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Status

• Since draft-ietf-sip-sips-02, 3 iterations of the working group document

• Almost went WGLC on draft-ietf-sip-sips-04…
  – …but “transport=tls” issue delayed it

• Completed Working Group last call comments on draft-ietf-sip-sips-05 just after July 16th
Major Changes since -02

- Proposed Standard (not Informational)
- Updates RFC 3261 (and RFC 3608)
- Deprecated last hop exception completely
- Added two error codes, 418 “SIPS Not Allowed” and 419 “SIPS Required”
- RFC 3261 Bugs fixes Appendix B has been added
- The re-instatement of the “transport=tls” or something similar, has been added to the Annex on “Future Steps in Specification”
WGLC Comments

• Editorial/clarification from John Elwell, Attila Sipos & Hans Persson
  – Will all be addressed in draft-ietf-sip-sips-06

• Error Codes

• Double Record-Routing
WGLC Comments: Error Codes

• Status Quo:
  – Keep 2 error codes, 418 “SIPS Not Allowed” and 419 “SIPS Required”
  – PROS:
    • No additional headers
  – CONS:
    • 2 error codes
    • Not applicable to URIs other than SIP and SIPS

• Attila’s Proposals:
  – One Error Code only (418 “URI Scheme Not Allowed”)
  – Allow-URI: sip (instead of 418)
  – Require-URI: sips (instead of 419)
  – PROS
    • Generalized to any URI scheme (e.g., sipsec, etc.), and thus future proof
  – CONS
    • 2 new headers
WGLC Comments: Double Record-Routing

• Adam Roach:
  – section 3.3.2 basically say: “If you implement this specification, you are explicitly forbidden from doing the following procedure, which is now explained in enough detail to implement”
  – Delete 3.3.2

• The author agrees with Adam