

SIPREC
draft-ietf-siprec-req-03
Requirements for
Media Recording using SIP

IETF 78.2 Interim meeting
Ken Rehor
on behalf of the team
12 Oct 2010

Draft authors: K. Rehor, A. Hutton, L. Portman, R. Jain, H. Lum

Agenda

- Draft -03
 - Updated -02 based on interim meeting (“78.1”)
- Open Issues and Public Comments
 - Continued and new items
- Next Steps

Draft -03: Fixed Items from 78.1

- Failure modes and handling
- Codec negotiation
- Pause/Resume
- Chat/IM/Text
- Sect 5, Use Case 4
- Req-005, -006: Recording Policy
- Req-022: Cancel a recording session
- Encryption keys (ticket #44)

(see Backup slides for details)

Open Issues and Public Comments

- DTMF
- REQ-023 – prevent recording
- REQ-024 – minor terminology
- Recording a Conference (ticket #43)
- Incremental delivery of metadata (ticket #46)
- Types of Media (ticket #45)
- Media Delays (ticket #
- Confidentiality, Integrity, Security, Authentication, Privacy requirements (ticket #35)

DTMF

- In-band audio
- Out-of-band: RFC2833
- As metadata?
 - It's really data, not metadata
- Added REQ-007bis1 and REQ-007bis2

Prevent Recording

- REQ-023 The mechanism **MUST** support a means for a SIP UA involved in a CS to request, prior to the start of recording, that the CS not be recorded Participant metadata.

→ Must this be a SIP UA?

Terminology

- REQ-024 The mechanism MUST provide a means of indicating to the end users of a Communication Session that the session in which they are participating is being recorded.

→ “Participants” rather than “end users”?

Recording a Conference

(ticket #43)

- Recording the view of a single participant versus recording the entire conference (including aspects that a given participant might not see)
- Participant metadata
 - Who's on the conference
 - Timing (join, leave, etc.)

<https://wiki.tools.ietf.org/wg/siprec/trac/ticket/43>

Incremental Delivery of Metadata

(ticket #46)

- Added new REQ
 - “The mechanism MUST provide a way for the SRC to convey any/all of the metadata to the SRS incrementally as it becomes known to the SRC over the course of the RS.”
- Not necessarily a 1:1 relationship between CS and RS
- → “The mechanism MUST provide a way for metadata to be conveyed to the SRS incrementally.”

<https://wiki.tools.ietf.org/wg/siprec/trac/ticket/46>

Media Delays (for use case 12)

(ticket #40)

- Minimum and maximum delay in streaming media from SRC to SRS, in the context of Use Case 12.

<https://wiki.tools.ietf.org/wg/siprec/trac/ticket/40>

Confidentiality, Integrity, Security, Authentication, Privacy (tracker #35)

- Very open-ended
- Can we utilize requirements in other specs?
- Security
- Authentication
 - How are permissions and identities managed?
- Privacy
 - Who has access to recordings?
 - How is access managed?
 - How can a user know they are being recorded?
 - How can they guarantee their recordings are managed according to their wishes (e.g. deleted)

<https://wiki.tools.ietf.org/wg/siprec/trac/ticket/35>

Security, Authentication

- Open tickets #35, 37:
- REQ-029 – security
<http://www.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/siprec/current/msg00451.html>
 - “Confidentiality, Integrity, Authentication”
- REQ-031 – SIP security model
 - “eavesdropping protection, authorization and authentication.”

Next Steps

- Resolve Open Issues and Public Comments
By ~~05 Oct 2010~~
15 Oct 2010?
- Publish next draft -03
~~05 Oct 2010~~
12 Oct 2010
- *Need to collect, prioritize, finalize requirements for security, etc.*
- Publish next draft -04
15 Oct 2010
- Final version for IETF 79
25 Oct 2010

Discussion

Backup

Publications

- draft-ietf-siprec-req-03 published Oct 11
- draft-ietf-siprec-req-02 published Sept 28
- draft-ietf-siprec-req-01 published Sept 01

Draft -03: Fixed Items from 78.1

- Failure modes and handling
- Codec negotiation
- Pause/Resume
- Chat/IM/Text
- Sect 5, Use Case 4
- Req-005, -006: Recording Policy
- Req-022: Cancel a recording session
- Encryption keys (#44)

Sect 5, Use Case 4

- "The recording session is a single RTP stream, therefore consists of a single offer/answer exchange. There may be mid-session RE-INVITE offer/answer exchanges for codec changes or for moving the RTP streams to handle failure scenarios."
- - Saying it is a single RTP stream might not work for multiple media. Perhaps "single RTP stream per medium"?
 - not quite right either...
- The first sentence is contradicted by the second sentence, which says that there can be further offer/answer exchanges.
- - Furthermore, this is getting too far into solution.
- I would suggest we delete these sentences.
- **→ fixed**

Section 5, used case 4:

- "A Recording Session records continuously without interruption."
- Yes, but only as long as there are media to record. It will clearly stop recording when not receiving any media.
- → ***Should it record silence during those periods?***
- → ***must be able to reproduce the conversation***

- ***Silent periods must be reproduced upon playback (e.g. by recording the silent period, by not recording the silent periods but marking them as metadata for a player to utilize, etc.)***

Section 5, use case 4:

- "Call details and metadata will still be signaled, but can be correlated to the recorded media."
 - Why "post-correlated"? Why can't they be correlated at the time?
 - yes
- "however this may be on a permanent filter-type basis, such as based on a SIP AoR of an agent that is always recorded."
 - This presumably is referring to correlation, but I don't understand it, particular the expression "filter-type basis".
- → remove this wording

REQ-006 (and -005)

- “The mechanism MUST support establishing Recording Sessions from the SRS to the SRC (SRS initiates recording). This requirement typically applies when the decision about whether a session should be recorded or not resides in the SRS.”
 - Do we really need this? We have decided it is the policy server that decides, and of course the policy server can be collocated with the SRS. This doesn't necessarily mean the SRS establishes the session. The policy server instructs the SRC to record and the SRC establishes the session. In fact, I could also question why we need REQ-005. Both REQ-005 and REQ-006 seem to be solution.
 - [*<krehor>*] *Generally agree but let's discuss...*
 - **→ Deleted as per discussion**

Metadata in/out of SIP dialog

- [JE] This is calling for two separate mechanisms. I am sure we must have discussed this in the past, but do we really want to make interoperability harder by having two mechanisms?
- → General question of whether we want to specify this detail in requirements doc or not

REQ-022 – Cancel Recording

- REQ-022: The mechanism MUST support a means to cancel and discard the recording and associated metadata for a Communication Session.
- REQ-022b: The mechanism MUST support a means to cancel and discard the recording but not the associated metadata for a Communication Session.
- → Fixed

Encryption Keys

(ticket #44)

- Updated REQ-031 and REQ-32
- Same keys for CS and RS
- Different keys for CS and RS

- Item will be closed

<https://wiki.tools.ietf.org/wg/siprec/trac/ticket/44>

Deferred to Version 2

- SRS initiated recording (tracker #
- Media transcoding (tracker #4)
- Zero-media-loss failover