

ietf 98  
**ice-sip-sdp**  
-12

Suhas Nandakumar

# Quick Recap ..

---

Thanks to **Adam Roach** for the detailed review

Version-12 incorporates Adam's review (most of them)

Open questions/Issues (Today)

Clarification Questions (on mailing list, awaiting response)

# `{signaling-protocol}` and ICE SDP

---

Issue: How do we handle SDP for the non-SIP use-cases ?

Current Draft - Only SIP, what about RTCWeb ?

Proposals:

- a) Keep the draft same
- b) Split `ice-sip-sdp` → `ice-sdp` and `ice-sip` drafts
  - i) *Keep sdp usage outside specific signaling transport*

# RFC6544's Fate

---

Issue: ice-bis && ice-sip-sdp obsoletes RFC5245. What's the state of RFC6544 ?

Proposals:

1. No-op on RFC6544, add ice-tcp candidates to ice-sip-sdp
2. Create RFC6544bis to refer to ice-bis and ice-sip-sdp drafts instead → **new work**
3. Bring RFC6544 text into ice-bis and ice-sip-sdp drafts → **new work with slow-down of current drafts.**

# ice-options support vs activation

---

Issue: Draft needs to distinguish between **feature support** vs **feature activation** for ice-options

Adam's comment “ kind of potential morass we ran into with SIP options tags: the patchwork means of means of indicating feature \*support\* versus feature \*activation\* made it very difficult to specify and implement things in a consistent fashion. I strongly recommend that this document spend a bit more text discussing this distinction, and maybe even consider a formal syntax for distinguishing between supported and activated features. “

Resolution: Not sure, Need more clarification from Adam ??

# Next Steps

---

Handling ice transport change and default candidates -  
waiting on pull request from **Roman Shpount**.

Close on the open issues from today.

**Thank you !!!**