SIP   J. Rosenberg
Internet-Draft   dynamicsoft
Expires: June 9, 2004   H. Schulzrinne
                                                  Columbia University
                                                          P. Kyzivat
                                                        Cisco Systems
                                                    December 10, 2003

Indicating User Agent Capabilities in the Session Initiation Protocol (SIP)
draft-ietf-sip-callee-caps-02

Status of this Memo

Copyright Notice

Abstract

This specification defines mechanisms by which a Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) user agent can convey its capabilities and characteristics to other user agents and to the registrar for its domain. This information is conveyed as parameters of the Contact header field.

Table of Contents

[1](#). **Introduction**

   Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) [1] user agents vary widely in
   their capabilities and in the types of devices they represent.
   Frequently, it is important for another SIP element to learn the
   capabilities and characteristics of a SIP UA. Some of the
   applications of this information include:

   o One user agent, a PC-based application, is communicating with
      another that is embedded in a limited-function device. The PC
      would like to be able to "grey out" those components of the user
      interface that represent features or capabilities not supported by
      its peer. To do that, there needs to be a way to exchange
      capability information within a dialog.

   o A user has two devices at their disposal. One is a videophone, and
      the other, a voice-only wireless phone. A caller wants to interact
      with the user using video. As such, they would like their call
      preferentially routed to the device which supports video. To do
      this, the INVITE request can contain parameters that express a
      preference for routing to a device with the specified capabilities
      [11].

   o A network application would like to asynchronously send
      information to a user agent in a MESSAGE [16] request. However,
      before sending it, they would like to know if the UA has the
      capabilites necessary to receive the message. To do that, they
      would ideally query a user database managed by the domain which
      holds such information. Population of such a database would
      require that a UA convey its capabilities as part of its
      registration. Thus, there is a need for conveying capabilities in
      REGISTER requests.

   SIP has some support for expression of capabilities. The Allow,
   Accept, Accept-Language and Supported header fields convey some
   information about the capabilities of a user agent. However, these
   header fields convey only a small part of the information that is
   needed. They do not provide a general framework for expression of
   capabilities. Furthermore, they only specify capabilities indirectly;
   the header fields really indicate the capabilities of the UA as they
   apply to this request. SIP also has no ability to convey
   characteristics; that is, information that describes a UA.

   As a result, this specification provides a more general framework for
   indication of capabilities and characteristics in SIP. Capability and
   characteristic information about a UA is carried as parameters of the
   Contact header field. These parameters can be used within REGISTER
   requests and responses, OPTIONS responses, and requests and responses

that create dialogs (such as INVITE).

[2](). Terminology

In this document, the key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED",
"SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY",
and "OPTIONAL" are to be interpreted as described in [RFC 2119]() [[2]()] and
indicate requirement levels for compliant implementations.

3. Definitions

   Feature: As defined in RFC 2703 [17], a piece of information about
      the media handling properties of a message passing system
      component or of a data resource. For example, the SIP methods
      supported by a UA represent a feature.

   Feature Tag: As defined in RFC 2703 [17], a feature tag is a name
      that identifies a feature. An example is ``sip.methods''.

   Media Feature: As defined in RFC 2703, [17], a media feature is
      information that indicates facilities assumed to be available for
      the message content to be properly rendered or otherwise
      presented. Media features are not intended to include information
      that affects message transmission.

         In the context of this specification, a media feature is
         information that indicates facilities for handling SIP
         requests, rather than specifically for content. In that sense,
         it is used synonymously with feature.

   Feature Collection: As defined in RFC 2533 [4], a feature collection
      is a collection of different media features and associated values.
      This might be viewed as describing a specific rendering of a
      specific instance of a document or resource by a specific
      recipient.

   Feature Set: As defined in RFC 2703 [17], a feature set is
      Information about a sender, recipient or other participant in a
      message transfer which describes the set of features that it can
      handle. Where a 'feature' describes a single identified attribute
      of a resource, a 'feature set' describes a full set of possible
      attributes.

   Feature Parameters: A set of SIP header field parameters that can
      appear in the Contact header field. The feature parameters
      represent an encoding of a feature set. Each set of feature
      parameters maps to a feature set predicate.

   Capability: As defined in RFC 2703 [17], a capability is an attribute
      of a sender or receiver (often the receiver) which indicates an
      ability to generate or process a particular type of message
      content. A capability is distinct from a characteristic in that a
      capability may or may not be utilized in any particular call,
      whereas a characteristic is a non-negotiable property of a UA. SIP
      itself will often negotiate whether or not capabilities are used
      in a call.

Characteristic: A characteristic is like a capability, but describes
   an aspect of a UA which is not negotiable. As an example, whether
   or not a UA is a mobile phone is a characteristic, not a
   capability. The semantics of this specification do not
   differentiate between capability and characteristic, but the
   distinction is useful for illustrative purposes. Indeed, in the
   text below, when we say "capability" it refers to both
   capabilities and characteristics, unless the text explicitly says
   otherwise.

Filter: A single expression in a feature set predicate.

Simple Filter: An expression in a feature predicate which is a
   comparison (equality or inequality) of a feature tag against a
   feature value.

Disjunction: A boolean OR operation across some number of terms.

Conjunction: A boolean AND operation across some number of terms.

Predicate: A boolean expression.

Feature Set Predicate: From RFC 2533 [4], a feature set predicate is
   a function of an arbitrary feature collection value which returns
   a Boolean result. A TRUE result is taken to mean that the
   corresponding feature collection belongs to some set of media
   feature handling capabilities defined by this predicate.

Contact Predicate: The feature set predicate associated with a URI
   registered in the Contact header field of a REGISTER request. The
   contact predicate is derived from the feature parameters in the
   Contact header field.

4. Usage of the Content Negotiation Framework

   This specification makes heavy use of the terminology and concepts in
   the content negotiation work carried out within the IETF, and
   documented in several RFCs. The ones relevant to this specification
   are RFC 2506 [3] which provides a template for registering media
   feature tags, RFC 2533 [4] which presents a syntax and matching
   algorithm for media feature sets, RFC 2738 [5], which provides a
   minor update to RFC 2533, and RFC 2703 [17] which provides a general
   framework for content negotiation.

   In case the reader does not have the time to read those
   specifications, Appendix A provides a brief overview of the concepts
   and terminology in those documents that is critical for understanding
   this specification.

   Since the content negotiation work was primarily meant to apply to
   documents or other resources with a set of possible renderings, it is
   not immediately apparent how it is used to model SIP user agents. A
   feature set is composed of a set of feature collections, each of
   which represents a specific rendering supported by the entity
   described by the feature set. In the context of a SIP user agent, a
   feature collection represents an instantaneous modality. That is, if
   you look at the run time processing of a SIP UA, and take a snapshot
   in time, the feature collection describes what it is doing at that
   very instant.

