

SIPPING Work Group IETF 69

Notes from SIPPING session 1

Scribe: Peter Blatherwick. Note, may be biased on configuration related topics!

- Agenda & Status
- . See slides
- Perceptual MOS (Ravi)
- . Described general MOS model, need for generalized reporting.
- . ITU is defining standardized MOS types
- . Contact Ravi if interested and/or discuss on mailing list
- Offer/Answer o-line usage (Paul Kyzivat)
- [draft-ietf-sipping-offeranswer-02.txt](http://www3.ietf.org/proceedings/06nov/IDs/draft-ietf-sip-sessionpolicy-framework-00.txt)<http://www3.ietf.org/proceedings/06nov/IDs/draft-ietf-sip-sessionpolicy-framework-00.txt>
- . Status update, believed to be nearly complete, ver 02 now on repository
- . Issue: sip-session vs SDP, what is session-id changes .> proposed just to point out behaviour is non compliant, reiterate 3264. Those wanting new session can just Invite/Replaces
- . Sparks, strongly supports proposal (Jonathan +1)
- . Krister, agreed, basically
- . Francois Audet, please explain how to proceed if invalid o-line detected. Response, there are limits to what can be done.
- . Stucker, when marrying 3264 & SIP, it becomes difficult to figure out. Say .in SIP, it is irrelevant..
- . Rosenberg, be crisp, say it is an error case, do whatever your error thing is
- . Chair / Gonzalo: Take to list to close down .. Nope, we are done.
- . Krister, new issue [which I did not catch or understand]
- . Sparks, this is a known SIP problem
- . Doc should say, .for future study.
- . Sparks, requests looong WGLC, due to implementer feedback needed
- . Chair / Gonzalo: agreed, at least 1 mo
- Race conditions (Paul Kyzivat)
- [draft-ietf-sipping-race-examples-02.txt](http://www3.ietf.org/proceedings/06nov/IDs/draft-ietf-sipsession-policy-framework-00.txt)<http://www3.ietf.org/proceedings/06nov/IDs/draft-ietf-sipsession-policy-framework-00.txt>
- . Completed WGLC May, summarized changes
- . Believed ready for IESG
- . Chair / Mary: speak now on list, otherwise ship it
- Service Identification (Rosenberg)
- [draft-rosenberg-sipping-service-identification-03.txt](http://www3.ietf.org/proceedings/06nov/IDs/draftietf-sip-session-policy-framework-00.txt)<http://www3.ietf.org/proceedings/06nov/IDs/draftietf-sip-session-policy-framework-00.txt>
- . Service ID architecture
- . Good response to .who has read. service ID architecture
- . Issue: what about Offerless Invite
- . Issue: Perils in context of use of service ID
- . Stucker: looking for use cases for Offerless Invite . those that can.t handle need to say why ! DON.t key off Invite
- . Spencer: Very useful . thanks
- . Krister, still discussing other examples; Offerless Invite not the only remaining issue
- . Paul Kyzivat xxxxxxxxx missed xxxxxxxxx
- . Ted Hardy: This is broader than this WG, coordination needed ! agreed.
- . Hummm, is this draft starting point for WG existing charter item ! strong consensus to proceed.
- . Media Tag document
- . Problem space is what does it mean for a UA to register saying .I do application. is not

useful. Proposed to create application sub-types in SDP.

