

INFO Framework

Eric Burger

Hadriel Kaplan

Christer Holmberg

Easier Stuff

- Change log is in an appendix to the text
- Wording clarifications from Arun Arunachalam, John Elwell, Adam Roach, Jonathan Rosenberg
 - UAS/UAC, better offer/offer, crisp dialog, etc.
- Why is there as send-info set?
 - UAS gets chance to chose preferential Info Packages
 - Sending and receiving are definitely distinct implementations
 - Receiving a package does not mean I can send it
 - Any reason not to have a send-info set?

Moderate Stuff

- Allow Contact: in INFO? Probably not. Editor's bug.
- send/recv-info headers in INFO?
 - Probably not.
 - Do not want INFO to renegotiate parameters. Yes?
- What to do with subsequent requests with no send/recv-info?
 - Use existing set? Saves bytes; session timer code can be INFO-ignorant
 - Cancel existing set? Burns bytes, but always works (i.e., 3pcc)
- Case sensitivity in INFO Package names?
 - Current text says Yes – case sensitive
 - Any reason not to be case sensitive?

Harder Items

- Specification strength for packages
 - Specification Required?
 - RFC2434 says this means one can find a specification somewhere
 - Specification does NOT have to be an RFC
 - Alternative is First Come First Served
- Option Tags
 - Media tags? E.g., sip.extension
 - SIP Option Tags? E.g., Require: INFO

Hardest Item: Multiple INFO bodies in single INFO

Pro

- Info Packages are Modern SIP Implementations
 - MUST handle multipart MIME if you are RFC3261-compliant
- Handling multipart means you have to parse body to find Info Package
- Finding Info Package once means you can find more than one

Con

- Lazy implementations that would do Info Packages but not full RFC 3261 will barf on receiving a multipart
 - Real problem; theory versus practice
- Perceived easier to implement
- Disallowing multiple Info Packages means one can conflate application-level responses with SIP responses, saving bytes and messages