

SIPPING MINUTES MONDAY

Chairs: Mary Barnes (opened meeting), Gonzalo Camarillo

Mary charts:

supplementary web site

status: need a bunch of charter updates

Henning comment: might be helpful to show general timeline, dates for different steps along the way -- doing

RFC published: 4730

Post-pub request: Jonathan and Keith noted errors, will be corrected.

Final review post WGLC, awaiting PROTO write-up

Two others need second review post WGLC: sbc-01 and spam-04 – need more comments on readiness for publication – are reviewers satisfied? Jonathan requested clarification, chairs explained what they are looking for. Francois asked due date on agreement – by end of month. Jon noted error, will be corrected.

Two undergoing WGLC – no volunteer reviewers yet – won't progress until we get them.

Today's agenda. Friday's agenda.

Other drafts of interest. Jonathan comment.

Henry – brief advertisement for "simple SIP" draft – looking for home.

Configuration framework. Sumanth

History: breakout session at IETF 67. design team appointed, planned and presneted two revisions.

Review of the scope of the draft.

Review of design team conclusions, changes in design-10, -11

Asked who had read the draft: about 30 people.

Further comments have been received on draft -11

Layout: does it reflect expectations? Any specific recommendations? Henning: would be very helpful to have an executive summary. 60 pages is probably too long. H. sees this as an action item for him. Creates terminology orthogonal to the current SIP terminology – as much as possible, refer to known art rather than paraphrasing and potentially changing. Sumanth: do get in to draft 11. Rohan: enrollment is not something that happens for every subscription. Specifically, base 3265 stuff on that specification, call out differences if any. H. will act. Rohan: not changing 3265. H: need to separate. Francois: process that includes subscription and some other stuff – just clarify that at the beginning. Sumanth: that's what they try to do in -11.

Underscore or not for DNS? H: don't do it. Need bigger discussion on the appropriate DNS mechanism. H: suggests this is a specific service. Talk to DNS people before this

gets to IESG. App-specific DNS names will not be favoured. Cullen: right people not in this room, need to seek them out.

device-id needed? H: User-Agent header field? Rohan: suggested earlier, rejected because too free-form. Cullen: trying to put same number in two places in same message: Contact and Event header field. Clarification: moved from From: in -11. Cullen: confidentially work gets multiplied if info propagated further. Dan Petrie: has to be in R-URI to get right profile. Rohan: distinction between local profile and trying to get through B2BUA – could get lost. Cullen as individual: not happy with attempts to outwit non-cooperative B2BUAs. For device profile, should be in R-URI. For local network profile might be OK to remove it. Seems to be agreed.

Fallback to HTTP?. Cullen: is it OK to then lose the subscription model? If poll mechanism specified, that is OK. H: more concerned that people will take shortcuts. HTTP simpler, hence won't implement more. Jonathan: today most stuff totally manual, best is doing daily poll. Arguing for fallback to HTTP because the bar in config is so much higher than current practice. Francois: don't call this fallback, rather, common practice. Don't remove it, just explain why asynchronous notification offers more. Rohan: complexity is in the specification, not in the implementation. Too many people asking for their special bit of procedure. Keep changing directions. HTTP unifies, rather than fallback. Dan P: this is a minimal bootstrapping mechanism – actually same process, started in a different place. Does not add complexity. H: could make HTTP-only implem legitimate "first class citizen", vs. alternate (i.e. fallback). He recommends making it a first class citizen. Francois: let's get this out. Aki: have several hundred HTTP-based customers. Henning: where do you get the URL for HTTP? Keith: something about documentation.

Do we need the local network profile? Rohan: if you want to do session policy, have to have local network profile. Henning: could be done as extension. No agreed data model yet. Retrieval mechanism not a big deal. Combinatorial complexity if we add, because of potential overlap. Volker: data model is the merging discussion. Conclusion: will continue current policy re local network profile.

