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“There are probably only two persons in the world that understand this.”
PRUNING OF PEER REF CANDS (1/2)

• WHAT’S THE ISSUE?
  – Text (5.1.3.3) specifies that “base replacement”* procedure only applies to server reflexive candidates
  – An updated check list might contain peer reflexive candidates
    • Peer reflexive candidates will not be pruned, since they won’t match another pair

*“For each pair where the local candidate is server reflexive, the server reflexive candidate MUST be replaced by its base. Once this has been done, the agent MUST prune the list. This is done by removing a pair if its local and remote candidates are identical to the local and remote candidates of a pair higher up on the priority list.”
(4) PRUNING OF PEER REF CANDS (2/2)

• HOW TO SOLVE IT?
  – **ALT #1**: Specify that “base replacement” procedure also applies to peer reflexive candidates
  
  – **ALT #2**: General statement that “base replacement” procedures to ALL candidates (no matter type)
    • Local candidate is always replaced by base, no matter the candidate type
(5) EMIL’S ISSUE

• WHAT’S THE ISSUE?

  – CHECK LIST INTERACTION WHEN UNFREEZING
    • Prevent complete check lists from being unfrozen at once
    • Make sure each candidate pair eventually gets unfrozen
  – “Emil’s table”
(6) AGGRESSIVE LEFTOVERS

• WHAT’S THE ISSUE?
  – Some text still need to be modified due to the removal of aggressive nomination
  – Pull request created by Bernard A
    • [https://github.com/ice-wg/rfc5245bis/pull/20](https://github.com/ice-wg/rfc5245bis/pull/20)
WHAT’S THE ISSUE?

- Spec currently defines the following check list types: active, frozen
  - **Active**: at least one cand pair state is “waiting”
  - **Frozen**: all cand pairs are frozen
- What if no cand pair state is “waiting”, but one or more states are “in-progress”? Isn’t the check list still “active”?
(8) SENDING FROM LOCAL CAND v BASE

• WHAT’S THE ISSUE?
  – Text says that connectivity checks are sent from local candidate.
  – Aren’t the checks sent from the base?
    • Eventhough, after pruning, it’s the same
(9) FIRST MEDIA STREAM

• WHAT’S THE ISSUE?
  – Text talks about “first media stream”
  – No guidance on what “first” means
    • Does it matter which media stream is “first”?
    • Does the first media stream need to have specific characteristics?
(10) ORDER OF CONNECTIVITY CHECKS

• WHAT’S THE ISSUE?
  – Text (5.1.3.4) saying that connectivity checks are sent in priority order

  “Waiting: A check has not been performed for this pair, and can be performed as soon as it is the highest-priority Waiting pair on the check list.”

  – Triggered checks are sent first
    • No relation between triggered checks and priority
UNFREEZING OF PAIR

• WHAT’S THE ISSUE?
  – Text (5.1.3.4) saying that pairs are unfrozen when some other check succeeds

  “Frozen: A check for this pair hasn't been performed, and it can't yet be performed until some other check succeeds, allowing this pair to unfreeze and move into the Waiting state.”

  – Pairs can be unfrozen also due to other reasons:
    • Timer expires and there are no pairs in Waiting state (5.1.4)
(12) UNFREEZING OF CHECK LIST

• WHAT’S THE ISSUE?

  – Text (6.1.2.4.3) saying that once all pairs in a check list are in Failed or Succeeded state, other check lists are unfrozen

  – What if there are still other active check lists?

  – Shouldn’t frozen lists be unfrozen when ALL other check lists are done?
(13) NEXT STEPS

• Implement clarifications
• Submit new version of draft-5245bis
• WGLC