Path MTU Discovery for RTP

Marc Petit-Huguenin
Gonzalo Salgueiro
2017-03-27

Why this draft?

- RFC 2736 and RFC 3550 clearly state that RTP and RTCP packets must have a size lower than the MTU because fragmentation is a bad idea.

- If fragmentation on the first link-layer is a bad idea, then it is also a bad idea elsewhere on the data path.

- This draft reuses the protocol specified in draft-ietf-tram-stun-pmtud, itself an implementation of RFC 4821 to discover the Path MTU.

What do we need?

- We need guidances from RTP/RTCP experts to decide what is the correct way to uniquely identify RTP/RTCP packets.

- We need guidance from SDP experts on how best to signal support for PMTUD.

- We need guidance from ICE experts about its use concurrently with the other stuff.

Where to progress it?

- Is there interest in this draft?
- If yes, what is the best place to progress that spec?