Network Working Group Internet-Draft

Intended status: Informational

Expires: July 26, 2014

M. Tuexen Muenster Univ. of Appl. Sciences R. Seggelmann T-Systems International GmbH R. Stewart Adara Networks S. Loreto Ericsson January 22, 2014

Additional Policies for the Partial Reliability Extension of the Stream Control Transmission Protocol

draft-ietf-tsvwg-sctp-prpolicies-01.txt

Abstract

This document defines policies for the Partial Reliability Extension of the Stream Control Transmission Protocol (PR-SCTP) allowing to limit the number of retransmissions or to prioritize user messages for more efficient send buffer usage.

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 http://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 July 26, 2014.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2014 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to $\underline{\mathsf{BCP}}$ 78 and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (http://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 Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

Table of Contents

${ extstyle 1}$. Introduction										2
<u>1.1</u> . Overview										2
<u>1.2</u> . Data Types										<u>3</u>
Additional PR-SCTP Policies .										<u>3</u>
2.1. Limited Retransmissions P	olic	У								<u>3</u>
2.2. Priority Policy										3
Socket API Considerations										
3.1. Support for Added PR-SCTP	Pol	icie	es							<u>4</u>
3.2. Socket Option for Getting	, the	PR-	-SCT	Ъ :	Stat	us				
(SCTP_PR_STATUS)										4
$ frac{4}{2}$. IANA Considerations										<u>5</u>
$\underline{\mathtt{5}}$. Security Considerations										<u>5</u>
$\underline{6}$. Acknowledgments										<u>5</u>
7. References										<u>5</u>
<u>7.1</u> . Normative References										
7.2. Informative References .										<u>6</u>
Authors' Addresses										6

1. Introduction

1.1. Overview

The SCTP Partial Reliability Extension (PR-SCTP) defined in [RFC3758] provides a generic method for senders to abandon user messages. The decision to abandon a user message is sender side only and the exact condition is called a PR-SCTP policy. [RFC3758] also defines one particular PR-SCTP policy, called Timed Reliability. This allows the sender to specify a timeout for a user message after which the SCTP stack abandons the user message.

This document specifies two additional PR-SCTP policies:

Limited Retransmission Policy: Allows to limit the number of retransmissions.

Priority Policy: Allows to discard lower priority messages if space for higher priority messages is needed in the send buffer.

1.2. Data Types

This documents uses data types from Draft 6.6 (March 1997) of POSIX 1003.1g: uintN_t means an unsigned integer of exactly N bits (e.g. uint16_t). This is the same as in [RFC6458]

2. Additional PR-SCTP Policies

2.1. Limited Retransmissions Policy

Using the Limited Retransmission Policy allows the sender of a user message to specify an upper limit for the number of retransmissions for each DATA chunk of the given user messages. The sender must abandon a user message if the number of retransmissions of any of the DATA chunks of the user message would exceed the provided limit. Please note that the number of retransmissions includes the fast and the timer based retransmissions.

Limiting the number of retransmissions to 0 is allowed. This will result in abandoning the message when it would get retransmitted for the first time. The use of this setting provides a service similar to UDP, which also does not send any retransmissions either.

The Limited Retransmissions Policy is used for data channels in the RTCWeb protocol stack.

2.2. Priority Policy

Using the Priority Policy allows the sender of a user message to specify a priority. When storing a user message in the send buffer while there is not enough available space, the SCTP stack may abandon other user messages with a priority lower than the provided one. The algorithm for selecting the message being abandoned is implementation specific.

After lower priority messages have been abandoned high priority messages can be transferred without blocking the send call.

The Priority Policy can be used in the IPFIX protocol stack. See [RFC7011] for more information.

3. Socket API Considerations

This section describes how the socket API defined in [RFC6458] is extended to support the newly defined PR-SCTP policies and to provide some statistical information.

Please note that this section is informational only.

