SIP Profile Drafts

SIPPING WG 7 Nov. 2005 IETF 64 Vancouver

Dan Petrie dpetrie@SIPez.com

Map of SIP Profile Related Drafts

- draft-ietf-sipping-config-framework-07.txt Discovery, Transport and Notification of Profiles
- draft-petrie-sipping-profile-datasets-03.txt General Profile format and data set schema
- draft-petrie-sipping-sip-dataset-01.txt Data set properties common to most user agents
- draft-petrie-sipping-identity-dataset-00.txt User agent identities that maybe registered or use for initiating signalling
- draft-ietf-sipping-media-policy-dataset-00.txt Media and codec related data set properties
- draft-petrie-sipping-voip-features-dataset-00.txt SIP VoIP feature related properties: digit maps, call waiting, transfer

Objectives and Status of Data Set Drafts

- First round of properties scoping:
 - Minimal set of vender independent properties to deploy a SIP VoIP service
 - Scoped out UI related properties to avoid controversy
 - Scoped out most call handling related properties to avoid implementation differences and controversy
- Demonstrate merging is trivial in most cases
 - SIP Identity Properties: aggregate across all profiles
 - Call Waiting: first occurrence found in: device and user profile
 - Bandwidth: smallest value across all profiles

Overall Issues

- XML format specification language and approach?
 - XML Schema

or

- ABNF ala Webday
- Format requirements:
 - Small foot print parser for UAs with limited resources
 - Schema validation is NOT required in UA
 - Must allow extensions and vender specific properties

Identity Datasets Issues

- Add support for identity aliases?
 E.g. Incoming request URI mapping to identity
- Add a use Certs property?
 E.g. get Private key and cert for identity
- Add a disable identity use if registration fails property?
 e.g. disallow making calls with identity

NAT Traversal Dataset?

- Dataset for NAT/Firewall related properties
 - STUN
 - TURN server
 - Use ICE
 - Use Mapped IP address
 - HTTP proxy

Route Set Property Issue

Specify only one route hop

or

- Allow route set in each profile:
 - Route order specified by property attribute meaningful only within a single profile
 - Order across profiles specified by policy (e.g. local network profile hops first, device profile hops second, user profile hops last)

Going Forward

- What absolutely mandatory properties did we miss for this first round?
- Are we headed in the right direction?
- What are is the criteria for determining which profile data sets are work group items?