



ERICSSON

RTP Header Extension for Source Description

[draft-ietf-avtext-sdes-hdr-ext-0](#)

2

Magnus Westerlund (Ericsson)

Bo Burman (Ericsson)

Roni Even (Huawei)

Mo Zanaty (Cisco)

Outline



- › Introduction
- › Changes
- › One vs Two bytes header
- › Next Steps

Introduction



- › The drafts goal is to define an RTP header extension that carries RTCP Source Description (SDES)
- › Draft has been updated twice since Dallas:
 - 01 in May
 - 02 in July

Changes in -01



- › Makes it clearer that SDES header extensions is not suitable for all type of header extensions.
- › Removes references to SRCNAME and APPID as the future of these are uncertain, and this document is planned to be finished before the end of the year.
- › Expanded transmission considerations and some tips on what RTCP information that can be used to determine successful or at least failure to deliver.
- › Discussion of how to avoid update flaps, a issue when sending both in RTP and RTCP.
- › Much clarified registration rules and actual registration

Changes in -02



- › New paragraph in Section 4.2.1 on one vs two byte headers.
- › A number of editorial changes

One vs Two byte headers



- › This issue is not specific to this draft
 - Is one allowed to do one switch from 1-byte to 2-byte?
 - Would happen if one don't know in advance for a SSRC what will be sent
 - Source Descriptions that change would be an issue
 - RFC 5285:
 - A stream MUST contain only one-byte or two-byte headers: they MUST NOT be mixed within a stream.
 - What are the requirement to support two-byte headers?
 - SDES items may require two-byte headers
 - Will it work in general?

One vs Two byte headers



> Way Forward

- For this draft:
 - Ensure that one make a decision when starting to use RTP header extension for an SSRC
 - A clarification in this draft
- Do we need to revise RFC 5285?
 - AVTCORE Work
 - Require Two-byte headers also?
 - Enable switching between one and two bytes?

Next Steps



> Needs Review

- Can we get volunteers to review before end of August

> Plan

- Update after review
- Do WG last call prior to Yokohama
- Resolve issues prior or at latest in Yokohama