   This model is important, since it provides guidance on how to
   determine whether something is a value for a particular feature tag,
   or a feature tag by itself. If two properties can be exhibited by a
   UA simultaneously, so that both are present in an instantaneous
   modality, they need to be represented by separate media feature tags.
   For example, a UA may be able to support some number of media types -
   audio, video, and control. Should each of these be different values
   for a single "media-types" feature tag, or should each of them be a
   separate boolean feature tag? The model provides the answer. Since,
   at any instance of time, a UA could be handling both audio and video,
   they need to be separate media feature tags. However, the SIP methods
   supported by a UA can each be represented as different values for the
   same media feature tag (the "sip.methods" tag), because
   fundamentally, a UA processes a single request at a time. It may be
   multi-threading, so that it appears that this is not so, but at a
   purely functional level, it is true.

   Clearly, there are weaknesses in this model, but it serves as a
   useful guideline for applying the concepts of RFC 2533 to the problem
   at hand.

5. **Computing Capabilities**

   To construct a set of Contact header field parameters which indicate
   capabilities, a UA constructs a feature predicate for that contact.
   This process is described in terms of RFC 2533 [4] (and its minor
   update, RFC 2738 [5]) syntax and constructs, followed by a conversion
   to the syntax used in this specification. However, this represents a
   logical flow of processing. There is no requirement that an
   implementation actually use RFC 2533 syntax as an intermediate step.

   A UA MAY use any feature tags that are registered through IANA in the
   SIP tree (Established in Section 12.1), IETF, or global trees [3];
   this document registers several into the SIP tree. The feature tags
   discussed in this specification are referred to as base tags. While
   other tags can be used, in order to identify them as feature
   parameters (as opposed to parameters for another SIP extension) they
   are encoded with a leading "+" sign in the Contact header field. It
   is also permissible to use the URI tree [3] for expressing
   vendor-specific feature tags. Feature tags in any other trees created
   through IANA MAY also be used.

   When using the "sip.methods" feature tag, a UA MUST NOT include
   values that correspond to methods not standardized in IETF standards
   track RFCs. When using the "sip.events" feature tag, a UA MUST NOT
   include values that correspond to event packages not standardized in
   IETF standards track RFCs. When using the "sip.schemes" feature tag,
   a UA MUST NOT include values that correspond to schemes not
   standardized in IETF standards track RFCs. When using the
   "sip.extensions" feature tag, a UA MUST NOT include values that
   correspond to option tags not standardized in IETF standards track
   RFCs.

   Note that the "sip.schemes" feature does not indicate the scheme of
   the registered URI. Rather, it indicates schemes that a UA is capable
   of sending requests to, should such a URI be received in a web page
   or Contact header field of a redirect response.

   It is RECOMMENDED that a UA provide complete information in its
   contact predicate. That is, it SHOULD provide information on as many
   feature tags as possible. The mechanisms in this specification work
   best when user agents register complete feature sets. Furthermore,
   when a UA registers values for a particular feature tag, it MUST list
   all values that it supports. For example, when including the
   "sip.methods" feature tag, a UA MUST list all methods it supports.

   The contact predicate constructed by a UA MUST be an AND of terms
   (called a conjunction). Each term is either an OR (called a
   disjunction) of simple filters or negations of simple filters , or a

single simple filter or negation of a single filter. In the case of a
disjunction, each filter in the disjunction MUST indicate feature
values for the same feature tag (i.e., the disjunction represents a
set of values for a particular feature tag), and each element of the
conjunction MUST be for a different feature tag. Each simple filter
can be an equality, or in the case of numeric feature tags, an
inequality or range. This contact predicate is then converted to a
list of feature parameters, following the procedure outlined below.

The contact predicate is a conjunction of terms. Each term indicates
constraints on a single feature tag, and each term is represented by
a separate feature parameter. The name of this parameter depends on
the feature tag. Any forward slashes in the feature tag are converted
to a single quote, and any colons are converted to an exclamation
point. If the feature tag name is not amongst the base tags specified
in Section 9, a plus sign is added to the front of the feature
parameter name. The plus sign MUST NOT be added if the feature tag
name is amongst the base tags. If the feature tag name is amongst the
base tags, and it is present in the SIP registry, the leading "sip."
is removed from the name. The result is the feature parameter name.

The value of the feature parameter depends on the the term of the
conjunction. If the term is a boolean expression with value of true,
i.e., (audio=TRUE), the contact parameter has no value. If the term
of the conjunction is a disjunction, the value of the contact
parameter is a quoted string. The quoted string is a comma separated
list of strings, each one derived from one of the terms in the
disjunction. If the term of the conjunction is a negation, the value
of the contact parameter is a quoted string. The quoted string begins
with an exclamation point (!), and the remainder is constructed from
the expression being negated.

The remaining operation is to compute a string from a primitive
filter (i.e., no and, or, or nots). If the filter is a simple filter
that is performing a numeric comparison, the string starts with an
octothorpe (#), followed by the comparator in the filter (=, >=, or
<=), followed by the value from the filter. If the value from the
filter is expressed in rational form (X / Y), then X and Y are
divided, yielding a decimal number, and this decimal number is output
to the string.

   RFC 2533 uses a fractional notation to describe rational numbers.
   This specification use a decimal form. The above text merely
   converts between the two representations. Practically speaking,
   this conversion is not needed since the numbers are the same in
   either case. However, it is described in case implementations wish
   to directly plug the predicates generated by the rules in this
   section into an RFC 2533 implementation.

If the filter is a range (foo=X..Y), the string is equal to X:Y,
where X and Y have been converted from fractional numbers (A / B) to
their decimal equivalent.

If the filter is an equality over a token or boolean, then that token
or boolean value ("TRUE" or "FALSE") is output to the string.

If the filter is an equality over a quoted string, the output is a
less than (<) followed by the quoted string, followed by a greater
than (>).

As an example, feature predicate:

```
(& (sip.mobility=fixed)
   (| (! (sip.events=presence)) (sip.events=winfo))
   (| (language=en) (language=de))
   (sip.description="PC")
   (sip.newparam=TRUE)
   (rangeparam=-4..5125/1000))
```

would be converted into the following feature parameters:

```
mobility="fixed";events="!presence,winfo";language="en,de"
 ;description="<PC>";+sip.newparam;+rangeparam="#-4:+5.125"
```

6. **Expressing Capabilities in a Registration**

   When a UA registers, it can choose to indicate a feature set
   associated with a registered contact. Whether or not a UA does so
   depends on what the registered URI represents. If the registered URI
   represents a UA instance (the common case in registrations), a UA
   compliant to this specification SHOULD indicate a feature set using
   the mechanisms described here. If, however, the registered URI
   represents an address-of-record, or some other resource that is not
   representable by a single feature set, it SHOULD NOT include a
   feature set. As an example, if a user wishes to forward calls from
   sip:user1@example.com to sip:user2@example.org, it could generate a
   registration that looks like, in part:

   REGISTER sip:example.com SIP/2.0
   To: sip:user1@example.com
   Contact: sip:user2@example.org

   In this case, the registered contact is not identifying a UA, but
   rather, another address-of-record. In such a case, the registered
   contact would not indicate a feature set.

