IPPM Session of BMWG

Dallas IETF

5 December 1995

Agenda:

- Brief review of history/status
- Delay Metric Discussion
- Flow Capacity Discussion
- Availability Discussion
- Role of router surrogates
- Volunteers for work on needed IDs
- Talk by Steve Corbato

Brief Review of History/Status

- Danvers BOF
- Formation as effort within BMWG
- Stockholm meeting
- Pittsburgh meeting

Criteria for IP Provider Metrics

- Concrete and repeatable
- No bias for identical technology; understood/fair bias for non-identical
- Useful to users/providers in understanding the performance they experience/provide
- Avoid inducing artificial performance goals

Hierarchy of Metrics

- Vague, gut-level concept: e.g., delay
- Precise, but possibly not measurable, concept: e.g., delay of 3000-byte packet from a to b
- Precise, measurable, repeatable concept useful for ‘standard’ metrics

Discussion of Delay Metrics

- Does ping measure the right thing?
- Delay minimum? average? percentile?
- Impact of asymmetric routing
- How do partial path delays combine?
- What technical work is needed?
- What IDs would we like to be able to write?

Discussion of Flow Capacity

- Does treno measure the right thing?
- Single sustained flow capacity?
- Aggregate over many short flows?
- How do partial path flow capacities combine?
- What technical work is needed?
- What IDs would we like to be able to write?

Discussion of Availability

- Different notions of availability:
  - email vs telnet/ftp/web vs MBone
  - to a given host vs to the 'whole' Internet
- How could availability be measured without huge numbers of pings?
- What technical work is needed?
- What IDs would we like to be able to write?

Role of Router Surrogates

- Examples:
  - traceroute
  - wping
  - treno
- Where should they go?
- How could they be managed, shared?

Closing Administrativia

- Volunteers needed
- IPPM Email list
- IPPM Web Page