speermint

Requirements Draft

http://tools.ietf.org/html/ draft-ietf-speermint-requirements-01

IETF 67 – Wednesday November 8 2006

Jean-François Mulé - jfm@cablelabs.com, Editor

IETF Speermint Working Group

Changes since draft-00 (1)

- **Integrated wg comments received on the mailing list and at the interim meeting**
- **Clarified the intent and scope of the ID**
  - When protocol mechanisms are used, provide guidelines or best current practices on how they should be implemented to facilitate session peering
  - the "must implement" rather than "must use"
- **Generalized some requirements beyond just VoIP**
- **Aligned terminology with draft-speermint-terminology**
- **Addressed various editorial comments**
  - E.g. Separated requirements from motivations/justifications

IETF Speermint Working Group

Changes since draft-00 (2)

- **Clarified a few technical requirements (RFC 2119 language)**
- **Added a requirement on the variability of Call Addressing Data per mailing list thread based on input from Daryl, Otmar, Penn and others**
- **Captured mailing list 'chats' about things that should be considered as part of a session peering policy**
  - Definition, Static vs. Dynamic, relationship with SIPPING policy
  - List of Parameters for policy description (new annex A)
- **Updated requirements to reflect wg consensus on Media & Codecs**
- **Started to develop text on Security**
  - Added input we got from various participants at the interim on the fact that some VSPs rely on network-layer and lower layer security mechanisms for VoIP exchanges
  - Added pointers to rtpsec bof for media related security requirements and new IDs on media security requirements
  - Replaced the basic TLS requirement with more detailed paragraphs per the wg recommendations at the interim

IETF Speermint Working Group

Session Peering Policies and Draft's Annex A

Goals:

- **Describe the types of policy information that needs to be discovered or exchanged between peers**

- **Position the discussion on "what" information is needed rather than focusing on the "how"**

- **Identify the things that can break calls due to lack of protocol interoperability**

Content of Annex A

- **IP Network Connectivity**
- **Media session parameters**
  - Codecs for audio, video, real time text, instant messaging media sessions
  - Modes of communications for audio - IM
  - Media transport
- **SIP**
  - SIP RFCs, methods and error responses
  - headers and header values
  - possibly, list of SIP RFCs supported by groups (e.g. by call feature)
- **Accounting**
- **Performance Metrics**
- **Security**
  - Call admission control, call authorization
  - Network and transport layer security parameters
  - Media security parameters

Is this a good direction for the ID?
Should we continue and provide more details on some of these?

IETF Speermint Working Group

TLS Considerations for session peering

Goals

- **Provide details on how TLS could be deployed and used between 2 VSPs/ASPs to secure SIP exchanges**

- **Capture what two VSPs/ASPs should discuss and agree on in order to establish TLS connections for SIP session peering**

Content of Section 4.4.2.

1. **Peers SHOULD agree on one or more Certificate Authorities (CAs) to trust for securing session peering exchanges**

2. **Peers SHOULD indicate whether their domain policies require proxy servers to inspect and verify the identity provided in SIP requests**

3. **SIP servers involved in the secure session establishment over TLS MUST have valid X.509 certificates and MUST be able to receive a TLS connection on a well-known port.**

4. **List some TLS/SIP Protocol parameters SHOULD be agreed upon**

5. **Validation of TLS client certificates**

6. **All of this should be part of session policy discussions**

Adapt this section & security requirements based on threat analysis and recommended solutions? Comments on TLS considerations for speermint?

IETF Speermint Working Group

Thanks.
Other Feedback?

mailto:speermint@ietf.org

IETF Speermint Working Group