

XCON Working Group
Brunner
Internet-Draft
NEC

M.

Expires: April 18, 2004
2003

October 19,

Issues and Requirements in Floor Control

[draft-brunner-xcon-fc-00](#)

Status of this Memo

This document
is an Internet-Draft and is in full conformance with
all provisions of
[Section 10 of RFC2026](#).

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the
Internet Engineering
Task Force (IETF), its areas, and its working
groups. Note that other
groups may also distribute working documents as
Internet-Drafts.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum
of six months
and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other
documents at any
time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as
reference
material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

The list of current Internet-Drafts can be accessed at [http://
www.ietf.org/ietf/1id-abstracts.txt](http://www.ietf.org/ietf/1id-abstracts.txt).

The list of Internet-Draft Shadow
Directories can be accessed at
<http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html>.

This
Internet-Draft will expire on April 18, 2004.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2003). All Rights Reserved.

Abstract

This documents lists issues and requierements for floor control in conferencing applications. It is meant in addition to the existing requirements draft "raft-koskelainen". It basically proposes to do floor control in a policy less way. Meaning that the policies are built into the floor dcontrol server, but not part of the protocol.

Brunner

Expires April 18, 2004

[Page

1]

Internet-Draft
2003

Issues in Floor Control

October

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	
		3
2.	Terminology	
		4
3.	Issues	
		5
3.1	Scope of the floor	
		5
3.2	Number of users concurrently holding the floor	
		5
3.3	Floor Control Policies	
		5
3.4	Explicite versus implicate floor passing	5
3.5	Floor passing trigger	6
3.6	Activity awareness	6
4.		
Requirements		7
Informative References		8

Author's Address	8
Intellectual Property and Copyright Statements	9

1. Introduction

Floor control is a mechanism used to deal with concurrency in distributed systems. So it basically deals with the question who is allowed to generate input or change/write to a resource.

In the context of conferencing systems floor control has two different goals. First it is about who is allowed to "speak" by sending data input into the conference, so has to do with access control. Second, there are some applications which also require the ordering of input in order to work correctly (single input/sequential input applications). In the later case floor control can help to create correctly functioning applications.

Brunner

Expires April 18, 2004

[Page 3]

2. Terminology

floor

- the right to generate some input.

floor control - determines at any given point in time, which entity is allowed to provide input, where entity could mean a user or an automated application.

floor holder -

user currently allowed to provide input.

floor control mechanisms - the low-level protocol handling the floor control.

floor control policy -

the rules for a certain operation of floor control.

Brunner

Expires April 18, 2004

[Page 4]

3. Issues

3.1 Scope of the floor

The floor can be assigned to various entities. E.g., a floor for a single session, an application, a conference. We assume an application can have several session, and a conference can have several applications. The floor can be bound to any of these entities. There is naturally a dependency on what application the floor control mechanisms is used for.

3.2 Number of users concurrently holding the floor

It is possible that several users concurrently hold the floor. For example, in the case of audio input to the conference, it is then mixed together. Other applications such as shared workspaces/ application sharing might have a problem with concurrent input.

3.3 Floor Control Policies

Floor control policies define the way how the floor is passed around. Here are some examples of floor passing:

- ring passing: the current floor holder must explicitly release the floor before anyone else can acquire it.
- Preemptive: any user can grab the floor at any time
- Timeouts: a user loses the floor after a period of inactivity or after a given time holding it.
- Moderated: a designated user has control over passing the

floor.

- IETF meetings: mostly moderated with queueing of floor requests.

3.4 Explicite versus implicite floor passing

Explicite floor passing requires an explicit action of a user passing the floor.

Implicit floor passing automatically gives the floor to a user as soon as he generates input. Implicit floor passing together with a preemptive policy corresponds actually to the case of having no floor control at all. For conversations this means also that a social protocol and etiquette is needed.

Implicit floor passing is much easier from users point of view, since no explicit action is required. Since the floor might be passed implicitly there need to be a group of users eligible to get the floor, where others might not get the floor implicitly. In the IETF

meeting example, the floor can implicitly pass between all the people having a microphone, where others waiting in the queue are not eligible for getting the floor implicitly.

[3.5](#) Floor passing

trigger

In implicit floor passing there needs to be a trigger to pass the floor automatically. Specifically in multi-application/session conference the trigger can be chosen freely. E.g., the person start speaking also get the floor for the shared whiteboard etc.

[3.6](#) Activity

awareness

In conferencing scenarios users normally want to be aware what is going on. So for example they might want to know who currently has the floor etc.

Brunner

Expires April 18, 2004

[Page 6]

4. Requirements

MUST allow for various scopes

MUST have single and concurrent floor
holders

MUST be independent of a particular floor control policy.
The
policy should be part of a particular implementation, not of the
mechanisms itself.

MUST be able to restrict the group of users
eligible for implicit
floor passing.

MUST provide means for
distributed floor information (e.g.,
current floor holder to other
participants

SHOULD allow for transporting trigger filter
information. What
triggers the implicit floor control
change

Brunner
April 18, 2004

Expires
[Page 7]

Internet-Draft
Floor Control

Issues in
October 2003

Informative References

[1]

Koskelainen, P., "Requirements for Floor Control", DRAFT
[draft-koskelainen-xcon-floor-control-req-00.txt](#), June 2003.

Author's Address

Marcus Brunner
Network Laboratories, NEC Europe Ltd.

Kurfuersten-Anlage 36
Heidelberg 69115
Germany

Phone: +49 (0)
[6221 905 11 29](#)
EMail:
brunner@ccrle.nec.de

Brunner

Expires April 18, 2004

[Page 8]

Intellectual Property
Statement

The IETF takes no position regarding the validity or scope of any intellectual property or other rights that might be claimed to pertain to the implementation or use of the technology described in this document or the extent to which any license under such rights might or might not be available; neither does it represent that it has made any effort to identify any such rights. Information on the IETF's procedures with respect to rights in standards-track and standards-related documentation can be found in [BCP-11](#). Copies of claims of rights made available for publication and any assurances of licenses to be made available, or the result of an attempt made to obtain a general license or permission for the use of such proprietary rights by implementors or users of this specification can be obtained from the IETF Secretariat.

The IETF invites any interested party to bring to its attention any copyrights, patents or patent applications, or other proprietary rights which may cover technology that may be required to practice this standard. Please address the information to the IETF Executive Director.

Full Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The Internet Society
(2003). All Rights Reserved.

This document and translations of it may be copied and furnished to others, and derivative works that comment on or

otherwise explain it
or assist in its implementation may be prepared,
copied, published
and distributed, in whole or in part, without
restriction of any
kind, provided that the above copyright notice and
this paragraph are
included on all such copies and derivative works.
However, this
document itself may not be modified in any way, such as by
removing
the copyright notice or references to the Internet Society or
other
Internet organizations, except as needed for the purpose of
developing Internet standards in which case the procedures for
copyrights
defined in the Internet Standards process must be
followed, or as
required to translate it into languages other than
English.

The
limited permissions granted above are perpetual and will not be
revoked
by the Internet Society or its successors or assignees.

This document
and the information contained herein is provided on an
"AS IS" basis and
THE INTERNET SOCIETY AND THE INTERNET ENGINEERING
TASK FORCE DISCLAIMS
ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING
BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY
WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION

Internet-Draft
Floor Control

Issues in
October 2003

HEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY
RIGHTS OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF
MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A
PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

Acknowledgment

Funding for the RFC Editor function
is currently provided by the
Internet
Society.

Brunner

Expires April 18, 2004

[Page 10]