

Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Expires: July 23, 2003

A. Niemi
Nokia
January 22, 2003

Requirements for Limiting the Rate of Event Notifications
draft-niemi-sipping-event-throttle-reqs-00

Status of this Memo

This document is an Internet-Draft and is in full conformance with all provisions of [Section 10 of RFC2026](#).

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), its areas, and its working groups. Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts.

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."

The list of current Internet-Drafts can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/ietf/lid-abstracts.txt>.

The list of Internet-Draft Shadow Directories can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html>.

This Internet-Draft will expire on July 23, 2003.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2003). All Rights Reserved.

Abstract

All event packages are required to specify a maximum rate at which event notifications are generated by a single notifier. Such a limit is provided in order to reduce network congestion. In addition to the fixed limits introduced by specific event packages, further mechanisms for limiting the rate of event notification are also allowed to be defined by event package specifications but none have been specified so far. This memo discusses the requirements for a throttle mechanism that allows a subscriber to further limit the rate of event notification.

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	3
2.	Conventions	3
3.	Example Use Case	3
4.	Requirements	4
5.	Security Considerations	4
	Normative References	5
	Informative References	5
	Author's Address	6
	Intellectual Property and Copyright Statements	7

1. Introduction

The SIP events framework described in [RFC 3265](#) [2] mandates that each event package specification defines an absolute maximum on the rate at which notifications are allowed to be generated by a single notifier. Such a limit is provided in order to reduce network congestion.

All of the existing event package specifications include a maximum notification rate recommendation, ranging from once in every five seconds [3], [4], [5] to once per second [6].

Per the SIP events framework, each event package specification is also allowed to define additional throttling mechanisms which allow the subscriber to further limit the rate of event notification. So far none of the event package specifications have defined such throttling mechanisms.

This memo discusses the requirements for a generic throttling mechanism, which allows the subscriber to limit the rate of event notifications. It is intended that the throttle mechanism is not event package specific, but commonly available to be used with all event subscriptions.

2. Conventions

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#) [1].

3. Example Use Case

There are many applications that potentially would make use of a throttle mechanism. This chapter only illustrates one possible use case, in which a mobile device uses the event throttling mechanism to limit the amount of traffic it may receive.

A mobile application is watching the state of 100 presentities each generating notifications at a maximum rate of once per five seconds. Assuming that the arrival times of notifications are evenly distributed, this will result in a maximum notification frequency of:

$$f = 100 * (1 / 5s) = 100 / 5 \text{ Hz} = 20 \text{ Hz}$$

experienced by the mobile. The same watcher subscribing using a throttle mechanism to limit the maximum rate at which notifications are to be generated to once per 20 seconds can expect a maximum notification frequency of:

$$f = 100 * (1 / 20s) = 100 / 20 \text{ Hz} = 5 \text{ Hz}$$

thus resulting in 75% reduction in the maximum rate of incoming presence notifications.

Note that the actual rate of notification is the sum of many factors, and this example only makes a very broad assumption on the absolute maximum rate at which the notifications might be generated.

4. Requirements

REQ1: The subscriber **MUST** be able to limit using a throttle mechanism the maximum rate at which the notifier is allowed to generate notifications in a subscription.

REQ2: The subscriber **MUST** be able to indicate that it requires the use of a throttle mechanism in the subscription.

REQ3: The subscriber **SHOULD** be allowed to indicate support for the throttle mechanism without requiring it.

REQ4: The notifier **MUST** be able to indicate that it does not support the use of a throttle mechanism in the subscription.

REQ5: If the throttle mechanism isn't required by the subscriber, the notifier **SHOULD** be able to ignore it.

REQ6: It **MUST** be possible to use the throttle mechanism in subscriptions to all events.

REQ7: It **MUST** be possible to use the throttle mechanism together with any event filtering mechanism.

REQ8: The notifier **MUST** be allowed to use a maximum rate lower than the one given by the subscriber.

