

RTP payload for text conversation. "RFC 2793bis"

<http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-ietf-avt-rfc2793bis-08.txt>

Arnoud van Wijk, Viataal

Gunnar Hellström, Omnitor

Paul Jones, CISCO

IETF 60, Aug. 2004

RFC 2793 text/t140 is revised in draft-ietf-avt-rfc2793bis-08.txt

- RTP payload format for **real time character by character** text conversation.
- Gives a live feeling to the text part of a real time call.
- Two formats
 - text/t140 for terminal sessions
 - audio/t140c for PSTN transit gateways
- Useful for all users and essential for people who have little or no use of voice in a call.

RFC2793bis comments during last call 18. July – 2. Aug

- Mainly just positive comments.
- A few requiring modifications.
- The solutions have been accepted

Comment 1, on congestion

Comment: Make it clear that the congestion considerations in section 9 are valid also when using other profiles than RTP/AVP.

Solution: Insertion in sec 9, first paragraph:

“The congestion considerations from section 10 of RFC 3550 [2], section 6 of RFC 2198 [3] and **any used profile, e.g.** the section about congestion in chapter 2 of RFC 3551 [11] apply with the following application specific considerations.”

Comment 2, on congestion

Comment: Make clear what conditions the bandwidth examples in sec. 9 are valid for.

Solution: Insertion in paragraph beginning "As guidance..", and deletion further down:

"As guidance, some load figures are provided here ***as examples based on use of IPv4, including the load from IP, UDP and RTP headers without compression.***"

...

"-With the (unusually high) load of 20 characters per second, in a language that make use of three octets UTF-8 characters, ~~***no header compression***~~, two redundant levels and 300 ms between transmissions, the maximum load of this application is 3300 bits/s."

Comment 3, sdp mapping

Comment: In sdp mapping section 10.3, it is not clear that it is valid for both formats text/t140 and audio/t140c.

Solution: Addition in sec.10.3, first paragraph:

“– The MIME type ("text" *or* "audio") goes in SDP "m=" as the media name.”

Comment 4: Level of redundancy

Comment: There are a few places where the draft is implicitly breaking the restriction of text/RED. When having defined a PT it implies a certain number of levels of redundancy. However the draft does not seem to keep to this. Examples where it is unclear are:

- Section 5.3, last paragraph on page 11.
- Second paragraph in Section 7.2

Solution: No change.

Explanation 1: After a long pause, there is no valid redundant data to transmit. Therefore occasionally fewer levels.

Explanation 2: The restriction may be valid only when using sdp, therefore the wording is left. Expect possible revision of RFC2198 to clarify.

Comment 5, default use of redundancy

Comment: “Personally I regret the weakening of some terms in this draft (about 2 generations redundancy as default and audio/t140c usage). I'd love to see more MUSTs in it. :-)
But I can live with the compromises in this draft and will in other drafts make the implementations more set into stone.”

Solution: No change. Words for use of default 2 levels of redundancy are strong enough for the common case when end-to-end conditions are not known. Still they leave room for development and application variations.

As comment says: other documents may profile usage.

Conclusions

- All comments satisfied with a few small edits.
- No open issues.