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One become Two

- The draft-ietf-mmusic-rtsp-nat-04 has been split into two draft:
  - RTSP-NAT-05 draft that intends to contain the solution for the NAT traversal of media flows for RTSP
  - RTSP-NAT-evaluation contains the analysis of different solutions that was discussed in the WG when selecting solution
Currently this draft only contains an outline of the ICE solution

An empty shell that needs to be filled out

Hope to be able to flesh out the solution before Vancouver
• This is primarily a problem description and analysis of different solutions that has been brought up to solve the issue.
• The problem is the NAT traversal of the media stream from RTSP server to client.
• Does not look at NAT traversal for the signalling stream.
Improvements

• Intends to update the text to address:
  – Summary of capabilities to handle use cases with both RTSP server and client behind NATs
  – Symmetric RTP is similar to ICE-Lite and need to check if we missed any arguments from there.
  – Editorial comments
Selection of Solution

• The WG consensus is to go with ICE
• On the mailing list it was raised that we should go for something simpler:
  – The argument boils down to that there are no need to support servers behind NATs
  – The main motivation for that is that we are not looking at how the RTSP signalling can reach a server behind a NAT
• To me there appear to exist solutions with limited applicability for signalling support:
  – Static forwarding rules in NAT
  – Using STUN/uPnP/MIDCOM/NSIS NAT&W + Dynamic DNS SRV records
Going Forward

• Would prefer to not have any changes of the consensus decision, however:
  – Having fleshed out the ICE solution will allow for analyzing the cost better
  – Cost is weighted against functionality
  – Try to avoid short sightness