
Speermint

Requirements on mechanisms for SIP session peering

draft-ietf-speermint-requirements-03

IETF 70 - Monday Dec 3 2007

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

IETF Speermint Working Group

Agenda

- **Changes in draft-03**
- **Any other Feedback**

Changes in draft-03

<http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-speermint-requirements-03>

- **Revised intended status and scope of the document**
 - Doc is now targetted as Informational
 - Scope is on requirements that enable the wg use case scenarios
 - » Change based on feedback received from John Elwell and Jon Peterson
- **Partially reworked Section 3 on requirements**
 - See requirements #1 through #8 based on consolidated use cases
 - Left other sections unchanged for now
 - » If this new direction is inline with what the wg wants, next revision will be published in January 2008 and be ready for more reviews

Open Issues (1)

- **Comments from Otmar Lendl**

- Need more clarity in the use of terminology indirect vs. assisted peering
 - » Based on updated terminology-ID, will be fixed in draft-04
- Other editorial nits

- **Comments from John Elwell**

- Needs to advertize ingress SBEs (signaling)
 - » E.g. putting NAPTR+SRV records in SSP domain name a la RFC 3263 is a way of advertising ingress points
- Needs to advertize SDEs (media elements)
 - » For debate
 - » SSPs would like to know where media is going to flow from/to for traffic engineering considerations and to optimize routing of media traffic
 - » May not be a requirement for all types of SSPs (enterprise, user groups) and all types of SIP exchanges (IM) but it is something done in today SIP interconnects for VoIP traffic

Thanks.
Other Feedback?

<mailto:speermint@ietf.org>