

Advancing Metrics on the Standards Track:
RFC 2679 bis: One-way Delay Metric
RFC 2680 bis: One-way Loss Metric

`draft-morton-ippm-rfc2679-01`

`draft-morton-ippm-rfc2680-00`

Guy Almes*, Sunil Kalidindi, Matt Zekauskas

Al Morton, guest editor

March 2013

* Original author, but did not respond when contacted via LinkedIn

Overview of 2679bis (first section)

- [RFC6808] provides the test plan and results supporting [RFC2679] advancement w/mods:
- the assumption of post-processing to enforce a constant waiting time threshold is compliant, RFC should be revised (see section 3.6)
- Type-P-One-way-Delay-Inverse-Percentile ignored, so deprecate
- Reference [RFC6703] in RFC2679bis to incorporate recent experience
- one erratum: "Held for document update"

2679bis Editor' s proposals

- Essentially, update unchanged text with Informative References
- Beginning of Section 4, in discussion of alternate sampling methods
 - >>> Editor proposal: Add ref to RFC 3432
Periodic sampling
- End of Section 4.6, on Methodologies w.r.t. out-of-order packets
 - >>> Editor proposal: Add ref to RFC 4737
Reordering metric
- NEXT STEPS ? ? ?
 - WG doc? WGLC? How best to proceed?

Overview of 2680bis (section 7)

- [draft-ietf-ippm-testplan-2680] provides the test plan and results supporting [RFC2680] advancement w/mods:
- the assumption of post-processing to enforce a constant waiting time threshold is compliant, RFC should be revised (see section 3.6)
- Type-P-One-way-Packet-Loss-Average common usage is -Loss-Ratio, so re-name
- Reference [RFC6703] in RFC2680bis to incorporate recent experience
- two errata: “Verified” "Held for doc. update"

2680bis Editor' s proposals

- Essentially, update unchanged text with Informative References
- Beginning of Section 3, in discussion of alternate sampling methods
 - >>> Editor proposal: Add ref to RFC 3432
Periodic sampling
- End of Section 3.6, on Methodologies w.r.t. out-of-order packets
 - >>> Editor proposal: Add ref to RFC 4737
Reordering metric
- NEXT STEPS ? ? ?
 - WG doc? WGLC? How best to proceed?

Next Steps for 2679bis and 2680bis

- This work is under our existing Charter:
 - The working group will advance these metrics along the standards track within the IETF. The WG will document the process of moving documents along the standards track, based on draft-bradner-metricstest [now RFC 6576].
- NEXT Step: WG docs? WGLC?
- The bottom line:
 - If you've read RFC2679 and RFC2680, and
 - sat through this presentation,
 - Then you've done enough work to help decide

BACKUP

Backup

Backup

Backup