   However, in some cases a UA may wish to express feature parameters
   for an address-of-record. One example is an AOR which represents a
   mutliplicity of devices in a home network, and routes to a proxy
   server in the user's home. Since all devices in the home are for
   personal use, the AOR itself can be described with the
   "sip.class=personal" feature parameter. A registration that forwards
   calls to this home AOR could make use of that feature parameter.
   Generally speaking, a feature parameter can only be associated with
   an address-of-record if all devices bound to that address-of-record
   share the exact same set of values for that feature parameter.

   Similarly, in some cases, a UA can exhibit one characteristic or
   another, but it is not known in advance which. For example, a UA
   could represent a device that is a phone with an embedded answering
   machine. The ideal way to treat such devices is to model them as if
   they were actually a proxy fronting two devices - a phone (which is
   never an answering machine), and an answering machine (which is never
   a phone). The registration from this device would be constructed as
   if it were an AOR, as per the procedures above. Generally, this means
   that, unless the characteristic is identical between the logical
   devices, that characteristic will not be present in any registration
   generated by the actual device.

   The remainder of this section assumes that a UA would like to
   associate a feature set with a contact that it is registering. This
   feature set is constructed and converted to a series of Contact

header field parameters, as described in Section 5, and those feature
parameters are added to the the Contact header field value containing
the URI that the parameters apply to.

The REGISTER request MAY contain a Require header field with the
value "pref" if the client wants to be sure that the registrar
understands the extensions defined in this specification. This means
that the registrar will store the feature parameters, and make them
available to elements accessing the location service within the
domain. In absence of the Require header field, a registrar that does
not understand this extension will simply ignore the Contact header
field parameters.

If a UA registers against multiple separate addresses-of-record, and
the contacts registered for each have different capabilities, a UA
MUST use different URIs in each registration. This is so that the UA
can uniquely determine the feature set that is associated with the
request URI of an incoming request.

As an example, a UA that supports audio and video media types, is a
voicemail server, and is not mobile would construct a feature
predicate like this:

```
(& (audio=TRUE)
   (video=TRUE)
   (sip.actor=msg-taker)
   (sip.automata=TRUE)
   (sip.mobility=fixed)
   (| (sip.methods=INVITE) (sip.methods=BYE) (sip.methods=OPTIONS)
      (sip.methods=ACK) (sip.methods=CANCEL)))
```

These would be converted into feature parameters and included in the
REGISTER request:


```
REGISTER sip:example.com SIP/2.0
From: sip:user@example.com;tag=asd98
To: sip:user@example.com
Call-ID: hh89as0d-asd88jkk@host.example.com
CSeq: 9987 REGISTER
Max-Forwards: 70
Via: SIP/2.0/UDP host.example.com;branch=z9hG4bKnashds8
Contact: <sip:user@host.example.com>;audio;video
  ;actor="msg-taker";automata;mobility="fixed"
  ;methods="INVITE,BYE,OPTIONS,ACK,CANCEL"
Content-Length: 0
```

Note that a voicemail server is usually an automata and a message

taker.

7. **Indicating Feature Sets in Remote Target URIs**

   Target refresh requests and responses are used to establish and
   modify the remote target URI in a dialog. The remote target URI is
   conveyed in the Contact header field. A UAC or UAS MAY add feature
   parameters to the Contact header field value in target refresh
   requests and responses, for the purpose of indicating the
   capabilities of the UA. To do that, it constructs a set of feature
   parameters according to the Section 5. These are then added as
   Contact header field parameters in the request or response.

   The feature parameters can be included in both initial requests and
   mid-dialog requests, and MAY change mid-dialog to signal a change in
   UA capabilities.

   There is overlap in the callee capabilities mechanism with the Allow,
   Accept, Accept-Language, and Allow-Events [9] header fields, which
   can also be used in target refresh requests. Specifically, the Allow
   header field and "sip.methods" feature tag indicate the same
   information. The Accept header field and the "type" feature tag
   indicate the same information. The Accept-Language header field and
   the "language" feature tag indicate the same information. The
   Allow-Events header field and the "sip.events" feature tag indicate
   the same information. It is possible that other header fields and
   feature tags defined in the future may also overlap. When there
   exists a feature tag that describes a capability that can also be
   represented with a SIP header field, a UA MUST use the header field
   to describe the capability. A UA receiving a message that contains
   both the header field and the feature tag MUST use the header field,
   and not the feature tag.

8. OPTIONS Processing

When a UAS compliant to this specification receives an OPTIONS
request, it MAY add feature parameters to the Contact header field in
the OPTIONS response for the purpose of indicating the capabilities
of the UA. To do that, it constructs a set of feature parameters
according to Section 5. These are then added as Contact header field
parameters in OPTIONS response. Indeed, if feature parameters were
included in the registration generated by that UA, those same
parameters SHOULD be used in the OPTIONS response.

[9](#). Contact Header Field

   This specification extends the Contact header field. In particular,
   it allows for the Contact header field parameters to include
   feature-param. Feature-param is a feature parameter that describes a
   feature of the UA associated with the URI in the Contact header
   field. Feature parameters are identifiable because they either belong
   to the well known set of base feature tags, or they begin with a plus
   sign.


```
   feature-param    =  enc-feature-tag [EQUAL LDQUOT (tag-value-list
                          / string-value ) RDQUOT]
   enc-feature-tag  =  base-tags / other-tags
   base-tags        =  "audio" / "automata" /
                       "class" / "duplex" / "data" /
                       "control" / "mobility" / "description" /
                       "events" / "priority" / "methods" /
                       "schemes" / "application" / "video" /
                       "language" / "type" / "isfocus" /
                       "actor" / "text"
   other-tags       =  "+" ftag-name
   ftag-name        =  ALPHA *( ALPHA / DIGIT / "!" / "'" /
                       "." / "-" / "%" )
   tag-value-list   =  tag-value *("," tag-value)
   tag-value        =  ["!"] (token-nobang / boolean / numeric)
   token-nobang     =  1*(alphanum / "-" / "." / "%" / "*"
                       / "_" / "+" / "`" / "'" / "~" )
   boolean          =  "TRUE" / "FALSE"
   numeric          =  "#" numeric-relation number
   numeric-relation =   ">=" / "<=" / "=" / (number ":")
   number           =  [ "+" / "-" ] 1*DIGIT ["." 0*DIGIT]
   string-value     =  "<" qdtext ">"
```

   Note that the tag-value-list uses an actual comma instead of the
   COMMA construction. Thats because it appears within a quoted string,
   where line folding cannot take place.