- . Issue: 3GPP still want to dispatch based on service URN
- . Current compromise proposal . move forward w.Media Tag document (but on back burner) ; move forward on P-A-Service ; 3GPP registers media feature tag .app-ref. in vendor space
- . David Oran: Clarification, is 3GPP a .vendor. in IETF sense? Response (JDR) . sorta, they are 3GPP.org.
- . Rohan: Don.t understand decision . why move forward in a way we figured was not good. JDR response [which I did not follow.], proposed as P-header which is agreed mechanism.
- . Fluffy: Can.t just say .we don.t care what you do.,
- . Paul K: Has come to acceptance. Why are we defining P-Asserted-Service?
- . Andrew ??? : there is no proposal to remove it, and there is language on how to use it (a .hint.). Must check contents of the message; it is written in 3GPP spec text. Assertion will be same either way, just shortens process.
- . Eric Burger: Please shoot Preferred Service.
- . Jonathan: Is it really useful as a performance improvement. Andrew, depends on how many services you have.
- . Andrew: remember, before we take a hum, this may be .least evil. alternative, given 3GPP will do something anyway. 3GPP compromise vote was very difficult to achieve.
- . Stucker: CRs exist in 3GPP to remove restriction to not Offerless Invite
- . ??? : Need to supply some solution, [which I did not understand]. Asserted-Service needs to be given minimum weight in service computation.
- . Hadrial Kaplan: proposal --- design-at-mic ensues
- . Adam: Need language to say .must not influence outcome..
- Configuration Framework (Sumanth)

[draft-ietf-sipping-config-framework-12.txthttp://www3.ietf.org/proceedings/06nov/IDs/draft-ietf-sipping-session-policy-framework-00.txt](http://www3.ietf.org/proceedings/06nov/IDs/draft-ietf-sipping-session-policy-framework-00.txt)

- . Chair / Mary: Background and history
- . Plea, we need to finish!
- . Rohan: Looked at diffs relative to -11, believes there are significant changes in -12
- . Sumanth: Technical and document content
- . Chair / Mary: Next steps:
- . Cullen (as individual), still don.t understand what credentials are used
- . Markus: need to understand relation to Outbound.
- . Mary: Broader issue, applies to any config.
- . Rohan: get the data from profile, then apply it to set up Outbound.
- . Roni: Need local data profile to find the outbound.
- . Dan: Don.t actually need outbound proxy to get this data, all you need to do is reach the PDS. Unclear what if any
- . Francois: Could spec .really good idea to support outbound..
- . Markus to address more explicit question to list.
- . Rohan: Stop fussing over editorial.
- . Sumanth: Current draft responds to comments from last IETF !
- . EKR: Relation to other config doc . do we
- . Hummm: Are we OK with proposed way forward, Sumanth finishing editorial changes, then be done. Rohan / Jon no need for hummm. OK, no humm, go for it !
- Simple Application Configuration Protocol (Simo Veikkolainen)

[draft-veikkolainen-sipping-app-config-00.txthttp://www3.ietf.org/proceedings/06nov/IDs/draft-ietf-sipping-session-policy-framework-00.txt](http://www3.ietf.org/proceedings/06nov/IDs/draft-ietf-sipping-session-policy-framework-00.txt)

- . Motivation, address non-SIP environments, very simple applications not needing Notify
- . Deliberately chose very restricted scope
- . Rohan: Is this right WG to address this? Is there a list of requirements that are NOT covered by SIP Config Framework?
- . Simo: Noted, also presented in Apps Area this week. Question for later.

- . Overview of operation
- . Open issues
- . Notification of changes (polling may be used instead). Also, bootstrap can lead to SIP Config server.
- . Identification of config objects
- . Reporting of success / failure (could be POST)
- . Way forward . Is it useful; Is it the right place.
- . Rohan: It is speculative without consensus on requirements (which are not written down)
- . Mary / Chair: Discuss on list.

Notes from SIPPING session 1

Scribe: Eric Burger, Humble Scribe

=====
Briefs:

- End-point Perceptual MOS, Ravi

Offer Answer

Paul Kyzivat

Credit Sawada-san, blame Paul for presentation :-)

Open Issue: sip-session versus SDP session

Change in SDP session-id; one interpretation is to ignore o= lines; another interpretation is to consider it a whole new offer-answer session

Proposal: Clearly state this is broken RFC 3264; if you want a new session, use INVITE/REPLACES.

