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(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