

---

# Audio/Video Transport Working Group

54th IETF, Yokohama  
17-18 July 2002

Stephen Casner -- *Packet Design*, [casner@acm.org](mailto:casner@acm.org)

Colin Perkins -- *ISI*, [csp@isi.edu](mailto:csp@isi.edu)

Mailing list: [avt@ietf.org](mailto:avt@ietf.org)

# Wednesday Agenda

---

- Introduction and document status 15
  - » Issue: G.726 sample packing order 5
  - » Issue: Maximum interval for CN 5
- Payload format for MIDI 5
- Payload format for interleaved audio 10
- Payload format for AC-3 audio 15
- Payload format for JPEG 2000 video 15
- Payload format for JVT Video 15
- Payload formats for MPEG4
  - » Simplified Elementary Streams with no SL 5
  - » Framework for delivery of MPEG-4 over IP 10
  - » FlexMux streams 15

# Thursday Agenda

---

- Payload format for iLBC speech 15
- Payload format for SMPTE 292M video 5
- Payload format for uncompressed video 15
- RTCP reporting extensions 15
- RTP retransmission 20
- Multiplexing RTP based on SSRC 10
- RTCP extensions for SSM sessions 15

# AVT Drafts in Process

---

- RFCs recently published:
  - » Payload format for AMR (RFC 3267)
- Drafts awaiting publication:
  - » RTP profile MIME registrations
  - » SDP bandwidth modifiers for RTCP bandwidth
  - » Payload format for Comfort Noise
  - » RTP spec & A/V Profile — “tentatively approved”

# Issue: G.726 sample packing

---

- RTP payload format packs samples into octets *little-endian*; ITU AAL2 payload format packs samples *big-endian*
- Text/diagram in RTP profile may not be clear enough
- Recent request to change RTP format
- One response objecting to change
- Define ITU format as second MIME type? (Dynamic payload type)

# Issue: Max interval for CN?

---

- Should the Comfort Noise payload format (which is at RFC editor) be modified to specify a maximum interval between CN packets?
- If so, what should the interval be?
- Or, does this belong in some application-specific document rather than the payload format itself?

*[RTCP is intended to indicate liveness]*

# AVT Drafts Submitted to IESG

---

- Enhanced IP/UDP/RTP header compression
- Tunneling multiplexed compressed RTP (TCRTP)
- Secure RTP
- Payload format for EVRC/SMV

# In AVT WG Last Call

---

- **RTCP feedback** (draft-ietf-avt-rtcp-feedback-02)  
(draft-burmeister-avt-rtcp-feedback-sim-00) *Informational*
- **MPEG-4** (draft-ietf-avt-mpeg4-simple-04)
- **Distr. speech recognition** (draft-ietf-avt-dsr-02)
- **Uneven level protection** (draft-ietf-avt-ulp-05)
- **Unequal erasure prot.** (draft-ietf-avt-uxp-03)



# ULP as revision of RFC2733?

---

- In RFC2733, the X and P bits in the RTP header don't retain their usual meaning!
  - » A few bits saved by putting the XOR'd bits there
  - » Means header validation must be special cased for FEC packets
- Proposal: Redesign ULP to fix this and replace RFC2733

# New Drafts Not Presented

---

- DTMF signaling (draft-ietf-avt-rfc2833bis-00)
  - » Several tones & events added or fixed
  - » Clarified that duration is unsigned; split durations exceeding range into multiple
  - » Distinguished states from events; states can be superseded before expiration
  - » Issue: Handling very long events (> 8 sec)
  - » Short-term effort with goal of Draft Std.  
*Volunteer for tracking interop?*

# 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