IPPM

IP Performance Metrics

IETF 90 Toronto / Tuesday 22 July 2014
Bill Cerveny & Brian Trammell, Co-Chairs

Note Well

- **Any submission to the IETF intended by the Contributor for publication as all or part of an IETF Internet-Draft or RFC and any statement made within the context of an IETF activity is considered an "IETF Contribution".** Such statements include oral statements in IETF sessions, as well as written and electronic communications made at any time or place, which are addressed to:

  - The IETF plenary session

  - The IESG, or any member thereof on behalf of the IESG

  - **Any IETF mailing list**, including the IETF list itself, any **working group** or design team list,

    - or any other list functioning under IETF auspices

  - Any **IETF working group or portion thereof**

  - Any Birds of a Feather (BOF) session

  - The IAB or any member thereof on behalf of the IAB

  - The RFC Editor or the Internet-Drafts function

  - *All IETF Contributions are subject to the rules of **RFC 5378** and **RFC 3979** (updated by **RFC 4879**).*

- Statements made outside of an IETF session, mailing list or other function, that are clearly not intended to be input to an IETF activity, group or function, are not IETF Contributions in the context of this notice. Please consult RFC 5378 and RFC 3979 for details.

- A participant in any IETF activity is deemed to accept all IETF rules of process, as documented in Best Current Practices RFCs and IESG Statements.

- A participant in any IETF activity acknowledges that written, audio and video records of meetings may be made and may be available to the public.

Status since London

- ~~Publication imminent on 2680 Test Plan~~ RFC 7290 published today!

- 2330 Update in RFC Editor Queue

- LMAP Reference Path awaiting shepherd writeup (my fault)

- Rate Problem needs to address WGLC comments

  - (and a new revision: the current is expired)

- Last round of WGLC comments on IPSec draft

  - New -04 revision posted today, do we need another WGLC?

- Registry drafts reorganized yesterday

  - Simplification of registry structure: no subregistries required

- Call for adoption

Rate Problem WGLC

- A few WGLC comments on the rate problem statement; one open issue:

- For rate measurement use cases, is it REQUIRED to support asymmetric packet sizes (upstream v. downstream)?

Calls for adoption

- Four documents, to 10 July

- 2679-bis, 2680-bis:

  - Two messages of support, one reviewer

  - (More support previously: these have a history)

- checksum-trailer, ECN and DSCP measurement:

  - One message of support, no reviewers

- No clear consensus yet to adopt any of these: we'll revisit this today

IPPM Agenda (IETF 90 Toronto)
Tuesday 22 July 2014 —16:40 - 18:40 EDT (UTC-4) Salon B

16:40	Welcome, Status, Agenda	Chairs
17:00	Registry Draft(s)	M. Bagnulo et al
17:30	Model-Based Metrics	M. Mathis
17:45	2679-bis, 2680-bis	A. Morton
17:55	draft-hedin-ippm-type-p-monitor (ECN/DSCP)	G. Mirsky
18:05	draft-deng-ippm-passive-wireless-usecase	L. Deng
18:15	draft-zheng-ippm-framework-passive	N. Elkins
18:25	draft-chen-ippm-coloring-based-ipfpm-*	M. Chen
18:35	draft-ietf-ippm-ipsec	K. Pentikousis