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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 a send-info set?
  - UAS gets chance to choose 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