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Agenda

• draft-ietf-siprec-req-04
  – Items fixed during interim meeting ("78.2") and discussion on mailing list

• Today: Open Issues and Public Comments
  – Continued and new items

• Next Steps
  – Items to be resolved
  – Publication schedule
**Draft -04: Fixed Items from 78.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ticket</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reduce user cases to manageable set</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Media codec negotiation</td>
<td>Already part of SIP. Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Do we need REQ-008 on failover?</td>
<td>Removed as per discussion on mailing list. Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Do we need REQ-009 on rejection?</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Do we need REQ-010 on redirection?</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Do we need REQ-030 on identifying a session as an RS?</td>
<td>Based on discussion on the mailing list, REQ is retained but reworded in draft-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Is REQ-032 on different keys needed?</td>
<td>Accepted/closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Lack of requirements on types of media to be covered</td>
<td>Updated REQ-008 in -04 to include DTMF (as defined by [RFC4733]).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Incremental delivery of metadata</td>
<td>Added REQ-025 to draft-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Delete REQ-031 concerning use of same key?</td>
<td>Removed REQ-031 but kept REQ-032 in draft-04 as per discussion on mailing list and for tracker ticket #47.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Open Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ticket</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Definitions of Pause/Resume and REQ-015/016</td>
<td>To be discussed today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Delete REQ-050? (authorization)</td>
<td>To be discussed today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Privacy requirements</td>
<td>To be discussed today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Clarification of REQ-029 on security</td>
<td>Security sections were expanded and restructured in -04. To be discussed today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Requirements for recording a conference</td>
<td>Additional definition required (to be discussed if time permits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Media delays for Use Case 12</td>
<td>Additional definition required (to be discussed if time permits)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pause/Resume definition proposal

• Pause: The action of temporarily discontinuing the transmission or collection of RS media

• Resume: The action of recommencing the transmission or collection of RS media

⇒ Recommend accepting this change to permit flexibility of deployments.

• Rational: Since we already have good definitions of CS and RS, and those definitions explain the relationship between CS and RS, we should be able to make the definition for Pause/Resume simple, refer it to RS only, and leverage the definitions already provided for CS and RS. Also, this keeps the definition of Pause/Resume focused on the context of the RS, not the CS or Playback.

• The purpose of a Pause of a recording is to temporarily discontinue the collection of CS media, typically for security reasons, and could be implemented by either temporarily discontinuing the SRC media transmissions or by temporarily discontinuing SRS media collection (depending on particular user needs). REQ-015 and REQ-016 support this notion.

– DS 28 Oct 2010
REQ-050 Authorization

- REQ-050 The mechanism SHALL allow only authorized SRC/SRS to initiate a recording session.

- Does the mechanism needs to do anything to support authorization?

- Internal matter for the SRC and/or the SRS.

- Difference SRC->SRS vs. SRS->SRC?

- Do we need this requirement?

- Even if we need this, is authorization a policy issue?

- Is it out of scope for this release?
Privacy: Scope

• Should SIPREC govern privacy of recorded media or metadata?

• Where would the rule-maker reside: with the SRC, with the SRS, elsewhere?

• What would be the nature of the rules?

⇒ This would be a huge undertaking. Recommend deferring to a future release

• Example: GEOPRIV uses a privacy mechanism that involves associating rules with location information, these rules governing the further distribution and use of the location information.
Privacy: Indicate Recording Reason

• New Requirement proposal:  
  (Alissa Cooper 8 Nov 2010)
  
  “The mechanism MUST provide a means of indicating to the participants involved in a CS the purpose for which their session is being recorded.”

• How would we standardize a set of purposes?
  – Very open-ended list of purposes
  – Add indication to SIP signaling?

⇒ Recommend to *not* include this
Privacy: Request to clarify scope

• Is SIPREC only to be used when all call participants have been informed that the session is being recorded?
  – Use cases already describe ‘known’ recording
  – Lawful intercept is already out of scope (last paragraph of introduction)
  – *REQ-023 states: Authorized participants can request no recording…*
  – *REQ-024 states: The mechanism MUST provide a means of indicating recording…*
  – Even if we make it mandatory to implement, not necessarily mandatory to deploy.

⇒ Recommend no change in scope
Confidentiality, Integrity, Security, Authentication, Privacy

- Open ticket #35: REQ-029 – security
  - “Confidentiality, Integrity, Authentication”

- REQ-031 – SIP security model
  - “eavesdropping protection, authorization and authentication."

- Expanded REQ-029, -031 into new sections
- Additional review & discussion of those reqs.
Recording a Conference (ticket #43)

• Recording the view of a single participant versus recording the entire conference (including aspects that a given participant might not see)

• Participant metadata
  – Who’s on the conference
  – Timing (join, leave, etc.)

https://wiki.tools.ietf.org/wg/siprec/trac-ticket/43
Media Delays (for use case 12)  
(ticket #40)

- Minimum and maximum delay in streaming media from SRC to SRS, in the context of Use Case 12.

- Timing relationship of RS media vs. CS media
- inform on delay?
- Know real time (wall clock time) when media originated?

https://wiki.tools.ietf.org/wg/siprec/trac/ticket/40
### Next Steps: To Do in Draft -05

**Resolved during mailing list discussions:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ticket</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Deletion of REQ-072</td>
<td>To be fixed in -05.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>REQ-060 / 061 on integrity</td>
<td>To be fixed in -05.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Deletion of REQ-073</td>
<td>To be fixed in -05.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Definitions of Pause/Resume and REQ-015/016</td>
<td>To be discussed today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Delete REQ-050? (authorization)</td>
<td>To be discussed today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Privacy requirements</td>
<td>To be discussed today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Clarification of REQ-029 on security</td>
<td>Expanding security, etc. in – draft-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Requirements for recording a conference</td>
<td>Additional definition required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Media delays for Use Case 12</td>
<td>Additional definition required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps

• Resolve Open Issues and Public Comments  By 22 Nov 2010

• Publish draft-05  29 Nov 2010
Discussion