SIP(Core) WG

IETF-74

History-Info header and Support of target-uri Solution Requirements

draft-barnes-sip-4244bis-00.txt
draft-rosenberg-sip-target-uri-delivery-01.
txt

Mary Barnes (barnes@nortel.com)

Francois Audet (audet@nortel.com)

March 24, 2009

Shida Schubert (shida@ntt-at.com)

Christer Holmberg (@ericsson.com)

Hans-Erik Van Elburg (@erissson.com)

Jonathan Rosenberg (jdrosen@cisco.com)

What's wrong with RFC 4244?

- In order to make it work in real life, you have to make "assumptions" on the hi-entries.
  - Service logic, PSTN mapping, etc.
  - First entry must be "Original Called Number"
  - Last entry is Contact
  - Second to last is "Called Number"
  - Third to last is "Redirecting Number"
  - You can't have "redundant" entries (by proxies) in between
  - 4244 is overly permissive
  - This causes complexity for implementers

What's wrong with 4244?

- Error in ABNF

- All the examples are using strict routing instead of loose routing resulting in complexity and pointlessness

- Repetitive text, background information that is not useful, etc.

- There is a gratuitous mandate to use TLS on all hops, or else remove entries

- Terminology issue from RFC 3261 (re-route, re-target, forward)

- Absorbing the changes of draft-rosenberg-sip-target-uri-delivery

draft-rosenberg-sip-target-uri-delivery

- Draft-rosenberg-sip-target-uri-delivery addresses the issue related with a loss of R-URI and associated parameter before R-URI rewrite needed by the UAS.

- It's a candidate draft for addressing the milestone "Delivering request-URI and parameters to UAS via proxy to WGLC (PS)" in SIP charter.

- As History-Info header captures the Request-URIs before they are overwritten, thus it's a natural solution for this problem.

March 24, 2009

Issues with using History-Info header

- History-Info header doesn't differentiate between:
  1. Request-URIs that are overwritten when the Request-URI is changed due to service lookup (in a Registrar) or configuration on a specific proxy that is responsible for the domain in the Request-URI in the incoming request
  2. Request-URIs that are changed when the Request is sent to a next Hop proxy.

Issue 1: Marking hi-entries

- Do we mark all mapped or registered URIs the same way (e.g., "istarget"), or do we map them separately (e.g., mapped-uri, reg-uri)?

- Do we need to do anything special about terminology inherited from RFC 3261 (re-routing vs re-targeting)?

- What name(s) do we use?

Issue 2: Pruning of hi-entries

- Do we mandate leaving in all hi-entries?
- Do we allow for removing the "no-op" hi-entries (hi-entries)?
  - i.e., proxy forwarding with loose route
- Do we just mandate keeping the original and the last three?

Issue 3: TLS

- Remove requirement to use TLS on each hop or remove hi-entries?

Next step

- Merge target-uri draft into 4244bis, or, do we keep 2 drafts?