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Abstract

This document describes potential approaches to multiplexing of QUIC along with RTP, RTCP, DTLS, STUN, TURN and ZRTP in WebRTC peer-to-peer data exchange.
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1. Introduction

There are a number of ways in which communication between WebRTC peers may utilize QUIC. One of these is transport of RTP over QUIC, described in [I-D.rtpfolks-quic-rtp-over-quic]. Another is use of QUIC [I-D.ietf-quic-transport] for data exchange. A Javascript API for use of QUIC in WebRTC data exchange has been incorporated into the ORTC API [ORTC], under development within the W3C ORTC Community Group.

In a WebRTC scenario where ICE [RFC5245] is utilized for NAT traversal, SRTP [RFC3711] is keyed using DTLS-SRTP [RFC5764] and QUIC is used for data exchange, RTP/RTCP [RFC3550] STUN [RFC5389], TURN [RFC5766], DTLS [RFC6347], ZRTP [RFC6189] and QUIC may all need to be multiplexed over a single ICE transport.

As noted in [RFC7983] Figure 3, protocol demultiplexing currently relies upon differentiation based on the first octet, as follows:

```plaintext
+----------------+                      +----------------+
| [0..3]         |                      | [128..191]     |
| [16..19]       |                      |               |
| [20..63]       |                      |               |
| [64..79]       |                      |               |
+----------------+                      +----------------+
Figure 1: DTLS-SRTP receiver’s packet demultiplexing algorithm.
```

As noted by Colin Perkins and Lars Eggert in [QUIC-Issue] this creates a potential conflict with the current design of the QUIC headers described in [I-D.ietf-quic-transport], since the first octet of the QUIC header is either:

```plaintext
+------------------+
| 1| Type (7) | Long header packet
+------------------+

which potentially produces values of the first octet in the range 129-134, conflicting with RTP/RTCP, or

```plaintext
+------------------+
| 0|C|K| Type (5) | Short header packet
+------------------+
```

Aboba, et. al Informational [Page 3]
which produces values for the first octet in the ranges 1-3, 33-35, 
65-67 or 97-99, potentially conflicting with STUN, DTLS and TURN.

1.1. Terminology

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", 
"SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this 
document are to be interpreted as described in [RFC2119].

2. Solutions

This section presents potential solutions to the QUIC multiplexing 
problem, including changes to the QUIC headers, addition of a 
multiplexing octet and use of heuristics.

2.1. QUIC Header Changes

As noted in [QUIC-Issue], one potential solution involves changes to 
the QUIC headers, such as setting the top two bits of the first octet 
of a QUIC packet to 1. This would imply a reduction in the size of 
the type fields:

```
+-----------------------------+
|1|1|1|Type (5) |  Long header packet 
+-----------------------------+

+-----------------------------+
|1|1|0|C|K|Type3|  Short header packet 
+-----------------------------+
```

Note: [QUIC-Spin] proposes to add a spin bit to the type octet within 
the QUIC header, in order to allow for RTT calculation. This would 
leave 4 bits for the type field in the long header packet and 2 bits 
for the type field in the short header, which would accomodate the 
type field values allocated in [I-D.ietf-quic-transport].

2.1.1. Pros and Cons

The advantage to this approach is that it adds no additional overhead 
on-the-wire. However it does require a reduction in the size of the 
QUIC Type fields and could potentially require allocation of the 
following initial octet code points for QUIC: For the Long header, 
225-230 (241-246 when the spin bit is set) and for the Short header, 
193-195 (209-11 with spin bit set), 209-211 (225-227 with spin bit 
set) and 217-219 (233-235 with the spin bit set). Utilizing all of 
these code points for QUIC would leave limited code points available 
for future allocations.
2.2. Multiplexing Shim

In this approach, an initial octet not allocated within [RFC7983] would be prepended to each QUIC packet, allowing QUIC packets to be differentiated from RTP, RTCP, DTLS, STUN, TURN and ZRTP based on the first octet alone. As an example, an octet with decimal value 192 could be used:

```
+----------+
|1|1|0|0|0|0|0|0|
+----------+
```

2.2.1. Pros and Cons

Advantages of this approach include simplicity and the consumption of only a single initial octet code point for demultiplexing of QUIC. The disadvantage is the addition of a single octet of overhead to every QUIC packet, which could impact performance where small payloads are exchanged, such as in peer-to-peer gaming.

2.3. Heuristics

During the QUIC WG interim in Seattle, Martin Thomson suggested the following heuristics for differentiation of QUIC packets from RTP/RTCP/DTLS/STUN/TURN/ZRTP:

1. Demultiplex differently during the "QUIC handshake" and "steady state".
2. During handshake, we only need to worry about the QUIC Long header, which simplifies the logic.
   a. Force all handshake packets to utilize the QUIC Long header.
   b. The QUIC Long header (0x1XXXXXXXX) (or 0x11XXXXXXXX with the spin bit set) does not conflict with STUN (0x000000XX), DTLS (0x0000XXXXXX), or TURN Channel (0x01XXXXXXX).
   c. The QUIC Long header does conflict with RTP/RTCP (0x10XXXXXX), but those packets typically aren’t sent until the QUIC handshake is completed. Corner case: an application starts off with audio and video keyed with DTLS-SRTP without QUIC, then the application wishes to add QUIC data (e.g. the user clicks on the "white-board" icon).
      i. Alternative: force the RTP padding bit to 1 using a one-byte pad if there isn’t already padding (pad == 0x01). Then force QUIC to have a type < 64 (the current max is 8).
      ii. Alternative: Disallow QUIC in this case, use SCTP data exchange instead.
3. During "steady state", we only need to worry about the QUIC Short header.
a. QUIC doesn’t need the Long header after the handshake.
b. The QUIC Short header (0x00XXXXXX or 0x01XXXXXX with the spin bit set) does not conflict with RTP/RTCP (0x10XXXXXX), so we only need to worry about conflicts with STUN/TURN/DTLS/ZRTP.
c. Disallow simultaneous use of DTLS and QUIC Short header packets.
   i. Alternative: when using DTLS and QUIC at the same time, only use the QUIC Long header. Not optimal, but isn’t really needed.
d. ICE can be demuxed using the magic cookie and checksum.
   i. Alternative: STUN can only conflict with 3 QUIC packet types: Version Negotiation, Client Initial, and Server Stateless Retry. Out of those, none should be needed during the steady state.
e. You shouldn’t need to demultiplex QUIC with TURN channel data or other STUN traffic. But what about consent packets?

2.3.1. Pros and Cons

This approach has the advantage that it requires no changes to QUIC headers, nor does it add any overhead to QUIC packets. Disadvantages include additional complexity within the multiplexing algorithm, the consumption of additional multiplexing code points, and potential future difficulties in adapting the algorithm to support changes to the QUIC protocol or additional protocols to be multiplexed.

3. Security Considerations

The solutions discussed in this document could potentially introduce some additional security considerations beyond those detailed in [RFC7983].

Due to the additional logic required, if mis-implemented, heuristics have the potential to misclassify packets.

When QUIC is used for only for data exchange, the TLS-within-QUIC exchange [I-D.ietf-quic-tls] derives keys used solely to protect the QUIC data packets. If properly implemented, this should not affect the transport of SRTP nor the derivation of SRTP keys via DTLS-SRTP, but if badly implemented, both transport and key derivation could be adversely impacted.
4. IANA Considerations

This document does not require actions by IANA.
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