

# BUNDLE

...yeah, we are still working on that

IETF#98

Chicago, USA

Christer Holmberg

Harald Alvestrand

Cullen Jennings

## (2) ISSUE: RTP attributes in non-RTP m-lines

- ISSUE:

- A non-RTP m- line is tagged as the offerer BUNDLE m- line
- TRANSPORT and IDENTICAL category SDP attributes shall only be associated with the tagged m- line
- What about RTP-specific SDP attributes?
  - E.g., rtcp-mux, rtcp-mux-only
  - Can we use those with non-RTP m- lines?

## (3) ISSUE: RTP attributes in non-RTP m-lines

- SOLUTION ALTERNATIVES:

1. Mandate that tagged m-line is for RTP
2. Allow RTP attributes in non-RTP m-lines

## (4) ISSUE: RTP attributes in non-RTP m-lines

- **SUGGESTION:**

**Alternative 2** (Allow RTP attributes in non-RTP m-lines)

NOTE: This was already discussed on the list. If you object now, why didn't you object then?

**QUESTION:** How/Where do we document this?

## (5) OTHER ISSUES

- **RTP-to-m-line mapping**
  - Long e-mail discussion
  - Move text from JSEP to BUNDLE
  - Separate presentation (Cullen)



Nobody knew RTP-to-m-line mapping could be so complicated.

## (6) OTHER ISSUES

- **MID security**

- People don't want to mandate MID SDES item encryption
- We need to justify why the generic encryption requirement does not apply to the MID SDES item
- PR by Magnus
  - <https://github.com/cdh4u/draft-sdp-bundle/pull/30>

# (7) OTHER ISSUES

- **Editorial comments**
  - Ekr
  - Taylor

**(8) THE END**