

Diameter Predicted Units

draft-bertz-dime-predictunits-00

L. Bertz

IETF 96, Berlin

What is it

- New Units type (like USED-UNITS and GRANTED-UNITS) that can be sent in a Diameter Response (S => C) that estimates the usage associated with an Authorized User
 - Most like sent as part of an Authorization
 - Can be sent independent of a GRANTED UNITS, i.e. an Access Request
- Allows Diameter Clients to get some idea of what load that could be expected for the Authorization
 - Units may be same as those in the GRANT but may include more than that (should)
 - Especially helpful for Virtualized network functions
- 1 AVP that is similar in form to U-S-U / G-S-U
- Predicted-Service-Units ::= < AVP Header: TBD1 >
 - [CC-Time]
 - [CC-Money]
 - [CC-Total-Octets]
 - [CC-Input-Octets]
 - [CC-Output-Octets]
 - [CC-Service-Specific-Units]
 - *[Service-Cost-Information]
 - *[AVP]
- Because it spans any form of Authorization response it made no sense to put it in just the RFC4006bis where it could be lost

Next Steps

- Read & Feedback!
 - 1 Feedback – Should this include an over-time or a Time of Day base AVP (e.g. TOD from RFC 5777)
 - Can add any AVP (it is extensible!) but we can add it as part of the spec.
- WG adoption

Diameter Predicted Units
draft-bertz-dime-predictunits-00

L. Bertz

IETF 96, Berlin

What is it

- New Units type (like USED-UNITS and GRANTED-UNITS) that can be sent in a Diameter Response (S => C) that estimates the usage associated with an Authorized User
 - Most like sent as part of an Authorization
 - Can be sent independent of a GRANTED UNITS, i.e. an Access Request
- Allows Diameter Clients to get some idea of what load that could be expected for the Authorization
 - Units may be same as those in the GRANT but may include more than that (should)
 - Especially helpful for Virtualized network functions
- 1 AVP that is similar in form to U-S-U / G-S-U
- Predicted-Service-Units ::= < AVP Header: TBD1 >
 - [CC-Time]
 - [CC-Money]
 - [CC-Total-Octets]
 - [CC-Input-Octets]
 - [CC-Output-Octets]
 - [CC-Service-Specific-Units]
 - *[Service-Cost-Information]
 - *[AVP]
- Because it spans any form of Authorization response it made no sense to put it in just the RFC4006bis where it could be lost

Next Steps

- Read & Feedback!
 - 1 Feedback – Should this include an over-time or a Time of Day base AVP (e.g. TOD from RFC 5777)?
 - Can add any AVP (it is extensible!) but we can add it as a part of the spec.
- WG adoption