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Caveats

Yeah, the disclaimers:

• This is NOT an official SIP Forum contribution

• This is NOT an official company or any other position statement

• Just an attempt to get some discussion …

• From just a guy who happened to be involved with work in the Tech WG at the time …

• All opinions, mistakes and dumb ideas are mine …
State of things

- SF Tech WG chartered to create interop spec for SIP Phones

- Scope:
  - Define configuration guidelines, feature set descriptions and interoperability guidelines for SIP endpoints
  - Apply existing SIP standards… not develop new ones
  - Work with IETF SIP / SIPPING / BLISS etc, complementary efforts
  - Produce one or more recommendations that require implementation of a broad range of SIP-related RFCs

- Sordid history:
  - Originally charted early ‘06 … languished
  - Re-started April ’07
  - Some initial progress – document shell defined, some content coming in place (specifically on SIP call features)
  - Then … all went silent again, late July ‘07 (lead, Larry Schessel, moved on)
Rough approach taken

**Groupings of “feature sets”**
- Basic / core SIP
- Configuration
- Security
- Media
- Telephony / call features
  - Basic
  - Business
  - Advanced
- Instant Messaging
- Presence
- etc …

**Within each, define**
- Minimum required support
  - Specific RFCs / sections, constraints
- Recommended support
  - “this would be even better”
- Prohibitions
  - “DON’T do this”
- Specific methods as initiator for individual features
  - “if initiating feature X, do exactly this”
- **Suite** of methods to support as receiver of a category of features
  - “if support features like X, Y, Z, be able to receive & handle all of these”

**Intent:**
- Set user / purchaser / deployer expectations on some basic feature groupings
- Enable clear, precise interop methods for defined features
- Do not inhibit innovation for new features within vague sets
So, now what?!

Some open questions and issues to discuss:

- Does the SF SIP Phone Interop Spec effort still seem worthwhile?
- Is it useful to further define things IETF is not able (or not willing) to specify, e.g.
  - SIP “profiles” (sets of RFCs corresponding to sets of functions)
  - Specific feature operation (detailed descriptions within BLISS guidelines)
  - Pieces of the puzzle outside of IETF (layer 2 functions, audio performance, etc)
- Is there too much overlap with BLISS efforts, or does it need to wait for BLISS to progress?
- Are there other bodies already doing this, in a position to succeed?