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Overview (1/3)

F01 – SIP INVITE sip:bob@biloxi.example.com SIP/2.0

... c=IN IP4 a.atlanta.example.com
**m=application 9 TCP/RTSP rtsp**
a=fmtp:rtsp request-uri: rtsp://b.biloxi.example.com/scene
a=fmtp:rtsp version: 2.0
a=fmtp:rtsp h-accept-ranges: NPT
a=connection:new
a=setup:active
**m=audio 6666 RTP/AVP 0**
a=rtpmap:0 PCMU/8000
a=sendrecv

RTSP SETUP is not used anymore
Overview (2/3)

F01 – SIP INVITE sip:bob@biloxi.example.com SIP/2.0

F02 – SIP SIP/2.0 200 OK

... c=IN IP4 b.biloxi.example.com

m=application 554 TCP/RTSP rtsp
a=control: rtsp://b.biloxi.example.com/scene
a=fmtp:rtsp version: 2.0
a=fmtp:rtsp h-accept-ranges: NPT
a=fmtp:rtsp h-session: 6238237
a=fmtp:rtsp h-date: Tue, 05 Sep 2006 09:56:44 GMT
a=fmtp:rtsp h-rtp-info: url="rtsp://b.biloxi.example.com/scene"

  ssrc=1631654733:seq=53961;rtptime=0

a=connection:new
a=setup:passive
a=rtspid m-stream:10

m=audio 8888 RTP/AVP 0
a=rtpmap:0 PCMU/8000
a=sendonly
a=label:10
Overview (3/3)

F01 – SIP INVITE sip:bob@biloxi.example.com SIP/2.0

F02 – SIP SIP/2.0 200 OK

F03 – SIP ACK

F04 – RTSP PLAY rtsp://b.biloxi.example.com/scene RTSP/2.0

F05 – RTSP RTSP/2.0 200 OK

F06 – RTSP PAUSE rtsp://b.biloxi.example.com/scene RTSP/2.0

F07 – RTSP RTSP/2.0 200 OK

FXX – SIP BYE

RTSP TEARDOWN is not needed anymore

FXY – SIP SIP/2.0 200OK
Issues listed in the draft

ISSUE-1: Should the RTSP SETUP and DESCRIBE methods be used or not?

ISSUE-2: Can't we find a more elegant proposal than the "rtsp" token in the fmt field of the m-line?

ISSUE-3: Do we allow to transport any necessary RTSP header within SDP or do we restrict the list to some really few RTSP headers?
Issues raised from the MMUSIC list

• Too many RTSP headers into the offer answer exchange
  • It may be that keeping SETUP* would help here, as well as for the 3 open-issues of the draft.

• Does the client always need a description of the session it is going to produce an offer for?
  • Existing SDP offer/answer seem to be enough.

• Security issues (not yet studied within the draft)
  • One Issue already raised on Session Id (may be also fixed by keeping SETUP*)

• Remove RTSPv1?
  • If it sounds more reasonable to the IETF community, let's only use RTSPv2

• How to handle different usage scenarios?
  • We need more discussions on this topic
Next Steps

- Is there interest in this work?
- Should the draft become a WG item?