

# Data Channels

Randell Jesup ([randell-ietf@jesup.org](mailto:randell-ietf@jesup.org))

Salvatore Loreto ([salvatore.loreto@ericsson.com](mailto:salvatore.loreto@ericsson.com))

Michael Tüxen ([tuexen@fh-muenster.de](mailto:tuexen@fh-muenster.de))

# Status

- draft-ietf-rtcweb-data-protocol
  - Got comments
  - No DISCUSS
- draft-ietf-rtcweb-data-channel
  - Got comments
  - One DISCUSS
- The following slides only cover non-editorial changes or suggestions

# draft-ietf-rtcweb-data-protocol (Issue 1)

- Pete Resnick: Use RFC 2119 language in Section 4
- **Fixed:**  
The opening side ~~can~~ **MAY** send user messages before the DATA\_CHANNEL\_ACK is received.

# draft-ietf-rtcweb-data-protocol (Issue 2)

- Alexey Melnikov: Add normative reference to UTF-8, which is used in Section 5.1.
- **Fixed:**  
Added reference to RFC 3629.

# draft-ietf-rtcweb-data-protocol (Issue 3)

- Spencer Dawkins: Use MUST instead of SHOULD in Section 8.2.2.
- **Fixed:**  
Please note that if new Channel Types support ordered and unordered message delivery, the high order bit ~~SHOULD~~ **MUST** be used to indicate whether the message delivery is unordered or not.

# draft-ietf-rtcweb-data-protocol (Issue 4)

- Benoit Claise: Fix obsoleted normative references
- **Not fixed:**  
Changing the reference from RFC 4347 to RFC 6347 would mean that RTCWeb used DTLS 1.2 instead of DTLS 1.0.
- This would need to be changed in other documents, too.
- Clear advice needed!
- The SCTP over DTLS document in TSVWG is blocked on this.

# draft-ietf-rtcweb-data-protocol (Issue 5)

- Pete Resnick: How to select even/odd streams in case DTLS is not used.
- **Proposed fix** (no feedback yet from Pete)  
Explain that the rule is only applicable when DTLS is used. In case DTLS is not used, some other mechanism has to be used which is out of scope of this document.

# draft-ietf-rtcweb-data-channel (Issue 1)

- Benoit Claise, Pete Resnick: Issues with Section 3 and Section 4.
- **Proposed fix (most likely not accepted):**  
Explicitly state that Section 3 and Section 4 are informational, don't use RFC 2119 language in Section 4.
- **Suggested by Pete and Benoit:**  
Remove Section 3 and 4 and possibly move them to draft-ietf-rtcweb-use-cases-and-requirements



# draft-ietf-rtcweb-data-channel (Issue 2)

- Martin Stiernerling: RFC 2119 language not appropriate in Section 5.

- **Fixed:**

In general, the lower layer interface of an SCTP implementation ~~SHOULD~~ **should** be adapted to address the differences between IPv4 and IPv6 (being connection-less) or DTLS (being connection-oriented).

# draft-ietf-rtcweb-data-channel (Issue 3)

- Alissa Cooper: inappropriate use of RFC 2119 language in Section 6.1.
- **Fixed:**  
The dynamic address reconfiguration extension defined in [RFC5061] MUST be used to signal the support of the stream reset extension defined in [RFC6525];. ~~Other~~ Other features of [RFC5061] are not REQUIRED to be implemented **OPTIONAL**.

# draft-ietf-rtcweb-data-channel (Issue 4)

- Pete Resnick, Spencer Dawkins: inappropriate use of RFC 2119 language in Section 6.5.
- **Fixed:**  
If it attempts to re-use a stream which is part of an existing data channel, the addition ~~SHOULD~~ **MUST** fail.

# draft-ietf-rtcweb-data-channel (Issue 5)

- Spencer Dawkins: Missing use of RFC 2119 language in Section 6.6 and missing explanation.
- **Fixed:**  
~~No more than one message should be put into an SCTP user message.~~ The message orientation of SCTP is used to preserve the message boundaries of user messages. Therefore, no more than one message **MUST** be put into an SCTP user message. If the deprecated PPID-based fragmentation and reassembly is not used, exactly one message **MUST** be put into an SCTP user message.