

RTCP Guidelines

draft-ott-avt-rtcp-guidelines-00.txt

Jörg Ott

jo@netlab.tkk.fi

Colin Perkins

csp@csperrkins.org

AVT WG · 13 March 2008

Why RTCP Guidelines...?

- RTP/RTCP provides a powerful toolbox for realizing adaptive applications
- Tailored to the nature of Internet communications

But: RTCP gets implemented only slowly

Yet: RTCP extensions invented for many purposes

And: Extensions sometimes appear redundant or are architecturally not in line with RTP


- Recap what RTP and RTCP can already do
- Discuss the fundamental limitations
- Give guidance on extending RTCP

RTCP Capabilities

- Sender and receiver reports [RFC3550]
 - (in “regular” intervals, typically ≥ 5 s)
 - Reception statistics (cumulative, sliding mean)
 - Sender RTT
 - Receiver RTT with XR [RFC 3611]
- More timely feedback [RFC 4585]
- More frequent feedback
 - Adapt the RTCP bit rate [RFC 3556]
 - Reduce the mean message size [non-compound]
- Unicast, multicast (SSM, ASM)

RTP and RTCP Feedback Loop

- Adaptive real-time applications
 - Tunable feedback loop for individual and group communications
 - From reporting per 5s and more to event-driven to once per RTT



Fundamental RTCP Limitations

- RTCP provides only occasional feedback. There is no per-packet feedback.
- Feedback not truly instant: $O(\text{RTT}) \rightarrow O(\text{seconds})$
- RTCP is inherently unreliable

RTCP Extensions: Basic Checks

- How much of this can existing RTCP already do?
 - Think hard!
 - Avoid functional redundancy
- Is the extension really of general use for entities in the Internet?
 - Or is it just link-specific?
- ...

Questions to ask and answer

- How will this new building block work with others?
- Will this work with all profiles?
- Is this in line with AVP or should this a new profile?
- Interoperability with non-extended nodes?
 - This includes mixed multicast groups
- Scalability across different networking conditions
 - Degradation with increased packet loss, latency, ...
 - Group sizes, group dynamics – RTP is *fundamentally* a group communication protocol
- ...

General Guidelines

- Think IP! Think groups! (and think semantics)
 - It's a different network
 - Don't re-create your favorite PSTN operation here
- Target re-usability
- Be precise and unambiguous and complete for all definitions
- Think about complexity
- Implicit local derivation vs. explicit signaling
- Soft vs. hard reliability
- ...

Now, where to go with this...?

- This is a rough first draft.
- Is this document useful?
- Should a future version make it into a WG item?

- Please read and comment