

JSEP

Justin Uberti
Cullen Jennings
Eric Rescorla*

Changes since -06

- Constrain SDP modifications (#8)
- Add security considerations (#53)
- Remove SDES discussion (#10)
- VAD discussion (#60)
- IceRestart and CreateOffer (#20)
- Guidance on attribute location (#19)
- Editorial (Procter, Westerlund, Shields)

When is onnegotiationneeded fired? (#26)

- HTA proposes “only in stable state”
- Cullen concerned about PRANSWER
- I don't understand this point?
- What about initial AddTrack()?

Proposed resolution: Adopt Harald's proposal.
Don't call when no offers have been
generated/processed (do we need INIT state?)

Turn on VAD in createAnswer (#64)

- What happens in answer if VAD is requested in the offer?

Proposed resolution: VAD on by default, but can be configured independently for caller and callee. Allows for 1-way VAD, useful in cases like security monitors.

More VAD

- What should go in the offer if VAD was previously on/off, but not specified in createOffer call?

Proposed resolution: VAD previous state is retained.

VAD (DTX/CN) in RTP (#69)

- JSEP VAD section describes support for VAD (§ 5.2.3.3)
- This is not mandated in the RTP draft

Proposed resolution: CN should be mandatory.
Needs change in RTP usage.

a=sendonly in offers (#66) (Slide 1/2)

- No way to indicate a=sendonly
- All outgoing MSTs induce a=sendrecv
- OfferToReceive* induces a=recvonly

(Resolution on next slide)

a=sendonly offers (#64) (Slide 2 of 2)

Proposed resolution: for M outgoing MSTs

- No OfferToReceive -> M sendrecv lines
- OfferToReceive:N > M -> N-M rcvonly lines, M sendrecv lines
- OfferToReceive:N < M -> M-N sendonly lines, M-N sendrecv lines
- OfferToReceive:true, M>0 -> M sendrecv lines
- OfferToReceive:true, M==0, 1 rcvonly line

m=line protocol identifier (#70) (I)

- 5763 says UDP/TLS/RTP/SAVPF
- ICE TCP implies use TCP/TLS/RTP/SAVPF (it specifies TCP/RTP/SAVPF)
- Browsers now use RTP/SAVPF
- Some things use RTP/AVPF (or RTP/SAVP or RTP/AVP!)
- DTLS/SCTP off in its own corner

m=line protocol identifier (#70) (II)

Proposed resolution:

- Emit what the specs say
 - either UDP/TLS/RTP/SAVPF or TCP/TLS/RTP/AVPF, depending on active candidate
- Ignore any string you get
 - This means that you may reply to SRTP/AVPF with UDP/TLS/RTP/AVPF
 - or TCP/TLS/RTP/AVPF with UDP/TLS/RTP/AVPF

Max-bundle implies rtcp-mux? (#77)

- What does max-bundle imply about rtcp-mux?
- Half the ports
- ... but compatibility; insisting on rtcp-mux breaks old stuff

Proposed resolution: force-bundle (new name?) is max-bundle that gathers half the ports but only works when remote does rtcp-mux

Changing of ICE credentials (#25)

- Text forbids changing ICE credentials
- Arguably not necessary with DTLS
- Our default should be to not allow changes, although this complicates app-generated SDP.

Proposed resolution: Editors disagree.