   The production for qdtext can be found in RFC 3261 [1].

   There are additional constraints on usage of feature-param that
   cannot be represented in a BNF. There MUST only be one instance of
   any feature tag in feature-param. Any numbers present in a feature
   parameter MUST be representable using an ANSI C double.

   The following production updates the one in RFC 3261 [1] for
   contact-params:

```
contact-params    =  c-p-q / c-p-expires / feature-param
                     / contact-extension
```

10. Media Feature Tag Definitions

   This specification defines an initial set of media feature tags for
   use with this specification. This section serves as the IANA
   registration for these feature tags, which are made into the SIP
   media feature tag tree. New media feature tags are registered in the
   IETF or global trees based on the process defined for feature tag
   registrations [3], or in the SIP tree based on the process defined in
   Section 12.1.

   Any registered feature tags MAY be used with this specification.
   However, several existing ones appear to be particularly applicable.
   These include the language feature tag [6], which can be used to
   specify the language of the human or automata represented by the UA,
   and the type feature tag [7], which can be used to specify the MIME
   types that a SIP UA can receive in a SIP message. The audio, video,
   application, data and control feature tags in the SIP tree (each of
   which indicate a media type, as defined in RFC 2327 [8]) are
   different. They do not indicate top level MIME types which can be
   received in SIP requests. Rather, they indicate media types that can
   be used in media streams, and as a result, match up with the types
   defined in RFC 2327 [8].

   If a new SDP media type were to be defined, such as "message", a new
   feature tag registration SHOULD be created for it in the SIP tree.
   The name of the feature tag MUST equal that of the media type, unless
   there is an unlikely naming collision between the new media type and
   an existing feature tag registration. As a result of this,
   implementations can safely construct caller preferences and callee
   capabilities for the new media type before it is registered, as long
   as there is no naming conflict.

   If a new media feature tag is registered with the intent of using
   that tag with this specification, the registration is done for the
   unencoded form of the tag (see Section Section 5). In other words, if
   a new feature tag "foo" is registered in the IETF tree, the IANA
   registration would be for the tag "foo" and not "+foo". Similarly, if
   a new feature tag "sip.gruu" is registered in the SIP tree, the IANA
   registration would be for the tag "sip.gruu" and not "+sip.gruu".

10.1 Feature Tags in the SIP Tree

   The feature tags in this section are all registered into the SIP
   media feature tag tree created by Section 12.1.

10.1.1 Audio

Media feature tag name: audio

ASN.1 Identifier: New assignment by IANA.

Summary of the media feature indicated by this tag: This feature tag
   indicates that the device supports audio as a streaming media
   type.

Values appropriate for use with this feature tag: Boolean.

The feature tag is intended primarily for use in the following
applications, protocols, services, or negotiation mechanisms: This
   feature tag is most useful in a communications application, for
   describing the capabilities of a device, such as a phone or PDA.

Examples of typical use: Routing a call to a phone that can support
   audio.

Related standards or documents: RFC XXXX [[Note to IANA: Please
   replace XXXX with the RFC number of this specification.]]

Security Considerations: Security considerations for this media
   feature tag are discussed in Section 11.1 of RFC XXXX . [[Note to
   IANA: Please replace XXXX with the RFC number of this
   specification.]]

10.1.2 Application

Media feature tag name: application

ASN.1 Identifier: New assignment by IANA.

Summary of the media feature indicated by this tag: This feature tag
   indicates that the device supports application as a streaming
   media type. This feature tag exists primarily for completeness.
   Since so many MIME types are underneath application, indicating
   the ability to support applications provides little useful
   information.

Values appropriate for use with this feature tag: Boolean.

The feature tag is intended primarily for use in the following
applications, protocols, services, or negotiation mechanisms: This
   feature tag is most useful in a communications application, for
   describing the capabilities of a device, such as a phone or PDA.

Examples of typical use: Routing a call to a phone that can supports
    gaming application.

Related standards or documents: RFC XXXX [[Note to IANA: Please
    replace XXXX with the RFC number of this specification.]]

Security Considerations: Security considerations for this media
    feature tag are discussed in Section 11.1 of RFC XXXX . [[Note to
    IANA: Please replace XXXX with the RFC number of this
    specification.]]

10.1.3 Data

Media feature tag name: data

ASN.1 Identifier: New assignment by IANA.

Summary of the media feature indicated by this tag: This feature tag
    indicates that the device supports data as a streaming media type.

Values appropriate for use with this feature tag: Boolean.

The feature tag is intended primarily for use in the following
applications, protocols, services, or negotiation mechanisms: This
    feature tag is most useful in a communications application, for
    describing the capabilities of a device, such as a phone or PDA.

Examples of typical use: Routing a call to a phone that can supports
    a data streaming application.

Related standards or documents: RFC XXXX [[Note to IANA: Please
    replace XXXX with the RFC number of this specification.]]

Security Considerations: Security considerations for this media
    feature tag are discussed in Section 11.1 of RFC XXXX . [[Note to
    IANA: Please replace XXXX with the RFC number of this
    specification.]]

10.1.4 Control

Media feature tag name: control

ASN.1 Identifier: New assignment by IANA.

Summary of the media feature indicated by this tag: This feature tag
   indicates that the device supports control as a streaming media
   type.

Values appropriate for use with this feature tag: Boolean.

The feature tag is intended primarily for use in the following
applications, protocols, services, or negotiation mechanisms: This
   feature tag is most useful in a communications application, for
   describing the capabilities of a device, such as a phone or PDA.

Examples of typical use: Routing a call to a phone that can supports
   a floor control application.

Related standards or documents: RFC XXXX [[Note to IANA: Please
   replace XXXX with the RFC number of this specification.]]

Security Considerations: Security considerations for this media
   feature tag are discussed in Section 11.1 of RFC XXXX . [[Note to
   IANA: Please replace XXXX with the RFC number of this
   specification.]]

10.1.5 **Video**

Media feature tag name: video

ASN.1 Identifier: New assignment by IANA.

Summary of the media feature indicated by this tag: This feature tag
   indicates that the device supports video as a streaming media
   type.

Values appropriate for use with this feature tag: Boolean.

The feature tag is intended primarily for use in the following
applications, protocols, services, or negotiation mechanisms: This
   feature tag is most useful in a communications application, for
   describing the capabilities of a device, such as a phone or PDA.

Examples of typical use: Routing a call to a phone that can support
   video.

Related standards or documents: RFC XXXX [[Note to IANA: Please
   replace XXXX with the RFC number of this specification.]]

