft-manyfolks-ippm-metric-registry http://www.ietf.org/proceedings/89/slides/slides-89-ippm-12.pdf Referring to this as a performance registry, would this be too broad a term? The scope of a performance metrics registry is broader than this group. Charter says defining metrics for certain things is out of scope. Yes, those things are out of scope, however a registry of metric definitions for those things is not. MPLS should look at this for example As I understand it, this is a registry that IPPM metrics would be registered in, and that other groups might also register in. The structure of the registry enforces certain things, whereas other groups may have other requirements. We were asked to broaden this by the Ops ADs. So there are problems in the base registry that make it less than useful for, for example, MPLS? yes Please send something to the list with specific comments. One of the intentions of the structure was to take all the common parts in the base registry, and put the unusual things in the subregistries. It might make more progress in IPPM if the scope were less generic. I'm hearing you say, start the work, but don't wait to surface it until last call, instead request earlier review. There is a performance metrics directorate, it seems like that would be a useful conduit for cross-area participation.	

IETF 89

IPPM Session

13:00 - 15:00, 03Mar14

Time	Who	Subject	Further Action
		Who is the user in these specs? That seems to need some clarification.	
13:30	**Registry Design Team** **Al Morton**	IPPM Active Sub-Registry: Design and Examples draft-mornuley-ippm-registry-active http://www.ietf.org/proceedings/89/slides/slides-89-ippm-8.pdf	
13:35		Fire alarm No further comments	
13:38	**Registry Design Team** **A Akhter**	Passive Performance Metrics Sub-Registry draft-akhter-ippm-registry-passive http://www.ietf.org/proceedings/89/slides/slides-89-ippm-11.pdf	
	M Bagnulo	We have a presentation later about passive measurement. Does the traffic selection criterion problem fall into that context?	
	A Akhter	Yes, I wouldn't be surprised that it's the first thing that has to be done there.	
	M Bagnulo	You'd like to see that the reference implementation actually exists? You can say that in the absence of a reference implementation, you can't register a metric.	
	B Trammell	Fixed vs runtime parameters, we only have to define fixed parameters, rather than runtime parameters.	
	M Bagnulo	It's out of scope for the registry, but it is not clear that it is out of scope for the WG in general.	
	G Mirsky	I'm not sure this is a 'passive metric', rather it is an IP performance metric obtained with a passive technique.	
	A Morton	The metrics in IPPM were designed to work when the measurement stream is known, so a-priori you know the exact timing and content of the packets. This is a very different thing than a passive measurement.	
	Y Stein	If we believe there is a physical reality to the things we are measuring, we should try for something that is independent of the traffic used to gain the measurement.	
	M Matthis	the real problem is the space of the preconditions requires 2nd order predicate calculus, which is non-computable	
	J Fubini	Can you please detail, to which extent the "Filter Criteria" column for the passive registry differs from the active registry Type-P-packet column?	
	A Akhter	Is there something about the traffic that limits you to that particular subset of traffic?	
	B Trammell	Brian: So, given scope will be decided in consultation with the ADs, are there clarifying questions for adoption?	
	Question	is the intention to have three docs?	

Time	Who	Subject	Further Action
	B Trammell	Yes	
	Question	Have you spoken to IANA about three docs vs one?	
	B Trammell	No, obviously we need to, but first we first need to figure out what we want.	
	B Trammell	Clear hum for adoption, will make a mailing list call for final adoption	
13:59	**Al Morton**	Rate Measurement Test Protocol Problem Statement draft-ietf-ippm-rate-problem-05 http://www.ietf.org/proceedings/89/slides/slides-89-ippm-4.pdf	
	I Varlashkin	If this goes through I will be getting quite a few questions from customers... if you take active measurements while there is some customer traffic, there will be very large variance. When someone starts designing a solution, it may be too late for such comments.	
	Question	The protocol, how does it respond to NAT?	
	Al Morton	There isn't a protocol solution, so you're looking for NAT traversal as a requirement. We can do that.	
14:04	**Al Morton**	LMAP Reference Path and Measurement Points draft-ietf-ippm-lmap-path-02 http://www.ietf.org/proceedings/89/slides/slides-89-ippm-3.pdf	
	B Trammell	additional comments? None.	
14:07	**Al Morton** (for Joachim)	Advanced Stream and Sampling Framework for IPPM draft-ietf-ippm-2330-update-02 http://www.ietf.org/proceedings/89/slides/slides-89-ippm-2.pdf	
	M Mathis	I've been remiss about resurrecting some work from a few years ago. There is some newer language in metrics space.	
	Al Morton	I've been looking at metrology in general, and the same concepts keep coming up under different names.	
	M Mathis	Repeatability comes in at least three different kinds, which loses ways to talk about the problem.	
	M Mathis	we wished we had an algebra on metrics, and couldn't make it work...	
	B Trammell	This is nice and self-contained, but there's more that can be done to 2330.	
	K Pentikousis	I remembered sending a bunch of references a while ago. I would like to see a bunch more informational references, seeing as the document is itself informational. It would be nice to have better literature coverage. Otherwise it's looking good. Should this be an informational draft ???	

