Generic RTP Multiplexing (GeRM)

Mark Handley USC/ISI mjh@isi.edu

- To be able to multiplex generic RTP streams
- When gateways cooperate, to have an overhead as low as one byte per multiplexed payload.
- When gateways don't cooperate, overhead depends on which traffic gets multiplexed together.
- Worst case: no worse than full RTP header per payload.

Status

• First idea during Chicago IETF.

Internet draft now available

▶ name changed from MuRGE to GeRM.

• No changes required from Chicago slides.

 Just improved the explanation and corrected typos.

GeRM Difference Coding



RTP Header



GeRM Header



GeRM Bits

- Bit 0:
 - zero=>Byte 1 unchanged (V=same, P=zero, CC=same)
 - ► one=>Byte 1 follows.
- Bit 1:
 - > zero=>PT unchanged, one=>PT follows
- Bit 2: M bit
- Bit 3: zero=>seq number unchanged
- Bit 4: zero=>timestamp unchanged
- Bit 5: zero=>SSRC (3 MS bytes unchanged)
- Bit 6: zero=>SSRC (LS byte increased by one)
- Bit 7:
 - > zero=>length unchanged
 - one=>one byte length field follows

Usage

- GeRM can be used between gateways with no additional signalling.
 - Approx 11 bytes per payload, vs 40 for IP/UDP/RTP.
- GeRM can be used with an additional signalling protocol that performs SSRC/SeqNo/Timestamp mappings.
 - Can reduce overhead to 1 byte per payload in the limiting case of same PT, same length payloads, no holes in the (mapped) SSRC
 - space.
 - Normal case for POTS->IPTEL->POTS would be approx 7 bytes if mapping is only done at call startup.

GeRM signalling

If we decide that this approach is promising, we should probably also specify a gateway->gateway signalling protocol.

- Allow robust SSRC mapping at call startup.
- Allow robust SSRC remapping when call terminates and leaves a space in the SSRC space.
 - May not be required if call startup rate is high.
- Allow seque remapping?
 - More difficult issue is one of silence supression.
- Allow timestamp remapping due to clock drift?
 - Only an issue for RTP not generated at the gateway.

What Are Our Goals?

- If we want a single mux protocol, probably we want something like GeRM.
- If we really care about a couple of bytes per payload, GeRM may not be efficient enough.
 - Probably have to have several different special purpose multiplexing protocols.
- I'm not going to push GeRM forward without concensus from this group that a general RTP multiplexing protocol is needed.

• What's the concensus?