

Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Expires: May 22, 2008

K. Drage
Alcatel-Lucent
November 19, 2007

A Process for Handling Essential Corrections to the Session Initiation
Protocol (SIP)
[draft-drage-sip-essential-correction-02](#)

Status of this Memo

By submitting this Internet-Draft, each author represents that any applicable patent or other IPR claims of which he or she is aware have been or will be disclosed, and any of which he or she becomes aware will be disclosed, in accordance with [Section 6 of BCP 79](#).

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/lid-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 May 22, 2008.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (C) The IETF Trust (2007).

Internet-Draft

Essential Corrections to SIP

November 2007

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.

Internet-Draft

Essential Corrections to SIP

November 2007

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 for a number of reasons. A revision could either replace or update an existing RFC. A replacement for an existing RFC would normally occur when there is a need to progress from proposed standard to draft standard, and will encompass substantially more work than merely documenting the identified error. An update to an RFC still requires a whole new RFC to be issued. This may appear too complex for a one line correction, or may just overwhelm potential submitters due to the complexity of the process.

There is also a need to control the number of updating RFCs that exist for any one specification. A situation where an RFC has 10 or 20 update RFCs clearly means that an implementor will miss at least one of these documents. Therefore the target is to have the SIP RFC or SIP extension RFC originally produced by the working group, and a single RFC that updates that document. Any subsequent RFC will therefore need to replace the any existing RFC that updates the original RFC.

[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 may be one correction or more corrections per internet draft. The underlying principle for splitting essential corrections into different internet drafts is one of envisaged amount of working group time to process a correction. A correction where the solution is likely to be contentious should be submitted as a separate internet draft to one where the solution is likely to be readily accepted, unless one is

dependent on the other. An informal naming technique will be used to assist in readily identifying these drafts; the appearance of "? fix" as the last part of the filename before the version number will be expected to indicate such a draft.

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 in time, an editor working on behalf of the SIP working group will compile all changes to the original RFC that have successfully completed working group last call into a internet draft, along with the contents of all previous RFC 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. This RFC will update the original SIP RFC or SIP extension RFC, and replace any previous update RFCs for that original RFC.

Further corrections after this point will repeat the process.

A web page will be maintained by the SIP WG chairs and the corrections editor giving the current status of corrections in progress. This is currently at:

[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 (probably as separate sections or subsections):

Reason for change. Text which explains why the change is necessary. This should be focussed on identifying why the text in the existing

RFC is incorrect.

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. This text should be drafted such that the working group can make a decision as to whether the change is essential or not.

The change. Provide only the normative changes outside the context of the sections of the corrected RFC. This section is for those implementors who want to understand the normative changes at an immediate view.

OPEN ISSUE: The above element has been inserted at the request of participants at IETF#69. The above element requires further study, both in the format it should take, and what occurs if after publication, it is found to differ from the next element. Should one element take precedence over the other, or do we sort it out at the next reissue of the change RFC.

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

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.

Drage

Expires May 22, 2008

[Page 10]

Internet-Draft

Essential Corrections to SIP

November 2007

Author's Address

Keith Drage
Alcatel-Lucent
Quadrant, StoneHill Green, Westlea
Swindon, Wilts
UK

Email: drage@alcatel-lucent.com

Full Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The IETF Trust (2007).

This document is subject to the rights, licenses and restrictions contained in [BCP 78](#), and except as set forth therein, the authors retain all their rights.

This document and the information contained herein are provided on an "AS IS" basis and THE CONTRIBUTOR, THE ORGANIZATION HE/SHE REPRESENTS OR IS SPONSORED BY (IF ANY), THE INTERNET SOCIETY, THE IETF TRUST AND THE INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE DISCLAIM ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION HEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

Intellectual Property

The IETF takes no position regarding the validity or scope of any Intellectual Property Rights or other rights that might be claimed to pertain to the implementation or use of the technology described in this document or the extent to which any license under such rights might or might not be available; nor does it represent that it has made any independent effort to identify any such rights. Information

on the procedures with respect to rights in RFC documents can be found in [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

Copies of IPR disclosures made to the IETF Secretariat and any assurances of licenses to be made available, or the result of an attempt made to obtain a general license or permission for the use of such proprietary rights by implementers or users of this 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.

Acknowledgment

Funding for the RFC Editor function is provided by the IETF Administrative Support Activity (IASA).