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Agenda

• Changes from -04 to -05
• Comments from the List
• Next Steps
Changes from Draft -04 to -05

• Updates in response to reviewers of the draft
  – Thanks to reviewers Martin Dolly and Shida Shubert
  – Section 4.1 - Syntax for UUI Header Field
    • Clarification of descriptive text in section 4.1 to match support for individual or multiple “User-to-User” header elements in syntax
    • UAs SHOULD ignore UUI data from packages or encoding that they do not understand.
    • Include guidelines and example for a re-direction use case
      – Note: example had error in using “purpose” which is now replaced by “package”
        » Will be changed in next version
  – Section 5 – Guidelines for UUI Packages
    • Clarify rules on what packages may define related to encodings and contents
  – Section 7 – Security Considerations
    • Clarifies that normal SIP mechanisms such as History Info can be used to track the identity for the inserter of UUI data
Discussion on the List
Hex Encoding

• Requests on clarification of rules for Hex Encoding
  – Comment from Thomas Belling that one implementation of UUI restricts use of hex characters to upper case
  – Response on list from several people that earlier drafts have always supported either lower or upper cases support for hex encoding
  – Thomas and Paul Kyzivat came back with proposals on text

• Proposal for the text
  – Proposal from Thomas on suggested text on March 13
    • Also create a separate section 4.X
    • Text is acceptable to the authors
      – Would create section 4.2
  – If agreed, can be added to the next draft
  – Can also be reviewed on the list
Discussion on the List
Section 4.1 Comments

• Comments from Celine Serrut-Valette:
  – Question on use of “purpose” in 4.1 example
    • Now should be “package” based on prior agreements
  – Suggested multiple “User-to-User” header fields MAY be present in a request or response, containing uui-data for the same or for different packages
    • Authors agree with this point
Discussion on the List
General

• Keith Drage comments on 3/27:
  – Section 1 – Edit to clean up distinctions between what is in mechanism draft vs. separate packages such as ISDN
  – Editorial:
    • Several places where “uui header field” needs to be replaced by “user-to-user header field”
  – Suggestion to add new section on compatibility and extendibility
  – Section 4 – Clarify whether the content in a package is the default or a new content value
    • Proposal for text such as: "If not present, the content MUST be assumed to be unknown as it is in the ISDN UUI Service. Newly defined UUI packages MUST define a new ‘content’ value."
    • Authors propose:
      “If the content header field is not present, the content MUST be assumed to be unknown. Newly defined UUI packages MUST define a new ‘content’ value.”
Next Steps

• Prepare updated draft to address comments
• Adjust draft based on agreements from this meeting (and review on list)
• Further alignment with ISDN Package draft (if needed)
• WGLC Timing?