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• draft-ietf-sipcore-proxy-feature-reqs-01
  – New requirements added
    • New Req-5
    • New Req-9
    • Additional clarification text to Req-4 and Req-5
    • Editorial changes
  – NUTSHELL: Making it more clear that an entity inserting a feature support indication one must not assume that other entities support the indicated feature, or even support the feature support indication mechanism as such.
• **draft-ietf-sipcore-proxy-feature-reqs-02** (October ’11)
  – New requirements added
    • New Req-12
    • New use-case
  – **NUTSHELL**: Clarifying that it must be possible to determine which features/capabilities are supported by the same proxy

• No additional comments on the requirements since -02 was submitted.
PROPOSAL TO THE WG

- AGREE, AND FINISH THE WORK ON, THE REQUIREMENTS
Feature-Caps

IETF#82, Taipei, Taiwan

draft-holmberg-sipcore-proxy-feature-02

Christer.Holmberg@ericsson.com
Ivo.Sedlacek@ericsson.com
H(adriel.)Kaplan@acmepacket.com
NUTSHELL

• New SIP header field, implementing the requirements of draft-ietf-sipcore-proxy-feature-02, by allowing SIP entities to indicate supported features/capabilities using feature tags.

• (Similar to RFC 3840 mechanism for SIP UAs)

“*I CAN do this.*”

“I HAVE DONE THIS”  “I WANT YOU TO DO THIS”
CHARACTERISTICS

• Can be used to indicate/re-indicate features supported for a SIP **dialog**
• Can be used to indicate/re-indicate features supported for a SIP **registration**
• Can be used to indicate supported features per **direction**
  – Not copied from requests into responses by UAS
• Feature support indications using **feature tags**
• **Multiple** header field instances allowed
  – An entity can insert its own header field
  – Allows to see how supported features are grouped among entities
• By default does not indicate which entity, just **an entity**
COMMENTS: New vs existing header field

• COMMENT
  – Use a separate header field in the first place
    • Previously existing header fields were used (Path, Record-Route, Route, Service-Route)
      – Direction problem
      – Used for routing

• SUGGESTION
  – New header field (Feature-Caps)
COMMENTS: Terminology

• COMMENT
  – We should not talk about proxies and UAs, as in most cases the entities using the mechanism are going to be something in between
    • E.g. B2BUA that inserts Record-Route

• SUGGESTION
  – Do not talk about proxies and UAs
  – Talk about entities “not represented by the Contact header field”
COMMENTS: Option-tag vs feature tag

• COMMENT
  – Use option-tag based mechanism instead of feature tag

• SUGGESTION
  – Do not use option-tag
    • The current use-cases do not define new SIP extensions
    • Mechanism is not to be used for mandating other entities to support features
    • Mechanism should allow IETF to ensure that protocol is not broken or misused (expert review)
COMMENTS: IANA and feature tags

• COMMENT
  – How can we make sure that IANA registrations for feature tags, intended to be used with Feature-Caps, contain enough information (e.g. reference to document describing procedures)?
    • Feature tag registry does not mandate reference as part of registration
      – Direction problem
      – Used for routing
        » Different semantics, and SBC “sensitive”

• SUGGESTION
  – Spec specifies information that needs to be provided for a feature tag to be used in a Feature-Caps header field
  – Asking IANA for guidance
PROPOSAL TO THE WG

1. AGREE TO START WORK ON PROTOCOL MECHANISM

2. ADOPT draft-holmberg-proxy-feature AS STARTING POINT FOR THE PROTOCOL MECHANISM
THANK YOU FOR LISTENING!