Session-specific policies Volker Hilt

Status update on two drafts

Changes in policy framework draft

Changes in event draft.

Both ready for WGLC

Clear separation of session info, session policy. Led to restructuring.

- Properties of a session (info)
- Policy that can be applied to multiple sessions

Multiple semantics for same format. => two different root elements, but same XML elements within them.

Need feedback on this new direction. Henning: what is relationship between local network profile and session policy document? Volker: not closely related.

Dependency on UA data set: latter not a WG item yet. Henning worried about the issues buried in merging. We are over-engineering.

Gonzalo summing up: keep drafts separate or work together now? Dan: reqts for merging affect how you build your data model. Gonzalo: once that issue settled, should drafts be separate or combined? Conclusion: discuss merging on list, decide on way forward after that. WGLC will be scheduled as soon as manageable.

Overflow design team Jonathan

Jonathan reqts, Volker methods draft. Still lots of difficult open technical issues. Need coordinated design team particularly to work on simulation. (Four Nortel people)

Some initial results demonstrating the problem.

Now move to simulating proposed algorithms – preliminary triage. When algorithms nailed down, run more extensive simulations to determine final recommendation. Aiming for July recommendation.

Mary: reqts doc already a WG doc, will go to WGLC soon

Robert: can early simulation results be made avail? Jonathan: can work on that.

Service Identification Jonathan leading

3GPP will do something in this area. So question is whether the IETF will give them any guidance?

Examples. Andrew Allen gave best enumeration. Rohan questioned IM vs. s/w update example – let's put aside. Others are enough to go on. J: not intending to debate merits of specific examples – only motivate discussions.

How is service ID used?

- invoke app servers
- dispatch to right app s/w in client
- accounting
- QoS decisions
- identify additional context needed
- for user to explicitly request specific resources – esp. app servers, e.g. recording
- service screening

How determined?

- client specification
- network assignment based on inspection
- ...

Why are people concerned? Many aspects of behaviour driven by single parameter. Lots of room for failure when service not understood by something along the path.

Observations: sometimes info needed not present in SIP – corner cases such as offerless INVITES, missing media properties

If two identical INVITES will lead to different results, something is missing.

Proposal: look at the cases where insufficient info present, figure out what has to be added e.g. require tag for POC, latency parameters in SDP

Define a provider asserted service ID, which can always be determined by examining SIP messages

Eric B: examples slide made all clear. POC: what is the target R-URI? Should it be the network devices? Not how it's done. Hence breaking basic SIP model, which expects endpoints to communicate. Would make more sense to address server, indicate called party. That fits SIP model better and makes more sense to apps area people.

Adam: probably biggest issue is that what happens is a surprise to the user agent. No one will use J's proposal, but he is compromising his principles.

Andrew Allen: Authorization a separate issue. R7 is frozen, but with a small amount of room to work the issue. if nothing avail by the end of this meeting, R7 will ignore IETF input. Liked J's earlier draft. Problem with new proposal is that TS 23.228 requires UE to insert the service identifier. J: reqt is satisfied by putting the right info in the INVITE. Andrew: political issue, opponents of IETF involvement will say reqt not met. So (J:) is it worth it to try? J: IETF not going to be quiet when they break SIP.

Rohan: likes proposal to find missing bits of SIP/SDP. Thinks we can find right way to signal all the shown examples. P-Header idea is less agreeable. Earlier P- stuff gave them permission to put wrong URI in the R-URI.

Jon: would like discussion on whether this should take this on, rather than tactics. This is the most pressing issue: whether people is committed.

Eric Rescorla: don't offer compromise unless we are convinced they will accept.

Henry: Have to be consistent with IAB position on E2E model. This is a DOS attack on endpoints.

Muhanna: can P-header escape trust reqt? J: can't do.

Eric: likes proposal, but ... Beauty of SIP is that feature interactions get resolved in the EP, not major. If you give more power to the ntwk you get much larger interaction problems. Have to bring 3GPP into fold – sheer numbers force us.

