Audio/Video Transport Working Group Internet-Draft

Intended status: Standards Track

Expires: April 14, 2013

A. Clark Telchemy G. Zorn Network Zen Q. Wu Huawei October 11, 2012

RTP Control Protocol (RTCP) Extended Report (XR) Block for Discard Count metric Reporting

draft-ietf-xrblock-rtcp-xr-discard-08.txt

Abstract

This document defines an RTP Control Protocol(RTCP) Extended Report (XR) Block that allows the reporting of a simple discard count metric for use in a range of RTP applications.

Status of this Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of BCP 78 and BCP 79.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at http://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on April 14, 2013.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2012 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to BCP 78 and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of

Internet-Draft RTCP XR Discard October 2012

the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

Table of Contents

<u>1</u> . Introduction	. 3
<u>1.1</u> . Discard Count Report Block	. 3
1.2. RTCP and RTCP XR Reports	. 3
1.3. Performance Metrics Framework	. 3
<u>1.4</u> . Applicability	
<u>2</u> . Terminology	. 5
2.1. Standards Language	. 5
3. Discard Count Metric Report Block	. 6
3.1. Report Block Structure	. 6
3.2. Definition of Fields in Discard Count Metric Report	
Block	. 6
<u>4</u> . SDP Signaling	. 9
4.1. SDP rtcp-xr-attrib Attribute Extension	. 9
4.2. Offer/Answer Usage	. 5
$\underline{5}$. IANA Considerations	. 10
<u>5.1</u> . New RTCP XR Block Type value	. 10
<u>5.2</u> . New RTCP XR SDP Parameter	. 10
<u>5.3</u> . Contact information for registrations	. 10
6. Security Considerations	. <u>1</u> 1
7. Contributors	. 12
8. Acknowledgments	. 13
<u>9</u> . References	. 14
9.1. Normative References	. 14
9.2. Informative References	. 14
Appendix A. Change Log	
A.1 draft-ietf-xrblock-rtcp-xr-discard-08	. 15
Authors' Addresses	16

1. Introduction

1.1. Discard Count Report Block

This document defines a new block type to augment those defined in [RFC3611] for use in a range of RTP applications. The new block type supports the reporting of the number of packets which are received correctly but are never played out, typically because they arrive too late to be played out (buffer underflow) or too early (buffer overflow). The metric is applicable both to systems which use packet loss repair techniques (such as forward error correction [RFC5109] or retransmission [RFC4588]) and to those which do not.

This metric is useful for identifying the existence, and characterizing the severity, of a packet transport problem which may affect users' perception of a service delivered over RTP.

This block may be used in conjunction with [BGDISCARD] which provides additional information on the pattern of discarded packets. However the metric in [BGDISCARD] may be used independently of the metrics in this block.

In case of Discard count metric block sent together with Burst gap discard metric block defined in [BGDISCARD] to the media sender or RTP based network management system, information carried in the discard count metric block and Burst gap discard metric block allows them calculate the some bust gap summary statistics, e.g., gap discard rate.

The metric belongs to the class of transport-related end system metrics defined in $[\underline{MONARCH}]$.

1.2. RTCP and RTCP XR Reports

The use of RTCP for reporting is defined in [RFC3550]. [RFC3611] defined an extensible structure for reporting using an RTCP Extended Report (XR). This document defines a new Extended Report block for use with [RFC3550] and [RFC3611].

1.3. Performance Metrics Framework

The Performance Metrics Framework [RFC6390] provides guidance on the definition and specification of performance metrics. The RTP Monitoring Architectures [MONARCH] provides guideline for reporting block format using RTCP XR. The Metrics Block described in this document are in accordance with the guidelines in [RFC6390] and [MONARCH].

1.4. Applicability

This metric is believed to be applicable to a large class of RTP applications which use a jitter buffer.

Discards due to late or early arriving packets affects user experience. The reporting of discards alerts senders and other receivers to the need to adjust their transmission or reception strategies. The reports allow network managers to diagnose these user experience problems.

The ability to detect duplicate packets can be used by managers to detect network layer or sender behavior which may indicate network or device issues. Based on the reports, these issues may be addressed prior to any impact on user experience.

2. Terminology

2.1. Standards Language

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in RFC 2119 [RFC2119].

In addition, the following terms are defined:

Received, Lost and Discarded

A packet shall be regarded as lost if it fails to arrive within an implementation-specific time window. A packet that arrives within this time window but is too early or late to be played out or thrown away before playout due to packet duplication or redundancy shall be regarded as discarded. A packet shall be classified as one of received (or OK), discarded or lost. The Discard Count Metric counts only discarded packets. The metric "cumulative number of packets lost" defined in [RFC3550] reports a count of packets lost from the media stream (single SSRC within single RTP session). Similarly the metric "number of packets discarded" reports a count of packets discarded from the media stream (single SSRC within single RTP session) arriving at the receiver. Another metric defined in [RFC5725] is available to report on packets which are not recovered by any repair techniques which may be in use.

3. Discard Count Metric Report Block

3.1. Report Block Structure

0	1													2													3				
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1
+-															- +																
		BT=PDC I DT resv. block length = 2														2															
+-	+-															- - +															
	SSRC of Source																														
+-	+-															- +															
										nι	umb	oeı	r	of	р	acl	ket	ts	d:	is	cai	rde	ed								
+-	+ - +	- -		+	· - +	+	+	- - +	-	 	+	- -	+	+	+ -	+	+	 	+	 	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+ - +	- - +	- - +	- - +

Figure 1: Report Block Structure

3.2. Definition of Fields in Discard Count Metric Report Block

Block type (BT): 8 bits

A Discard Count Metric Report Block is identified by the constant PDC.