Security Considerations: Security considerations for this media
   feature tag are discussed in Section 11.1 of RFC XXXX . [[Note to
   IANA: Please replace XXXX with the RFC number of this
   specification.]]

10.1.6 Text

Media feature tag name: text

ASN.1 Identifier: New assignment by IANA.

Summary of the media feature indicated by this tag: This feature tag
   indicates that the device supports text as a streaming media type.

Values appropriate for use with this feature tag: Boolean.

The feature tag is intended primarily for use in the following
applications, protocols, services, or negotiation mechanisms: This
   feature tag is most useful in a communications application, for
   describing the capabilities of a device, such as a phone or PDA.

Examples of typical use: Routing a call to a phone that can support
   text.

Related standards or documents: RFC XXXX [[Note to IANA: Please
   replace XXXX with the RFC number of this specification.]]

Security Considerations: Security considerations for this media
   feature tag are discussed in Section 11.1 of RFC XXXX . [[Note to
   IANA: Please replace XXXX with the RFC number of this
   specification.]]

10.1.7 Automata

Media feature tag name: sip.automata

ASN.1 Identifier: New assignment by IANA.

Summary of the media feature indicated by this tag: The sip.automata
   feature tag is a boolean value that indicates whether the UA
   represents an automata (such as a voicemail server, conference
   server, IVR, or recording device) or a human.

Values appropriate for use with this feature tag: Boolean. TRUE
   indicates that the UA represents an automata.

The feature tag is intended primarily for use in the following
applications, protocols, services, or negotiation mechanisms: This
   feature tag is most useful in a communications application, for
   describing the capabilities of a device, such as a phone or PDA.

Examples of typical use: Refusing to communicate with an automata
   when it is known that automated services are unacceptable.

Related standards or documents: RFC XXXX [[Note to IANA: Please
   replace XXXX with the RFC number of this specification.]]

Security Considerations: Security considerations for this media
   feature tag are discussed in [Section 11.1](#) of RFC XXXX . [[Note to
   IANA: Please replace XXXX with the RFC number of this
   specification.]]

[10.1.8](#) Class

Media feature tag name: sip.class

ASN.1 Identifier: New assignment by IANA.

Summary of the media feature indicated by this tag: This feature tag
   indicates the setting, business or personal, in which a
   communications device is used.

Values appropriate for use with this feature tag: Token with an
   equality relationship. Typical values include:

   business: The device is used for business communications.

   personal: The device is used for personal communications.

The feature tag is intended primarily for use in the following
applications, protocols, services, or negotiation mechanisms: This
   feature tag is most useful in a communications application, for
   describing the capabilities of a device, such as a phone or PDA.

Examples of typical use: Choosing between a business phone and a home
   phone.

Related standards or documents: RFC XXXX [[Note to IANA: Please
   replace XXXX with the RFC number of this specification.]]

Security Considerations: Security considerations for this media
   feature tag are discussed in [Section 11.1](#) of RFC XXXX . [[Note to
   IANA: Please replace XXXX with the RFC number of this

specification.]]

10.1.9 Duplex

Media feature tag name: sip.duplex

ASN.1 Identifier: New assignment by IANA.

Summary of the media feature indicated by this tag: The sip.duplex
    media feature tag lists whether a communications device can
    simultaneously send and receive media ("full"), alternate between
    sending and receiving ("half"), can only receive ("receive-only")
    or only send ("send-only").

Values appropriate for use with this feature tag: Token with an
    equality relationship. Typical values include:

    full: The device can simultaneously send and receive media.

    half: The device can alternate between sending and receiving
        media.

    receive-only: The device can only receive media.

    send-only: The device can only send media.

The feature tag is intended primarily for use in the following
applications, protocols, services, or negotiation mechanisms: This
    feature tag is most useful in a communications application, for
    describing the capabilities of a device, such as a phone or PDA.

Examples of typical use: Choosing to communicate with a broadcast
    server, as opposed to a regular phone, when making a call to hear
    an announcement.

Related standards or documents: RFC XXXX [[Note to IANA: Please
    replace XXXX with the RFC number of this specification.]]

Security Considerations: Security considerations for this media
    feature tag are discussed in Section 11.1 of RFC XXXX . [[Note to
    IANA: Please replace XXXX with the RFC number of this
    specification.]]

10.1.10 Mobility

Media feature tag name: sip.mobility

ASN.1 Identifier: New assignment by IANA.

Summary of the media feature indicated by this tag: The sip.mobility
   feature tag indicates whether the device is fixed (meaning that it
   is associated with a fixed point of contact with the network), or
   mobile (meaning that it is not associated with a fixed point of
   contact). Note that cordless phones are fixed, not mobile, based
   on this definition.

Values appropriate for use with this feature tag: Token with an
   equality relationship. Typical values include:

   fixed: The device is stationary.

   mobile: The device can move around with the user.

The feature tag is intended primarily for use in the following
applications, protocols, services, or negotiation mechanisms: This
   feature tag is most useful in a communications application, for
   describing the capabilities of a device, such as a phone or PDA.

Examples of typical use: Choosing to communicate with a wireless
   phone instead of a desktop phone.

Related standards or documents: RFC XXXX [[Note to IANA: Please
   replace XXXX with the RFC number of this specification.]]

Security Considerations: Security considerations for this media
   feature tag are discussed in Section 11.1 of RFC XXXX . [[Note to
   IANA: Please replace XXXX with the RFC number of this
   specification.]]

10.1.11 **Description**

Media feature tag name: sip.description

ASN.1 Identifier: New assignment by IANA.

Summary of the media feature indicated by this tag: The
   sip.description feature tag provides a textual description of the
   device.

Values appropriate for use with this feature tag: String with an
   equality relationship.

The feature tag is intended primarily for use in the following
applications, protocols, services, or negotiation mechanisms: This
feature tag is most useful in a communications application, for
describing the capabilities of a device, such as a phone or PDA.

Examples of typical use: Indicating that a device is of a certain
make and model.

Related standards or documents: RFC XXXX [[Note to IANA: Please
replace XXXX with the RFC number of this specification.]]

Security Considerations: Security considerations for this media
feature tag are discussed in Section 11.1 of RFC XXXX . [[Note to
IANA: Please replace XXXX with the RFC number of this
specification.]]

10.1.12 Event Packages

Media feature tag name: sip.events

ASN.1 Identifier: New assignment by IANA.

Summary of the media feature indicated by this tag: The event
packages [9] supported by a SIP UA. The values for this tag equal
the event package names that are registered by each event package.

Values appropriate for use with this feature tag: Token with an
equality relationship. Values are taken from the IANA SIP Event
types namespace registry.

