# draft-ligot-bliss-sip-services-guide

Arnaud Ligot (University of Namur)
Thomas Froment (Alcatel-Lucent)

http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ligot-bliss-sip-services-guide-01

BLISS – IETF 71st March 11<sup>th</sup> 2008.

Speaker: Thomas Froment

# **Draft objective**

# Categorization and centralization of references for the "SIP services" in the scope of BLISS

- 1) Clarification: make sure that we discuss the same thing...
  - **Names**: 3 to 5+ names related to the same service 'category' e.g. Automated Handling, Call forwardings (CFx), Call diversions (CDiv),...

### - Documents scope

Don't compare a service specification standardizing a complete system: user profile format, application server behaviour (e.g. TISPAN) with another one giving an example of protocol usage (e.g. draft-ietf-sipping-service-examples)

#### - Architecture differences

Not trying to standardize the service at IETF, still useful to separate the architecture alternatives to clarify the discussion: e.g. does an 'active intermediary' (a proxy, B2BUA, application server....) contributes to the service implementation or not?

- 2) Centralization & categorization of information: I want to implement this, where should I look for?
  - Requirements, frameworks
  - Call flows, examples
  - Full service specifications

#### **Next**

#### To do

- Some references are probably missing, could be completed with other references and inputs, e.g. coming from enterprise domain,
- update TISPAN references being transferred to 3GPP
- Improve analysis and comments on references

## **Open questions**

- Does it belong to BLISS? Possible usage for BLISS:
  - Today: input document for WG design teams? some of the given references are good illustrations of 'what is done elsewhere' but is it too late?
  - Tomorrow: when BLISS work is done, reference BLISS RFCs 'a la' hitchhiker's guide?
- Publish this in another WG? on my blog?
- Extend/reduce the scope?
- Is it useful for somebody else?
- Contributors?