



SIP CLF Problem Statement

Draft-ietf-sipclf-problem-statement-04

(V. K. Gurbani, E. Burger, T. Anjali, H. Abdelnur, and O. Festor)

Presenter: Peter Musgrave

IETF 79, Beijing, China

November 9, 2010

Changes since -03

- Example in S9 is now “representational-neutral”.
 - Could not put it in tabular format due to 72-character IETF I-D/RFC restriction, but the current format (hopefully) does not favor indexed-ASCII or ASCII approach.
- Took out artifacts such as “record size”, since they are more pertinent to a specific representation format.

Changes since -03

- Transport is now a field on the SIP CLF line itself (i.e., not saved twice as part of {Destination,Source}:port:xport.)
- Disaggregated previously aggregated fields:
 - CSeq is now two fields: CSeq-Method, Cseq-number.
 - Destination:port:xport is now two fields: Destination-address, Destination-port.
 - Source:port:xport is now two fields: Source-address, Source-port.

Changes since -03

- Disaggregated previously aggregated fields:
 - To is now To (URI) and To-tag.
 - From is now From (URI) and From-tag.
- No provisions for logging bodies anymore (list consensus.)
- Escaped characters logged as received.

Open issue 1 (of 2) in -03

- **OPEN ISSUE:** 4K limit on mandatory headers.
Where does this limit apply?
 - Each field in SIP CLF no more than 4K limit?
 - Or the entire SIP CLF record no more than 4K?

Open issue 2 (of 2) in -03

- **OPEN ISSUE:** Should the source/destination field:
 - ONLY hold a raw IP address?
 - ALLOWED to hold either a raw IP address or a DNS name?
- Discussion on mailing list produced no strong consensus.

Open issue 2 (of 2) in -03 (contd.)

- Pros of IP address only:
 - maps well to IPFIX primitive data type *ipv{4,6}address*.
 - if round-robin DNS is used, you know the specific IP address.
 - some deployments may not have DNS.
- Cons of IP address only:
 - Provides implicit advantage in representation to IPFIX through *ipv{4,6}address*.
 - relegates DNS names to an additional TLV tuple (extra implementation work.)
 - round-robin DNS is not widely used in SIP.

Open issue 2 (of 2) in -03 (contd.)

- Pros of allowing both:
 - Internet clients and servers are routinely coded to accept either IP address or DNS name.
 - DNS names are more readable than IP addresses.
 - Implementers choose what to use.
- Cons of allowing both:
 - SIPCLF reader has to be prepared to interpret field as IP address or DNS name. But, no big deal since Internet clients and servers routinely accept IP addresses or DNS names.

Next steps

- Resolve open issues.
- WGLC?

Thanks!