The feature tag is intended primarily for use in the following
applications, protocols, services, or negotiation mechanisms: This
feature tag is most useful in a communications application, for
describing the capabilities of a device, such as a phone or PDA.

Examples of typical use: Choosing to communicate with a server that
supports the message waiting event package, such as a voicemail
server [12].

Related standards or documents: RFC XXXX [[Note to IANA: Please
replace XXXX with the RFC number of this specification.]]

Security Considerations: Security considerations for this media
feature tag are discussed in Section 11.1 of RFC XXXX . [[Note to
IANA: Please replace XXXX with the RFC number of this
specification.]]

10.1.13 **Priority**

Media feature tag name: sip.priority

ASN.1 Identifier: New assignment by IANA.

Summary of the media feature indicated by this tag: The sip.priority
   feature tag indicates the call priorities the device is willing to
   handle. A value of X means that the device is willing to take
   requests with priority X and higher. This does not imply that a
   phone has to reject calls of lower priority. As always, the
   decision on handling of such calls is a matter of local policy.

Values appropriate for use with this feature tag: An integer. Each
   integral value corresponds to one of the possible values of the
   Priority header field as specified in SIP [1]. The mapping is
   defined as:

   non-urgent: Integral value of 10. The device supports non-urgent
      calls.

   normal: Integral value of 20. The device supports normal calls.

   urgent: Integral value of 30. The device supports urgent calls.

   emergency: Integral value of 40. The device supports calls in the
      case of an emergency situation.

The feature tag is intended primarily for use in the following
applications, protocols, services, or negotiation mechanisms: This
   feature tag is most useful in a communications application, for
   describing the capabilities of a device, such as a phone or PDA.

Examples of typical use: Choosing to communicate with the emergency
   cell phone of a user.

Related standards or documents: RFC XXXX [[Note to IANA: Please
   replace XXXX with the RFC number of this specification.]]

Security Considerations: Security considerations for this media
   feature tag are discussed in Section 11.1 of RFC XXXX . [[Note to
   IANA: Please replace XXXX with the RFC number of this
   specification.]]

10.1.14 **Methods**

Media feature tag name: sip.methods

ASN.1 Identifier: New assignment by IANA.

Summary of the media feature indicated by this tag: The sip.methods
   (note the plurality) feature tag indicates the SIP methods
   supported by this UA. In this case, "supported" means that the UA
   can receive requests with this method. In that sense, it has the
   same connotation as the Allow header field.

Values appropriate for use with this feature tag: Token with an
   equality relationship. Values are taken from the Methods table
   defined in the IANA SIP parameters registry.

The feature tag is intended primarily for use in the following
applications, protocols, services, or negotiation mechanisms: This
   feature tag is most useful in a communications application, for
   describing the capabilities of a device, such as a phone or PDA.

Examples of typical use: Choosing to communicate with a presence
   application on a PC, instead of a PC phone application.

Related standards or documents: RFC XXXX [[Note to IANA: Please
   replace XXXX with the RFC number of this specification.]]

Security Considerations: Security considerations for this media
   feature tag are discussed in Section 11.1 of RFC XXXX . [[Note to
   IANA: Please replace XXXX with the RFC number of this
   specification.]]

10.1.15 Extensions

Media feature tag name: sip.extensions

ASN.1 Identifier: New assignment by IANA.

Summary of the media feature indicated by this tag: The
   sip.extensions feature tag is a list of SIP extensions (each of
   which is defined by an option-tag registered with IANA) that are
   understood by the UA. Understood, in this context, means that the
   option tag would be included in a Supported header field in a
   request.

Values appropriate for use with this feature tag: Token with an
   equality relationship. Values are taken from the option tags table
   in the IANA SIP parameters registry.

The feature tag is intended primarily for use in the following
applications, protocols, services, or negotiation mechanisms: This
feature tag is most useful in a communications application, for
describing the capabilities of a device, such as a phone or PDA.

Examples of typical use: Choosing to communicate with a phone that
supports quality of service preconditions instead of one that does
not.

Related standards or documents: RFC XXXX [[Note to IANA: Please
replace XXXX with the RFC number of this specification.]]

Security Considerations: Security considerations for this media
feature tag are discussed in Section 11.1 of RFC XXXX . [[Note to
IANA: Please replace XXXX with the RFC number of this
specification.]]

10.1.16 **Schemes**

Media feature tag name: sip.schemes

ASN.1 Identifier: New assignment by IANA.

Summary of the media feature indicated by this tag: The set of URI
schemes [10] that are supported by a UA. Supported implies, for
example, that the UA would know how to handle a URI of that scheme
in the Contact header field of a redirect response.

Values appropriate for use with this feature tag: Token with an
equality relationship. Values are taken from the IANA URI scheme
registry.

The feature tag is intended primarily for use in the following
applications, protocols, services, or negotiation mechanisms: This
feature tag is most useful in a communications application, for
describing the capabilities of a device, such as a phone or PDA.

Examples of typical use: Choosing to get redirected to a phone number
when a called party is busy, rather than a web page.

Related standards or documents: RFC XXXX [[Note to IANA: Please
replace XXXX with the RFC number of this specification.]]

Security Considerations: Security considerations for this media
feature tag are discussed in Section 11.1 of RFC XXXX . [[Note to
IANA: Please replace XXXX with the RFC number of this
specification.]]

10.1.17 Actor

Media feature tag name: sip.actor

ASN.1 Identifier: New assignment by IANA.

Summary of the media feature indicated by this tag: This feature tag
    indicates the type of entity that is available at this URI.

Values appropriate for use with this feature tag: Token with an
    equality relationship. The following values are defined:

principal: The device provides communication with the principal
    that is associated with the device. Often this will be a
    specific human being, but it can be an automata (for example,
    when calling a voice portal).

attendant: The device provides communication with an automaton or
    person that will act as an intermediary in contacting the
    principal associated with the device, or a substitute.

msg-taker: The device provides communication with an automaton or
    person that will take messages and deliver them to the
    principal.

information: The device provides communication with an automaton
    or person that will provide information about the principal.

The feature tag is intended primarily for use in the following
applications, protocols, services, or negotiation mechanisms: This
    feature tag is most useful in a communications application, for
    describing the capabilities of a device, such as a phone or PDA.

Examples of typical use: Requesting that a call not be routed to
    voicemail.

Related standards or documents: RFC XXXX [[Note to IANA: Please
    replace XXXX with the RFC number of this specification.]]

Security Considerations: Security considerations for this media
    feature tag are discussed in Section 11.1 of RFC XXXX . [[Note to
    IANA: Please replace XXXX with the RFC number of this
    specification.]]

10.1.18 Is Focus

Media feature tag name: sip.isfocus

ASN.1 Identifier: New assignment by IANA.

