

# Media OPS BoF

IETF 105

Chairs: Leslie Daigle & Glenn Deen

# Note Well

This is a reminder of IETF policies in effect on various topics such as patents or code of conduct. It is only meant to point you in the right direction. Exceptions may apply. The IETF's patent policy and the definition of an IETF "contribution" and "participation" are set forth in BCP 79; please read it carefully.

- As a reminder:
  - By participating in the IETF, you agree to follow IETF processes and policies.
  - If you are aware that any IETF contribution is covered by patents or patent applications that are owned or controlled by you or your sponsor, you must disclose that fact, or not participate in the discussion.
  - As a participant in or attendee to any IETF activity you acknowledge that written, audio, video, and photographic records of meetings may be made public.
  - Personal information that you provide to IETF will be handled in accordance with the IETF Privacy Statement.
  - As a participant or attendee, you agree to work respectfully with other participants; please contact the ombudsteam (<https://www.ietf.org/contact/ombudsteam/>) if you have questions or concerns about this.

Definitive information is in the documents listed below and other IETF BCPs. For advice, please talk to WG chairs or Ads:

- BCP 9 (Internet Standards Process)
- BCP 25 (Working Group processes)
- BCP 25 (Anti-Harassment Procedures)
- BCP 54 (Code of Conduct)
- BCP 78 (Copyright)
- BCP 79 (Patents, Participation)
- <https://www.ietf.org/privacy-policy/> (Privacy Policy)

# Agenda

- Agenda Bashing, Blue Sheets, etc
- Introduction to BoF - chairs - 5 minutes
- Brief Review of the VIG (Video Interest Group) side meetings - Glenn Deen - 10 minutes
- Video using IETF technologies
  - Glenn Deen - draft-deen-mops-smtp-2110-normative-references-00 - 5 minutes
  - Sanjay Mishra - OpenCaching (Streaming Video Alliance work) - 15 mins
- Highlights of issues with low-latency video streaming - Justin Uberti- 10 minutes
- Scope of Video on the Internet - Jake Holland - 25 minutes
  - draft-jholland-mops-taxonomy-00
- Scoping Discussion of IETF-specific work
  - Identification of concrete work items: - E.g., A roadmap document about the various video-related and video-delivery-related standards
  - Solicit volunteers — for work items, onward discussion
  - Review of draft WG charter - draft at <https://yana.techark.org/vig-at-ietf/mops-draft-charter/>
  - Standard RFC 5434 WG-interest questions

# Introduction

# Purpose

- *Highlight* the many existing video activities that are leveraging IETF protocol work, identify gaps in IETF work and/or areas of incompatibility with video technology development efforts being carried out elsewhere
- *Identify*
  - a core group of IETF participants working on video activities across the IETF's technology areas,
  - and possible onward discussion areas

# Challenges

- This is multifaceted
  - This work covers a lot of traditional IETF “Areas”
  - No clear single home for it
  - Some of the work is being done in other organizations, but touches on IETF standards
    - Some coordination would be helpful

# Objective

- Hoping to launch a WG or other formal group for regular meetings
  - Charter discussion at the end of the meeting

# Others' presentations



# Scoping discussion

# Draft Charter

- Available here:  
<https://yana.techark.org/vig-at-ietf/mops-draft-charter/>
- Based on MBONED and v6OPS WG charters

# Overview

- Internet- and Internet-protocol-delivered video/media is popular, leading to significant technology development across industries not traditionally thought of as Internet technology developers or operators, as well as considerable quantities of traffic on local and transit networks. Continued development of Internet-using technologies should be properly coordinated in order to ensure that the existing technologies are well-utilized, and new ones are developed in sympathy with the Internet's core protocols and design.
- MOPS will solicit input on operational issues and practices, existing and proposed technologies related to the deployment, engineering, and operation of media streaming and manipulation protocols and procedures in the global Internet, inter-domain and single domain. In this case, media is considered to include the transport of video, audio, objects and any combination thereof, possibly non-sequentially. The scope is media and media protocols' interactions with the network, but not the technologies of control protocols or media formats.

# Goals

The goals of mops are:

1. Solicit input from network operators and users to identify operational issues with media delivery in and across networks, and determine solutions or workarounds to those issues.
2. Solicit discussion and documentation of the issues and opportunities media acquisition and delivery and of the resulting innovations.
3. Operational solutions for identified issues should be developed in mops and documented in informational or BCP drafts.
4. Document operational requirements for media acquisition and delivery
5. Develop mechanisms and procedures for sharing operational information to aid in operation of media technologies in the global Internet
6. Develop tools, extend protocols and provide operational and implementation advice that assists in media technology administration, diagnostics, troubleshooting and deployment between/within native and non-native environments.

# Charter scoping paras

- These documents should document media operational experience, including global Internet, inter-domain and within-domain operations.
- Media operational and deployment issues with specific protocols or technologies (such as Applications, Transport Protocols, Routing Protocols, DNS or Sub-IP Protocols) are the primary responsibility of the groups or areas responsible for those protocols or technologies. However, the mops Working Group may provide input to those areas/groups, as needed, and cooperate with those areas/groups in reviewing solutions to mops operational and deployment problems.

# Additional constraints

- Future work items within this scope will be adopted by the Working Group only if there is a substantial expression of interest from the community and if the work clearly does not fit elsewhere in the IETF.
- There must be a continuous expression of interest for the Working Group to work on a particular work item. If there is no longer sufficient interest in the Working Group in a work item, the item may be removed from the list of Working Group items.

# RFC5434

Are we ready?

# Key questions (RFC 5434)

- Have we identified
  - there is a problem that needs solving, and the IETF is the right group to attempt solving it.
  - there is a critical mass of participants willing to work on the problem (e.g., write drafts, review drafts, etc.).
  - the scope of the problem is well defined and understood, that is, people generally understand what the WG will work on (and what it won't) and what its actual deliverables will be.
  - there is agreement that the specific deliverables (i.e., proposed documents) are the right set. - it is believed that the WG has a reasonable probability of having success (i.e., in completing the deliverables in its charter in a timely fashion).
- And, if not, what do we need to do to get there?