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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!
  – 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