Francois: should make clear what to do when you get this broken response. What to do when there is noncompliant behavior?

Argument: even though o= line is irrelevant since Dialog ID is in SIP; converse is SDP is SDP, so must respect o= line

RESULT: changing session-id is not compliant. What to do is implementation dependent (an error)

Open Issue: Re-INVITE, answer in provisional response, Re-INVITE gets rejected. Is this in scope of this document?

RESULT: SIP problem, not SIPPING, so not in this document

"... is for future study in the SIP work group."

Race Conditions

Paul Kyzivat

No issues resolved

Service Identification

JDR

No issues resolved

Discussion on what to do with offerless INVITES

Kudos to JDR from Spencer.

Ted: Should this be taken to Apps, as this sounds like a bigger issue? Ted will think about it.

Service Identification is a charter item; do we take JDR's draft as basis for work group item? YES.

Media Tags

JDR

Saying UAS does media=application does not mean anything.

Lots of discussion on the usefulness of P-Asserted-Service and the pure evil of P-Preferred-Service.

MUST SEND COMMENTS TO IETF MAIL LIST, AS DRAFT IS IN IETF LAST CALL.

<http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-drage-sipping-service-identification-00.txt>

Configuration Framework

Sumanth Channabasappa

Mary introduces a 6+ year saga of the history of this draft.

Open Issue: how does this draft work with SIP Outbound? Would discovering the outbound proxy be part of this work? Do not need outbound for the topology this draft addresses.

No need for another WGLC.

Open Issue: needs a single (language) editor

Resolution:

Simple Application Configuration Protocol

Simo Veikkolainen

Issue: Draft says some requirements not being addressed, however, those missing requirements not enumerated.

Notes from SIPPING session 2

Scribe: John Elwell 13:00 Thursday 26 July 2007

Chairs announced a new process whereby requirements would undergo a review in SIPPING prior to shipping to SIP for work on mechanism.

Draft-houri-sipping-presence-scaling-requirements. Chairs asked SIPPING members to check it out.

Overload design team - Rosenberg reported. Results from two different simulators yielded markedly different results from currently drafted mechanism. In process of coding up two new proposals for feeding into simulator, probably next week.

Draft-vakil-sipping-notify-pause. Question from author whether state diagram made sense - no comments. Stucker: questioned the "huge costs" of doing fresh subscriptions. Author stated it would be things like going through authorisation policy. Lawrence: felt we would still incur all these costs on pause/resume, except for cost of new dialog. Brian Stucker agreed with previous speaker - without numbers, not possible to assess the gains. Rosenberg agreed with author that there is some overhead reduction possible, particular in an IMS environment, say. Also said we are seeing different user interfaces emerging, and might be useful. Kaplan: says an unsubscribe would remove yourself from others' buddy lists, but others disagreed. Andrew Allen: savings seem insignificant, but needs to read the draft. Hour: might be helpful. Hum taken - slightly more have interest in pursuing this work than think we should not pursue it.

File sharing - Garcia. Draft-ietf-mmusic-file-transfer-mech is not able to solve all use cases, so has put together a file sharing framework, an event package and a file descriptions extension to PIDF. These three drafts are evolution of previous trilogy of resource sharing drafts, but with reduced scope to describe files only. Mahy: all three documents seem to lack requirements. Garcia: looking to see if interest, from which could derive requirements. Chair: wants to get a feeling for whether it is a good idea to work on something like this, and then derive requirements. Mahy: still thinks good idea to hear exactly what the author has in mind. Chair invited comments on whether it is appropriate to use SIP, based on the reasons on one of the slides. Audet: worried about what is the use case, particularly for using MSRP rather than HTTP. Garcia: wants to be able to make files available on device without going to trouble of setting up a web server. Audet: but if files are going to be put on a server, why won't HTTP do? Mahy: thinks the event package concept is OK, but although event package might be done in SIPPING, rest of work probably doesn't belong here, e.g., APPS might be more appropriate and would have a lot more experience. Jennings: thinks SIPPING is the most reasonable place to ask the question. Kyzivat: finds it hard to believe would want to keep subscription open on off chance that a file of interest might become available. Chair asked if anyone extremely uncomfortable with using SIP for this. Sparks: mildly uncomfortable. Chair: in conclusion, have some feedback, but need more discussion on list. Sparks: this once again is the question of where we draw the line on event packages.

