# RTSP 2.0 NAT Traversal

draft-ietf-mmusic-rtsp-nat-05

draft-ietf-mmusic-rtsp-nat-evaluation-00

Magnus Westerlund

Thomas Zeng

IETF 69

# 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 solutution

# draft-ietf-mmusic-rtsp-nat-05

- 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

# draft-ietf-mmusic-rtsp-nat-evaluation-00

- 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 applicabilty 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