RTP Payload Format Restrictions

draft-ietf-mmusic-rid

IETF 98 – Chicago, Illinois, USA

MMUSIC Working Group

Adam Roach

We are almost done.

WE ARE SO CLOSE I CAN TASTE IT

6.4. Offerer Processing of the SDP Answer

- In the current text, the answerer can change the restrictions such that the offerer cannot honor them, which causes them to be ignored:

  3. If the restrictions have been changed between the offer and the answer, the offerer MUST ensure that the modifications can be supported; if they cannot, the offerer SHALL discard the "a=rid" line.

- What does the offerer do next (the answerer doesn't know there is a problem)?

Possible approaches

1. Keep as-is: the restriction failed to be negotiated, so it doesn't apply. This generally makes sense because the session would have been established just fine even if the either party didn't support rid.

2. Change text so that the restriction (if any) expressed in the offer stands. This probably makes a little more sense: we know the offerer can honor it, and while it is not as restricted as the answer, at least it's part of the way there.

3. Add some more mechanism (probably an additional offer/answer exchange) by which the offerer tells the answerer that it can't honor the restriction. It would probably look like something along the lines of "here's my sending restriction, and I can't constrain it any further."

Proposal: Option 2

- While I think option 1 is quite defensible, option 2 clearly has better properties.
  - In either case, we would want to add an advisory statement indicating that attempts to restrict constraints further in an answer may fail.
- Option 3 would require substantial extra mechanism, while providing very little benefit.