

The use of the SIPS URI Scheme in SIP

draft-ietf-sip-sips-05

François Audet - audet@nortel.com

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