IPPM Agenda

3 March 2004

IPPM Working Group

Chairs:

- Matt Zekauskas matt@internet2.edu
- Henk Uijterwaal henk@ripe.net

Email:

- ippm@ietf.org
- ippm-request@ietf.org
- https://www1.ietf.org/mailman/listinfo/ippm

Agenda

- Introduction (5')
- Milestones for the group (15')
- Reordering metrics (5')
- Draft-ietf-ippm-reporting-mib (15')
- Non end-2-end measurement protocols (5')
- AOB

Scribe

Scribe for minutes? (we usually edit)

Scribe for instant messaging?

 [Authors: please send any slides to matt@internet2.edu]

IPPM Milestones

Henk Uijterwaal

- 1. Create initial draft on the definitions of link bandwidth capacity.
 - Potential author identified
- 2. Create initial draft on a sensitivity analysis of one-way delay and loss metric parameters (companion to the AS).
 - Drop this, part of the dropped AS effort.
- 3. Create draft on a One-Way Active Measurement Protocol that satisfies the requirements document.
 - Needs review, in particular of the security area
 - Last call after that
 - July 2004?

- 4. Create initial draft on comparing ITU and IETF IP performance metrics.
 - Drop this?
- 5. Submit link bandwidth capacity definitions draft to the IESG, for consideration as an Informational RFC.
 - Depends on #1
- Submit draft on bulk transfer capacity metric based on the bulk transfer framework (CAP) to the IESG for Proposed Standard.
 - No response from authors

- 7. Submit recommendation to the IESG on whether to advance, recycle, or deprecate RFCs 2678, 2679, 2680, and 2681 (connectivity, loss, & delay).
 - Collect implementation reports
- 8. Submit draft on a packet reordering metric to the IESG for Proposed Standard
 - Needs review
 - What to do with reordering density?
 - WG last call around IETF60
 - Finished by October
- Submit AS for one-way delay and loss to the IESG for PS
 - Drop this, no interest in AS

Implementation reports RFC 2678-2679-2680-2681

- Name of implementation
- Organization
- Origin of code
- Platform (what it is running on)
- Contact
- Metrics and features implemented
- Metrics and features not implemented
 - Why not
- Tests done on the implementation
 - Comparison of metrics with 2+ implementations
 - Verify results with passive methods
 - Error estimation, clock source
 - **–** ...

Always

As much as

you can

give us

- 10. Submit sensitivity analysis of one-way delay and loss, for consideration as an Informational RFC.
 - Drop this work item
- 11. Submit draft on a MIB for reporting IPPM metrics to the IESG for Proposed Standard.
 - To be discussed later
- 12. Submit draft on the One-Way Active Measurement Protocol to the IESG for consideration as a PS
 - See #3

13. Discuss re-chartering or ending working group

Packet Reordering Metric for IPPM

http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-ietf-ippm-reordering-05.txt



Al Morton
Len Ciavattone
Gomathi Ramachandran
Stanislav Shalunov
Jerry Perser
March 1, 2004

Changes in draft 05 and Next Steps

New Appendix to cover Fragmentation

- Four more parameters
 - MoreFrag, the state of the More Fragments Flag in the IP header
 - FragOffset, the offset from the beginning of a fragmented packet, in 8 octet units (also from the IP header).
 - FragSeq#, the sequence number from the IP header of a fragmented packet currently under evaluation for reordering. When set to zero, fragment evaluation is not in progress.
 - NextExpFrag, the Next Expected Fragment Offset at the Destination, in 8 octet units. Set to zero when fragment evaluation is not in progress.
- Pseudo-Code is complex make this informative only?

Changes in 05

- Jon's Examples on Reordering-free Run Definition (Section 4.5)
- Next, Address Comments from mailing list (pls read)

Questions

