

OPSAWG  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: 23 February 2026

Y. Liu  
ZTE  
Z. Li  
Y. Liu  
China Mobile  
C. Lin  
New H3C Technologies  
G. Dong  
China Telecom  
22 August 2025

Export of ~~SRv6~~ Path Segment Identifier Information in IPFIX  
draft-liu-opsawg-ipfix-path-segment-03

#### Abstract

This document introduces a new IPFIX Information Element to identify the Path Segment Identifier (PSID) in the SRH for SRv6 and MPLS path identification-~~purpose~~.

#### Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of BCP 78 and BCP 79.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <https://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on 23 February 2026.

#### Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2025 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to BCP 78 and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<https://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components

extracted from this document must include Revised BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Revised BSD License.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction . . . . .	2
2. Terminology . . . . .	3
3. SRv6 PSID in IPFIX . . . . .	4
4. Operational Considerations . . . . .	4
4.1. Exporting, Decoding and Analyzing srhPSID . . . . .	5
4.2. Scope of srhPSID . . . . .	5
5. Security Considerations . . . . .	5
6. IANA Considerations . . . . .	6
7. Acknowledgement . . . . .	6
8. References . . . . .	6
8.1. Normative References . . . . .	6
8.2. Informative References . . . . .	7
Authors' Addresses . . . . .	7

1. Introduction

[RFC9487] introduces new IP Flow Information Export (IPFIX) Information Elements (IEs) to identify a set of information related to Segment Routing over IPv6 (SRv6). For the SRv6 segment list, two IPFIX IPv6 SRH IEs are defined in [RFC9487], srhSegmentIPv6BasicList (elementID:496) and srhSegmentIPv6ListSection (elementID:497), both encoding the Segment List in the SRH starting from Segment List[0].

When monitoring a traffic flow in an SR network, a typical use case is to answer the following questions:

- \* How many packets are steered into a certain SR path?
- \* Which SR Policy or candidate path or segment list does this SR path belongs to?

To answer these questions, when exporting ~~the flow record using~~ IPFIX ~~Messages~~flow records, the SR path information needs to be included.

An SRv6 path could be identified by the content of a segment list in IPFIX using IE496 or IE497, but the segment list is not always the best key identifier due to the following reasons:

- \* When a segment list contains many SIDs, the size of IPFIX message (especially the data record) would be large, making the collecting and analyzing of flow records inefficient.

**Commented [TG1]:** If you intend to cover MPLS-SR as well, I suggest to separate the introduction section into a SRv6 and a MPLS-SR part. In MPLS-SR you can refer to <https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc5102.html#section-5.6.15> to the mplsLabelStackSection\* IE's and describe that a network node may not capable to export the entire MPLS label stack.

- \* In the cases that different SRv6 policies use the same segment list for traffic steering, it is difficult to distinguish the traffic flow of different SRv6 policies.
- \* An SRv6 path may not be identified by the segment list carried by the SRH in reduced mode as described in section 4.1.1 of [RFC8754] ~~as where~~ the first SID is not present in the SRH.
- \* When the `srhSegmentIPv6BasicList` or `srhSegmentIPv6ListSection` contains compressed-SID containers [I-D.ietf-spring-srv6-srh-compression], additional information and processing procedures are required to decode compressed-SID containers as described in [RFC9487] section 6.2 to obtain the original segment list information before compression.

Path Segment is a type of Segment Routing (SR) segment, and a Path Segment Identifier (PSID) is used to identify an SR path. PSID in SRv6 networks is defined in [I-D.ietf-spring-srv6-path-segment]. In SRH, the PSID appears as the last entry in the segment list.

This document introduces a new IPFIX Information Element to identify the Path Segment Identifier (PSID) in the SRH for SRv6 path identification purpose.

## 2. Terminology

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "NOT RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in BCP 14 [RFC2119] [RFC8174] when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

This document makes use of the terms defined in [RFC7011], [RFC8402], and [RFC8754].

The following terms are used as defined in [RFC7011]:

- \* IPFIX
- \* IPFIX Information Elements
- \* Metering Process
- \* Template Record
- \* Data Record
- \* Collector

The following terms are used as defined in [RFC8402]:

- \* Segment Routing (SR)
- \* Segment List
- \* SRv6

The following terms are used as defined in [RFC8754]:

- \* SRH
- \* Last Entry

3. SRv6 PSID in IPFIX

A new IE "~~srhPSID~~srhPsidIPv6" is defined in this document to identify the Path Segment Identifier(PSID) in the SRH, it carries a 128-bit IPv6 address that represents an SRv6 PSID.

Name: ~~srhPsidIPv6~~srhPSID

ElementID: TBD1

Description: The 128-bit IPv6 address that represents an SRv6 PSID.

Abstract Data Type: ipv6Address

Data Type Semantics: default

Additional Information: Specified in Section 3 of [I-D.ietf-spring-srv6-path-segment].

Reference: This document.

Although IE ~~srhPsidIPv6~~srhPSID is used to identify an SRv6 path, this document doesn't limit using ~~srhPsidIPv6~~srhPSID together with srhSegmentIPv6BasicList or srhSegmentIPv6ListSection in the same IPFIX message, see section4.2 for more information.

4. Operational Considerations

**Commented [TG2]:** Please add also Path Segment Identifier with the PSID abbreviation and normative reference to RFC 9545 and reference to draft-ietf-spring-srv6-path-segment.

**Formatted:** English (United States)

**Commented [TG3]:** I suggest to add a use case section and mention that they visibility for Network Observability is provided described in <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-spring-srv6-path-segment-12#section-2> and <https://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc9545.html#section-3>.

