

IETF 65 SIP meeting

draft-ietf-sip-connected-identity-00

&

draft-elwell-sip-tispan-connected-identity-01

draft-ietf-sip-connected-identity-00

- Open issue 2 – the need for an option tag to indicate UAS support for the Identity header field in mid-dialog requests
 - Advantage – saves UPDATE request/response after answer if the AoR of the callee is the same as To header URI (i.e., not retargeted)
 - Disadvantage – yet another option tag
 - Will anyone really support id-change without connected-identity?
 - Email suggestion to make it dependent on receipt of Identity header field and id-change option tag (presence of AS could mean presence of VS)

draft-ietf-sip-connected-identity-00

- Open issue 3 – sip-identity is silent on how to behave if identity in From header field is not one that authenticated UAC is allowed to assert
 - Effectively left to local policy (whether to reject or forward without Identity header field)
 - Policy may be different for mid-dialog requests
 - Propose to add note to this effect

draft-ietf-sip-connected-identity-00

- Open issue 4 – (not in draft but identified subsequently) – Should we mandate UPDATE for sending connected-identity?
 - Fewer messages than re-INVITE
 - Avoids offer-answer exchange (but may be an argument to include it in order to get it signed)
 - Can say that support for RFC 3311 is mandatory if you support the id-change tag
 - Have heard only one voice against this

draft-ietf-sip-connected-identity-00

- Open issue 5 – (not in draft but identified subsequently) – Should we mandate inclusion of SDP offer in UPDATE request?
 - Not strictly necessary
 - But would be signed, in same way that SDP offer in INVITE request is signed

draft-ietf-sip-connected-identity-00

- Open issue 1 – should To header field URI in response be allowed to differ from the request?
 - Body of opinion that says that this is an entirely different consideration from the one in Vancouver that led to decision to allow From header field URI to change in mid-dialog requests
 - No warning in RFC3261 that such a relaxation might occur in the future (unlike the From URI change)
 - Body of opinion that says it would not be useful
 - Body of opinion that says it doesn't harm anything
 - TISPAN requirements

draft-elwell-sip-tispan-connected-identity-01

- Written following discussions between connected-identity author and some TISPAN experts
- Main motivation was to get closure of open issue 1 on connected-identity
- Was written and submitted before draft-rosenberg-sip-identity-coexistence-00 appeared

draft-elwell-sip-tispan-connected-identity-01

- Based on TISpan requirement for 2-identity delivery (which can be traced back to PSTN behaviour)
- Some discussion of this on mailing list, which seemed to generate some consensus towards accepting the notion of two different identities for two different purposes
- Draft assumes this as starting point (rightly or wrongly)

draft-elwell-sip-tispan-connected-identity-01

- Use of PAI for first identity / From (+Identity) for second identity in request
- TISSPAN wants to use PAI for first identity / To for second identity in response
 - but requires change of To header field URI in response – body of opinion against
 - doesn't provide any means of authenticating that response identity
 - connected-identity as stands would solve it, but...

draft-elwell-sip-tispan-connected-identity-01

- How gateway at ingress from PSTN to SIP knows that 200 OK to INVITE request will be followed by UPDATE request with revised and/or authenticated URI?
 - Can't delay sending answer signal to PSTN indefinitely or until timeout – needs to be done quickly
 - Proposal for another option tag in 200 OK to INVITE request to indicate that sending UPDATE is supported and will occur
 - Could possibly overload tag from open issue 2 if we thought there was sufficient synergy (one says support on receipt, the other says support on send)

draft-elwell-sip-tispan-connected-identity-01

- Options mentioned in this draft:
 1. Use connected-identity solution (perhaps with option tag)
 2. Use To header field URI in response to provide unauthenticated response ID
 3. Use new header field in response
 4. SAML mentioned – but that would probably just be a variant of option 1.
 5. Use parameter in existing header field

draft-ietf-connected-identity-00

- Ways forward:
 - A) –add tag to indicate support for sending connected identity and mandate sending UPDATE if this tag has been received in Supported header field of 200 response to INVITE request
 - Could be considered to have some merit without necessarily accepting the TISPAN 2-identity concept
 - B) – do nothing – if this is not considered to be a problem, or not one that should be addressed in connected-identity draft
 - The other options in tispan-connected-identity probably don't need to be solved in this draft

draft-ietf-connected-identity-00

- Editorial point:
 - Do correct values for Identity header field need to be shown (along with the corresponding private key that generates them), as in sip-identity?
 - Or should we regard the sip-identity draft as the source of such examples and leave the contents of the header field blank?