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**Introduction and Progress Report**

Ott/Mulé
Working Group Status (1)

- Revised WG Charter accepted
  - Various new milestones added
- RFCs Published since Vancouver
  - draft-dondeti-oma-mmusic-sdp-attrs-00.txt [RFC 5159]
  - draft-levin-mmusic-xml-media-control-13.txt [RFC 5168]
- RFC-Editor Queue
  - draft-ietf-mmusic-ice-19.txt
- Publication requested
  - draft-ietf-mmusic-qos-identification-01.txt
- Awaiting Write-up and Publication Request
  - draft-ietf-mmusic-sdp-capability-negotiation-09.txt
  - draft-ietf-mmusic-file-transfer-mech-08.txt
  - draft-ietf-mmusic-sdp-source-attributes-01.txt

Working Group Status (2)

- Awaiting update
  - draft-ietf-mmusic-decoding-dependency-01.txt
    Short WGLC to come
  - draft-ietf-mmusic-media-loopback-08.txt
    Draft-09 posted; Expect WGLC soon
- Ready for WGLC
  - draft-ietf-mmusic-connectivity-precon-04.txt
- Other Drafts
  - draft-ietf-mmusic-rfc4566bis-00.txt
  - draft-ietf-sip-dtls-srtp-framework-00.txt
  - draft-ietf-mmusic-media-path-middleboxes-01.txt
LS from 3GPP on use of .invalid for IPv4 connection addresses

- [https://datatracker.ietf.org/liaison/449/](https://datatracker.ietf.org/liaison/449/)
- The liaison statement asks "whether the .INVALID address may be used to indicate an unspecified IPv4 connection address and does IETF offer any recommendation in this respect?"

**Notes**
- The 3GPP question relates to use of SDP in H.248 protocol
- See MMUSIC mailing list and July thread on this topic

**Proposed response from MMUSIC to 3GPP**
Recommend that 3GPP continues to use 0.0.0.0 to signal an invalid connection address in SDP connection lines with IPv4 addresses based on the following:
- while the SDP aBNF allows .invalid (RFC 4566), the SDP offer/answer RFC has a normative requirement for implementations to support 0.0.0.0 as a connection address to indicate that neither RTP nor RTCP should be sent to the peer.
- feedback received on the IETF MMUSIC mailing list from several SIP implementers indicate that only 0.0.0.0 is supported by IPv4-only endpoints.
- Note that this feedback is from the SIP community, not the H.248 one.

RTSP 2.0 and other Standards Bodies

- Liaison statement sent in January from MMUSIC
  - 3GPP, ATIS, CableLabs, DVB IPI, DLNA,
  - ETSI TISPAN, ISMA, OMA, Open IPTV Forum and ITU
- Several responses
- Intense discussion at the interim meeting
  - Very good input and ideas
  - Increased awareness
- Now in the process of responding
- Need to further the work in/on RTSP
Responses to MMUSIC Liaison Statements

- A liaison statement sent in January from MMUSIC to
  - 3GPP, ATIS, CableLabs, DVB IPI, DLNA,
  - ETSI TISPAN, ISMA, OMA, Open IPTV Forum and ITU-T

- Purpose
  - Inform them of ongoing work on RTSP 2.0
  - Remind them of RFC 4775 re: protocol extensions
  - Request info on any RTSP extensions to seek wider review

- Responses received by MMUSIC
  - Deadline to respond was April 7, 2008
  - Responses received from 3GPP, CableLabs, ETSI TISPAN, Open IPTV Forum and ITU-T SG9 & SG-16
  - Reviewed the RTSP-related LS during MMUSIC interim meeting in May (see notes)

==> Next slides present summary and proposed next steps

3GPP LS to MMUSIC

- Thorsten Lohmar presented LS from 3GPP TSG-SA WG 4 at interim: https://datatracker.ietf.org/documents/LIAISON/file542.doc
  1. RTSP extensions for Fast content switching
     - SA4 has defined a feature tag for each of the fast content switching extensions
  2. RTSP behavior to set-up FLUTE sessions with RTSP
  3. RTSP headers for Quality of Experience signaling
  4. 3GPP has started work on time shifting

- 3GPP work seems to have no impact on scope of core RTSP/2.0
- Some of the 3GPP headers are documented for IANA registration in draft-westerlund-mmusic-3gpp-sdp-rtsp-06.txt

