RTCP SDES SRCNAME

Magnus Westerlund

Bo Burman

Patrik Sandgren

draft-westerlund-avtext-rtcp-sdes-srcname-00

Overview

› Use Cases

›

› Proposal

› Way Forward

General Problem

– SSRCs may be in same or different RTP sessions

For streams in different RTP sessions, requiring the same SSRC over multiple RTP sessions could be used

› For streams in different RTP sessions, requiring the same SSRC

›

Should be possible to use in all use cases where this RTP/RTCP mechanism is needed

– Same SSRC can't be used when streams are in the same session

› Should be possible to use in all use cases where this RTP/RTCP mechanism is needed

Use Cases

RTP Retransmission with SSRC multiplexing
- – Determines association between source and retransmission by matching NACK to Retransmitted packet based on sequence number
- – Limitation that end-points can't have multiple outstanding retransmission request before association is established.
- – Not guaranteed to work in group communication cases

› Simulcasting different version of the same stream
- – [draft-westerlund-avtcore-rtp-simulcast-00](#)

  associated

› SVC using Multi-session Transport
- – Underspecified but appear to rely on same SSRC over multiple sessions to associate different layers

› Forward Error Correction
- – Needs to associate the FEC data with source stream(s)

Related Solutions

Thus requiring SDP based signaling

–

›

–SDP complement for grouping, as it is in signaling

–only defines to link RTP sessions, different RTP sessions

› SDP Grouping Framework (RFC 5888)

–Groups two m= lines, commonly different RTP sessions

–Likely to be used to indicate the relation of the RTP sessions when association of SSRCs in different RTP sessions are needed

SDP Grouping Framework (RFC 5888)

–Groups two m= lines, commonly different RTP sessions

–Likely to be used to indicate the relation of the RTP sessions when association of SSRCs in different RTP sessions are needed.

RTP/RTCP General Solution

› rather than on signaling only would be a useful tool.

› What are the interests in the WG for the general problem?

Proposal

› Refine specified IOP Guidlines for CNAME "RTP Control Protocol
– The labels recommended to be a version of the randomized
(RTCP) Canonical Names (CNAMEs)" (RFC6222) by including an
enumeration of the end-points streams before hashing.

› Define how to use it with SDP Source attribute (RFC5576)
– Enables early binding in SDP when appropriate

short comings ourselves

› We don't plan to go back fixing the identified cases with short comings ourselves

› Interest in the proposed solution?