

SIPCORE WG

IETF 81

History Info Header and Support of target-uri Solution Requirements

draft-ietf-sipcore-4244bis-05.txt

Mary Barnes (mary.ietf.barnes@gmail.com)

Francois Audet (francois.audet@skype.net)

Shida Schubert (shida@ntt-at.com)

Christer.Holmberg (@ericsson.com)

Hans-Erik Van Elburg (ietf.hanserik@gmail.com)

Status

- Draft was updated right after IETF80 based on comments provided by John Elwell and others.
- Second WGLC started on June 6th and following reviewers provided extensive comments.
 - Paul Kyzivat
 - Andrew Allen
 - Christer Holmberg
 - Cullen Jennings
 - Dale Worley
 - Hadriel Kaplan
 - Roland Jesske

Issue 1 : semantics of “rc”

- Issue
 - Current “rc” only covers case where R-URI is changed to an address registered through REGISTER.
- Suggestion on ML:
 - Change the semantic of “rc” to mean change in R-URI while target user remained the same.
- Options:
 - 1. Change the semantics of “rc” as it was suggested on the ML
 - 2. On top of 1, also re-introduce “np” (noop) which will allow us to distinguish entry by 4244 and 4244bis.
- Proposal:
 - Go with 1.

Issue 2 : tel URI handling

- Issue:
 - There is little text describing how tel URI should be handled.
- Suggestion on ML:
 - Add descriptive text surrounding how tel URI is added to H-I. (Christer offered to suggest texts)
- Proposal:
 - Add descriptive text to cover tel URI.

Issue 3 : indexing missing entity

- Issue:
 - Currently text says “In the case that a SIP entity adds an hi-entry on behalf of the previous hop, the hi-index MUST be set to 1”.
- The intention was to identify the gap but the reference system breaks as you may end up with redundant index when there are gaps (many 1 and its children).
- Proposal:
 - Use 0 to indicate gap.

Issue 4 : Document structure

- Issue:
 - RFC4244bis has no normative text surrounding its use in specific application.
- Suggestion on ML:
 - Merge the call-flow document with the core spec and make the behavior normative for each application uses.
- Proposal:
 - Leave the document structure as is
 - Section 11 (Application Considerations) provides normative behavior for extracting the information in the Header field.
 - The rfc4244bis describes a toolset. Call-flow describes its usage. This is how we always did things. It allows people to be innovative with the toolset we provide.

Issue 5 : Backward compatibility

- Issue:
 - Some concerns about how things will behave when there are both 4244 and 4244bis entities in the same network.
- Proposal:
 - Will add the text of analysis and call-flow example to show the implication of mixed environment to section 15.1.

Way Forward

- Update 4244bis by the beginning of September reflecting nits provided on ML and what we agreed upon today.
- Update 4244bis-call-flow based on the revised 4244bis at the same time.
- If necessary another WGLC by mid to end of September.
- Accept call-flow doc as WG item.