

STIR WG

IETF-100

PASSPorT Extension for Resource-Priority
Authorization
(draft-ietf-stir-rph-01)
November, 2017

Ray P. Singh, Martin Dolly, Subir Das, and An Nguyen





Background and Overview

- **Draft-ietf-stir-rph-00: PASSPorT Extension for Resource-Priority Authorization**
 - Proposes a PASSPorT extension to convey cryptographically-signed assertion of authorization for communications “Resource-Priority”
 - Allows authorized service providers to sign and verify content of the SIP “Resource-Priority” header field specified in [RFC4412] and used to support priority services such as National Security /Emergency Preparedness (NS/EP) Priority Services, civil Emergency and Public Safety.
 - Draft -00 was presented in STIR Interim meeting in IETF-99
 - Few comments were received during IETF-99 and on the mailing list
 - Submitted draft-ietf-stir-rph-01 addressing all comments

List of Updates in Draft-ietf-stir-rph-01



Comment	Proposed Resolution
<p>Clarify if the RPH attestation requires a second PASSporT object with another signature in addition to the PASSporT object that is used for calling user telephone number attestation.</p>	<p>Following text is added in paragraph 4, Section 1: “This PASSporT object is used to provide attestation of a calling user authorization for priority communications. This is necessary in addition to the PASSporT object that is used for calling user telephone number attestation. “</p>

List of Updates in Draft-ietf-stir-rph-01



Comment

Inconsistent reference in Section 5.
Section 6, IANA considerations, Section 6.2 says:
" This document requests value for "namespace" which is specified in [RFCThis]."
But I can find no reference to "RPH types" in the rest of the document. Nor can I find any other references to "rph" array. And I can't find anything that indicates what this a single value for "namespace" is.
So I am not sure how it/they will be used.
Some additional description and clarification would be useful.

Proposed Resolution

Updated the reference and clarified the text in paragraph 2, Section 5:
"A new IANA registry has been defined to hold potential values of the "rph" array; see Section 6.2. The definition of the "rph" claim may have one or more such additional information field(s). Details of such "rph" claim to encompass other data elements are left for future version of this specification."
Section 6.2 is revised:
"This specification requests that the IANA add a new entry to the PASSporT Types registry for the type "rph" which is specified in [RFCThis]. This specification also requests that the IANA create a new registry for PASSporT "rph" types. Registration of new PASSporT "rph" types shall be under the specification required policy. This registry is to be initially populated with a single value for "auth" which is specified in [RFCThis]."



Next Steps

- Address WGLC comments
- Authors will publish draft-02 addressing WGLC comments