             IANA Registry for the Session Initiation Protocol (SIP)
                          "Priority" Header Field

Abstract

   This document defines a new IANA registry to keep track of the values
   defined for the Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) "Priority" header
   field. It updates RFC 3261.

Status of This Memo

   This is an Internet Standards Track document.

   This document is a product of the Internet Engineering Task Force
   (IETF). It represents the consensus of the IETF community. It has
   received public review and has been approved for publication by the
   Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG). Further information on
   Internet Standards is available in Section 2 of RFC 5741.

   Information about the current status of this document, any errata,
   and how to provide feedback on it may be obtained at
   http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6878.

1. Introduction

    This document defines a new IANA registry to keep track of the values
    defined for the Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) "Priority" header
    field. This header field was defined in [RFC3261], Section 20.26.
    It was clearly specified in a way that allows for the creation of new
    values beyond those originally specified; however, no registry has
    been established for it.

2. IANA Considerations

    This document adds a new sub-registry, "Priority Header Field
    Values", to the "Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) Parameters"
    registry page. Its format and initial values are as shown in the
    following table:

```
                    +------------+-----------+
                    | Priority   | Reference |
                    +------------+-----------+
                    | non-urgent | RFC 3261  |
                    | normal     | RFC 3261  |
                    | urgent     | RFC 3261  |
                    | emergency  | RFC 3261  |
                    +------------+-----------+
```

    The policy for registration of values in this registry is "IETF
    Review" as that term is defined by [RFC5226]. This policy was chosen
    over lighter-weight policies due the potential architectural impact
    of the semantics associated with new values. Efforts contemplating
    adding a Priority value should consider whether the SIP Resource-
    Priority [RFC4412] or even a different protocol would be more
    appropriate for achieving their requirements.

3. Security Considerations

    This document does not have any impact on the security of the SIP
    protocol. Its purpose is purely administrative in nature.

4. References

4.1. Normative References

   [RFC3261] Rosenberg, J., Schulzrinne, H., Camarillo, G., Johnston,
              A., Peterson, J., Sparks, R., Handley, M., and E.
              Schooler, "SIP: Session Initiation Protocol", RFC 3261,
              June 2002.

   [RFC5226] Narten, T. and H. Alvestrand, "Guidelines for Writing an
              IANA Considerations Section in RFCs", BCP 26, RFC 5226,
              May 2008.

4.2. Informative References

   [RFC4412] Schulzrinne, H. and J. Polk, "Communications Resource
              Priority for the Session Initiation Protocol (SIP)",
              RFC 4412, February 2006.

Author's Address

   Adam Roach
   Mozilla
   Dallas, TX
   US

   EMail: adam@nostrum.com