Document Status

• Finished WGLC October 2009
• Received reviews
• -23 addresses these plus more (see next slide)

• new version ready for next WGLC
• diff is here:
Changes from -22 to -23

• many editorials,
• naming,
• change of header classifications,
• corrected or changed RFC 2119 language levels,
• corrected examples and usage of the new test/example IP address ranges,
• copying and adjusting more text from the HTTP spec,
• added Conditional RAP policy for Seek-Style,
• proxy muxing,
• putting an upper limit on a number of numerical values,
• updated the changes section.
Conditional RAP (CoRAP)

• Section 4.9.1. Random Access and Seeking
• Section 16.45. Seek Style
• Conditional Random Access:
  Based on the above Random Access but intended to handle a case where the distance in the media between random access points are large and where small seek forward using Random Access would move the client further away than the current point.
Proxies and CSeq

• Clarified usage in Section 16.19:
• Proxies that aggregate several sessions on the same transport will have to ensure that the requests sent towards a particular server have a joint sequence number space, i.e., they will regularly need to renumber the CSeq header field in requests (from proxy to server) and responses (from server to proxy) to fulfill the rules for the header. The proxy MUST increase the CSeq by one for each request it transmits, without regard of different sessions.
Multiplexing at Proxies

• This requires that RTSP requests from multiple clients are multiplexed onto a common connection for requests outgoing to a RTSP server and on the way back the responses are demultiplexed from the server to per client responses. [...]

• This multiplexing of requests and demultiplexing of responses is done by using the CSeq header field (see Section 16.19). The proxy has to rewrite the CSeq in requests to the server and responses from the server and remember what CSeq is mapped to what client.
Grouping of Media Lines

• For RTSP it is mainly important to know how to handle grouped medias received by means of SDP, i.e., if the media are under aggregate control or if aggregate control is not available

• It is RECOMMENDED that grouped medias are handled by aggregate control, to give the client the ability to control either the whole presentation or single medias.

• **Question:**

• how should the dependencies in [RFC5583] be handled
  – “Signaling Media Decoding Dependency in the Session Description Protocol (SDP)”
Wrap-Up

• Draft seems to be stable

• *Need your review now!*  

• Timeline for the next steps?  
  – WGLC  
  – time to fix comments  
  – submitted to IESG