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Quick Recap ..

---

Thanks to Adam Roach for the detailed review

Version-12 incorporates Adam’s review (most of them)

Open questions/Issues (Today)

Clarification Questions (on mailing list, awaiting response)
${signaling-protocol} and ICE SDP

---

Issue: How do we handle SDP for the non-SIP use-cases?

Current Draft - Only SIP, what about RTCWeb?

Proposals:

a) Keep the draft same
b) Split ice-sip-sdp → ice-sdp and ice-sip drafts
   i) Keep sdp usage outside specific signaling transport
RFC6544’s Fate

---

Issue: ice-bis && ice-sip-sdp obsoletes RFC5245. What’s the state of RFC6544?

Proposals:

1. No-op on RFC6544, add ice-tcp candidates to ice-sip-sdp
2. Create RFC6544bis to refer to ice-bis and ice-sip-sdp drafts instead → new work
3. Bring RFC6544 text into ice-bis and ice-sip-sdp drafts → new work with slow-down of current drafts.
ice-options support vs activation

---

Issue: Draft needs to distinguish between feature support vs feature activation for ice-options

Adam’s comment “kind of potential morass we ran into with SIP options tags: the patchwork means of means of indicating feature *support* versus feature *activation* made it very difficult to specify and implement things in a consistent fashion. I strongly recommend that this document spend a bit more text discussing this distinction, and maybe even consider a formal syntax for distinguishing between supported and activated features. “

Resolution: Not sure, Need more clarification from Adam ??
Next Steps

Handling ice transport change and default candidates - waiting on pull request from Roman Shpount.

Close on the open issues from today.
Thank you !!!