

New Revision of the Interactive Connectivity Establishment (ICE)

draft-ietf-mmusic-rfc5245bis-04
draft-ietf-mmusic-ice-sip-sdp-05

IETF 93, Dallas, TX

March 27th, 2015

Ari Keränen

ari.keranen@ericsson.com

Updates since -03

- Privacy address fix
 - If privacy IPv6 addresses in use, don't gather other IPv6 addresses from the same interface
 - Text from Simon Perrault
- Updated ICE answer (in SDP draft)
 - Don't drop dialog if ICE goes missing (3264 fallback); ICE restart when ICE back in SDP
 - Text from Thomas Stach

SIP & RTP Split

- With SIP: so far so good
 - SIP used as example of signaling protocol
- Some RTP mentions still in the base spec
 - RTCP considerations
 - Component IDs
 - Pacing formula
- Suggestion: keep these in the base spec

Bundled Traffic and Ta

- Impact to transaction pacing formula when multiple streams of traffic are bundled
 - “STUN should not use more bandwidth than the RTP itself will use”
 - Already calculated across all media streams: no impact

ICE, DTLS, and Virtual Connections

- Discussed soon
- What needs to go to ICE bis?
 - fixes and extension hooks

Connectivity Check (STUN transaction) Pacing

- Latest information
 - (coming next)
- Anecdotal:
 - Chrome has been using 50 ms without problems
 - 20-50 ms seems to work
 - Using same low value for non-RTP traffic does not seem to break anything

Time for full reviews

- After the next update
- Volunteers?