

IPTEL WG	C. Jennings	
Internet-Draft	Cisco Systems	
Updates: 3966 (if approved)	V. Gurbani	
Intended status: BCP	Bell Laboratories, Alcatel-Lucent	
Expires: December 21, 2008	June 19, 2008	

[TOC](#)

**The Internet Assigned Number Authority (IANA) tel Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) Parameter Registry
DOCNAME**

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/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 December 21, 2008.

Abstract

This document creates an Internet Assigned Number Authority (IANA) registry for tel Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) parameters and their values. It populates the registry with the parameters defined in the tel URI specification, along with the parameters in tel URI extensions defined for number portability and trunk groups.

Table of Contents

- [1.](#) Introduction
 - [2.](#) Terminology
 - [3.](#) Use of the Registry
 - [4.](#) IANA Considerations
 - [4.1.](#) tel URI Parameters Registry
 - [4.2.](#) Registration Policy for tel URI Parameters
 - [5.](#) Security Considerations
 - [6.](#) Acknowledgments
 - [7.](#) References
 - [7.1.](#) Normative References
 - [7.2.](#) Informative References
 - [§](#) Authors' Addresses
 - [§](#) Intellectual Property and Copyright Statements
-

1. Introduction

[TOC](#)

The tel URI (RFC3966 [\[1\]](#) ([Schulzrinne, H., "The tel URI for Telephone Numbers," December 2004.](#))), defines a URI that can be used to represent resources identified by telephone numbers. The tel URI, like many other URIs, provides extensibility through the definition of new URI parameters and new values for existing parameters. However, RFC3966 did not specify an IANA registry where such parameters and values can be listed and standardized. This specification creates such a registry.

2. Terminology

[TOC](#)

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [\[2\]](#) ([Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels," March 1997.](#)).

3. Use of the Registry

[TOC](#)

The tel URI parameters and values for these parameters MUST be documented in a RFC or other permanent and readily available public specification in order to be registered by IANA. This documentation MUST fully explain the syntax, intended usage, and semantics of the parameter. The intent of this requirement is to assure interoperability

between independent implementations, and to prevent accidental namespace collisions between implementations of dissimilar features. Documents defining tel URI parameters or parameter values MUST register them with IANA as described in [Section 4 \(IANA Considerations\)](#). The IANA registration policy for such parameters is "Specification Required, Designated Expert," and is further discussed in [Section 4.2 \(Registration Policy for tel URI Parameters\)](#).

Some tel URI parameters only accept a set of predefined parameter values while others can take any value. There are also parameters that do not have any value; they are used as flags.

Those URI parameters that take on predefined values typically take on a large number of values. Registering each of those values, or creating a sub-registry for each such parameter is not appropriate. Instead, we have chosen to register URI parameter values by reference. That is, the entry in the URI parameter registry for a given URI parameter contains references to the RFCs defining new values of that parameter.

Accordingly, the tel URI parameter registry contains a column that indicates whether or not each parameter accepts a value. The column may contain "No value" or "Constrained". A "Constrained" in the column implies that certain predefined values exist for this parameter and the accompanying RFC or other permanent and readily available public specification should be consulted to find out the accepted set of values. A "No Value" in the column implies that the parameter is used either as a flag, or does not have a set of predefined values. The accompanying RFC or other permanent and readily available public specification should provide more information on the semantics of the parameter.

4. IANA Considerations

[TOC](#)

The specification creates a new IANA registry named "tel URI Parameters".

4.1. tel URI Parameters Registry

[TOC](#)

New tel URI parameters and new values for existing tel URI parameters MUST be registered with IANA.

When registering a new tel URI parameter the following information MUST be provided:

- *Name of the parameter.

- *Whether the parameter only accepts a set of predefined values.

*Reference to the RFC or other permanent and readily available public specification defining the parameter and new values.

When registering a new value for an existing tel URI parameter the following information MUST be provided:

*Name of the parameter.

*Reference to the RFC or other permanent and readily available public specification providing the new value.

Note to IANA editor: When a new value for an existing tel URI parameter is standardized, the Reference column of Table 1 (below) corresponding to the parameter name must be updated to include the new RFC number. Table 1 contains the initial values for this registry.

Parameter Name	Predefined Values	Reference
-----	-----	-----
isub	Constrained	[RFC 3966]
isub-encoding	Constrained	[RFC 4715]
ext	Constrained	[RFC 3966]
phone-context	Constrained	[RFC 3966]
enumdi	No value	[RFC 4759]
npdi	No value	[RFC 4694]
rn	Constrained	[RFC 4694]
rn-context	Constrained	[RFC 4694]
cic	Constrained	[RFC 4694]
cic-context	Constrained	[RFC 4694]
tgrp	Constrained	[RFC 4904]
trunk-context	Constrained	[RFC 4904]

Table 1: IANA tel URI parameter registry

4.2. Registration Policy for tel URI Parameters

[TOC](#)

As per the terminology in [\[3\] \(Narten, T. and H. Alvestrand, "Guidelines for Writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs," May 2008.\)](#) and actions accorded to such a role, the registration policy for tel URI parameters shall be "Specification Required, Designated Expert" (the former implicitly implies the latter.)