H: they want a feature by reference model rather than feature by value. Problem is that you can't parametrize the feature. Clarifying question: is service URN totally discarded? J: may be useful in some contexts e.g end user request for recorder to inserted

Andrew: reinforcing concern that without 3GPP/IETF agreement, entities outside 3GPP specs will be unable to interoperate with mobile terminals.

Roni: can see usefulness for identifier in more general context. Provides further info to developers on how to achieve particular functionality.

Miguel: people using feature tags – advisory. Won't succeed in identifying missing parts – people have gone through this exercise already.

Adam: understands that they have specified what they want in TS 23.228. (J: but that is wrong). Adam: if IETF being asked to give blank cheque, work is misguided.

Keith: need to capture "don't use" as well as "use".

J: does "Accept-Contact" capture all of the example semantics? Not defensible.

?: capabilities have to be added to signalling

Dean agreed.

Mary: hum on whether to do work

Rohan: need to have agreement on general approach – need informal discussion

Cullen: do it if people agree on need.

Hum on whether to work on this problem in this WG: yeas and nays approximately even.

Post-discussion: Rohan: really talking about different work thrusts: UA expressiveness vs. P-header. May need to revisit Friday after offline discussion

Meeting WG milestones more effeciently/effectively

Proposal on list fully supported, has already affected two documents.

Other options: - Jonathan says he responds to pings. Andrew A: chairs need to use discretion on dropping drafts to bottom of queue. Back-up editors a possibility.

Showed info available in the WG spreadsheet. Robert complains it isn't easy to find.

Mary will check out.

SIPPING FRIDAY

Cullen on service ID

Asking WG to produce:

- expository doc discussing problem of service id and its perils to interop and correctness
- P-header allowing trusted edge elmn to store the result of its nalysis of a SIP msg, which can be used by trusted elmns in a trusted domain
- media feature tag reg for subtypes of the application type

Spencer: supports these steps.

Accepted.

ICE vs ANAT Jonathan

Summarizing list discussion

Option 1: ICE deprecates ANAT and is used as IPv6 transition

Option 2: ANAT is the v4/v6 transition technique, can use ICE on top of it. Potential interop issues.

Option 3 (little support) SDPCap replaces ANAT, can add ICE on top

PRO/CON chart

Long discussion of RFC 3484

...

Hadriel arguing against deprecation of ANAT for fear ICE does not get deployed – leaves no v6 transition alternative. Counter-argument that we must do the right thing. If market rejects, we have to do something else. If we don't believe in ICE, we shouldn't move it fwd, but that is not the current view.

Chose to deprecate ANAT in favour of ICE

Mechanism for file directory w/ SIP

IPR declared

Apps area interested in related problem. Watch list for further developments. Henning/SIMPLE have some ideas.

MSRP?

Jonathan: across the arch line

Henning: doesn't quite agree. NSF model doesn't work – polling – event notification definitely better route.

Paul K has trouble fitting to event framework.

Someone doing something similar

Dean: how about RSS?

Can continue to discuss on SIPPING list for now

SIP E2E Perf Metrics Malas

Review of adjustments based on comments

Various comments

ADs figuring out where to do this – definitely important work

Call completion Denis

BFCP vs event-based soln

Proposal: SIP event package

Swervice id output as means of identifying call back priority indication

extends Allow-Event to 180 and 486 responses

John Elwell in support of event

PaulK clarification: can solns still be refined? Yes.

Jonathan clarification: humming for WG item? No

Hum favours event-based approach

Jonathan protesting development of solns in TISPAN rather than here

Need more discussion on list

Early media Richard Barnes

No agreement on defn of problem – continue on list

Early Media Francois for Brian Stucker

Distinguishes problem addressed from the subject of Richard B's draft

Issue is RFC 3959 hasn't been deployed