

RTP Topologies

draft-ietf-avtcore-rtp-topologies-update-04

Stephan Wenger

Situation

- WGLC completed Oct. 14
 - Colin: ok (update from -03 to -04 addressed Colin's previous concerns, and he helped drafting language—thanks Colin)
 - Bo: ok except for nits
 - Roni posted a comment about the lack of documentation of the proper reaction to RTP header extensions and that are interrelated with RTCP signaling (9/26/2014)
 - Stephan pushed back (10/7/2014)
 - No further discussion on mailing list
 - WG input requested

Issue

- Roni's issue: The topologies-update draft does not specifically address the requirements for middleboxes related to the use of RTCP header extensions in the context of consistency with RTCP signaling. This has relevance for bundle and CLUE.
- Roni's proposal: "[...] a general statement [that] middle boxes (mixers, translators,...) must see that the RTP header extensions are correct and verify that duplicate information in RTP header extensions and RTCP will remain consistent."
- Stephan: topologies cannot address every possible niche scenario
- Stephan: many practical middleboxes never look at RTP header extensions (pass-through or throw-away)
- Stephan: many header extensions have no relationship with RTCP.

Questions

- Do we need to address Roni's suggestion in the draft?
- If yes, in what level of detail. Options
 - Broad statement as Roni suggested (seems to me to be inappropriate in at least some scenarios for reasons provided in some detail in my email 10/7/2014)
 - Could refer specifically to the one scenario that apparently triggered Roni's concern (bundle use of an RTP header extension).
 - Could try to generalize that scenario in the way Roni appear to have intended. Which, as evidence shows, is VERY hard to do correctly.