

Rich Call Data PASSporT extension  
draft-ietf-stir-passport-rcd-01

STIR Working Group  
IETF103

# Overview of update

- New update includes a new mechanism, specific to 'rcd' that allows for the use of the 'rcd' claim without necessarily using the extension.
- Rich Call Data such as Caller ID or CNAM is often “additional” data to the core call.
- For extensions like 'shaken', should we require a new extension that is 'shaken+rcd' for example?
- Current text allows the use of 'rcd' and is basically riding on top of other extension. If the Verification Service understands both the extension and 'rcd', then it is able to verify both. If the Verification Service does not understand 'rcd' that claim is simply ignored.

# Example of 'shaken' + 'rcd' claim

## SIP INVITE

```
INVITE sip:+12155551213@biloxi.com SIP/2.0
Via: SIP/2.0/UDP
pc33.atlanta.com;branch=z9hG4bK776asdhds
Max-Forwards: 70
To: "Bob" <sip:+12155550213@biloxi.com;
user=phone>
From: "Alice" <sip:+12155550212@atlanta.com;
user=phone>;tag=1928301774
Call-ID: a84b4c76e66710@pc33.atlanta.com
CSeq: 314159 INVITE
Date: Sat, 13 Nov 2015 23:29:00 GMT
Identity: "sv5CTo05KqpSmtHt3dcEiO/1CWTS
ZtnG3iV+1nmurLXV/HmtYNS7Ltrg9dlxkWzoeU
7d7OV8HweTTDobV3itTmgPwCFjaEmMyEI
3d7SyN21yNDo2ER/Ovgtw0Lu5csIppPqOgluX
ndzHbG7mR6Rl9BnUhHufVRbp51Mn3w0gfUs=";
info=<https://biloxi.example.org/
biloxi.cer>;alg=ES256;ppt="shaken"
Contact: <sip:alice@pc33.atlanta.com>
Content-Type: application/sdp
Content-Length: 142
```

## PASSporT

Protected Header

```
{
  "alg": "ES256",
  "typ": "passport",
  "ppt": "shaken",
  "x5u": "https://biloxi.example.org
        /biloxi.cer"
}
```

Payload

```
{
  "attest": "A"
  "dest": {"tn": ["12155550213"]}
  "iat": 1443208345,
  "orig": {"tn": "12155550212"},
  "origid": "123e4567-e89b-12d3-a456
            -426655440000",
  "rcd": {"nam": "Alice"}
}
```

# Additional Update to Discuss

- Two Cases to support:
  - POCN - Plain old Calling Name
  - Rich Call Data - JCard, URIs to Logos, etc.
- For Plain old Calling Name, use mechanisms similar to 8224 and discussed in 'rcd' where the name is passed both in the claim and in From and/or PAID and a string compare is performed to validate the name passed. Both compact/full form would be supported.
- For “larger” and more comprehensive rich call data where there isn't current as much widely established mechanisms in SIP (as far as I'm aware), use the 'rcd' claim as both the way to validate the data as well as the primary mechanism to transport the data in place. Only full form would be supported.

# Rich Call Data

- Rich Call Data could take many forms, however many of the current use cases can likely be supported using with RFC7095 jCard, so would propose that like 'nam', 'jcd' would be another standard type.
- Name, Address, URI to logos, etc.
- One thing to think about is the security/verification of logos or other file objects pointed to by URIs