TCP Candidates with Interactive Connectivity Establishment (ICE)

draft-ietf-mmusic-ice-tcp-10

J. Rosenberg, A. Keranen, B. Lowekamp, A. Roach

IETF 79, Beijing, China

November 10th, 2010

Ari Keränen

Changes since last time (rev -08)

- ICE TCP framework draft was merged
  - instead of just STUN & TURN, various kind of NAT traversal mechanisms are listed and their implementation encouraged
  - prioritization recommendations for the new types
  - removed and/or generalized STUN & TURN specific text
- Added Appendix A where limitations of TCP based NAT traversal are discussed

Review comments

- Example of the SDP would be nice
  - Need to make sure it's correct (and clearly non-normative)
- New candidate types would also apply for UDP
  - Perhaps a new draft about that some day?
- Multiple candidate types increases size of the checklist and also complexity; could perhaps start with smaller amount of types
  - True, but can't be (?) simplified without hurting success probability and/or speed

Next Steps (at IETF78)

- Feedback/comments
- New, merged version of the drafts
  - Need review(er)s
- Fix what is fixable but trying to keep it simple
- Document limitations
- WGLC

Next Steps …

- Feedback/comments ✓
- New, merged version of the drafts ✓
  - Need more review(er)s?
- Fix what is fixable but trying to keep it simple ✓
- Document limitations ✓
- WGLC
  - although, there's (at least) one more revision coming before with some small fixes..

The small fixes

- Clarified when need to keep connections to TURN server alive
- One new paragraph to appendix A about limitations of the new techniques
  - Require support from endpoints and/or network elements
  - Without comprehensive experimental data on how well different techniques are supported the actual increase of success probability is hard to evaluate

Next step(s)

- Anything more to fix?
- WGLC