Simple TWAMP (STAMP) Extensions for Segment Routing Networks

draft-gandhi-ippm-stamp-srpm-02

Rakesh Gandhi - Cisco Systems (rgandhi@cisco.com) - Presenter
Clarence Filsfils - Cisco Systems (cfilsfil@cisco.com)
Daniel Voyer - Bell Canada (daniel.voyer@bell.ca)
Mach(Guoyi) Chen - Huawei (mach.chen@huawei.com)
Bart Janssens - Colt (Bart.Janssens@colt.net)

Agenda

- Requirements and Scope
- Summary of Extensions
- Next Steps

Requirements and Scope

Requirements:

- Support in-band Performance Measurement for links and SR paths

Goals:

- Avoid provisioning test sessions on Session-Reflector for stateless mode
- Avoid control protocol for signaling dynamic parameters
- High scale for number of test sessions and faster detection interval
  - Support hardware implementation

Scope:

- STAMP [RFC 8762]
- STAMP Extensions [RFC8972]

STAMP Session-Sender Control Code Field

Control Code (8-bit) Flags:

0x0: Existing (default) behavior as defined in RFC 8762.

0x1: In-band Reply Requested.
Indicates that this test packet has been sent over a bidirectional path and the reply is required in-band over the same incoming link in the reverse direction.

0x2: No Reply Requested.

```
 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                        Sequence Number                        |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                          Timestamp                            |
|                                                               |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|         Error Estimate        |              SSID             |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|         MBZ                                   |  Control Code  |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                                                               |
|                      MBZ   (24 octets)                        |
|                                                               |
|                                                               |
|                                                               |
|                                                               |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+

  Control Code in Session-Sender Test Packet — Unauthenticated
```

STAMP Session-Sender Control Code Field - Usage

- For link delay measurement
  - Reflector needs to send reply on the same incoming link (symmetric delay on forward and reverse link)
  - Link can be Virtual, LAG or LAG member
- Avoid provisioning each test session (session id, source-address) on Session-Reflector (can have an order of 1K links)
  - Stateless mode of STAMP Session-Reflector as defined in RFC 8762

STAMP Return Path TLV

Return Path TLV (value TBA2) to carry one Sub-TLV for return path:

Sub-TLVs Types:

- Type (value 1): Return Address. Destination node address for the reply; different than the Source Address in the test packet

- Type (value 2): SR-MPLS Label Stack of the Return SR Path

- Type (value 3): SR-MPLS Binding SID [draft-ietf-pce-binding-label-sid] of the Return SR Policy

- Type (value 4): SRv6 Segment List of the Return SR Path

- Type (value 5): SRv6 Binding SID [draft-ietf-pce-binding-label-sid] of the Return SR Policy

```
 0                   1                   2                   3
 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|STAMP TLV Flags|  Type = TBA2  |            Length             |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                     Return Path Sub-TLV                       |
.                                                               .
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+

               Figure: Return Path TLV
```

```
 0                   1                   2                   3
 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|STAMP TLV Flags|   Type        |            Length            |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                        Segment(1)                            |
.                                                              .
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
.                                                              .
.                                                              .
.                                                              .
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                        Segment(n)                            |
.                                                              .
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+

        Figure: Segment List Sub-TLV in Return Path TLV
```

STAMP Return Path TLV - Usage

- For SR path, reply test packet may need to be sent on a specific return SR path
- Bidir SR Path (forward and reverse) dynamically computed using CSPF by the head-end node
  - Path can change often based on topology change, link/node failure in the network, etc.
- No signaling in SR
- Avoid signaling and maintaining dynamic state on Session-Reflector to store return paths for each test session (each session-id, source-address)
  - Order of 10K SR Policy (that can have active and standby candidate-path and each can have multiple segment-lists)

STAMP Destination Node Address TLV

Destination Node Address TLV (value TBA1):

- Indicates the address of the intended destination node of the Session-Sender test packet.
- The Session-Reflector node **MUST NOT** send reply if it is not the intended destination node of the test packet.
- Useful when test packet is sent with 127/8 destination address (e.g. sweeping ECMP paths).

```
 0                   1                   2                   3
 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|STAMP TLV Flags|   Type        |            Length             |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|      Reserved                 |         Address Family        |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
~                           Address                             ~
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+

          Figure: Destination Node Address TLV Format
```

Next Steps

- Welcome your comments and suggestions
- Requesting WG adoption

Thank you