



Connection Establishment for Media Anchoring (**CEMA**) for the Message Session Relay Protocol (MSRP)

IETF#81, Quebec City, Canada

draft-ietf-simple-msrp-sessmatch-13

Christer.Holmberg@ericsson.com

Staffan.Blau@ericsson.com

MAJOR CHANGES FROM -11

- › **Session matching modification removed**
 - RFC 4975 session matching procedure used
- › **SDP c/m-line used for MSRP TCP connection establishment**
- › **“Middlebox” terminology used instead of “ALG”**
 - Middlebox definition added

OTHER CHANGES FROM -11

- › a=msrp-cema attribute defined
- › sessmatch option-tag removed
- › Support of RFC 6135 mandatory
 - Helps to avoid cases where a middlebox needs to enable MSRP B2BUA functionality
- › Additional applicability statement text
- › Additional security considerations text

CEMA ADVANTAGES

- › Works with TLS name based authentication.
- › Fewer cases where middleboxes need to enable MSRP B2BUA functionality.
- › Allows end-to-end TLS in the presence of middleboxes
 - Previously a middlebox always had to enable MSRP B2BUA.
 - Meaning middlebox had to read plaintext in all situations

MSRP B2BUA BEHAVIOR NEEDED

- › RFC 4975 UA is “active”
 - Establishes MSRP TCP connection (based on SDP a=path)
- › RFC 4975 UA uses an MSRP relay
 - Also when the RFC 4975 UA is “passive”, as it cannot be assumed that the SDP c/m-line contains the address of the relay (but rather the address of the UA)
- › Needed for backwards compatibility

Opportunity for End-to-End Security

- › Both UAs support CEMA
- › RFC 4975 UA is “passive” (and does not use an MSRP relay)
 - Previous versions of sessmatch required MSRP B2BUA behavior in this case.
- › UA supports CEMA and uses MSRP relay
 - Previous versions of sessmatch required MSRP B2BUA behavior in this case.
- › MSRP B2BUA BEHAVIOR **NOT NEEDED**

COMMENTS: Topology hiding

- › **Comment:** CEMA does not allow MSRP topology hiding, as the a=path attribute can not be modified (without the modifier acting as a MSRP B2BUA).
- › **Reply:** Topology hiding was not possible in pre-CEMA versions of sessmatch either, as the MSRP messages are not modified.

COMMENTS: TLS

- › **Comment:** Do we need to mandate usage of TLS when communicating with middleboxes?
- › **Proposal:** When CEMA UAs communicate, they **MUST** use TLS for MSRP.
- › When communicating with 4975 UAs, the draft refers to the 4975 procedures:

“NOTE: As defined in RFC 4975, if TLS authentication fails, the user need to be able to decide whether to try to anyway establish an MSRP connection.”

COMMENTS: Middlebox MSRP B2BUA decision

- › Draft currently says:

“In cases where support of the CEMA extension is indicated by at least one MSRP endpoint, the Middlebox can simply modify the SDP c/m-line address information for the MSRP connection.”

- › **Comment:** Middlebox needs to make decision when it receives SDP offer.

COMMENTS: Editorial

- › MSRP B2BUA definition
- › Note that a FQDN (in a=path and/or SDP c-line) needs a DNS lookup in order to check a=path/c-line match)
- › Table that shows when MSRP B2BUA enabling is needed.

PROPOSAL TO THE WG

› **1. ADDRESS COMMENTS**

› **2. WGLC**

THANK YOU FOR
LISTENING!