Summary of the media feature indicated by this tag: This feature tag
    indicates that the UA is a conference server, also known as a
    focus, and will mix together the media for all calls to the same
    URI [13].

Values appropriate for use with this feature tag: Boolean.

The feature tag is intended primarily for use in the following
applications, protocols, services, or negotiation mechanisms: This
    feature tag is most useful in a communications application, for
    describing the capabilities of a device, such as a phone or PDA.

Examples of typical use: Indicating to a UA that the server it has
    connected to is a conference server.

Related standards or documents: RFC XXXX [[Note to IANA: Please
    replace XXXX with the RFC number of this specification.]]

Security Considerations: Security considerations for this media
    feature tag are discussed in Section 11.1 of RFC XXXX . [[Note to
    IANA: Please replace XXXX with the RFC number of this
    specification.]]

11. Security Considerations

11.1 Considerations for Media Feature Tags

   This section discusses security considerations for the media feature
   tags, including, but not limited to, this specification.

   The media feature tags defined in Section 10 reveal sensitive
   information about a user or the user agent they are utilizing. Some
   of the feature tags convey capability information about the agent -
   for example, the media types it can support, the SIP methods it can
   support, and the SIP extensions it can support. This capability
   information might be used for industrial espionage, for example, and
   so its protection may be important. Other attributes, such as the
   mobility, priority and isfocus attributes, reveal characteristics of
   the user agent. These attributes are more sensitive than the
   capability information. They describe the way in which a user agent
   is utilized by a user, and thus reveal information about user
   preferences and the ways in which they want calls handled. Some
   feature tags, such as languages, reveal information about the user
   themself. As a result of this, applications which utilize these media
   feature tags SHOULD provide a means for ensuring their
   confidentiality.

   The media feature tags can be used in ways which affect application
   behaviors. For example, the SIP caller preferences extension [11]
   allows for call routing decisions to be based on the values of these
   parameters. Therefore, if an attacker can modify the values of these
   feature tags, they may be able to affect the behavior of
   applications. As a result of thihs, applications which utilize these
   media feature tags SHOULD provide a means for ensuring their
   integrity. Similarly, media feature tags should only be trusted as
   valid when they come from the user or user agent described by those
   feature tags. As a result, mechanisms for conveying feature tags
   SHOULD provide a mechanism for guaranteeing authenticity.

11.2 Considerations for Registrations

   As per the general requirements in Section 11.1, when media feature
   tags are carried in a registration, authenticity, confidentiality and
   integrity need to be provided. To accomplish this, registrations
   containing capability information SHOULD be made by addressing the
   registration to a SIPS URI (in other words, the Request URI of the
   request would be sips:example.com when creating a registration in the
   example.com domain). Furthermore, the registrar SHOULD challenge the
   UA using digest over TLS, to verify its authenticity. The combination
   of TLS and digest provide integrity, confidentiality and
   authenticity, as required.

It is not necessary for the Contact in the registration to itself
contain a sips URI, since the feature tags are not carried in
incoming requests sent to the UA.

11.3 Considerations for OPTIONS Responses

When including information on capabilities in a response to an
OPTIONS request, a UA SHOULD verify with the user (either through a
user interface or though aprior configuration) whether or not
capability information should be divulged to the requestor. If the
identity of the requestor cannot be cryptographically verified (using
digest or the SIP identity enhancements [15]), the user SHOULD also
be alerted to this fact, and be allowed to make a choice about
whether such information should be divulged.

If the user does wish to reveal capability information to the
requestor, and wishes to guarantee its confidentiality, but the
request did not arrive using SIPS, the UAS SHOULD redirect the
request to a sips URI. This will cause the UAC to send the OPTIONS
request using SIPS instead, and therefore provide confidentiality of
any responses sent over the secure connections.

Furthermore, S/MIME MAY be used in the OPTIONS response. In that
case, the capability information would be contained only in the
secured S/MIME body, and not in the header fields of the OPTIONS
response.

11.4 Considerations for Dialog Initiating Messages

When a UAS generates a response that will initiate a dialog, and they
wish to include capability information in the Contact header field,
the same considerations as described in Section 11.3 apply.

When a UAC generates a request that will initiate a dialog, it SHOULD
obtain permission from the user (either through a user interface or
apriori configuration) before including capability information in the
Contact header field of the request. Confidentiality and integrity of
the information SHOULD be provided using SIPS. S/MIME MAY be used.

12. IANA Considerations

There are a number of IANA considerations associated with this
specification.

12.1 SIP Media Feature Tag Registration Tree

This specification serves to create a new media feature tag
registration tree, per the guidelines of Section 3.1.4 of RFC2506
[3]. The name of this tree is the "SIP Media Feature Tag Registration
Tree", and its prefix is "sip.". It is used for registration of media
feature tags that are applicable to the Session Initiation Protocol,
and whose meaning is only defined within that usage.

The addition of entries into this registry occurs through IETF
consensus, as defined in RFC 2434 [18]. This requires publication of
an RFC that contains the registration. The information required in
the registration is identical to the IETF tree. As such,
specifications adding entries to the registry should use the template
provided in Section 3.4 of RFC 2506.

12.2 Media Feature Tags

This specification registers a number of new Media feature tags
according to the procedures of RFC 2506 [3]. These registrations
(contained in Section 10.1) are all made into the newly created SIP
tree for media feature tags.

12.3 SIP Option Tag

This specification registers a single SIP option tag, pref. The
required information for this registration, as specified in RFC 3261
[1], is:

Name: pref

Description: This option tag is used in a Require header field of a
    registration to ensure that the registrar supports the caller
    preferences extensions.

13. Acknowledgments

The initial set of media feature tags used by this specification were
influenced by Scott Petrack's CMA design. Jonathan Lennox, Bob
Penfield, Ben Campbell, Mary Barnes, Rohan Mahy and John Hearty
provided helpful comments. Graham Klyne provided assistance on the
usage of RFC 2533. Thanks to Allison Mankin for her comments and
support, and to Ted Hardie for his guidance on usage of the media
feature tags.

Normative References

   [1]   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.

   [2]   Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement
          Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, March 1997.

   [3]   Holtman, K., Mutz, A. and T. Hardie, "Media Feature Tag
          Registration Procedure", BCP 31, RFC 2506, March 1999.

   [4]   Klyne, G., "A Syntax for Describing Media Feature Sets", RFC
          2533, March 1999.

   [5]   Klyne, G., "Corrections to "A Syntax for Describing Media
          Feature Sets"", RFC 2738, December 1999.

   [6]   Hoffman, P., "Registration of Charset and Languages Media
          Features Tags", RFC 2987, November 2000.

   [7]   Klyne, G., "MIME Content Types in Media Feature Expressions",
          RFC 2913, September 2000.

   [8]   Handley, M. and V. Jacobson, "SDP: Session Description
          Protocol", RFC 2327, April 1998.