You may want to start the use case section by mentioning Network Observability and why Flow Characteristics should be monitored by referring to terms and their relationships defined in <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-nmop-terminology>.

**Commented [TG4]:** I suggest to define a second IPFIX entity for MPLS as well and reference RFC 9545.

#### 4.1. Exporting, Decoding and Analyzing srhPsidIPv6~~srhPSID~~

As specified in [I-D.ietf-spring-srv6-path-segment], the P-flag in the SRH is set to indicate the presence of PSID. ~~In order to~~To generate Flow Records with PSID included, the metering process MUST understand the P-flag. Only when the P-flag is set SHOULD the metering process capture the last entry in the SRH to get the PSID. If the P-flag in the packet is unset, when the srhPsidIPv6~~srhPSID~~ appears in the template record, the corresponding field in the data record is RECOMMENDED to set to all zero.

After decoding the IPFIX messages at the collector, to get the flow record with PSID ~~included in it at the collector~~, the collector might process the flow record locally or send it to ~~an analyzer for further analysis~~an analyzer for further analysis purpose~~an analyzer for further analysis purpose~~a data processing or analytics component. In order to recognize the SR path, the analysis node SHOULD be aware of which SR path the PSID identifies. How to get this information is out of the scope of this document.

#### 4.2. Scope of srhPsidIPv6~~srhPSID~~

As in [I-D.ietf-spring-srv6-path-segment] section 3, the PSID allocation depends on the use cases, including:

- \* each segment list may have its own PSID with different value;
- \* the same PSID may be used for some or all the segment list under a Candidate path;
- \* the same PSID may be used for some or all Candidate Path within an SRv6 policy.

If srhPsidIPv6~~srhPSID~~ and srhSegmentIPv6BasicList/srhSegmentIPv6ListSection appear together, the srhPsidIPv6~~srhPSID~~ MAY be used to identify an SR Policy or candidate path, and the information carried in srhSegmentIPv6BasicList/srhSegmentIPv6ListSection shows the detailed segment list belonging to this SR Policy or candidate path. This document does not limit how to use srhPsidIPv6~~srhPSID~~ and the detail is out of scope.

#### 5. Security Considerations

There are no additional security considerations regarding allocation of these new IPFIX IEs compared to [RFC7012].

Other security considerations for SRv6 PSID described in [I-D.ietf-spring-srv6-path-segment] apply to this document.



6. IANA Considerations

This document requests IANA to create one new IE under the "IPFIX Information Elements" registry [RFC7012] available at [IANA-IPFIX].

Element ID	Name	Reference
TBD1	<u>srhPsidIPv6srhPSID</u>	This document

7. Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank Thomas Graf, Cheng Li and Chongfeng Xie for their helpful comments and suggestions.

8. References

8.1. Normative References

[I-D.ietf-spring-srv6-path-segment]  
Li, C., Cheng, W., Chen, M., Dhody, D., and Y. Zhu, "Path Segment Identifier (PSID) in SRv6 (Segment Routing in IPv6)", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-ietf-spring-srv6-path-segment-12, 3 April 2025, <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-spring-srv6-path-segment-12>>.

[IANA-IPFIX]  
IANA, "IP Flow Information Export (IPFIX) Entities", <<https://www.iana.org/assignments/ipfix>>.

[RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.

[RFC7011] Claise, B., Ed., Trammell, B., Ed., and P. Aitken, "Specification of the IP Flow Information Export (IPFIX) Protocol for the Exchange of Flow Information", STD 77, RFC 7011, DOI 10.17487/RFC7011, September 2013, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7011>>.

- [RFC7012] Claise, B., Ed. and B. Trammell, Ed., "Information Model for IP Flow Information Export (IPFIX)", RFC 7012, DOI 10.17487/RFC7012, September 2013, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7012>>.
- [RFC8174] Leiba, B., "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in RFC 2119 Key Words", BCP 14, RFC 8174, DOI 10.17487/RFC8174, May 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8174>>.
- [RFC8402] Filsfils, C., Ed., Previdi, S., Ed., Ginsberg, L., Decraene, B., Litkowski, S., and R. Shakir, "Segment Routing Architecture", RFC 8402, DOI 10.17487/RFC8402, July 2018, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8402>>.
- [RFC8754] Filsfils, C., Ed., Dukes, D., Ed., Previdi, S., Leddy, J., Matsushima, S., and D. Voyer, "IPv6 Segment Routing Header (SRH)", RFC 8754, DOI 10.17487/RFC8754, March 2020, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8754>>.

## 8.2. Informative References

- [I-D.ietf-spring-srv6-srh-compression] Cheng, W., Filsfils, C., Li, Z., Decraene, B., and F. Clad, "Compressed SRv6 Segment List Encoding (CSID)", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-ietf-spring-srv6-srh-compression-23, 6 February 2025, <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-spring-srv6-srh-compression-23>>.
- [RFC9487] Graf, T., Claise, B., and P. Francois, "Export of Segment Routing over IPv6 Information in IP Flow Information Export (IPFIX)", RFC 9487, DOI 10.17487/RFC9487, November 2023, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc9487>>.

## Authors' Addresses

Yao Liu  
ZTE  
Nanjing  
China  
Email: [liu.yao71@zte.com.cn](mailto:liu.yao71@zte.com.cn)

Zhenqiang Li  
China Mobile  
Email: [lizhenqiang@chinamobile.com](mailto:lizhenqiang@chinamobile.com)



Yisong Liu  
China Mobile  
Email: liuyisong@chinamobile.com

Changwang Lin  
New H3C Technologies  
Email: linchangwang.04414@h3c.com

Guozhen Dong  
China Telecom  
Email: donggz@chinatelecom.cn