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Background

• The IPPM Framework (RFC2330) identifies two key prerequisites for valid measurements:

1. Valid measurement packets
   • “Standard-formed” packets
   • “…all metric definitions … include an implicit assumption that the packet is *standard formed*”...
   • Explicit criteria catalogue

2. Result may depend on measurement packet type
   • Distinct treatment of measurement packets along the path
   • Abstract term: packet of Type-P
   • Measurement is representative for any type (Type-P) vs. result is valid for ICMP-packets-64-byte-payload
Motivation and History

- Any {RFC|draft|metric} that references **IPv6 is out of scope of the RFC2330 IPPM framework**!
  - RFC2330, sec. 15 “…includes a valid IP header: the version field is 4 (later, we will expand this to include 6)”…

- **Trigger**: GEN-ART review of RFC 2679-bis

  - Input by Brian Carpenter: **no IPv6 coverage**
    - RFC 2679-bis only vs. IPPM update
    - Decision for IPPM update

- **IPv6-support for IPPM “outsourced” to dedicated draft**
  - Precondition for –bis RFCs to pass GEN-ART and IESG review
  - More documents pending in the queue (active-passive, PDM, …)
  - Avoid replication: one document can do the update for all.
Status @IETF98

- **Adoption as IPPM WG item**, July 2016
- Extensive comments from Fred Baker and Marius Georgescu:
  - Extension Headers covered in Type-P and Standard Formed packet sections
  - Load balancer as an example of Class C (equal treatment)
  - Examples where Type-P *changes from Src to Dst.*
  - IP address family coexistence means more circumstances to discuss (v4 v6 transition).
    - Major new section covers NAT, v4v6, Header Compression
Status @IETF98

• Discussion needed
  • Handling of large packets in IPv6 (including fragment extension headers, PMTUD, PLMTUD),
  • Extent of coverage for 6LO and IPv6 Header Compression, and
  • The continued need to define a "minimal standard-formed packet".
  • IPv6 header treatment in intermediate nodes

• Concluding that, WGLC…
Handling of large packets in IPv6

- Path MTU Discovery (PMTUD)
- Packetization Layer Path MTU Discovery (PLMTUD)
- **Adopt RFC2330 IPV4 fragment handling procedure for IPv6 fragments, too**
  - Fragments are NOT standard formed
  - Use of non-fragmented packets for measurements only.
  - Scope of IPPM framework metrics excludes fragmented IP(v4) packets.
  - Accepting IPv6 fragments would mean reviewing and updating **ALL** existing metrics
6lo and IPv6 Header Compression

- If we do not include them explicitly, 6lo and ROHC IPv6 packets are out of scope of the IPPM (like IPv6 is right now).

- 6lo and IPv6 HC rely on state to be stored in gateway nodes (ingress, egress)
  - 6lo and ROHC modify Type-P
  - Distinct MTUs, physical-layer support, encryption,…
  - IPv6 addresses mapped to 6LoWPAN addressing scheme
    - No source, destination IPv6 addresses available

- Conclusion: 6LoWPAN for further study
  - Considered out of scope for this draft
  - No more work
**Definition** of minimal standard-formed packet

“A particular type of standard-formed packet often useful to consider is the "minimal IP packet from A to B" - this is an IP packet with the following properties:

- It is standard-formed.
- Its data payload is 0 octets.
- It contains no options.”

“Note that we do not define its protocol field…”

**Who has used this definition?**

- Practical use (router handling of "undefined“ protocol?)
- IANA allocation: "no transport header“?

**Proposal:** remove definition of **minimal standard-formed packet** for IPv4 and IPv6
IPv6 Extension Header Treatment

- IPv6 extension header treatment in intermediate nodes
  - Subject to discussions in v6ops
- Inspection/addition/removal of extension headers useful in the context of IPPM
  - Restricted to closed (enterprise) segments?
  - In-situ OAM (ioam)
- Challenges:
  - Extension header modifications change Type-P
  - Treatment in subsequent nodes (Segment routing?)
- Proposal: allow, point out challenges/drawbacks
Status and Next Steps

• Proposals (solutions) presented for all open topics.
• Asking for WG and list feedback on proposals
• Integrate changes into document.
• Following: draft ready for WGLC.
RFC 2330, Sec. 13:

- “A fundamental property of many Internet metrics is that the value of the metric depends on the type of IP packet(s) used to make the measurement…”
- “…Whenever a metric's value depends on the type of the packets involved in the metric, the metric's name will include either a specific type or a phrase such as "type-P".
- …”Generic notion of a "packet of Type-P“…”
  - Fully defined (port-http-tcp-connectivity-50byte-payload)
  - Partially defined (UDP packet)
  - Generic (Type-P)
- **Type-P becomes part of any metric definition**
  - Example: Define "IP-Type-P-connectivity" metric instead of "IP-connectivity" metric
RFC 2330 Update: Type-P

- Mention special treatment of packets
  - Diffserv, ECN, Router alert, extension headers, …
- Identify case when Type-P changes along the path
  - Type and length changes because of IPv4 <-> IPv6 translation, or IPv6 extension headers adding or removal
  - Modified values SHOULD be noted and reported with the results
- Discuss possible impact of NAT along path
  - Unpredictable impact on delay
  - Stateful NAT: state created on first packet: delay penalty
- RFC2330 Note: class C equivalence for path (MAP RG!)
  - “…it would be very useful to know if a given Internet component treats equally a class C of different types of packets. If so, then any one of those types of packets can be used for subsequent measurement of the component. This suggests we devise a metric or suite of metrics that attempt to determine C.”
RFC 2330, Sec. 14:

• “…all metric definitions … include an implicit assumption that the packet is *standard formed*”...
• “…a packet is standard formed if it meets all of the following criteria:…”
  • Length (IP header) = sizeof (IP header) + sizeof(payload)
  • Valid IP header: “version field is 4 (later, we will expand this to include 6)” (quote RFC2330!)
  • Header length >= 5, checksum is correct, no IP fragment.
  • Src and dest addr. correspond to the hosts in question.
  • TTL sufficiently large or 255
  • No IP options unless explicitly noted.
  • If transport header is present: valid checksum and fields.
  • Length B: 0 <= B <= 65535 …
RFC 2330 Update: Std-Formed Packet

- IPv4 and IPv6 allowed
- Basic requirements (aggregated IPv4 and IPv6):
  - Valid IP header
  - Not an IP fragment.
  - Source and Destination addresses intended.
  - Transport header: valid checksum and valid fields
- Separate discussion of IPv4 and IPv6
  - IPv4 unchanged
- IPv6
  - Version field 6, total length including extension headers
  - Extension headers: none or correct types and correct order, extension header parameters conforming with IANA
  - Note controversies (RFCs 6564 and 7045): intermediate nodes inspect/add/delete/change IPv6 extension headers
Next Steps

- Urgent need to update IPPM for IPv6
  - RFCs and documents in queue depend on it!
  - Draft scope and structure is stable
  - Feedback and Input requested

- Call for adoption as IPPM WG item.
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