REQ9: Authentication and integrity protection **SHOULD** be applied to subscriptions that apply the throttle mechanism.

Note that [Section 5](#) contains further discussion on the security implications of the throttle mechanism.

5. Security Considerations

Naturally all of the security considerations for event subscriptions

and notifications also apply to subscriptions and notifications that use the throttle mechanism. In addition, using the event throttle mechanism introduces some new security issues to consider:

The throttle mechanism might allow a subscriber to set a very low maximum notification rate - one that possibly exceeds the subscription expiration. Such a limit inserted by a malicious third party would result in very few if any notifications to be generated, which could be perceived as theft of service to the subscriber.

Similarly, the throttle mechanism might allow the subscriber to set a very high maximum rate of notification that possibly is higher than the default recommended rate of notification. Such a high rate inserted by a malicious third party could result in denial of service of the notifier due to performance issues.

Using the throttle mechanism potentially allows a subscriber to increase the number of active subscriptions due to the decrease in the maximum rate of notifications generated by a single notifier. If a malicious third party is able to remove the throttle from the subscriptions, the subscriber might be flooded with notifications.

All of the above problems can be avoided by ensuring that the integrity and authenticity of subscriptions is protected by applying relevant security measures.

Normative References

- [1] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.

Informative References

- [2] Roach, A., "Session Initiation Protocol (SIP)-Specific Event Notification", [RFC 3265](#), June 2002.
- [3] Rosenberg, J., "A Presence Event Package for the Session Initiation Protocol (SIP)", [draft-ietf-simple-presence-09](#) (work in progress), December 2002.
- [4] Rosenberg, J., "A Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) Event Package for Registrations", [draft-ietf-sipping-reg-event-00](#) (work in progress), October 2002.
- [5] Rosenberg, J., "A Watcher Information Event Template-Package for the Session Initiation Protocol (SIP)", [draft-ietf-simple-winfo-package-04](#) (work in progress), December

2002.

- [6] Mahy, R., "A Message Summary and Message Waiting Indication Event Package for the Session Initiation Protocol (SIP)", [draft-ietf-sipping-mwi-01](#) (work in progress), November 2002.

Author's Address

Aki Niemi
Nokia
P.O. Box 321
NOKIA GROUP, FIN 00045
Finland

Phone: +358 50 389 1644
EMail: aki.niemi@nokia.com

Intellectual Property Statement

The IETF takes no position regarding the validity or scope of any intellectual property or other rights that might be claimed to pertain to the implementation or use of the technology described in this document or the extent to which any license under such rights might or might not be available; neither does it represent that it has made any effort to identify any such rights. Information on the IETF's procedures with respect to rights in standards-track and standards-related documentation can be found in [BCP-11](#). Copies of claims of rights made available for publication and any assurances of licenses to be made available, or the result of an attempt made to obtain a general license or permission for the use of such proprietary rights by implementors or users of this specification can be obtained from the IETF Secretariat.

The IETF invites any interested party to bring to its attention any copyrights, patents or patent applications, or other proprietary rights which may cover technology that may be required to practice this standard. Please address the information to the IETF Executive Director.

Full Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2003). All Rights Reserved.

This document and translations of it may be copied and furnished to others, and derivative works that comment on or otherwise explain it or assist in its implementation may be prepared, copied, published and distributed, in whole or in part, without restriction of any kind, provided that the above copyright notice and this paragraph are included on all such copies and derivative works. However, this document itself may not be modified in any way, such as by removing the copyright notice or references to the Internet Society or other Internet organizations, except as needed for the purpose of developing Internet standards in which case the procedures for copyrights defined in the Internet Standards process must be followed, or as required to translate it into languages other than English.

The limited permissions granted above are perpetual and will not be revoked by the Internet Society or its successors or assignees.

This document and the information contained herein is provided on an "AS IS" basis and THE INTERNET SOCIETY AND THE INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE DISCLAIMS ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION

HEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF
MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

Acknowledgement

Funding for the RFC Editor function is currently provided by the
Internet Society.