

DISPATCH, Monday, IETF 92 MINUTES

Monday, March 2015, 13:00-15:00

Chairs: Mary Barnes, Cullen Jennings

Notetakers: Roni Even and Dan Burnett

Jabber Scribe: Ted Hardie

Meetcho recording: [http://recordings.conf.meetecho.com/Playout/watch.jsp?
recording=IETF92_DISPATCH&chapter=chapter_0](http://recordings.conf.meetecho.com/Playout/watch.jsp?recording=IETF92_DISPATCH&chapter=chapter_0)

Summary:

Routing Out of Dialog Request: There is general agreement that there is a problem to be solved, but there is no agreement on the solution. The author should revise the document to include a more precise problem statement and remove the solution (for now).

CNIT: There is interest in working on this. A revised charter is needed. The charter should be more clear about the problem statement and should not necessarily state that the solution will be a new SIP header.

VRS: There was weak support within the WG to continue to refine the problem statement. The document should focus on the problem and not the solution.

GeoJSON: There is some interest in the WG in this work, however, it's not yet ready to be dispatched. A charter is required and it needs to be specific as to how it does and doesn't relate to existing IETF work (e.g., GEOPRIV).

== Andrew Allen, "Routing Out of Dialog Request" =
Document: draft-allen-dispatch-routing-out-of-dialog-request-01

More discussion may be needed. Some believe there may already be solutions to this. There are also disagreements about how much this will be implemented.

= Richard Shockey, "Calling name identity Trust (CNIT)" =
Charter: <http://www.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/cnit/current/msg00178.html>

Brian Rosen argued that some form of data validation has to be listed as within scope in the charter.

Others have questioned how this work is different from STIR, how much needs to be done via IETF standards (and SIP in particular), etc.

Summary: There is work to be done in this space, but the problem is not yet well enough defined to charter a group.

5 or six hands went up to help Rich with doing this.

= Brian Rosen, "VRS" =

Document: draft-kyzivat-dispatch-trs-call-info-purpose-01

There seem to be questions about whether this is our problem since it was engendered by the default VRS provider having the IP address but not being willing to legally assert location of the source user since they aren't receiving payment.

Cullen points out that the callinfo header is often removed by SBCs, so it might be worth adding a new one.

Preference is to do this in SIPCORE.

Bernard points out that this could be a broader issue.

Keith thinks this is motivated by US regulations only and, if so, is not appropriate.

Adam Roach says this cannot go to SIPCORE without changing the charter for SIPCORE.

Summary decision: There is rough agreement (7 in favor, 2 against) to refine the problem statement, in the form of a charter, to be sent again to DISPATCH.

= Erik Wilde, "GeoJSON" =

Charter: <https://github.com/geojson/draft-geojson/blob/master/charter.md>

Document: draft-butler-geojson

Jon Peterson said that privacy of the format will have to be considered.

Summary: Authors will continue working on the charter and an eventual vote on the list for creation of a new WG.

Chairs Status

RFC 5727 – what to do with dispatch process

Keith: move to historic and rely on charter

John P:

Jonathan Lennox; need to see what to do with dispatch and apparea WG

Routing Out of Dialog Request

Slide 1

Slide 2 Problem

Slide 3 Potential solutions

Slide 4 new SIP header field

Slide 5 new rr-param

Slide 6 new URI parm in record route uri

Slide 7 new feature-capability indicator

Slide 8 embed Route in the contact URI

Slide 9 option tag

Slide 10 way forward

Adam : scope question just about dialog reuse. Agrees that need to address but thinks that do not need new protocol elements. Just information

Andrew: open to new options for solution.

John P : it is a policy issue

Mary: there is a problem that needs working on but do not agree on the solution.

Action: new revision with the problem and no solution

Calling name identity Trust (CNIT)

Slide 1 –

Martin Dolly it is broken when third party cache CNAM.

Slide 2 – how to proceed

John P – there is a problem but the slide is not only about charter (what headers to use...) , need to agree on the problem and the solution space. Need to say what is the problem and use cases, the states use cases are too narrow

Martin Dolly : talked about other foras mentioned and the work they are doing.

Brian Rosen: need to make the name valid. Need to define how to validate the names otherwise the transport solution is not important. Need to be in the charter

Richard: valid problem that need decision , need to charter. Need to clarify the problem and name validation should be in the charter.

Cullen asked : 5-6 people are going to help Richard with building the charter.

VRS – Brian for Paul K

Video relay service

Slide 1 – context

Slide 2 – FCC constrains

Requires deaf's user public IP address in the US

Slide 3 why signal the IP address

The user can chose a VRS realy provider directly but the chosen provider need the IP address for billing the FCC (US address)

Rest of slides about solution

Cullen: call-info may be stripped by SBCs

Richard: do we need a WG;

Brian: need to see registration requirements based on solution.

Keith: why solve for one national administrator, do we solve for any national administrator

Christer: is this just for VRS (scope) (sending the IP address).

Brian: in the solution VRS is an example

Bernard: it is a broader problem also for emergency services

Ted: if this is a general solution need to describe the security issues and how they are addressed.

Chairs: how many would like to see the IETF solve this problem (considering the IETF privacy concerns and the international IETF concerns not a US specific).

Chairs: should we continue working in refining the problem. – Preference for this

Chairs: bring again to dispatch with clearer problem – this maybe the proposed charter.

GeoJSON

John P : IETF had concerns in the past about sending location without addressing the privacy issues.

Brian: concern about another solution to the one that exists and used with emergency location.

Cullen: it is a description and not how to disclose.

Brian; still concerned since can be used for disclosing location.

Richard Barnes: to John, there are now solutions to address privacy. To Brian about interoperability, I am not worried about it.

Brian: This is a concern for the charter, not against.

Cullen as chair: looks like interest to continue, also look at change control.