Benchmarking Methodology WG (bmwg)
Interim Meeting replacing IETF 107

• Friday, May 15, 2020
  1100-1300 Eastern Daylight Time (UTC+4)

• Chairs:
  – Al Morton (acm(at)research.att.com)
  – Sarah Banks (sbanks(at)encrypted.net)

• If you are not subscribed to the BMWG mailing list and would like to be, please go to https://www.ietf.org/mailman/listinfo/bmwg
We work as Individuals, and try to be nice to each other.

(as of March 2018)
This is a reminder of IETF policies in effect on various topics such as patents or code of conduct. It is only meant to point you in the right direction. Exceptions may apply. The IETF's patent policy and the definition of an IETF "contribution" and "participation" are set forth in BCP 79; please read it carefully.

As a reminder:

• By participating in the IETF, you agree to follow IETF processes and policies.
• If you are aware that any IETF contribution is covered by patents or patent applications that are owned or controlled by you or your sponsor, you must disclose that fact, or not participate in the discussion.
• As a participant in or attendee to any IETF activity you acknowledge that written, audio, video, and photographic records of meetings may be made public.
• Personal information that you provide to IETF will be handled in accordance with the IETF Privacy Statement.
• As a participant or attendee, you agree to work respectfully with other participants; please contact the ombudsteam (https://www.ietf.org/contact/ombudsteam/) if you have questions or concerns about this.

Definitive information is in the documents listed below and other IETF BCPs. For advice, please talk to WG chairs or ADs:

• BCP 9 (Internet Standards Process)
• BCP 25 (Working Group processes)
• BCP 25 (Anti-Harassment Procedures)
• BCP 54 (Code of Conduct)
• BCP 78 (Copyright)
• BCP 79 (Patents, Participation)
• https://www.ietf.org/privacy-policy/ (Privacy Policy)
BMWG Agenda

Note-Taker(s), Jabber, IPR,

WG Status (Chairs)

WG Drafts:
- EVPN - status: IESG processing (AD Reviewed - more editing)
- Next Generation Firewall Benchmarking
- Back-to-Back Frame (Update to RFC2544)

Proposals:
- Multiple Loss Ratio Search
- Probabilistic Loss Ratio Search
- Network Function Service Density
  draft-mkonstan-nf-service-density (expired),
  revisit the overall problem space, explore tighter collaboration options
- Benchmarking Methodology for EVPN VPWS
- Benchmarking Methodology for EVPN Multi-casting

AOB:
Quick WG Status

• EVPN Draft in IESG Processing (Ad Rev+)

• Proposals keep coming:
  – Network Virtualization Platforms, VNF Benchmarking
  – New EVPN Proposals
  – Search Algorithms
  – Service Density
  – Container Implementation Testing
  – 5G Transport Network
  – YANG Data Model for Tester Mgmt
BACKUP
Current Milestones

Aug 2018 - Methodology for Next-Gen Firewall Benchmarking to IESG Review
Dec 2018 - Update to RFC2544 Back-to-back Frame Benchmarking to IESG Review
Dec 2018 - Methodology for EVPN Benchmarking to IESG Review
Dec 2018 - Draft on Selecting and Applying Model(s) for Benchmarking to IESG Review
Dec 2018 - Draft on General VNF Benchmarking Automation to IESG Review
Dec 2018 - Considerations for Benchmarking Network Virtualization Platforms to IESG Review
BMWG Activity

• New RFCs:
  – None!

• Charter Update
  – DONE!

• Supplementary BMWG Page
  – http://bmwg.encrypted.net/
Benchmarking activities as described in this memo are limited to technology characterization using controlled stimuli in a laboratory environment, with dedicated address space and the constraints specified in the sections above.

The benchmarking network topology will be an independent test setup and MUST NOT be connected to devices that may forward the test traffic into a production network, or misroute traffic to the test management network.

Further, benchmarking is performed on a "black-box" basis, relying solely on measurements observable external to the DUT/SUT.

Special capabilities SHOULD NOT exist in the DUT/SUT specifically for benchmarking purposes. Any implications for network security arising from the DUT/SUT SHOULD be identical in the lab and in production networks.
## Work Proposal Summary Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Area &gt; Criteria \ V</th>
<th>EVPN &amp; PBB EVPN</th>
<th>VNF (was VBaaS)</th>
<th>Virtualized Platforms</th>
<th>SFC</th>
<th>Back-to-back Frame</th>
<th>Network Service Layer Abs Model</th>
<th>Next-Gen Firewalls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Scope of Charter? (acm)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft(s)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. Support at meetings</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>IETF-98, many comments</td>
<td>Revised draft</td>
<td></td>
<td>Discuss @ IETF-103</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. Support on List</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments &amp; Testing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependencie s/Notes</td>
<td>Reviewers &amp; charter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>expired</td>
<td>expired</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>