

Requirements for indication of features supported by a SIP proxy

IETF#82, Taipei, Taiwan

draft-ietf-sipcore-proxy-feature-reqs-02

Christer.Holmberg@ericsson.com

Ivo.Sedlacek@ericsson.com

SINCE IETF#81 (1/2)

- **draft-ietf-sipcore-proxy-feature-reqs-01**
 - New requirements added
 - New Req-5
 - New Req-9
 - Additional clarification text to Req-4 and Req-5
 - Editorial changes
 - **NUTSHELL**: Making it more clear that an entity inserting a feature support indication one must not assume that other entities support the indicated feature, or even support the feature support indication mechanism as such.

SINCE IETF#81 (2/2)

- **draft-ietf-sipcore-proxy-feature-reqs-02**
(October '11)
 - New requirements added
 - New Req-12
 - New use-case
 - **NUTSHELL**: Clarifying that it must be possible to determine which features/capabilities are supported by the same proxy
- **No additional comments on the requirements since -02 was submitted.**

PROPO^oSAL TO THE WG

- AGREE, AND FINISH THE
WORK ON, THE
REQUIREMENTS

Feature-Caps

IETF#82, Taipei, Taiwan

draft-holmberg-sipcore-proxy-feature-02

Christer.Holmberg@ericsson.com

Ivo.Sedlacek@ericsson.com

[H\(adriel.\)Kaplan@acmepacket.com](mailto:H(adriel.)Kaplan@acmepacket.com)

NUTSHELL

- New SIP header field, implementing the requirements of draft-ietf-sipcore-proxy-feature-02, by allowing SIP entities to indicate supported features/capabilities using feature tags.
- (Similar to RFC 3840 mechanism for SIP UAs)

“I CAN do this.”

~~“I HAVE DONE THIS”~~

~~“I WANT YOU TO DO THIS”~~

CHARACTERISTICS

- Can be used to indicate/re-indicate features supported for a SIP **dialog**
- Can be used to indicate/re-indicate features supported for a SIP **registration**
- Can be used to indicate supported features per **direction**
 - Not copied from requests into responses by UAS
- Feature support indications using **feature tags**
- **Multiple** header field instances allowed
 - An entity can insert its own header field
 - Allows to see how supported features are grouped among entities
- By default does not indicate which entity, just **an entity**

COMMENTS: New vs existing header field

- **COMMENT**

- Use a separate header field in the first place
 - Previously existing header fields were used (Path, Record-Route, Route, Service-Route)
 - Direction problem
 - Used for routing

- **SUGGESTION**

- New header field (Feature-Caps)

COMMENTS: Terminology

- **COMMENT**

- We should not talk about proxies and UAs, as in most cases the entities using the mechanism are going to be something in between
 - E.g. B2BUA that inserts Record-Route

- **SUGGESTION**

- Do not talk about proxies and UAs
- Talk about entities “not represented by the Contact header field”

COMMENTS: Option-tag vs feature tag

- **COMMENT**

- Use option-tag based mechanism instead of feature tag

- **SUGGESTION**

- Do not use option-tag
 - The current use-cases do not define new SIP extensions
 - Mechanism is not to be used for mandating other entities to support features
 - Mechanism should allow IETF to ensure that protocol is not broken or misused (expert review)

COMMENTS: IANA and feature tags

- **COMMENT**

- How can we make sure that IANA registrations for feature tags, intended to be used with Feature-Caps, contain enough information (e.g. reference to document describing procedures)?
 - Feature tag registry does not mandate reference as part of registration
 - Direction problem
 - Used for routing
 - » Different semantics, and SBC “sensitive”

- **SUGGESTION**

- Spec specifies information that needs to be provided for a feature tag to be used in a Feature-Caps header field
- Asking IANA for guidance

PROPOSAL TO THE WG

- **1. AGREE TO START WORK ON PROTOCOL MECHANISM**
- **2. ADOPT draft-holmberg-proxy-feature AS STARTING POINT FOR THE PROTOCOL MECHANISM**

**THANK YOU FOR
LISTENING!**