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Problem Statement

- SIP responses get bigger due to response aggregation resulting from forking, R-R headers with state information, other headers (Path, Service-Route, …), SDP in answer, …
- If response size > link MTU, fragmentation results; reassembly often not possible.
- Result: a failed session attempt over UDP, but may succeed over TCP.
- UDP depreciation will not happen overnight: in the meantime, better to diagnose when and how UDP is causing problems.
The Problem
Possible Solutions

- Use provisional responses: 140, 141 (described later).
- A repairable final response (possibly 4xx).
  - Problems: HERFP, false positives.
- Use message/sipfrag in a 4xx (a la hop-limit-diagnostics).
  - Problems: What to prune in the response?
- Request in backwards direction.
  - Problems: No Contact to send the request to, UA may not be directly accessible (NATs), forking results in many requests coming back.
Solution: Provisional responses
WG List Discussion – 14x approach

- Are both 140 (proxy) and 141 (uas) needed? Can one be suppressed?
  - The 140 is intended only for when the proxy is changing from UDP due to message size; not for all changes to UDP.
  - Incremental deployment argues for both

- Interaction with PRACK?
  - Can we send the 14x without 100rel without affecting UA state machines when other 1xx responses use it?

- Specifically requesting TCP all the way through.
  - Can do so for the R-URI with “transport=tcp” on the retried request, but what about intermediaries routing the request based on alternate logic?
WG List Discussion - alternatives

- In 4xx response solution, can we tolerate false positives (i.e., force a call to fail that would have otherwise succeeded)?
- Request in the backwards direction?
Next steps

- WG interest in pursuing this?
- WG item?
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Recap

- When sending 483 Hop Limit Exceeded, Include the headers from the request as a message/sipfrag body
- Analogous to ICMP behavior used by traceroute
WG List Discussion

- Expands use of Warning to non-SDP errors
- Generates large responses
  - Problematic for UDP
- Is this useful for other error responses as well?
- Request in reverse direction?