# ETSI GS NGP 012 V1.1.1 (2018-12)





Disclaimer

The present document has been produced and approved by the Next Generation Protocols (NGP) ETSI Industry Specification Group (ISG) and represents the views of those members who participated in this ISG.

It does not necessarily represent the views of the entire ETSI membership.

# Reference DGS/NGP-0012 Keywords performance, security

#### **ETSI**

650 Route des Lucioles F-06921 Sophia Antipolis Cedex - FRANCE

Tel.: +33 4 92 94 42 00 Fax: +33 4 93 65 47 16

Siret N° 348 623 562 00017 - NAF 742 C Association à but non lucratif enregistrée à la Sous-Préfecture de Grasse (06) N° 7803/88

#### Important notice

The present document can be downloaded from: http://www.etsl.org/standards-search

The present document may be made available in electronic versions and/or in print. The content of any electronic and/or print versions of the present document shall not be modified without the prior written authorization of ETSI. In case of any existing or perceived difference in contents between such versions and/or in print, the only prevailing document is the print of the Portable Document Format (PDF) version kept on a specific network drive within ETSI Secretariat.

Users of the present document should be aware that the document may be subject to revision or change of status.

Information on the current status of this and other ETSI documents is available at <a href="https://portal.etsi.org/TB/ETSIDeliverableStatus.aspx">https://portal.etsi.org/TB/ETSIDeliverableStatus.aspx</a>

If you find errors in the present document, please send your comment to one of the following services: https://portal.etsi.org/People/CommiteeSupportStaff.aspx

#### **Copyright Notification**

No part may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and microfilm except as authorized by written permission of ETSI.

The content of the PDF version shall not be modified without the written authorization of ETSI.

The copyright and the foregoing restriction extend to reproduction in all media.

© ETSI 2018. All rights reserved.

**DECT**<sup>™</sup>, **PLUGTESTS**<sup>™</sup>, **UMTS**<sup>™</sup> and the ETSI logo are trademarks of ETSI registered for the benefit of its Members. **3GPP**<sup>™</sup> and **LTE**<sup>™</sup> are trademarks of ETSI registered for the benefit of its Members and of the 3GPP Organizational Partners.

oneM2M™ logo is a trademark of ETSI registered for the benefit of its Members and of the oneM2M Partners.

**GSM**® and the GSM logo are trademarks registered and owned by the GSM Association.

## Contents

Intell	llectual Property Rights	4			
Forev	eword	4			
Moda	dal verbs terminology	4			
1	Scope	5			
2	References	5			
2.1	Normative references	5			
2.2	Informative references	5			
3	Definition of terms, symbols and abbreviations	5			
3.1	Terms				
3.2	Symbols				
3.3	Abbreviations				
4	Overview	6			
5	Methodology	6			
6	Key Performance Indicators for network protocols	7			
6.1					
6.2	KPIs for performance	8			
6.3	KPIs for mobility	8			
6.4	KPIs for buffering	9			
6.5	KPIs for multihoming	9			
6.6	KPIs for protocol efficiency	9			
6.7	KPIs for security and privacy	11 11			
6.8 6.9	VDIs for interpreparability	11 12			
	KPIs for naming and addressing  KPIs for performance  KPIs for mobility  KPIs for buffering  KPIs for multihoming  KPIs for protocol efficiency  KPIs for security and privacy  KPIs for traffic management  KPIs for interoperability  Assessment of return on investment  About this clause  Deployment effort	12			
7	Assessment of return on investment.	12			
7.0	About this clause	12			
7.1 7.2	Payanya apportunities	12 12			
	About this clause	13			
Anno	iex A (informative): Guidance on weighting of KPIs				
A.0	Rationale for weighting	14			
A.1	Weighting KPIs within a KPI category	14			
A.2	Weighting for a network	14			
A.3	Weighting for a scenario	14			
Anno	nex B (informative): Authors & contributors	15			
Anno	nnex C (informative): Bibliography16				
Anno	nex D (informative): Change History	17			
Histo	tory	18			

## Intellectual Property Rights

#### **Essential patents**

IPRs essential or potentially essential to normative deliverables may have been declared to ETSI. The information pertaining to these essential IPRs, if any, is publicly available for **ETSI members and non-members**, and can be found in ETSI SR 000 314: "Intellectual Property Rights (IPRs); Essential, or potentially Essential, IPRs notified to ETSI in respect of ETSI standards", which is available from the ETSI Secretariat. Latest updates are available on the ETSI Web server (https://ipr.etsi.org/).

Pursuant to the ETSI IPR Policy, no investigation, including IPR searches, has been carried out by ETSI. No guarantee can be given as to the existence of other IPRs not referenced in ETSI SR 000 314 (or the updates on the ETSI Web server) which are, or may be, or may become, essential to the present document.

