Real-time Transport Protocol (RTP) Recommendations for SIPREC

(draft-eckel-siprec-rtp-rec-03)

Charles Eckel (eckelcu@cisco.com)

IETF 83 SIPREC WG Meeting March 29, 2011

Goals for this sessions

- I. Separate RTP roles of SRC within CS vs. RS
- 2. RTP session usage by SRC
- 3. Expand recommendations for UA
- 4. Discuss future of this draft

Independent Sessions

- RTP models for CS != those for RS
- CS = Existing session to be recorded
- RS = Session established with the recorder

RTP models for CS != those for RS

RTP Model for SBC (CS) vs. SRC (RS)

- SBC might act as RTP forwarding or transcoding translator
- Yet SRC might act as RTP endpoint or mixer



SRC Using Multiple m-lines



 If SRS does not support, it rejects some m-lines and SRC needs to choose another option.

SRC Using SSRC Multiplexing



 If SRS does not support, SRC finds out through RTCP receiver reports and chooses another option

SRC Using Mixing



- If SRS does not support, it relies on metadata
- Does SRC need to know?

Multiple CNAMEs per Participant

- What to do about it?
- I. Include list of CNAMEs in Participant metadata
- 2. Use SDP attribute to group them
- 3. Don't allow it
- 4. Don't worry about it
- 5. ...

Recommendations for UAs

- Most of the draft focuses on the SRC and SRS
- Loss handling touches on UAs a bit
- We have the concept of a recording aware UA
- Should be add recommendations for recording aware UAs?

Next Steps

- draft-eckel-siprec-rtp-rec exists a standalone document
- This was done purposely to facilitate development and discussion of RTP related SIPREC functionality
- Plan of record is to incorporate into draft-ietf-siprecprotocol eventually
- Is now the appropriate time?
- Alternatively, do we adopt as its own working group draft?