A Process for Handling Essential Corrections to the Session Initiation
                           Protocol (SIP)
              draft-drage-sip-essential-correction-00

Status of this Memo

   Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering
   Task Force (IETF), its areas, and its working groups. Note that
   other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-
   Drafts.

   Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months
   and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any
   time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference
   material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

   The list of current Internet-Drafts can be accessed at
   http://www.ietf.org/ietf/1id-abstracts.txt.

   The list of Internet-Draft Shadow Directories can be accessed at
   http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html.

   This Internet-Draft will expire on April 19, 2007.

Copyright Notice

Abstract

   The Session Initial Protocol (SIP) defined in RFC 3261 and a large
   number of extensions forms a considerable body of work, which through
   sheer size has a number of errors that require correction. This
   document explains the process for managing essential corrections to
   SIP.

1. Introduction

RFC 3261 [1] and its extensions have already had a number of issues
identified against it, and other issues are expected. These are
issues where the normative text of the already published
specification is found to be either in error, or lacking, such that
interoperability is endangered.

There has been a reluctance to document these issues due to updates
to RFCs requiring a whole new RFC to be issued. This may be appear
too complex for a one line correction, or may just overwhelm
potential submitters due to the complexity of the process.

2. Objective

For SIP RFCs and RFCs specifying SIP extensions, provide clear
guidelines as to when corrective RFC content is required that updates
the original specification. If the work is an extension or of
editorial nature, then existing rules should be followed.

3. Process

   Corrections will be proposed to the SIP working group.

   All changes should be essential. An essential change is one where in
   the absence of the correction, it will not be possible to implement
   the specification contained in the original RFC in a manner to ensure
   interoperability or correct operation. Clarifications, statements of
   best practice, additional informative material, and editorial
   revisions are in general not essential – if publication of such
   material is necessary, it should be published as a separate
   informational RFC. The working group will analyse the proposed
   correction and decide whether it is essential.

   The correction will be processed as an internet-draft belonging to
   the SIP working group. For management purposes, there should be one
   correction or set of related corrections per internet draft –
   corrections relating to two different errors should be processed as
   two separate internet drafts. When complete the internet draft will
   be working group last called by the SIP working group, along with any
   required expert review that may be appropriate to the contents.

At an appropriate period time, an editor working on behalf of the SIP
working group will compile all changes that have successfully
completed working group last call into a internet draft, along with
the contents of all previous documents that update the SIP RFC
requiring correction.

The internet draft will be submitted to IESG as a proposed standards
track RFC for approval for publication, without any further working
group last call.

Further corrections after this point will repeat the process.

4. Required Contents For a Change Request Internet-Draft

   In addition to the normal rules for contents of a standards track
   RFC, sections to the RFC should document the following:

   Reason for change. Text which explains why the change is necessary.

   Summary of change. Enter text which describes the most important
   components of the change. i.e. how the change is made.

   Consequences if not approved. Enter here the consequences if this
   change were to be rejected. Explain the issues that implementations
   will have in the absence of this change, i.e. what fails to operate
   correctly.

The change. Clearly identify the section of the RFC to be changed,
and show precisely how the text change. An implementor should be
able to take the original RFC and edit the change as described to
obtain the new approved text.

5. Security considerations

   There are no security considerations relating to this document.

6.   IANA considerations

This document requires no action by IANA.

7. References

   [1]   Rosenberg, J., "SIP: Session Initiation Protocol", June 2002.

Author's Address

    Keith Drage
    Lucent Technologies
    Optimus, Windmill Hill Business Park
    Swindon, Wilts
    UK

    Email: drage@lucent.com

Full Copyright Statement

Intellectual Property

specification can be obtained from the IETF on-line IPR repository at
http://www.ietf.org/ipr.

The IETF invites any interested party to bring to its attention any
copyrights, patents or patent applications, or other proprietary
rights that may cover technology that may be required to implement
this standard. Please address the information to the IETF at
ietf-ipr@ietf.org.