

# IPPM

## IP Performance Metrics

IETF 99 Prague / Wednesday 19 July 2017  
Bill Cervený & **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 8179***
- 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 8179 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.

# WG draft status

- RFC 8186 published!
- draft-ietf-ippm-model-based-metrics-11:  
updated 29 June; ready for ballot?
- draft-ietf-ippm-6man-pdm-option-13  
completing IESG evaluation
- draft-ietf-ippm-2330-ipv6-01  
still waiting on 6man
- draft-ietf-ippm-alt-mark-05  
WGLC complete, waiting for writeup (thanks Carlos!)
- draft-ietf-ippm-twamp-yang-03  
WGLC starts now (shepherd volunteers?)
- draft-ietf-ippm-metric-registry-12 / -initial-registry-04  
in progress (path metrics in new draft?)

# IPPM Agenda / IETF 99 Prauge

Wednesday 19 July 2017 — 09:30 UTC+2

09:30 Note Well, Agenda, Status

10m Chairs

09:40 draft-ietf-ippm-[initial,metric]-registry

15m A. Morton

9:55 draft-ietf-ippm-2330-ipv6

15m J. Fabini

Rechartering (for IOAM, etc.)

Discussion

10:10 draft-brockners-inband-oam-data

draft-song-ippm-ioam-scalability

draft-amf-ippm-route

60m - Chairs  
- Frank Brockners  
- Haoyu Song  
- J. I. Alvarez-Hamelin

TWAMP-Light and BBF

11:10 draft-morton-ippm-port-twamp-test

draft-mirsky-ippm-twamp-refl-registered-port

draft-mirsky-ippm-twamp-light-yang

20m - A. Morton  
- G. Mirsky  
- G. Mirsky

# IPPM Lightning Talks

## IETF 99 Prague

- draft-fioccola-ippm-multipoint-alt-mark  
Giuseppe Fioccola
- draft-mizrahi-ippm-multiplexed-alternate-marking  
Tal Mizrahi
- draft-xiao-ippm-twamp-ext-direct-loss  
Xiao Min
- draft-mizrahi-intarea-packet-timestamps  
Tal Mizrahi
- draft-ding-tcp-emdi-00, draft-zheng-emdi-udp-00  
Roni Even
- draft-bhaprasud-ippm-pm  
Sudhin Jacob

# Rechartering IPPM

- We've had our current charter since IETF 86 in Orlando (March 2013).
- It may or may not cover bringing in IOAM, for which there seems to be rough WG consensus.
- It doesn't optimally cover what we're doing now, and the work we might want to do in the future.
- Let's make some small edits to catch up to the present.

# Paragraph 1

## (scope)

The IP Performance ~~Metrics~~ **Measurement** (IPPM) Working Group develops and maintains standard metrics that can be applied to the quality, performance, and reliability of Internet data delivery services and applications running over transport layer protocols (e.g. TCP, UDP) over IP. ~~Specifying network or lower layer OAM mechanisms is out of scope of the IPPM charter.~~ It also develops and maintains **methodologies and protocols** for the measurement of these metrics. These metrics, **protocols, and methodologies** are designed such that they can be used by network operators, end users, or independent testing groups. Metrics developed by the IPPM WG are intended to provide unbiased quantitative performance measurements ~~and not a value judgement.~~

# Paragraph 3

(editorial, we've rechartered)

...[m]etric definitions will follow the template given in RFC 6390. ~~It is possible that new measurement protocols will be needed to support new metrics; if this is the case, the working group will be rechartered to develop these protocols.~~

# Paragraph 6

(editorial, we've got a registry)

...[a]greement about the definitions of metrics and methods of measurement enables accurate, reproducible, and equivalent results across different implementations. To this end, the WG ~~will~~ defines **s** and maintains **s** a registry of metric definitions. The WG encourages work which assesses the comparability of measurements of IPPM metrics with metrics developed elsewhere.

# Paragraph 7

(scope examples, information/data models)

...[t]he WG also encourages work which improves the availability of information about the context in which measurements were taken, **for example (but not limited to) measurement implementation information, conditions on the network(s) on which measurements are taken, and/or information about the data-plane topology of these network(s). It may foster this work by defining information and data models for storage and dissemination of measurement data.**