

I
E
T
F
96



SDP Examples - RTCWeb

draft-ietf-rtcweb-sdp-02

V1

Suhas Nandakumar
Cullen Jennings

About ..

1. JSEP based Offer/Answer SDP for common RTCWeb use-cases.
2. Up-to-date “Informational Reference” for Spec writers and implementers.
3. “Annotated Reference” for SDP usage.
4. Examples - Basic, Multi-stream (Simulcast, SVC, FEC, RTX), Conferencing.

01 → 02 : Changes

1. Examples reflect latest versions of BUNDLE-31, JSEP-14, ICE-SIP-SDP-08 , mmusic-sctp-sdp-16, flex-fec-02 drafts (Open Issues , next slide)
2. Major facelift of the examples to enhance readability
 - a. Consistent usage of IP Address , Port numbers
 - b. SSRC Values
 - c. Consistent ordering of SDP attributes
3. Fix syntax errors from -01

Many thanks to Paul Kyzivat's feedback for triggering these changes.

Open Issue: a=rtcp usage

1. JSEP mandates a=rtcp in all the offers/answers (even in bundled m= line)
2. BUNDLE-31 says - “ The answerer MUST NOT associate an SDP ‘rtcp’ attribute with any bundled “m=” lines in the answer”
3. ICE-SIP-SDP-08 says - “ ... rtcp MUST be included if there exists rtcp component and whose port is not +1 of the rtp port”

Open issue: a=rtcp-mux-only

1. JSEP doesn't say anything
2. BUNDLE-31 says : "The offerer MUST associate rtcp-mux-only with each bundle-only m= line"

Open issue: a=fingerprint

1. JSEP mandates a=fingerprint in all the m= lines
2. BUNDLE-31 says: “Attributes that belong to IDENTICAL/TRANSPORT category MUST be included in the m=line that corresponds to offerer/answerer BUNDLE-tag only”

Open issues: more..

1. JSEP SDP Usage vs Generic SDP Usage

-- Comment from Oleg

2. ICE-BIS vs RFC5245 Reference

-- Comment from Christer regarding “ice2” ice-option

Next Steps

1. Converge on open issues across the specs
2. Feedback on Examples
 - a. Do they sufficiently cover most common use-cases ?
 - b. Need more ?
3. Review, Review, Review