

Applying IETF IP Performance Metrics to Broadband Mapping

Brian Trammell

Networked Systems Group, ETH Zürich
Co-chair, IETF IP Performance Metrics WG

Mapping of Broadband Services in Europe
1st Stakeholder Consultation Workshop
Brussels, 8 June 2016

Who am I?

- Senior Researcher, ETH Zürich, Switzerland
 - focus on Internet measurement and architecture
- Co-Chair, IETF IP Performance Metrics (IPPM) Working Group (WG)
 - not speaking for the working group



Overview

- Applicable metrics and methodologies
- Registry of tests for broadband performance
- Experiments in better bandwidth metrics
- A word about comparability

Applicable Metrics

- One-way packet loss (RFC 7680)
 - Measurement simple, interpretation harder
 - Cannot separate line condition from congestion
 - TCP induces loss to measure capacity
- One- (RFC 7679) and two-way (RFC 2681) delay
 - Two-way doesn't require clock sync
- Delay variance (RFC 3393) ("jitter")

Active delay measurement



- OWD: synchronize clocks, send timestamp, compare
- TWD: send packet, reflect, compare
- Loss: "infinite" OWD
- Jitter: derived from delay
- *Any protocol with IDs usable for TWD*

Test Protocols



- One-way Active Measurement Protocol (OWAMP) & Two-Way Active Measurement Protocol (TWAMP)
- Arbitrary UDP packets as measurement traffic
- Control protocol between initiator and reflector
- Can be used for loss and timing on CPE to operator segment, or CPE to Internet.

Test Registry

- Bridge gap between RFCs and recommended tests for access network measurement.
- Methodology for a few common tests, focus on comparable implementability
 - UDP two-way delay (RFC 2681)
 - UDP delay variation (RFC 3393)
 - DNS response latency (like RFC 2681, but with DNS)
 - UDP one-way delay (RFC 7679)
- Work in progress, complete in 2016?

What about bandwidth?

- IPPM founded in 1990s to define transfer capacity metrics...
- We still haven't managed it.
 - Network links are reactive (see RFC 7312)
 - Congestion-controlled traffic is reactive
 - “send a big file with TCP” measures a mix of capacity, latency, loss, TCP congestion control at the sender.




What about bandwidth?

- Problem: TCP is reactive

$$B = \min\left(\frac{W_{max}}{RTT}, \dots\right)$$

- Approach: account for this by “open-looping” congestion control with synthetic traffic
- Mathis & Morton, draft-ietf-ippm-model-based-metrics
- New metric type: pass/fail at rate X:
 - “does link L support of X Mb/s?”
- Work in progress, experimental RFC done end 2016?

Comparability in Broadband Mapping



- Metric comparison: equivalent definitions
- Measurement comparison: equivalent methodology
- Implementation details matter, too.
- ***Analysis necessary to compare apples to apples***

Getting Involved

- The IETF is a non-membership, volunteer-driven, voluntary standards organization.
- Open participation on the mailing lists
 - ippm@ietf.org (IPPM WG: metrics and methods)
 - imap@ietf.org (LMAP WG: control and reporting)
- IETF 96 in Berlin, 17-22 July
- Questions? come talk to me, or ietf@trammell.ch