The Designated Expert when deliberating on whether to include a new parameter in the tel URI registry may use the criteria provided below

to reach a decision (this is not an exhaustive list but representative of the issues to consider when rendering an equitable decision):

*If the tel URI -- with the parameter under consideration -- will be converted to a URI used by other signaling protocols such as the Session Initiation Protocol (SIP [\[5\]](#) ([Rosenberg, J., Schulzrinne, H., Camarillo, G., Johnston, A., Peterson, J., Sparks, R., Handley, M., and E. Schooler, "SIP: Session Initiation Protocol," June 2002.](#))) or H.323 [\[7\]](#) ([ITU-T H.323, "H.323: Packet-based multimedia communications systems," June 2006.](#)), then the expert must consider whether this parameter merely encapsulates signaling information that is not meaningful to the processing of requests in the domain of the converted URI. For example, certain Integrated Services Digital Network (ISDN) User Part (ISUP, [\[8\]](#) ([ITU-T Q.764, "Signaling System No. 7: ISDN User Part Signaling Procedures," December 1999.](#))) parameters have no equivalent corollary in SIP; thus their presence or absence in a SIP URI will not hinder the normal rules for processing that URI. Other parameters may affect the normal processing rules associated with the URI; in such cases, the expert must consider carefully the ramifications, if any, of the presence of such parameters.

*Certain parameters of a tel URI can be optional. These parameters act as metadata about the identifier in the tel URI. Optional parameters should provide additional information to a service for which they apply instead of acting as enablers of that service in the first place. The service must continue to be invoked and operate normally even in the absence of these parameters.

5. Security Considerations

[TOC](#)

The registry in this document does not in itself have security considerations. However, as mentioned in [\[4\]](#) ([Mankin, A., Bradner, S., Mahy, R., Willis, D., Ott, J., and B. Rosen, "Change Process for the Session Initiation Protocol \(SIP\)," December 2002.](#)), an important reason for the IETF to manage the extensions of SIP is to ensure that all extensions and parameters are able to provide secure usage. The supporting RFC publications for parameter registrations described in this specification MUST provide detailed security considerations for them.

[TOC](#)

6. Acknowledgments

The structure of this document comes from [6] (Camarillo, G., "The Internet Assigned Number Authority (IANA) Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) Parameter Registry for the Session Initiation Protocol (SIP)," December 2004.), which is the equivalent work done in the SIP domain to establish a registry. Ted Hardie, Alfred Hoenes, Jon Peterson and Jonathan Rosenberg provided substantive comments that have improved this document.

Brian Carpenter, Lars Eggert, Pasi Eronen, Chris Newman, and Glen Zorn provided feedback during IESG review and Gen-ART review.

7. References

[TOC](#)

7.1. Normative References

[TOC](#)

[1]	Schulzrinne, H., " The tel URI for Telephone Numbers ," RFC 3966, December 2004 (TXT).
[2]	Bradner, S. , " Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels ," BCP 14, RFC 2119, March 1997 (TXT , HTML , XML).
[3]	Narten, T. and H. Alvestrand, " Guidelines for Writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs ," BCP 26, RFC 5226, May 2008 (TXT).

7.2. Informative References

[TOC](#)

[4]	Mankin, A., Bradner, S., Mahy, R., Willis, D., Ott, J., and B. Rosen, " Change Process for the Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) ," RFC 3427, December 2002 (TXT).
[5]	Rosenberg, J., Schulzrinne, H., Camarillo, G., Johnston, A., Peterson, J., Sparks, R., Handley, M., and E. Schooler, " SIP: Session Initiation Protocol ," RFC 3261, June 2002 (TXT).
[6]	Camarillo, G., " The Internet Assigned Number Authority (IANA) Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) Parameter Registry for the Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) ," BCP 99, RFC 3969, December 2004 (TXT).
[7]	ITU-T H.323, "H.323: Packet-based multimedia communications systems," June 2006.
[8]	ITU-T Q.764, "Signaling System No. 7: ISDN User Part Signaling Procedures," December 1999.

Authors' Addresses

[TOC](#)

	Cullen Jennings
	Cisco Systems
	170 West Tasman Drive
	Mailstop SJC-21/2
	San Jose, CA 95134
	USA
Phone:	+1 408 902-3341
Email:	fluffy@cisco.com
	Vijay K. Gurbani
	Bell Laboratories, Alcatel-Lucent
	2701 Lucent Lane
	Room 9F-546
	Lisle, IL 60532
	USA
Phone:	+1 630 224-0216
Email:	vkg@alcatel-lucent.com

Full Copyright Statement

[TOC](#)

Copyright © The IETF Trust (2008).

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.