Problem Statement for SIP-signaled Peer-to-Peer Communication across Middleboxes

> Martin Stiemerling, Juergen Quittek Thomas Dietz, Saverio Niccolini

65th IETF meeting, P2P SIP session

# **Goals and Non-Goals**

#### Goals

 Identify potential issues of SIP-based P2P communication related to NAT and firewall traversal
 to be considered when designing standards for a SIP-based P2P infrastructure

#### Non-Goals

- Constrain a future P2P SIP architecture in any way
  - Still we need to list potential communication steps that might raise issues
  - Those steps are not necessary part of the final SIP-based P2P solution
- Suggest NAT traversal methods to be selected for P2P solution

## **Potential Communication Steps**

- Steps considered
   middlebox detection
   registration
   search for relays
   address lookup
   call setup
   call termination
- Not all steps might be necessary
- Several steps may be combined into one

## **Middlebox Detection**

- Detect Middleboxes
  - $\boldsymbol{\omega}$  on the signaling path
  - ω on the data path

#### Communication means detection for

- $\boldsymbol{\omega}$  registration
- ω incoming / outgoing signaling
- $\boldsymbol{\omega}$  data streaming to and from other terminals or relays

#### Checks to be performed

- ω sending and receiving UDP packets
- ω opening incoming and outgoing TCP connections
- $\boldsymbol{\omega}$  use of certain fixed port numbers
- the option to relay or tunnel signaling messages and streamed data
- NAT parameter detection
  - ω full cone, half cone, other funny cone, ...

IETF 65 P2P SIP MIDDLEBOX

# Registration

- Authentication of the user
- Notification of communication capability and willingness
- Registration of contact parameters
- Notification of service provisioning capability and willingness

### **Further Steps**

- Search and Connect Relay
  - Occurrent Constructor of the suggested by infrastructure
- Address Lookup
   Per-call lookup
   Buddy list lookup
- Connection Establishment and Termination

## **Middlebox Traversal Methods**

• Tunneling

in highly restricted environments onlycontroversial:

HTTP and DNS tunneling are not legitimate
TURN could be OK

- Network-initiated Middlebox Signaling
   m probably not the right choice for P2P SIP
- Terminal-initiated Middlebox Signaling
   wseveral methods known

## **Terminal-initiated Middlebox Signaling**

- Specified
  STUN (RFC3489)
  UPnP (UPnP Forum)
  SOCKS (RFC 1928)
  RSIP (RFC 3103)
- Under development
   STUN update (behave WG)
   ICE (mmusic WG)
   NSIS (nsis WG)

## **Open Issues for SIP-based P2P**

#### SIP-unrelated

middlebox detection beyond UDP

### SIP-related

- ω terminal reachability
- o communication service requirements
- o communication service offers
- The relevance of these issues strongly depends on the choice of P2P architecture

## **Middlebox Detection Beyond UDP**

 Limited or no middlebox detection for TCP and DCCP available

 Middlebox signaling for TCP is covered by UPnP, SOCKS, RSIP, NSIS.

- TCP considered for signaling and for data

   Several SIP-signaled services use TCP
   RTP over TCP used when UDP is blocked
- Might get solved partially by ICE TCP
   w still in early state

# **Terminal Reachability**

- Relevance depends on registration and relay detection process.
- Terminal might need to register first and then find and connect to a relay in order to be reachable.
- In between these two steps it would be reachable for signaling but unreachable for data transmission and should be registered as such.
- Currently, the SIP protocol does not provide explicit means for signaling such a state.

# **Communication Service Requirement**

- The terminal might need to express its needs for relaying
  - ω signaling messages,
  - ω lookup requests,
  - ω data streams.
- Infrastructure nodes might need to suggested relays to be used to terminals.
- For both, request and suggestion, signaling means are required.
  - Extension Header Field for Service Route Discovery During Registration (RFC 3608) might offer means.

## **Communication Service Offering**

- A terminal in an unrestricted (or just slightly restricted) environment might be able (and the user willing) to offer services to other peers, such as relay services and lookup services.
- Currently, the SIP protocol does not provide explicit means for signaling such offers.

## **Open Issues for SIP-based P2P**

#### SIP-unrelated

middlebox detection beyond UDP

### SIP-related

- o terminal reachability
- o communication service requirements
- o communication service offers
- The relevance of these issues strongly depends on the choice of P2P architecture