#### **Trademarks**

The present document may include trademarks and/or tradenames which are asserted and/or registered by their owners. ETSI claims no ownership of these except for any which are indicated as being the property of ETSI, and conveys no right to use or reproduce any trademark and/or tradename. Mention of those trademarks in the present document does not constitute an endorsement by ETSI of products, services or organizations associated with those trademarks.

#### **Foreword**

This Group Specification (GS) has been produced by ETSI Industry Specification Group (ISG) Next Generation Protocols (NGP).

## Modal verbs terminology

In the present document "shall", "shall not", "should", "should not", "may", "need not", "will", "will not", "can" and "cannot" are to be interpreted as described in clause 3.2 of the <u>ETSI Drafting Rules</u> (Verbal forms for the expression of provisions).

"must" and "must not" are NOT allowed in ETSI deliverables except when used in direct citation.

## 1 Scope

The scope of the present document is to specify Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) that can be used to compare the efficiency, performance and security of Next Generation Protocols (NGPs) against current networking protocols.

The relative importance of each KPI depends on the scenario in which protocols are being compared. Therefore, this document provides guidelines for weighting the KPIS to help arrive at a meaningful comparison. Scenarios of particular relevance are detailed in ETSI NGP GS 001 [1], with resulting requirements listed in ETSI NGP GS 005 [2].

#### 2 References

#### 2.1 Normative references

References are either specific (identified by date of publication and/or edition number or version number) or non-specific. For specific references, only the cited version applies. For non-specific references, the latest version of the referenced document (including any amendments) applies.

Referenced documents which are not found to be publicly available in the expected location might be found at <a href="https://docbox.etsi.org/Reference">https://docbox.etsi.org/Reference</a>.

NOTE: While any hyperlinks included in this clause were valid at the time of publication, ETSI cannot guarantee their long term validity.

The following referenced documents are necessary for the application of the present document.

- [1] ETSI GS NGP 001: "Next Generation Protocol (NGP); Scenario Definitions".
- [2] ETSI GS NGP 005: "Next Generation Protocol (NGP); Next Generation Protocol Requirements".

## 2.2 Informative references

References are either specific (identified by date of publication and/or edition number or version number) or non-specific. For specific references, only the cited version applies. For non-specific references, the latest version of the referenced document (including any amendments) applies.

NOTE: While any hyperlinks included in this clause were valid at the time of publication, ETSI cannot guarantee their long term validity.

The following referenced documents are not necessary for the application of the present document but they assist the user with regard to a particular subject area.

[i.1] ETSI TR 121 905: "Digital cellular telecommunications system (Phase 2+) (GSM); Universal Mobile Telecommunications System (UMTS); LTE; Vocabulary for 3GPP Specifications (3GPP TR 21.905)".

## 3 Definition of terms, symbols and abbreviations

#### 3.1 Terms

For the purposes of the present document, the following terms apply:

**Key Performance Indicator (KPI):** measurable property that significantly impacts business operations as its value changes

#### 3.2 Symbols

Void.

#### 3.3 Abbreviations

For the purposes of the present document, the abbreviations given in ETSI TR 121 905 [i.1] and the following apply:

 $3GPP^{TM}$ 3<sup>rd</sup> Generation Participation Project Computer Emergency Response Team **CERT** IoT Internet of Things ΙP Internet Protocol **ISG Industry Specific Group Key Performance Indicator KPI** Network Address Translation NAT NGP **Next Generation Protocols PDU** Protocol Data Unit ROI Return On Investment

TCP Transmission Control Protocol

## 4 Overview

Next Generation Protocols aim to improve on existing protocols in various ways. Any improvement shall be demonstrable and measurable. Hence the need for a set of KPIs with which to measure, and compare, Next Generation Protocols against the protocols they intend to replace.

## 5 Methodology

Each KPI consists of several characteristics:

- An ID for reference.
- A definition and rationale, to explain why this is a Key Performance Indicator.
- A metric, to indicate the unit of measurement.
- Desired value.

For the most accurate comparison, only the protocols being tested should vary, and other elements (CPUs, network paths, access media, etc.) should remain fixed. This does not apply for hardware-only processing comparisons against software processing.

