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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