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What we want to achieve today

• Summarize current status.
• Discuss resolution of issues identified in -03 (as discussed at IETF-76).
• Discuss new issue identified post-IETF76.
• Document ready for WGLC.
Since IETF 76

- draft-barnes-sipcore-rfc4244bis-03 -> draft-ietf-sipcore-rfc4244bis-00
Changes from barnes-03 to sipcore-00

• Editorial changes including removal of some vestiges of tagging all entries (including the "aor" tag).
• Clarified privacy processing.
Issue resolution based on IETF-76 discussion

Additional text added to clarify that a service such as voicemail can be done in multiple ways. For example,

a) Forwarding the request to the mailbox for the first hi-targeted-to-uri in the History-Info header within the domain for which the processing entity is responsible (e.g., in a PBX environment).

b) Forward the request to the mailbox for the last hi-targeted-to-uri tagged with "mp" in the History-Info header (e.g., in a customer service environment).
Issues identified post IETF-76

Redirect server behavior broken:

– Redirect server *cannot* populate the HI header
  → Can't predict whether a request will be sent to specific target in the Contact header in 3xx.
Redirect Server Issue resolution

Solution:

1) Changed handling at redirect server to add a **new** URI parameter to the targets in Contact header returned in 3xx response - removed the functionality for redirect server to adding the History-Info entries (basically reverting to core RFC 4244 Processing)

2) URI parameter is added to all target URIs as they are determined → processing independent of whether the target list was populated from a 3xx response (section 16.5 of RFC 3261)

3) URI parameter is removed as History-Info header is constructed (section 16.6 of RFC 3261).
Other options considered

1) URI parameter only for “target” attribute (and revert History-Info to 4244 behavior):
   → More complex processing – information in two places. URI parameter can be lost as some entities remove URI parameters.

2) Include History-Info header with “target” attribute as a URI parameter:
   → obfuscates the information and information is more likely to be lost as some entities remove URI parameters.
Example

History-Info: <sip:bob@example.com>;index=1
History-Info: <sip:bob@192.0.2.3?Reason=SIP;cause=302>;index=1.1;rc
History-Info <sip:carol@example.com>;index=1.2;mp=1
History-Info: <sip:carol@192.0.2.4>;index=1.2.1;rc
History-Info: <sip:vm@example.com>;index=1.3;mp=1.2
History-Info: <sip:vm@192.0.2.5>;index=1.3.1
Way Forward

• Ready for WGLC.