



# Multiple RTP Sessions over a Single Transport Flow

CAPITALS

[draft-westerlund-avtcore-transport-multiplexing-01](#)

Magnus Westerlund – Ericsson

Colin Perkins – University of Glasgow

# Outline

---

- › Introduction
- › Problem Statement
- › Requirements
- › Evaluation of Proposals
- › Authors Recommendation
- › Way Forward

WXYZ[\]^\_`abcdefg  
h~+23  
00x0U0U0Yr1&  
/AaAaCcCcDdD  
NnNnOoOoEeEeRrRr  
ZzZzJjJj...Ww  
EeEeGgGgIiIiK  
SsSsTtTtUuUu

ETYФXЧЙАЕНЮα

КЛМНОПРСТУФХ  
МНОПРСТУФХЦЧ  
ЪьёӨVТtёæWw

# Introduction

---

- › Deployment of Network Address Translators (NAT) and Firewalls (FW) is very common
- › This has generated a situation where each additional transport flow comes at;
  - Some additional delay in performing NAT traversal;
  - A risk that NAT traversal fails for some flows causing application failure;
  - A concern over the resource consumption in NAT and Firewalls
- › Currently the only specified separator of RTP sessions are transport flows

WXYZ[\]^\_`abcdefgh  
@~+23  
00x0U0U0Yr!\$%  
/AaAaaCcCcDdD  
NnNnOoOoEeEeRrRr  
ZzZzJjJj...Ww  
EeEeGgGgIiIiKk  
SsSsTtTtUuUu

ЭТУФХЦЙАЕНЮа

КЛИНОПРСТУФХ  
МНОПРСТУФХЦЧ  
ЬЪЭӨVТГæWw

# Problem Statement

---

- › In the RTP multiplexing architecture there is discussion about a number of cases where using multiple RTP sessions are appropriate
- › Using multiple RTP sessions currently forces the application to use multiple transport flows.
  - Concerns over the associated costs can prevent the application from making the best choice
- › To avoid forcing the applications to select between using multiple sessions and having to pay the extra cost when transport differentiation isn't required a general solution should be defined
- › A single solution in this space can minimize interoperability issues



# Requirements

---

1. Support multiple RTP sessions over one transport flow
  2. Enable same SSRC value in multiple RTP sessions
    1. Avoid SSRC translation in gateways/translators
    2. Support existing extensions
  3. Ensure SRTP functions
  4. Don't Redefine used bits
  5. Firewall Friendly
  6. Monitoring and Reporting should still function
  7. Usable over Multicast
  8. Incremental deployment
- › Do people agree this as reasonable set of requirements?



# Comparison

Solution	1	2.1	2.2	3	4	5	6	7	8	OH
Header Extension	Yes	Yes	Partially	Yes	Partially	Partially	Partially	Yes	Yes	No (8+)
Multiplexing Shim	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partially	Partially	Yes	Yes	Partially (1)
Single Session	No	No	Partially	Yes	Yes	Partially	Partially	Yes	No	Yes (0)
SRTP MKI field	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partially	Partially	Partially	Partially	Yes	Yes	Partially (4)
Octet in the Padding field	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Partially	Partially	Partially	Yes	Yes	Partially (2)
Redefine the SSRC field	Yes	No	Partially	Partially	No	Partially	Partially	Yes	No	Yes (0)

Yes
Partially
No

RTP Sessions over Single Transp

- Support multiple RTP sessions over one transport flow
- Enable same SSRC value in multiple RTP sessions
  - Avoid SSRC translation in gateways/translators
  - Support existing extensions
- Ensure SRTP functions
- Don't Redefine used bits
- Firewall Friendly
- Monitoring and Reporting should still function
- Usable over Multicast
- Incremental deployment



# Recommendations

---

- › The Authors recommends that the WG develops a solution based on Multiplexing Shim
- › The conclusion of Quebec discussion was to do both Single Session and enable multiple sessions on a single transport flow:
  - Multiplexing Shim: draft-westerlund-avtcore-transport-multiplexing-01
  - Single Session: draft-lennox-rtcweb-rtp-media-type-mux-00
  - Signalling: draft-holmberg-mmusic-sdp-bundle-negotiation-00
- › Do we need both?

WXYZ[\]^\_`abcdefg  
hijklmnopqrstu  
vwxyz0123456789  
:;<=>?@AaBbCcDdE  
FfGgHhIiJjKkLlMm  
NnOoPpQqRrSsTtUu  
VvWwXxYyZz{|}~

ЭТУФХЦШЩЪЫЭИЮ

КЛМНОПРСТУФХ  
ЦЧШЩЪЫЭИЮ  
ЬЪЭӨВѴѶѷѸѹѺѻѼѽѾѿ