## 6 Key Performance Indicators for network protocols

## 6.1 KPIs for naming and addressing

Table 6.1

ID	Definition and rationale	Metric	Desired value
Add1	Scalability: the number of entities that	Integer	A higher number of addressable entities.
	can be uniquely addressed by the		
	scheme. An address scheme should		
	scale to support the projected		
	addressable entities of the network.		
	The measurement is the count of		
	addressable entities supported by the		
	address scheme itself without		
V 440	external mappings (e.g. NAT).	Time a (mas)	A shorter times to keep to allocate in address on to in autition.
Add2	Allocation and reuse: the efficiency of	Time (ms)	A shorter time taken to allocate <i>n</i> addresses to <i>n</i> entities;
	allocating an address to an		a shorter time taken to reallocate <i>n</i> addresses.
	addressable entity, and of re-		
	allocating that address as required. The latency incurred in allocating/re-		
	allocating addresses impacts network		
	scalability and flexibility.		A A
Add3	Encoding: the minimum bits required	bits	Fewer bits to encode the address.
Auus	to encode the address per the	Dits	i ewer bits to efficult the address.
	addressing scheme specification.		18 118
Add4	Are the Address semantics	Yes/no	No. at V Riday to the Control of the
	overloaded?	DARI Silver	3/4 /3/5/1/1.
	Host addresses are location-	A 15.1	N. 118 17 1
	dependent; application names are	20, 250	dare uda out
	location-independent. Loose coupling	r Agia	Art Star Holy
	of these simplifies mobility and	All all's	(10 <sup>6</sup> ) 1.6 <sup>3</sup>
	multihoming.	7 2600	No. 6 Legislands of the Control of t
Add5	Location-independent naming: does		Yes.
	the application identifier persist when	iteh 26ia	
	it has moved to a new host?	. 92.1 635)	
	This hides complexity from other	Yes/Non aidsitethy/hoa addrees9/hoa addrees9/hoa	
	communicating processes.		
Add6	Ability to set the lifetime of an	Yes/no	Yes.
	address.		
Add7	Ability to allocate addresses to	Yes/no	Yes.
	entities not yet attached.		
Add8	Ability to allocate static addresses.	Yes/no	Yes.

#### KPIs for performance 6.2

Table 6.2

ID	Definition and rationale	Metric	Desired value
Per1	Void.		
Per2	Latency: the delay between the encapsulation of application data into a network protocol datagram by the sending endpoint; the forwarding of those datagrams to the destination endpoint; and the subsequent decapsulation of the datagram to extract the application data.	Time (ms)	The lower latency (see note 1).
Per3	Predictability/reliability: the ability of the protocols to deliver datagrams without loss or corruption; and to deliver datagrams in order as required.	Lost/corrupted packets as a % of the flow total.	Lower error % (see note 2).
Per4	Jitter: any variation in latency over time. Lower jitter would indicate a more predictable network protocol.	Standard deviation from expected latency.	The lower jitter (see note 3).

The latency testing for a given scenario may require consideration of, or set values for:

- error rate
- load
- scalability
- mobility

NOTE 2: This measurement assumes that any network protocol retransmission mechanism is active. Therefore the

measurement should allow for such mechanisms to detect and recover from any loss/corruption.

NOTE 3: Measurements should be taken over a range of network conditions, including high network load and poor signal (for mobile access)

### KPIs for mobility 6.3

ID	Definition and rationale	Metric	Desired value
Mob1	Latency to handover	Time (ms)	The lower time.
	The delay to switch access networks whilst		
	maintaining flow continuity.		
Mob2	Overhead of handover	Bytes	The smaller number of bytes.
	The buffer handover when switching access		
	networks (including LTE mobility and LTE		
	<->WiFi mobility).		
Mob3	Packet loss of handover	Integer	The smaller number of packets.
	The packets dropped during access network		
	handover.		

#### KPIs for buffering 6.4

Table 6.4

ID	Definition and rationale	Metric	Desired value
Buf1	Void		
Buf2	Drop/queue support The ability of the protocol to request that the network either drop or queue packets under resource contention.	Yes/No	Yes
Buf3	Queue occupancy support when choosing optimal route.	Yes/No	Yes
Buf4	Support for configurable scheduling - queuing for a configurable time.	Yes/no	Yes

#### KPIs for multihoming 6.5

Table 6.5

ID	Definition and rationale	Metric	Desired value
MH1	Do the protocols name the node, and not	Yes/No	Yes
	the network interface? This allows native	,A	A
	multihoming and reduces complexity,		
	improves scalability, load balancing and		مراكة والمراكة
	session continuity.	210	all all
MH2	Do the protocols support aggregation of	Yes/No	Yes we will be a second of the
	content from different destination sources,	Y KEN	\sis^1,1.1.
	to provide resilience?	15.1	198 V.
	Ito provide resilience?	192.	10 1

## 6.6

KPIs for protocol efficiency desired the protocols will improve perfect More efficient protocols will improve performance, and should reduce the energy consumed by processing and transmission.

Table 6.6

ID	Definition and rationale	Metric	Desired value
PE1	Protocol efficiency: The ratio of useful data in the payload to overhead has a direct financial impact on communication links; More performant protocols will deliver a higher value per second. NGP protocols shall minimize header complexity and overhead.	*******	A higher proportion of application bits as ratio of total bits
PE2	Processing overheads: instructions The number of instructions required to process the protocol headers. If software, how many machine instructions. If logic, how many gates.	Number of processing steps (Integer)	Lower number