

End-to-End Session-ID

draft-ietf-insipid-session-id

IETF-89

London, March 4, 2014

James Polk



Diffs (-02 to -05)

- **-02 to -03 :**
 - No changes (Only to avoid draft expiration).
- **-03 to -04 :**
 - Implemented the backwards compatibility mechanism agreed to in Vancouver.
 - No comments received.
- **-04 to -05 :**
 - Addressed pending review feedback (Paul Kyzivat and Brett Tate). [Note: some pending items remain].
 - Most editorial changes and document organization.

Follow-Up on BT's Comments

- 1XX responses broken into two classes (wrt to Session ID):
 - Those that have reached an endpoint, and
 - Those that have not reached an endpoint
- Those that have not, cannot return anything other than a null local-uuid
 - We don't want to split the section on which type of SIP intermediary the SIP request has reached, do we?
 - *Proposal – we keep the split text in wrt to the type of provisional response it is*

Follow-Up on PK's Comments

- Why can't cascading MCUs respond with {M',M'}?
 - This is broken because *any* UUID MUST be unique through space and time, so having (say) MCU-2 respond with the same UUID as MCU-1 (in the same transaction no less) is a violation of the spirit of uniqueness.
 - *Proposal – stick with the text in Section 9.6; but probably need to articulate that this does not apply when an MCU is propagating the conference's UUID.*

Open Issues (#1)

- **Section 9.3 (Basic Call Transfer using reINVITE) :**
 - Standard SIP signaling does not use an INVITE to perform a call transfer. However, it is common for PBX systems to perform a transfer "behind the scenes" wherein a REFER is not consistently utilized.
 - *Do we drop the example or do we need further explanatory text?*
 - *Proposal - it's informative text in an example (only), and it's how a LOT of systems using SIP do call transfer (mostly enterprises)*

Open Issues (#2)

- **Section 9.9 (Session ID in an out-of-dialog REFER Transaction) :**
 - In this section, we use $\{X,Y\}$ as the Session-ID related to the OOD REFER exchange. This ensures that the exchange is treated as a distinct session.
 - *Do we want that? Or do we want to consider such exchanges to be part of the same session and re-use $\{A,B\}$?*
 - *Proposal - better as $\{A',B'\}$ or $\{X',Y'\}$ because of the rule 'different dialog ID, different Session ID'...*
 - *[Note: Also need to fix label for Figure 10]*

Open Issues (#3)

- **Section 11 (Security Considerations) :**
 - IESG Review of Session-ID Requirements draft confirms we need to beef up the security considerations, especially privacy-related concerns.
 - *Can we (as a group) enumerate the security (and privacy) issues that might arise through the use of the Session-ID?*
 - *Proposal – Editors will offer preliminary text, but need WG to offer additional suggestions/text on-list.*

Next Steps

- What's next?
- To finish we need...
 - a robust Security Cons section
 - do last editorial bits
 - wait till IETF91 to ask for publication because it's a very beautiful place [or so a little birdy told me ... ;-)]

Backup Slides

Transfer Call w/ OOD REFER

Session ID	Bob	Alice	Carol
{A,N}	<-----INVITE-----		
{B,A}	-----200 OK----->		
{A,B}	<-----ACK-----		
{B,A}	--INVITE {hold}---->		
{A,B}	<-200 OK-----		
{B,A}	--- ACK ----->		
{X,N}	--REFER----->	(Refer-To:Carol)	
{Y,X}	<-202 Accepted-----		
{Y,X}	<NOTIFY {100 Trying}		
{X,Y}	-200 OK----->		
{A,N}		--INVITE----->	
{C,A}		<-200 OK-----	
{A,C}		---ACK----->	
{A,B}	<--NOTIFY {200 OK}--		
{B,A}	---200 OK----->		
{B,A}	--BYE----->		
{A,B}	<-200 OK-----		
{C,A}		<-----BYE-----	
{A,C}		-----200 OK->	