Audio/Video Transport Working Group 53nd 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 Simplified Elementary Streams with no SL Framework for delivery of MPEG-4 over IP 	5 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)