

Status of draft-ietf-cuss-sip-uui-05

James Rafferty and Alan Johnston

IETF 83

CUSS WG

March 30, 2012

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 identify 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?