# Diameter Congestion And Filter Attributes

IETF 89, London, UK

Lyle Bertz (<a href="mailto:lyle.t.bertz@sprint.com">lyle Bertz (<a href="lyle.t.bertz@sprint.com">lyle Bertz (<a href="lyle.t.bertz@sprint.com")>lyle Bertz (<a href="lyle.t.bertz@sprint.com")>lyle Bertz (<a href="lyle.t.bertz@sprint.com")>lyle Bertz (

Brent Hirschman (brent.hirschman@sprint.com)

Supplement to

draft-bertz-dime-congestion-flow-attributes-02

### RFC 5777 Foundation

- RFC 5777
- Filter–Rule AVP
  - The basis our work.
  - Condition/Action design

```
Filter-Rule ::= < AVP Header: 509 >
         [Filter-Rule-Precedence]
         ; Condition part of a Rule
         [ Classifier ]
         * [ Time-Of-Day-Condition ]
         ; Action and Meta-Data
         [Treatment-Action]
         ; Info about QoS related Actions
         [ QoS-Semantics ]
         [ QoS-Profile-Template ]
         [ QoS-Parameters ]
         [ Excess-Treatment ]
         ; Extension Point
         * [ AVP ]
```

## **Congestion Management**

- Filter-Rule does not support ECN in 2 ways
  - 1. No AVP to add to condition part to Classify ECN marked traffic
  - No Congestion-Treatment Action Set (RFC has Excess-Treatment and Treatment-Action AVPs)
- We need to build many filters for Congestion Management
  - How do we know they are working? (Is any traffic captured)
  - What can we observe on existing filters in order to remove unused ones OR ones deprecated by new filters?

### Progress since IETF88

- 3GPP UPCON is moving forward
  - Still evaluating options
  - Off-path (OAM) Solution is moving forward but is not part of session control plane
  - ECN is present in 3GPP (Emergency calling, IMS, etc.) not part of the core
- Multipath TCP is ramping up
  - Need path level congestion marking
- Lack of ECN adoption in production often cited as a barrier even though UEs and eNodeB must support it for Emergency calls

### **Questions for Consideration**

- When should we add TCP ECE and CWR filters?
- When do we add Classifier support for ECN for RTP over UDP (RFC 6679)?
- What can we do to progress this Draft?

# Background

## **ECN Specific AVPs**

- ECN-IP-Codepoint AVP (Enumerated)
  - Specifies the Explicit Congestion Notification codepoint values to match in the IP header.
  - Use: Place in Filter-Rule's Classifier
- Congestion-Treatment AVP (Grouped)
  - Similar in design/use to Excess-Treament AVP
  - NOTE: Criteria for Congestion or traffic under congestion is out of scope of the AVP specification
  - Flow-Count AVP (Unsigned64)
    - Indicates the number of protocol specific flows. The protocol is determined by the filter
  - Packet-Count AVP (Unsigned64)
    - Indicates the number of protocol specific packets.

### Filter AVPs for maintenance

#### Two AVPs

- Flow-Count AVP (Unsigned64)
  - Indicates the number of protocol specific flows. The protocol is determined by the filter
- Packet-Count AVP (Unsigned64)
  - Indicates the number of protocol specific packets.

#### Uses

- Use in accounting/reporting to determine if Filter is working as planned
- Can be combined with other AVPs to provide rudimentary traffic profile (e.g. bytes per flow, bytes per packet, etc.)
- Can be sent in Filter-Rule as prescriptive