

RTSP Issues

draft-ietf-mmusic-rfc2326bis-09
Presenting: Magnus Westerlund

Updates in 09

- Editorial updates in:
 - Section 4.1: Message Types
 - Section 6.1: Request line
 - Section 6.2: Request headers
 - Section 9: Connections (Rewrite of some subsections)
 - Section 14.34: Range header
 - Appendix F: Backwards compatibility
- Changing Cseq start value to 0 instead of 1
- Switching URI reference from RFC 2396 to RFC 3986

Updates in 09

- Clarified RTP-Info parameters:
 - URI SHALL be present
 - “seq” is RECOMMENDED
 - “rtptime” SHOULD be present and value usage has be clarified
 - Example added
 - Issue remain, see next slide
- Transport header support listing a number of SSRCs used in session
- Starting updating syntax for explicit white spacing rules, however work is not finished and input is solicited

Issue: RTP-Info

- What is the minimal information in RTP-Info?
 1. Allow only URI with out information carrying parameter
 2. Request that at least one of "seq" and "rtptime" be present if an RTP stream is to be included in the header.
- The second may be implied by the 2326 erroneous BNF

Issue: Explicit white spacing

- A. It is okay that all RTSP headers have base syntax:
message-header = field-name HCOLON [field-value] CRLF
Where HCOLON is:
- LWS = [CRLF] 1*(SP / HT)
 - SWS = [LWS] ; sep whitespace
 - HCOLON = *(SP / HTAB) ":" SWS
- B. Comma separated list (1#) has been RULE 1*("," RULE), which is change to:
- RULE 1*(COMMA RULE)
 - COMMA = SWS "," SWS

Issue: Explicit white spacing

- C. The changing of “=” to EQUAL in most cases with exception of the range headers

EQUAL = SWS "=" SWS

"source" "=" host -> "source" EQUAL host

Which allows “source = example.com”, “source =example.com”

- D. Replacement of ";" in most places with the rule:

SEMI = SWS ";" SWS

This affects mostly the “Transport” header, where now the each transport spec now can be broken over lines and contain spaces and tabs

Issue: HTTP headers

- Currently the HTTP defined header is referenced to RFC 2616
- RFC 2616 does not use RFC 2234 BNF with explicit white spacing
- What does we do?
- Proposal: Copy syntax into the specification and provide explicit syntax

Future work

- Add Status Code 463 text to next version
- Continue editing
- Authors to try to put more time into the editing
- Volunteers editing, reviewing are solicited