IETF

Re: [sipcore] Reuse of Sip Call-Id question..

Paul Kyzivat <pkyzivat@cisco.com> Tue, 09 June 2009 13:08 UTCShow header

```
Adam,

I will agree with you on this one.

Yet I want to emphasize the need for conservatism on the originating
side. I have repeatedly seen cases where somebody says on of:
- I can reuse the same callid because the from and to tags will
   make the dialog id unique
- I can reuse the same from tag because the callid and to tag will
   make the dialog id unique
- I can reuse the same to tag because the callid and from tag will
   make the dialog id unique

Of course nobody agrees on which ones really must be unique.

When you reason this way you are betting that everybody else involved
has made compatible assumptions to the one you are making.

        Thanks,
        Paul

Adam Roach wrote:
> [as an individual]
>
> This is an excellent example of where Postel's Maxim would address the
> problem. (For the unaware, Postel's Maxim is "be conservative in what
> you do, be liberal in what you accept from others"). For the failure
> Glenn is describing, it takes the efforts of two misbehaving systems to
> cause a failure.
>
> There is nothing in RFC3261 that normatively assigns semantics to a
> Call-ID by itself. It is meaningful only when combined with other
> identifiers, such as To: and From: tags. If you have software that is
> failing when it sees duplicate Call-IDs, then that is a bug that should
> be resolved.
>
> However, this misbehavior wouldn't happen if the sending party were a
> bit more conservative in what it sent -- if it were more vigorous in
> generating new Call-IDs for new attempts.
>
> If we're seeing real-life failures due to this behavior, I'd say both
> sides are at fault. It takes two to dance this "Failure Tango".
>
> /a
>
>
> Hisham Khartabil wrote:
```

EXHIBIT

1030

```
>> the same.
>>
>> The transaction layer will pass the request to the UAS Core if there
>> is no match in the transaction (branch in top via header). In that
>> case, the core will not find a dialog match (since it rejected the
>> original request) and will process the new request as a new request.
>>
>> Hisham
>>
>> 2009/6/6 Dean Willis <dean.willis@softarmor.com>:
>>
>>> On Jun 5, 2009, at 10:18 AM, Cahall, Glenn wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>> Paul,
>>>>
>>>> Thanks for the response.
>>>>
>>>> Once I read your response, I felt that I needed to explain the
>>>> situation
>>>> in more detail.
>>>>
>>>> Customer is sending us an INVITE, our response is a 486 BUSY.  This
>>>> exact
>>>> scenario (all with same TNs) repeats itself 100+ times over the next 90
>>>> seconds or so.  All 100+ INVITEs contain the same Call-Id.  However,
>>>> tag
>>>> value in the From field is different.
>>>>
>>>> So....now that you know more about the situation....is this in
>>>> violation
>>>> of the RFC?
>>>>
>>>> Also, during our discussions on the topic, we argued whether or not
>>>> Call-Id could be reused.  In short, as stated before, even if the
>>>> initial
>>>> call was successful, they believed that as soon as that call was
>>>> completed,
>>>> they were free to use the exact same Call-Id on the very next call.
>>>>
>>>
>>> The From: tag SHOULD be invariant if the Call-ID is re-used in
>>> response to a
>>> 4xx, else the transaction won't match. And the CSeq SHOULD increase,
>>> since
>>> it is a new INVITE. This is specified in paragraph 6 of section
>>> 8.1.4.5 in
>>> RFC 3261. In practice, state matching fails if this isn't honored, so it
>>> really could have been specified as a MUST; that is, we should probably
>>> rewrite RFC 3261 to say something like:
>>>
>>> "The UAC MAY retry a transaction following certain 400-class
>>> Failure to observe these two operational requirements is likely to
>>> result in
>>> proxies or the UAS not matching the retried transaction to any retained
>>> state from previous transactions, which could result in errors
>>> ranging from
>>> erroneous log entries to denial-of-service scenarios, and it is in
>>> extremely
>>> poor taste too."
>>>
>>> In other words, the tag should be the same, the CSeq should
>>> increment, and
>>> you spank the customer  for being annoying.
>>>
>>> Failing that, how's the Retry-After: header field on your 486 populated?
>>> Perhaps you could crank it up to about 60 seconds, THEN spank them
>>> for being
>>> annoying it if they ignore it.
>>>
>>> --
>>> Dean
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> _______________________________________________
>>> sipcore mailing list
>>> sipcore@ietf.org
>>> https://www.ietf.org/mailman/listinfo/sipcore
>>>
>>>
>> _______________________________________________
>> sipcore mailing list
>> sipcore@ietf.org
>> https://www.ietf.org/mailman/listinfo/sipcore
>>
>
> _______________________________________________
> sipcore mailing list
> sipcore@ietf.org
> https://www.ietf.org/mailman/listinfo/sipcore
>
```

[sipcore] Reuse of Sip Call-Id question.. Cahall, Glenn
- Re: [sipcore] Reuse of Sip Call-Id question.. Paul Kyzivat
  - Re: [sipcore] Reuse of Sip Call-Id question.. Cahall, Glenn
    - Re: [sipcore] Reuse of Sip Call-Id question.. Byron Campen
    - Re: [sipcore] Reuse of Sip Call-Id question.. Paul Kyzivat
- Re: [sipcore] Reuse of Sip Call-Id question.. Attila Sipos
- Re: [sipcore] Reuse of Sip Call-Id question.. Attila Sipos
  - Re: [sipcore] Reuse of Sip Call-Id question.. Byron Campen
    - Re: [sipcore] Reuse of Sip Call-Id question.. Paul Kyzivat
      - Re: [sipcore] Reuse of Sip Call-Id question.. Byron Campen

I E T F

Re: [sipcore] Reuse of Sip Call-Id question.. Bob Penfield

Re: [sipcore] Reuse of Sip Call-Id question.. Paul Kyzivat

Re: [sipcore] Reuse of Sip Call-Id question.. Dean Willis

Re: [sipcore] Reuse of Sip Call-Id question.. Dean Willis

Re: [sipcore] Reuse of Sip Call-Id question.. Dale Worley

Re: [sipcore] Reuse of Sip Call-Id question.. Dean Willis

Re: [sipcore] Reuse of Sip Call-Id question.. Bob Penfield

Re: [sipcore] Reuse of Sip Call-Id question.. Dale Worley

Re: [sipcore] Reuse of Sip Call-Id question.. Hisham Khartabil

Re: [sipcore] Reuse of Sip Call-Id question.. Adam Roach

Re: [sipcore] Reuse of Sip Call-Id question.. Dean Willis

Re: [sipcore] Reuse of Sip Call-Id question.. Paul Kyzivat

Re: [sipcore] Reuse of Sip Call-Id question.. Dean Willis

Re: [sipcore] Reuse of Sip Call-Id question.. Paul Kyzivat

Hide Navigation Bar

< Date >

< Thread >

v2.15.0 | Report a Bug | By Email