FLUTE revised
<draft-ietf-rmt-flute-revised-14>

IETF83, March 26th, 2012, Paris

V. Roca

informatiques *mathématiques*

inria

Revisions under progress

- goal is to take into account comments from
  - ❍ **IESG (still 3 Discuss as of March 26th)**
  - ❍ **Gen-ART (Francis D.)**
  - ❍ **IANA**
  - ❍ **Julian Reschke (during LC)**
  - ❍ -14 partially addresses the comments received (work in progress…)

- details of what remains to be done:

1- Peter Saint-Andre (Discuss)

1. Apparently the application/fdt+xml media type was not reviewed on the ietf-types list, per RFC 4288. At least I see no request for a review in the archives at http://www.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/ietf-types/current/maillist.html

2. The IANA Considerations section is missing a registration of the "urn:ietf:params:xml:ns:fdt" namespace.

Revisions under progress… (cont')

○ IANA suggested actions to address this…

ACTION 1:

Upon approval of this document, IANA will
make the following IETF XMLschema
registration at
http://www.iana.org/assignments/xml-registry/
schema.html
with this document as the reference:

Name: fdt (??)
URI: urn:ietf:params:xml:**schema**:fdt (??)
File: [per section 3.4.2 of this document]

ACTION 2:

Upon approval of this document, IANA will register
the following application media type at
http://www.iana.org/assignments/media-types/
application/index.html

fdt+xml [RFC-to-be]

ACTION 3:

Upon approval of this document, IANA will create the
following registry in a new "FLUTE" registry page to
be listed under the "Reliable Multicast Transport (RMT)
Parameters" header at http://www.iana.org/protocols.
Registry Name: FLUTE Content Encoding Algorithm
Registration Procedures: Specification Required
Reference: [RFC-to-be]

Value Description   Reference
0 null [RFC-to-be]
1 ZLIB [RFC1950]
2 DEFLATE [RFC1951]
3 GZIP [RFC1952]
4-255 Unassigned

ACTION 4:

IANA will register the following LCT Header Extension Types at
http://www.iana.org/assignments/lct-header-extensions

192 EXT_FDT LCT [RFC-to-be]
193 EXT_CENC LCT [RFC-to-be]

Revisions under progress… (cont')

2- Robert Sparks (Discuss)

[…]
The document needs clearer discussion around the reuse of FDT Instance IDs. I hope I've misunderstood a fundamental idea and a simple clarification will address the following questions.

- ○ **my feeling is that there's no issue here, but clarification is needed.**

* Currently, receipt of an instance that reuses the id from a non-expired instance SHOULD be considered an error. When would the reciever _NOT_ consider this an error? Why is the document leaving receiver behavior out of scope? This seems to invite interoperability failure in deployed systems.

- ○ **it's forbiden ("MUST be considered an error" is more appropriate), but does it break backward compatibility (which is anyway no longer guaranted by FLUTEv2)?**

Revisions under progress… (cont')

3- Stephen Farrell (Discuss removed, now Comment)

- many comments addressed in -14
- still one remaining point about security (see March 19th mail)

4- Francis Dupont (Gen-ART)

- most of comments have been addressed, but he may have new ones (didn't finish the review)

5- Julian Reschke

- many comments received, not finished addressing them
- co-authors' opinion welcome for some comments…