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Going, going, gone?

• In WGLC at the moment
• Some list discussion, some private correspondence
  – Bad dates
  – “canon” or something else
  – PAI: baseline or an extension
  – Diversion
  – Housekeeping
Bad dates

• How to respond when a Date header is stale
  – Signature is valid, Date is bad
  – Could send, like, a 400 Bad Request with an appropriate reason phrase
    • Really, this is
  – Could make up a new status code
    • Better chance it could be repaired

• Remember some Dates changed in transit
  – If you do that, you are bad and you should feel bad
“canon” or something else

• Some last minute concerns about “canon”
  – Does SIP really even carry a PASSporT object?
    • Or just the data needed to let a verifier make one
• Two other paths:
  – Should we always include the whole PASSporT?
    • Some list discussion
  – If not, should we use the baseline RFC7515 Appendix F mechanism?
    • Seems to only let us omit the claims, not the header
• Whatever we do, we need some motivation text
  – And at least one solid “canon” example
PAI as an extension?

• Today, “orig” can come from From or PAI
  – If PAI is in the request, take it from PAI
• One implementer commented that this might be better as a “ppt” extension
  – It would be explicit then rather than
  – Just have an extra claim for PAI, so we’d cover both it and the From
• Why not?
  – Our motto: any environment where you send PAI knows to use PAI already – 4474bis reflects that
• My proposal: no change
Diversion

• Got one comment about how to handle forwarding and other cases where the effective “To” changes
  – A known limitation in the mechanism
  – In baseline SIP, of course, the Request-URI changes, not the To

• But, this is still worth thinking about
  – Could conceivably have a “ppt” extension
  – Add a new ppt Identity header with an OCN field
    • Possibly even chainable a la History-Info
Housekeeping

- Should we add a terminology section?
- Got some good nits from Olle