   [9]   Roach, A., "Session Initiation Protocol (SIP)-Specific Event
          Notification", RFC 3265, June 2002.

   [10]   Berners-Lee, T., Fielding, R. and L. Masinter, "Uniform
          Resource Identifiers (URI): Generic Syntax", RFC 2396, August
          1998.

Informative References

   [11]   Rosenberg, J., Schulzrinne, H. and P. Kyzivat, "Caller
          Preferences for the Session Initiation Protocol (SIP)",
          draft-ietf-sip-callerprefs-10 (work in progress), October 2003.

   [12]   Mahy, R., "A Message Summary and Message Waiting Indication
          Event Package for the Session Initiation Protocol (SIP)",
          draft-ietf-sipping-mwi-03 (work in progress), July 2003.

   [13]   Rosenberg, J., "A Framework for Conferencing with the Session
          Initiation Protocol",
          draft-ietf-sipping-conferencing-framework-00 (work in
          progress), May 2003.

   [14]   Howes, T. and M. Smith, "LDAP: String Representation of Search
          Filters", draft-ietf-ldapbis-filter-04 (work in progress),
          March 2003.

   [15]   Peterson, J., "Enhancements for Authenticated Identity
          Management in the Session Initiation Protocol (SIP)",
          draft-ietf-sip-identity-01 (work in progress), March 2003.

   [16]   Campbell, B., Rosenberg, J., Schulzrinne, H., Huitema, C. and
          D. Gurle, "Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) Extension for
          Instant Messaging", RFC 3428, December 2002.

   [17]   Klyne, G., "Protocol-independent Content Negotiation
          Framework", RFC 2703, September 1999.

   [18]   Narten, T. and H. Alvestrand, "Guidelines for Writing an IANA
          Considerations Section in RFCs", BCP 26, RFC 2434, October
          1998.

Authors' Addresses

   Jonathan Rosenberg
   dynamicsoft
   600 Lanidex Plaza
   Parsippany, NJ 07054
   US

   Phone: +1 973 952-5000
   EMail: jdrosen@dynamicsoft.com
   URI: http://www.jdrosen.net

Henning Schulzrinne
Columbia University
M/S 0401
1214 Amsterdam Ave.
New York, NY 10027
US

EMail: schulzrinne@cs.columbia.edu
URI: http://www.cs.columbia.edu/~hgs

Paul Kyzivat
Cisco Systems
1414 Massachusetts Avenue
BXB500 C2-2
Boxboro, MA 01719
US

EMail: pkzivat@cisco.com

Appendix A. **Overview of RFC 2533**

   This section provides a brief overview of RFC 2533 and related
   specifications that form the content negotiation framework. This
   section does not represent normative behavior. In the event of any
   conflict between the tutorial material here and the normative text in
   RFC 2533, RFC 2533 takes precedence.

   A critical concept in the framework is that of a feature set. A
   feature set is information about an entity (in our case, a UA), which
   describes a set of features it can handle. A feature set can be
   thought of as a region in N-dimensional space. Each dimension in this
   space is a different media feature, identified by a media feature
   tag. For example, one dimension (or axis) might represent languages,
   another might represent methods, and another, MIME types. A feature
   collection represents a single point in this space. It represents a
   particular rendering or instance of an entity (in our case, a UA).
   For example, a ``rendering'' of a UA would define an instantaneous
   mode of operation that it can support. One such rendering would be
   processing the INVITE method, which carried the application/sdp MIME
   type, sent to a UA for a user that is speaking English.

   A feature set can therefore be defined as a set of feature
   collections. In other words, a feature set is a region of
   N-dimensional feature-space, that region being defined by the set of
   points - feature collections - that make up the space. If a
   particular feature collection is in the space, it means that the
   rendering described by that feature collection is supported by the
   device with that feature set.

   How does one represent a feature set? There are many ways to describe
   an N-dimensional space. One way is to identify mathematical functions
   which identify its contours. Clearly, that is too complex to be
   useful. The solution taken in RFC 2533 is to define the space with a
   feature set predicate. A feature predicate defines a relation over
   an N-dimensional space; its input is any point in that space (i.e. a
   feature collection), and is true for all points that are in the
   region thus defined.

   RFC 2533 describes a syntax for writing down these N-dimensional
   boolean functions, borrowed from LDAP [14]. It uses a prolog-style
   syntax which is fairly self-explanatory. This representation is
   called a feature set predicate. The base unit of the predicate is a
   filter, which is a boolean expression encased in round brackets. A
   filter can be complex, where it contains conjunctions and
   disjunctions of other filters, or it can be simple. A simple filter
   is one that expresses a comparison operation on a single media
   feature tag.

For example, consider the feature set predicate:

```
(& (foo=A)
   (bar=B)
   (| (baz=C) (& (baz=D) (bif=E))))
```

This defines a function over four media features - foo, bar, baz and
bif. Any point in feature space with foo equal to A, bar equal to B,
and either baz equal to C, or baz equal to D and bif equal to E, is
in the feature set defined by this feature set predicate.

Note that the predicate doesn't say anything about the number of
dimensions in feature space. The predicate operates on a feature
space of any number of dimensions, but only those dimensions labeled
foo, bar, baz and bif matter. The result is that values of other
media features don't matter. The feature collection
{foo=A,bar=B,baz=C,bop=F} is in the feature set described by the
predicate, even though the media feature tag ``bop'' isn't mentioned.
Feature set predicates are therefore inclusive by default. A feature
collection is present unless the boolean predicate rules it out. This
was a conscious design choice in RFC 2533.

RFC 2533 also talks about matching a preference with a capability
set. This is accomplished by representing both with a feature set. A
preference is a feature set - its a specification of a number of
feature collections, any one of which would satisfy the requirements
of the sender. A capability is also a feature set - its a
specification of the feature collections that the recipient supports.
There is a match when the spaces defined by both feature sets
overlap. When there is overlap, there exists at least one feature
collection that exists in both feature sets, and therefore a modality
or rendering desired by the sender which is supported by the
recipient.

This leads directly to the definition of a match. Two feature sets
match if there exists at least one feature collection present in both
feature sets.

Computing a match for two general feature set predicates is not easy.
Section 5 of RFC 2533 presents an algorithm for doing it by expanding
an arbitrary expression into disjunctive normal form. However, the
feature set predicates used by this specification are constrained.
They are always in conjunctive normal form, with each term in the
conjunction describing values for different media features. This
makes computation of a match easy. It is computed independently for
each media feature, and then the feature sets overlap if media
features specified in both sets overlap. Computing the overlap of a
single media feature is very straightforward, and is a simple matter

   of computing whether two finite sets overlap.

Intellectual Property Statement

Full Copyright Statement

Acknowledgement