

SDP: Session Description Protocol

`draft-ietf-mmusic-rfc4566bis-10`

IETF 90 – July 2014

Ali C. Begen

`abegen@cisco.com`

Outstanding Issues

- We have 7 items in the tracker:

<http://tools.ietf.org/wg/mmusic/trac/report/1>

4 defects and 3 enhancements

- Defects:

1. Update the format of the IANA registries to reflect the dependency between addrtype and net type: **Agreed (Same or separate draft?)**
2. Section 8.2.4 defines the IANA registry and populates it with the attributes defined in 4566, however, Section 8.2.4 does not specify the name or format of the table: **Agreed**
3. Make the registration of new network or address types mandatory (Sections 8.2.6 and 8.2.7): **Agreed**

- Enhancements:

1. Should we add a new column called “registered network type” in the addrtype table in the IANA registry as not all address types are applicable for all network types? **Agreed (Same or separate draft?)**
2. Need to provide ABNF syntax for all 4566 attributes: **Paul K. will work on this after Toronto**
3. Should the source-level attributes defined in 5576 be included in the same table structure in the IANA registry? **Agreed (Same or separate draft?)**
4. Lack of a consistent format for defining new attributes: **See next slide**

Consistent Format for Defining New Attributes

- See: <http://www.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/mmusic/current/msg13471.html>
- Question is whether the definition of a new attribute should:
 1. Define the full syntax of the line (starting with "a="),
 2. Should provide additional definitions of <attribute> (via "/=")
 3. Should provide additional definitions of <att-field> and <att-value> (via "/=")
 4. Provide definitions of the name and value that are consistent with <att-field> and <att-value> without formally extending the definitions of those