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V. Roca
Revisions under progress

● goal is to take into account comments from
  ○ IESG (still 3 Discuss as of March 26th)
  ○ Gen-ART (Francis D.)
  ○ IANA
  ○ Julian Reschke (during LC)
  ○ -14 partially addresses the comments received (work in progress…)

● details of what remains to be done:

1- Peter Saint-Andre (Discuss)

1. Apparently the application/fdt+xml media type was not reviewed on the ietf-types list, per RFC 4288. At least I see no request for a review in the archives at http://www.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/ietf-types/current/maillist.html

2. The IANA Considerations section is missing a registration of the "urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:fdt" namespace.
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- IANA suggested actions to address this...

**ACTION 1:**

Upon approval of this document, IANA will make the following IETF XML schema registration at [http://www.iana.org/assignments/xml-registry/schema.html](http://www.iana.org/assignments/xml-registry/schema.html) with this document as the reference:

- **Name:** fdt (??)
- **URI:** urn:ietf:params:xml:schema:fdt (??)
- **File:** [per section 3.4.2 of this document]

**ACTION 2:**

Upon approval of this document, IANA will register the following application media type at [http://www.iana.org/assignments/media-types/application/index.html](http://www.iana.org/assignments/media-types/application/index.html)

fdt+xml [RFC-to-be]

**ACTION 3:**

Upon approval of this document, IANA will create the following registry in a new "FLUTE" registry page to be listed under the "Reliable Multicast Transport (RMT) Parameters" header at [http://www.iana.org/protocols](http://www.iana.org/protocols).

- **Registry Name:** FLUTE ContentEncodingAlgorithm Registration Procedures
- **Value** | **Description** | **Reference**
  | | |
  0 | Null | [RFC-to-be]
  1 | ZLIB | [RFC1950]
  2 | DEFLATE | [RFC1951]
  3 | GZIP | [RFC1952]
  4-255 | Unassigned |

**ACTION 4:**

IANA will register the following LCT HeaderExtension Types at [http://www.iana.org/assignments/lct-header-extensions](http://www.iana.org/assignments/lct-header-extensions)

- 192 EXT_FDT LCT [RFC-to-be]
- 193 EXT_CENC LCT [RFC-to-be]
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2- Robert Sparks (Discuss)

 [...] 
The document needs clearer discussion around the reuse of FDT Instance IDs. I hope I've misunderstood a fundamental idea and a simple clarification will address the following questions.

○ My feeling is that there’s no issue here, but clarification is needed.

* Currently, receipt of an instance that reuses the id from a non-expired instance SHOULD be considered an error. When would the receiver _NOT_ consider this an error? Why is the document leaving receiver behavior out of scope? This seems to invite interoperability failure in deployed systems.

○ It’s forbidden (“MUST be considered an error” is more appropriate), but does it break backward compatibility (which is anyway no longer guaranteed by FLUTEv2)?
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3- Stephen Farrell (Discuss removed, now Comment)
   ◆ many comments addressed in -14
   ◆ still one remaining point about security (see March 19\textsuperscript{th} mail)

4- Francis Dupont (Gen-ART)
   ◆ most of comments have been addressed, but he may have
     new ones (didn’t finish the review)

5- Julian Reschke
   ◆ many comments received, not finished addressing them
   ◆ co-authors’ opinion welcome for some comments...