Draft-marjou-sipping-b2bua. Chair indicated in advance that we just need to understand purpose of draft, and not delve into mechanisms. Author: explained why needed, because there a lot of things broken by B2BUAs, leading to adoption of other solutions (e.g., INFO rather than KPML). Hardie: might want to avoid marketing names like "transparent B2BUA" if we go ahead with this. Author: this is the name that is often applied to such devices. Sinnreich: would like to see an explanation in draft why this does not break the entire SIP architecture. Also concern that B2BUAs or SBCs following this would break ICE. Dolly: in an architecture where different application services are dealing with different aspects of signalling, we need something of this nature. Audet: this seems like a logical conclusion to the existing SBC functions draft, and this says "don't be too much like a SIP UA" if you are going to be an SBC, so thinks it is useful work. Peterson: there is not a 1:1 relationship between B2BUAs and SBCs. Kyzivat: the work "transparent" is clearly incorrect. But some of the stuff in here is useful, in saying if you are going to mess things up, at least minimise the harm. Stucker: we are focusing too much on edge proxy issues rather than the application server issue that Dolly mentioned. This is a huge topic, and may span more than one group. Rosenberg: thinks it is quite similar to the NAT behaviour problem, and there is value in producing a document (e.g., helping to build things without having to have software upgrades to allow new SIP extensions). Kaplan: all SIP boxes are B2BUAs of some form. Also would like to address the bad B2BUAs. Dolly: this is about transparent B2BUAs in middle of network, and not about NAT/firewall. Jennings: comparison with BEHAVE group not appropriate, because they didn't produce guidelines. Sparks: knows at least one box that is not a B2BUA. Hum: more people thought it would be harmful rather than useful to work on this. Needs more discussion on mailing list.

Draft-ren-sipping-replace-instant-message. Burger: knows that it can't work, but recognises that people will expect something that purports to do a recall function. Campbell: has only ever worked in walled-garden situations, and become harmful, even if it did work, in multi-domain environments. Hardie: would not want the author to waste his time on something that past experience has shown to be not workable. Allen: this is an application problem, not a protocol problem, because message has already arrived at the destination mailbox. Might be feasible in a closed environment like IMS. Burger: MESSAGE is the new INFO? Might be something for SIMPLE to look at, but extremely small window in which to achieve recall. Jonathan ????: Might be better to consider saying to an automaton "never mind". ????: Noted that we have discussed only recall, not replace. Mahy: to some up the discussion, the cat is already out of the bag, so something like "never mind" is all we can achieve. Hum indicates this is not useful.

Draft-holberg-sipping-199. Chair: should only discuss whether this is a problem we want to solve. Sparks: is this just HERFP? Chair: author will explain. Rosenberg: despite what the author presented, identifying the resources that can be released is EXACTLY what we need to know and quantify. Author: gave example of a per-dialog codec. Elwell: Can't release codec, because don't know that a future early dialog might still want to use it. Stucker: can give examples of resources not listed here, e.g., QoS. Author: covered under "bandwidth". Audet: thinks this really is HERFP, so we should decide whether we do or don't want to solve

