



RTSP 2.0

WG last call comments

Draft-ietf-mmusic-rfc2326bis-22

# Overview

---

- › WG last call has ended
- › Issues
  - Seek-style with conditional Random Access Point policy
  - IANA comments
  - Media type review
  - ABNF Syntax
  - Grouping of media lines
  - Aggregation in proxies
- › Editorials
- › Missing reviews
  - Proper media type review
  - URI reviews
- › Going forward

## WG Last call has ended

---

- › Many thanks to the people that has read the document fully or at least partially.
- › Those who posted to the mailing list are:
  - Christian Haas
  - Thomas Schierl
  - Yingjie Gu
- › Issues has been entered into tracker

# Seek-Style with conditional RAP

---

## › Problem

- Playback time is at  $t=15$  seconds.
- User drags marker forward to seek to  $t=20$  seconds
- Client issues the seek (PLAY with appropriate Range)
- Server responds starting with a RAP at  $t=13$  seconds;
- seek forward has made us go backwards!

## › Conditional RAP seek-style (RAPcond)

- closest RAP with a forward seek, is prior to the servers current playout point
- server replies with 200 ok if RAP is at playout or beyond
- server replies with 4xx (466) if RAP is before playout

# IPR Statement on Seek-Style

---

- › submitted September 2009 by Ericsson
  - <https://datatracker.ietf.org/ipr/1189/>
  - <http://www.wipo.int/pctdb/en/wo.jsp?WO=2008156390>
- › Concerns Seek-Style and related in RFC2326bis
  - “Basically, according to the invention, the client requests transmission of a media stream from a unicast transport source, said request including information of where in the media stream the transmission should start. This is achieved by the inclusion of a specific indication of a desired starting frame” [WO 2008/156390]

# IANA comments

---

- › Many thanks for this early review
- › [https://sourceforge.net/tracker/?func=detail&aid=2890263&group\\_id=23194&atid=377744](https://sourceforge.net/tracker/?func=detail&aid=2890263&group_id=23194&atid=377744)
- › Intended to create a separate registry compared to RTSP 1.0
- › Proposed that Status code registry should use **Specification required** with expert review instead of **standards action**
- › Mostly clarifications on the initial table values.

# Text/parameters

---

- › Media type review raised the following issue:
  - Martin J Duerst: I haven't looked at the draft itself, but it seems to me that "parameters" in text/parameters is a way too generic word. I suggest choosing another word that helps people remind what this type is about in a bigger context.
- › This is isn't easily resolved as the type has been in used with the current name. My suggestion is to clarify its origin and its generic usability.

# ABNF Syntax

---

- › Raised by Christian Haas
- › Accept-params: gate additional accept parameters with initial q= value to separate them from media type specific parameters.
- › Retry-After has broken syntax
  - Propose to simplify it down to date or delta-seconds
- › Allow header can be empty
  - Does not make sense
  - Propose to disallow that
- › Short form "c" for content-type
  - Single header that uses short form
  - Propose to remove short form

# Usage of Grouping of media lines

---

- › Thomas Schirel brought up the text about grouping of media lines (RFC 3388)
- › Currently listed as unspecified
  - However, there are clearly cases when it makes sense to use grouping
- › Will need to be specified on a per semantic basis
- › Behavior when RTSP client encounters unknown
  - Can't support session seems simple but may be unnecessary restricting
  - Issue if some semantic indicates one at a time behavior etc, that may require RTSP level interactions that aren't allowed.

# Session Aggregation in Proxies

---

- › Raised by Yingjie Gu
- › Several things are implementation specific
- › However some clarifications on the aggregation and handling of such headers as CSeq seems needed.
- › Text will be proposed later

# Editorials

---

- › Changes section
- › Spelling errors
- › Some ABNF butification

# Missing Reviews

---

- › We need to once more solicit for media type review after having addressed the comment we received.
- › We have gotten no URI-reivew yet. That is important as we URI's are not what any of us authors are well versed in.
  - Will request a new review after the IETF meeting

# Way forward

---

- › Continue discussing the open issues
  - Try to close them quickly
- › Submit a new draft after the meeting addressing the issues
- › Second WG last call on the proposed changes