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About ..

1. JSEP based Offer/Answer SDP for common RTCWeb use-cases.
2. Up-to-date “Informational Reference” for Spec writers and implementers.
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