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Instead of calling the capability indications "feature caps", we should call them "feature capability indicators".
PROPOSAL

• Replace ”feature cap” with ”feature capability indicator”

• Header field name unchanged
• ABNF unchanged
• Change does not impact what is sent on the wire
As the feature-cap in the ABNF is defined as a header field parameter, should it have some representation in the IANA SIP header field parameter table?

Feature-Cap:*;+g.myfeature
Feature-Cap:*;+g.yourfeature=x
IANA SIP header field parameter table addition:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Header Field</th>
<th>Parameter Name</th>
<th>Predefined Values</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feature-Caps</td>
<td>&lt;feature-cap&gt;*</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>[xxx]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*<feature-cap>* denotes parameter names conforming to the syntax defined in [xxx]. Valid feature-cap are registered in [reference to the new feature-cap registries].
THANK YOU!