

SIPREC Protocol (draft-ietf-siprec-protocol-08)

November 8, 2012

IETF 85

Authors: L. Portman, H. Lum, A. Johnston, A. Hutton, C. Eckel

Since last meeting

- 2 revisions to address comments from last meeting
 - Draft-ietf-siprec-protocol-07
 - Most changes are here
 - Draft-ietf-siprec-protocol-08
 - Editorial fixes

Changes (1)

- Reorganize major headings
 - Section 6 - SIP Handling
 - Procedures at SRC, SRS, record-aware UA
 - Section 7 - SDP Handling
 - Procedures at SRC, SRS, record-aware UA
 - Section 8 - RTP/RTCP Handling
 - Section 9 - Metadata

Changes (2)

- Added new text in security section
- Addressed all discussion points from last meeting

New normative statements on security

- SRC and SRS MUST support SIP with TLS and MAY support SIPS with TLS
- RS SHOULD be at least as secure as CS
- SRC and SRS MUST implement TLS mutual authentication
- SRC and SRS MUST support RTP/SAVP and RTP/SAVPF
- SRC MUST secure SDP with SDP Security Descriptions
- SRC MUST negotiate a different security key than the one being used in the CS, ...
- ... metadata SHOULD be protected at the transport level by SIPS/TLS

Comments so far (1)

- **Avoid the words mute/unmute in section**

7.1.1.1:

"... when a CS stream is mute/unmuted, this information is conveyed in the metadata by the SRC. The SRC SHOULD NOT modify the media stream with a=inactive for mute since this operation is reserved for pausing the RS media."

- **Suggest to change to:**

"Note that when a CS stream's direction is changed, for example to inactive, this information is conveyed in the metadata by the SRC. The SRC SHOULD NOT in this case change the RS media stream direction since this operation is reserved for pausing the RS media."

Comments (2)

- Support for m= lines
 - Do we need normative statements about what SRS needs to support in terms of multiple m= lines?
 - Is it an implementation issue if SRS rejects unmixed media streams but the SRC cannot mix media streams?