BUNDLE -04

Christer Holmberg
Harald Alvestrand
Cullen Jennings

IETF #87

28th July - 2nd August , 2014
Berlin, Germany

(1) MAJOR CHANGES

› MAJOR EDITORIAL CHANGES
 – SDP O/A procedures
 – BUNDLE address selection

› SUGGESTION FOR NEW TEXT SENT TO THE LIST
 – Thank You to everyone who commented and contributed!
  › Bernard A, Colin P, Cullen J, Emil I, Eric R, Harald A, Kevin D, Martin T, Paul K, Thomas B, Thomas S,…

› -04 SUBMITTED JUNE 14th

(2) EXAMPLE

1st OFFER

v=0
o=alice 2890844526 2890844526 IN IP4 host.atlanta.com
c=IN IP4 host.atlanta.com
t=0 0
a=group:BUNDLE foo bar
m=audio 10000 RTP/AVP 0 8 97
a=mid:foo
b=AS:200
a=rtpmap:0 PCMU/8000
a=rtpmap:8 PCMA/8000
a=rtpmap:97 iLBC/8000
m=video 20000 RTP/AVP 31 32
a=mid:bar
b=AS:1000
a=rtpmap:31 H261/90000
a=rtpmap:32 MPV/90000

2nd OFFER

v=0
o=alice 2890844526 2890844527 IN IP4 host.atlanta.com
c=IN IP4 host.atlanta.com
t=0 0
a=group:BUNDLE foo bar
m=audio 10000 RTP/AVP 0 8 97
a=mid:foo
b=AS:200
a=rtpmap:0 PCMU/8000
a=rtpmap:8 PCMA/8000
a=rtpmap:97 iLBC/8000
m=video 10000 RTP/AVP 31 32
a=mid:bar
b=AS:1000
a=rtpmap:31 H261/90000
a=rtpmap:32 MPV/90000

(3) THE QUESTIONS (1/3)

› **Q1**: Can we agree that, within a BUNDLE group (including all m- lines associated with the group), any given PT value can only be used for a single codec configuration?

  – Yes (Paul K, Colin P)

› **Q2:** If Q1, do we agree that we need EXPLICIT text somewhere*, as there are opinions that simply referencing RFC 3550 might not be clear enough?

  – * e.g. BUNDLE, draft-ietf-avtcore-multiplex-guidelines,…
  – Yes (Paul K, Colin P)

› **Q7**: Within a BUNDLE group, do we allow the usage of the same PT value in multiple RTP m- lines, for the SAME codec configuration?

  – How do we define "same codec configuration"? (Roni E)

(4) THE QUESTIONS (2/3)

› **Q3**: Do we need to specify a default mechanism for mapping RTP data to m-lines?

  – Shall not be mandated to map RTP data to m- line (Mo Z, Harald A)
    › Informative descriptions of mapping mechanisms fine (Mo Z)
  – There shall be one default mechanism, IF one needs to map (Colin P)
    › Based on SSRC, if available
  – Must be a reason why one uses multiple m- lines for the same RTP media type, therefore it must always be possible to map to m- line (Paul K)

› **Q4**: If Q3, do we mandate applications to support, and use (unless applications are made aware of other mechanisms supported by all endpoints) PT for mapping received RTP media?

(5) THE QUESTIONS (3/3)

› **Q5**: **Within** a SIP session, once both endpoints have indicated support of BUNDLE, do we allow an Offerer to assign an address:port to multiple m- lines, **before** the Answerer has selected that address:port as a BUNDLE address?

  › Yes (Paul K)
  › Nobody else commented

› **Q6**: If Q5, do we allow an Offerer to assign an address:port to multiple m- lines **before** the Answerer has, within the SIP session, indicated that it supports BUNDLE? A typical example would be assigning an address:port to multiple m-lines already in the initial SDP Offer for a SIP session.

  – Yes, in cases where the Offerer knows that the Answerer supports BUNDLE there is no need to send a 1st Offer with different address:port values (Paul K)
  – Nobody else commented

NOTHING ELSE

THANK YOU FOR LISTENING!