- Next Steps
  - Need volunteer to review latest 3GPP spec and Magnus’ IETF I-D
    - Publication request of draft-westerlund-mmusic-3gpp-sdp-rtsp-06.txt imminent
  - Proposed response to 3GPP LS:
    - Need I-D to explain and potentially register RTSP/FLUTE work
    - Ask 3GPP to bring requirements for time shifting extensions to IETF MMUSIC
CableLabs Response to MMUSIC LS

- https://datatracker.ietf.org/documents/LIAISON/file560.txt
- RTSP extensions are defined for intra-cable network system communications in the CableLabs Edge Resource Management Interface (ERMI) Spec
  - Update: since draft-00 publication, and based on interim MMUSIC feedback, some RTSP changes have been requested in DOCSIS
    - Expect updated I-D soon to reflect some of the changes
    - Future I-D to propose IANA registration for RTSP extensions
- Next Steps
  - Proposal: no further LS response to CableLabs
  - Need volunteer to review next version of mmusic-rtsp-ermi-extensions
    - Likely in October timeframe

ETSI LS from TISPAN WG3 to MMUSIC

- TISPAN WG3 working on "standardization of IPTV services over IMS" and has defined extensions and modifications to RTSP [RFC 2326].
- Two methods for supporting IPTV services delivered over IMS with different combinations of SIP and RTSP.
- One of the 2 methods describes a tightly coupled SIP/RTSP model that uses an extended and modified version of RTSP 1.0.
  - The main modification is to use SIP for RTSP session establishment and teardown.
  - A SIP Invite with SDP offer/answer is used to setup the media flows and a TCP connection for RTSP requests and responses, removing the need for the RTSP SETUP and TEARDOWN methods.
- ETSI TISPAN WG3 would encourage IETF MMUSIC WG to consider defining support for the above described functionality. If such specification would become available TISPAN will consider adopting the use of it.
- Next Steps
  - Open mike discussion
**ITU-T SG 9 LS to MMUSIC**

- SG9 has not defined any RTSP extensions
- SG9 has active interest in the use of RTSP for IPTV applications and other potential Recommendations
- SG9 request more information on RTSP/2.0 being incompatible with RTSP/1.0
- Next Steps: Draft a response to ITU-T SG9
  - Include main reasons why RTSP 2.0 is incompatible with RTSP 1.0
  - This should be written in the RTSP/2.0 draft first per interim and referenced in the MMUSIC response

**ITU-T SG16 LS to MMUSIC**

- Response from ITU-T SG16 is for information, no responses needed
  - https://datatracker.ietf.org/liaison/457/
- Q3/16
  - Developing draft new H.248.66 “Packages for RTSP and H.248 Interworking”. This draft Recommendation provides guidance on mapping Real Time Streaming Protocol (RTSP) Methods, Error/Status Codes and Header Fields to H.248 protocol information elements, packages and procedures.
  - Several packages are defined that enhance interoperability between RTSP and the H.248, however the functionalities defined in these packages may be used for other applications/services.
  - This draft Recommendation is currently based on RTSP2.0 defined by draft-ietf-mmusic-rfc2326bis-15.txt. We will continue to update our draft based on further progress on your draft.
  - At this stage we are not proposing any extension methods. See Attachment 1 for our latest draft.
- Q21/16
  - ITU-T Recommendation H.610 “Full service VDSL - System architecture and customer premises equipment” (see Attachment 2) uses RTSP in VoD management.
  - It does not include any extension. The use cases of RTSP are presented in its clauses 15.3, 15.4 and 15.5. We request you to keep us updated in order us to make alignment of H.610 with any update of RTSP 2.0.
Open IPTV-Forum LS to MMUSIC

• https://datatracker.ietf.org/documents/LIAISON/file559.doc
• Open IPTV Forum working on its Release 1 specification that will use RTSP in the context of A/V stream selection and control for Content on Demand services.
• Due to the use of SIP in a managed network environment to initiate the VoD streaming session, the allowed mechanism of v1 to issue an RTSP PLAY without a previous RTSP SETUP will be used.
  – Open IPTV Forum request feedback from IETF on this
  – To help ensure compatibility of the Forum’s specifications to reference RTSP V2 in future releases we would like to seek assurance that the ability to issue a PLAY without a previous SETUP will be allowed in V2.
• Next Step
  – Need volunteer to draft LS response