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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/

› 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
› 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.
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 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