
Audio/Video Transport Working Group

53rd IETF, Minneapolis

17-19 March 2002

10th Anniversary Meeting

Stephen Casner -- *Packet Design*, casner@acm.org

Colin Perkins -- *ISI*, csp@isi.edu

Mailing list: avt@ietf.org

Wednesday Agenda

- Payload formats for MPEG4
 - » Multiple Sync Layer streams 5
 - » Simplified Elementary Streams with no SL
 - » Framework for delivery of MPEG-4 over IP 10
- RTP payload for state signaling events 15
- RTP retransmission framework 15
- RTCP extensions for SSM sessions 15
- RTCP reporting extensions 15
- RTCP extensions for call quality metrics 10
- Multiplexing RTP based on SSRC 10

Multiplexing on SSRC ID

- Should we change “RTP session” to be:
<destination network address,
destination port pair for RTP and RTCP,
SSRC ID (associated with source, not dest)>
- Restated: Why disallow multiplexing of
RTP sessions based on SSRC ID
(RTP spec lists several reasons)

Multiplexing on SSRC ID (2)

- Definition change would conflict with endpoint generating multiple sources in one session (two video cameras)
- Assignment of SSRC ID would need to be coordinated among sources
- Question prompted by poor OS performance with many ports -- why not fix the OS instead?

Monday Agenda

- Introduction and document status 10
- Payload format for MIDI 5
- Secure RTP profile 15
- Payload format for JVT Video 20
- Payload format for iLBC speech 20
- Payload format for AC-3 audio 15
- Payload format for SMPTE 292M video 15
- RTP profile for RTCP-based feedback 15

Presenters Please Note!

- Starting your presentation, please say if:
 - » There is IPR associated with your draft
 - » Your draft is *not* offered in accordance with Section 10 of RFC 2026

AVT Drafts in Process

- RFCs recently published:
 - » Payload format for DV video (RFC 3189)
 - » Payload format for DV audio (RFC 3190)
- Drafts awaiting publication:
 - » RTP payload format for AMR/WB audio — RFC ed
 - » RTP spec and A/V Profile — IESG Last Call
 - Profile comment: remove “quadrophonic” channel order
 - Spec comment: loss = 1 when no packets received
 - Spec comment: session bandwidth = RTP + RTCP?
 - Spec comment: MUST vs SHOULD use even/odd ports

RTP even/odd port text:

For UDP and similar protocols, RTP **SHOULD** use an even destination port number and the corresponding RTCP stream **SHOULD** use the next higher (odd) destination port number. For applications that take a single port number as a parameter and derive the RTP and RTCP port pair from that number, if an odd number is supplied then the application **SHOULD** replace that number with the next lower (even) number to use as the base of the port pair. For applications in which the RTP and RTCP destination port numbers are specified via explicit, separate parameters (using a signaling protocol or other means), the application **MAY** disregard the restrictions that the port numbers be even/odd and consecutive although the use of an even/odd port pair is still encouraged.

AVT Drafts Submitted to IESG

- RTP profile MIME registrations
- SDP bandwidth modifiers for RTCP bandwidth
- Payload format for Comfort Noise
- Enhanced IP/UDP/RTP header compression
- Tunneling multiplexed compressed RTP (TCRTP)

In AVT WG Last Call

- Secure RTP profile (draft-ietf-avt-srtp-03)
- RTCP feedback (draft-ietf-avt-rtcp-feedback-02)
(draft-burmeister-avt-rtcp-feedback-sim-00) *Informational*
- MPEG-4 (draft-ietf-avt-mpeg4-multisl-04)
(draft-ietf-avt-mpeg4-simple-01) *Informational*
- Distr. speech recognition (draft-ietf-avt-dsr-01)
- EVRC/SMV speech (draft-ietf-avt-evrc-smv-00)
- Uneven level protection (draft-ietf-avt-ulp-04.txt)
- Unequal erasure prot. (draft-ietf-avt-uxp-02.txt)