IETF 89

IPPM Session

13:00 - 15:00, 03Mar14

Time	Who	Subject	Further Action
14:15	**K Pentikousis**	Network Performance Measurement for IPsec draft-ietf-ippm-ipsec-02 http://www.ietf.org/proceedings/89/slides/slides-89-ippm-5.pdf	K Pentikousis
	Al Morton B Trammell	combine modes? IPSec ? next draft by Kostas will address	
	Al Morton	It struck me that we might be able to combine modes into using just two bits. I'm not sure you can really start at 16, I think we've used some.	
	K Pentikousis	The nice thing is you can advertise we can do this, so the server won't have a problem with either way.	
	Sumita Chakhrabhati	<about coauthor/comments very recently>	
	K Pentikousis	Kostas: This should work for any two endpoints	
	Sumita Chakhrabhati	Sumita: Probably mobile networks will be the first to try it	
	B Trammell	We can wait for a new revision before doing WGLC	
14:28	**M Mathis**	Model Based Metrics http://www.ietf.org/proceedings/89/slides/slides-89-ippm-9.pdf	
	M Ackermann	Is everything here more active metrics?	
	M Mathis	My perspective is more hybrid. There's some interesting issues there.	
	M Ackermann	Sounds like many people are interested in active/passive/hybrid.	
	B Trammell	There's a problem statement on that, it's the last thing on the agenda.	
	M Mathis	4898 is a hybrid technique, for example.	
14:36	**Peng Fan**	Performance Metrics for Web Browsing draft-fan-ippm-web-metrics-00 http://www.ietf.org/proceedings/89/slides/slides-89-ippm-10.pdf	
	R Wealdon	We see many web requests when the first byte fails to arrive. What does this do to the metric?	
	Peng Fan	We treat this as an infinite value.	
	B Trammell	These issues are also covered in 2330, which would have some discussion.	
	Murali Suriar	A number of the metrics apply to a few other kinds of applications, and so I'd be curious as why you would not make it a higher level kind of thing. HTTP in particular can have quite a few elements or objects, and would hope you could talk further about some of those issues, and maybe DNS resolution time.	

IETF 89

IPPM Session

13:00 - 15:00, 03Mar14

Time	Who	Subject	Further Action
	Peng Fan	We can certainly add more. We did consider DNS resolution time; we can add that if necessary.	
	M Mathis	Any HTTP experts in the room? Existing browsers have essentially these items; waterfall diagrams are a common diagnostic. I believe there's been a standards discussion about the various markers that appear in those diagrams, and there has been a huge amount of work elsewhere.	
	B Trammell	And so you should not duplicate this?	
	M Mathis	Yes	
	B Trammell	And so ask HTTPbis?	
	Y Stein	There is also some of this in netflow	
	B Trammell	For ipfix, and netflow, there's quite a lot of running code, many approaches	
	B Trammell	If this comes in, there needs to be confidence we are not duplicating, and consult with other groups.	
14:48	**L Deng**	Problem Statement for IP measurement in mobile networks http://www.ietf.org/proceedings/89/slides/slides-89-ippm-6.pdf	
14:56	**V Zhang**	Hybrid Measurement using IPPM Metrics http://www.ietf.org/proceedings/89/slides/slides-89-ippm-7.pdf	
	Y Stein	In addition to the two mechanisms you mentioned, you could also get good synchronisation by agreeing on timing of counter reads.	
	B Trammell	Comments please.	
15:00	**B Trammell**	**Meeting adjourned**	