3.1. Support for Added PR-SCTP Policies

As defined in $[{\tt RFC6458}],$ the PR-SCTP policy is specified and configured by using the following sctp_prinfo structure:

```
struct sctp_prinfo {
  uint16_t pr_policy;
  uint32_t pr_value;
};
```

When the Limited Retransmission Policy described in <u>Section 2.1</u> is used, pr_policy has the value SCTP_PR_SCTP_RTX and the number of retransmissions is given in pr_value.

For using the Priority Policy described in <u>Section 2.2</u>, pr_policy has the value SCTP_PR_SCTP_PRIO. The priority is given in pr_value. The value of zero is the highest priority and larger numbers in pr_value denote lower priorities.

The following table summarizes the possible parameter settings defined in [RFC6458] and this document:

3.2. Socket Option for Getting the PR-SCTP Status (SCTP_PR_STATUS)

This socket option uses IPPROTO_SCTP as its level and SCTP_PR_STATUS as its name. It can only be used with getsockopt(), but not with setsockopt(). The socket option value uses the following structure:

```
struct sctp_prstatus {
   sctp_assoc_t sprstat_assoc_id;
   uint64_t sprstat_abandoned_unsent;
   uint64_t sprstat_abandoned_sent;
};
```

sprstat_assoc_id: This parameter is ignored for one-to-one style sockets. For one-to-many style sockets this parameter indicates for which association the user wants the information. It is an error to use SCTP_{CURRENT|ALL|FUTURE}_ASSOC in sprstat_assoc_id.

Tuexen, et al. Expires July 26, 2014 [Page 4]

sprstat_abandoned_unsent: The number of user messages which have been abandoned, before any part of the user message could be sent.

sprstat_abandoned_sent: The number of user messages which have been abandoned, after a part of the user message has been sent.

There are separate counters for unsent and sent user messages because the SCTP_SEND_FAILED_EVENT supports a similar differentiation. Please note that an abandoned large user messages requiring an SCTP level fragmentation is reported in the sprstat_abandoned_sent counter as soon as at least one fragment of it has been sent. Therefore each abandoned user messages is either counted in sprstat_abandoned_unsent or sprstat_abandoned_sent.

If more detailed information about abandoned user messages is required, the subscription to the SCTP_SEND_FAILED_EVENT is recommended.

sctp_opt_info() needs to be extended to support SCTP_PR_STATUS.

4. IANA Considerations

This document requires no actions from IANA.

5. Security Considerations

This document does not add any additional security considerations in addition to the ones given in [RFC4960], [RFC3758], and [RFC6458].

6. Acknowledgments

The authors wish to thank Ka-Cheong Poon, Irene Ruengeler, Jamal Hadi Salim, and Vlad Yasevich for their invaluable comments.

7. References

7.1. Normative References

[RFC3758] Stewart, R., Ramalho, M., Xie, Q., Tuexen, M., and P. Conrad, "Stream Control Transmission Protocol (SCTP)
Partial Reliability Extension", RFC 3758, May 2004.

[RFC4960] Stewart, R., "Stream Control Transmission Protocol", RFC 4960, September 2007.

7.2. Informative References

[RFC6458] Stewart, R., Tuexen, M., Poon, K., Lei, P., and V. Yasevich, "Sockets API Extensions for the Stream Control Transmission Protocol (SCTP)", RFC 6458, December 2011.

[RFC7011] Claise, B., Trammell, B., and P. Aitken, "Specification of the IP Flow Information Export (IPFIX) Protocol for the Exchange of Flow Information", STD 77, RFC 7011, September 2013.

Authors' Addresses

Michael Tuexen Muenster University of Applied Sciences Stegerwaldstrasse 39 48565 Steinfurt DE

Email: tuexen@fh-muenster.de

Robin Seggelmann T-Systems International GmbH Fasanenweg 5 70771 Leinfelden-Echterdingen DE

Email: robin.seggelmann@t-systems.com

Randall R. Stewart Adara Networks Chapin, SC 29036 US

Email: randall@lakerest.net

Salvatore Loreto Ericsson Hirsalantie 11 Jorvas 02420 FI

Email: Salvatore.Loreto@ericsson.com