HERFP. The problems targeted by this contribution are lesser in magnitude than the problems of HERFP in general. Holmberg: proposed solution to HERFP was too complex. Audet: maybe we need to look at HERFP requirements afresh and try to find something simpler. Mahy: on relationship with HERFP, the requirements for this are significantly simpler than HERFP. Also there is no dependency on UAC supporting this extension, so useful for diagnostics after then event. Stucker: no impact if don't support it. Mahy: the proposal is not harmful. Rosenberg: it is harmful to introduce something that doesn't do anything useful. Elwell: only use seems to for early media, to allow switching to a different stream, but then would perhaps need to be looked at in context of early media problems. Audet: Agree with Mahy. We should continue to discuss and see how useful it is. Dolly: would help to address some customer problems early media. Kyzivat: could be harmful if it causes intermediaries to keep more state than they otherwise would. Author: this goes into technical discussions. Worley: problem worth tackling provided it can do a couple of specific things: UAS can send the indication, and UAC can identify the particular early media stream that will stop. Author: possibility of UAS sending it has in fact been discussed and will be considered. Mahy: to WORley: nothing in the proposal that prevents what he asks for. Hum indicated that there was interest in working on the problem. Discussions on extending to whole HERFP problem to occur on the mailing list.

Draft-saito-mmusic-sdp-ike. SIPING has been asked by MMUSIC chairs to run a sanity check. So does anyone think this is a sensible thing to do using SIP or a bad thing to do. Hardly anyone had read the draft and nobody came forward with an opinion, so people are invited to volunteer to review the draft. Draft to be completed within a couple of weeks.

Notes from SIPPING session 2

Scribe: Dale Worley 13:00 Thursday 26 July 2007

** Note Well statement

** Present agenda

** Present scheme for advancing documents that make normative changes to SIP but do not require heavy assessment of requirements.

** Jonathan Rosenberg gives status of overload control study
Simulations are being worked on
Comparing various overload control algorithms

** Extension to pause/resume notifications

Presented by Mohammad Vakil.

Question regarding how large are the costs of establishing a subscription

Author refers to draft
Discussion ensues

More discussion regarding whether this mechanism will provide significant savings.

Chair takes hum whether this problem is interesting -- Pro slightly louder than Con. Chair encourages author to discuss on the mailing list.

** SIP file directory

Presented by Miguel Garcia.

Rohan Mahy asks why the requirements aren't presented first. Gonzalo Camarillo responds that the current organization was the Chair's idea, to establish first a "best" mechanism and then to assess whether it is worth implementing.

Chair emphasizes he wants a discussion of "Why use SIP for file subscriptions?"

Discussion ensued, as to whether the subject is worth the work.

Discussion ensues as to the correct WG for this study.

** Transparent B2BUA

Presented by Xavier Marjou.

Chair reminds speaker that presentation is to discuss requirements.

Discussion regarding the use of the term "transparent B2BUA".

Discussion regarding what the overall purpose of this document is or

should be.

Idea was floated that this I-D is "BEHAVE for SBCs".

Chair takes hum that "BEHAVE for SBCs" would be useful vs. harmful -- "harmful" is louder.

** Replace Instant Message in SIP

Presented by Da Qi Ren.

Chair emphasizes that this discussion is about "Is it useful?", not about the implementation mechanism.

Discussion ensued as to whether message recall/replacement was possible, desirable, or would be demanded by users.

Author was advised by some participants that the problem was intractable and could eat his life.

Chair asks for hum regarding whether this operation (regarding replaces and recall together) was useful vs. useless -- "useless" is louder.

** Response Code for Indication of Terminated Dialog

Presented by Christer Holmberg.

Question raised whether this problems is the same as the HERFP problem. Chair assures audience that that question will be addressed.

Vigorous discussion regarding the resources that might be saved using this mechanism.

Meta-discussion of the amount of benefit needed to make a proposal worth working on.

Chair takes hum on whether should be worked on -- majority for "worked on".

** Media Description for IKE in SDP

This I-D was referred to SIPPING from MMUSIC.

Chair states this is to review this proposal and decide whether it's a sensible use of SIP.

Chair determined that nobody had read draft.

Chair asked for volunteers to read the draft and report.