[Note to RFC Editor: please replace PDC with the IANA provided RTCP XR block type for this block.]

Interval Metric flag (I): 2 bits

This field indicates whether the reported metric is an interval, cumulative, or sampled metric [MONARCH]. The Discard Count Metric value can be reported as either an interval metric (I=10) or a cumulative metric (I=11). It does not make sense to report the Discard Count Metric as a sampled metric, so the value I=01 MUST NOT be used. The value I=00 is reserved, and MUST NOT be used.

Discard Type (DT): 2bits

This field is used to identify the discard type used in this report block. The discard type is defined as follows:

00: Report packet discarded or being thrown away before playout due to packets duplication.

01: Report packet discarded due to too early to be played out.

10: Report packet discarded due to too late to be played out.

11: Report the total number of discarded packets due to both early and late to be played out.

An endpoint MAY report only one of the above four discard types blocks in an compound RTCP report in a reporting interval. It MAY also report a combination of discard types in a compound RTCP report but not all combinations are valid. The endpoint MAY report duplicate packet discard (DT=0) block with any other discard (DT=1, 2, or 3) block. Additionally, an endpoint MUST NOT report combined discard (DT=3) block with early discard (DT=1) or late discard (DT=2) report block.

Some systems send duplicate RTP packets for robustness or error resilience. This is NOT RECOMMENDED since it breaks RTCP packet statistics. If duplication is desired for error resilience, the mechanism described in [RTPDUP]] can be used, since this will not cause breakage of RTP streams or RTCP statistics.

Reserved (resv): 4 bits

These bits are reserved. They MUST be set to zero by senders and ignored by receivers.

block length: 16 bits

The length of this report block in 32-bit words, minus one. For the Discard Count block, the block length is equal to 2.

SSRC of source: 32 bits

As defined in <u>Section 4.1 of [RFC3611]</u>.

number of packets discarded: 32 bits

Number of packets discarded over the period (Interval or Cumulative) covered by this report.

If the measured value exceeds 0xFFFFFFD, the value 0xFFFFFFE MUST be reported to indicate an over-range measurement. If the measurement is unavailable, the value 0xFFFFFFF MUST be reported.

Note that the number of packets expected in the period associated with this metric (whether interval or cumulative) is available from the difference between a pair of extended sequence numbers in the Measurement Information block [MEASI], so need not be repeated in this block.

Internet-Draft RTCP XR Discard October 2012

4. SDP Signaling

[RFC3611] defines the use of SDP (Session Description Protocol) [RFC4566] for signaling the use of XR blocks. XR blocks MAY be used without prior signaling.

4.1. SDP rtcp-xr-attrib Attribute Extension

This section augments the SDP [RFC4566] attribute "rtcp-xr" defined in [RFC3611] by providing an additional value of "xr-format" to signal the use of the report block defined in this document.

```
rtcp-xr-attrib = "a=" "rtcp-xr" ":" [xr-format *(SP xr-format)] CRLF
(defined in [RFC3611])
xr-format =/ xr-pdc-block
xr-pdc-block = "pkt-dscrd-count"
```

4.2. Offer/Answer Usage

When SDP is used in offer-answer context, the SDP Offer/Answer usage defined in [RFC3611] applies.

5. IANA Considerations

New block types for RTCP XR are subject to IANA registration. For general guidelines on IANA considerations for RTCP XR, refer to [RFC3611].

5.1. New RTCP XR Block Type value

This document assigns the block type value PDC in the IANA "RTCP XR Block Type Registry" to the "Discard Count Metrics Block".

[Note to RFC Editor: please replace PDC with the IANA provided RTCP XR block type for this block.]

5.2. New RTCP XR SDP Parameter

This document also registers a new parameter "pkt-dscrd-count" in the "RTCP XR SDP Parameters Registry".

5.3. Contact information for registrations

The following contact information is provided for all registrations in this document:

Qin Wu (sunseawq@huawei.com)

101 Software Avenue, Yuhua District Nanjing, Jiangsu 210012 China

6. Security Considerations

It is believed that this proposed RTCP XR report block introduces no new security considerations beyond those described in [RFC3611]. This block does not provide per-packet statistics so the risk to confidentiality documented in Section 7, paragraph 3 of [RFC3611]] does not apply.

Contributors

Geoff Hunt wrote the initial draft of this document.

8. Acknowledgments

The authors gratefully acknowledge reviews and feedback provided by Bruce Adams, Philip Arden, Amit Arora, Bob Biskner, Kevin Connor, Claus Dahm, Randy Ethier, Roni Even, Jim Frauenthal, Albert Higashi, Tom Hock, Shane Holthaus, Paul Jones, Rajesh Kumar, Keith Lantz, Mohamed Mostafa, Amy Pendleton, Colin Perkins, Mike Ramalho, Ravi Raviraj, Albrecht Schwarz, Tom Taylor, and Hideaki Yamada, Kevin Gross, Varun Singh, Claire Bi, Roni Even, Dan Romascanu.

9. References

9.1. Normative References

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", March 1997.
- [RFC3550] Schulzrinne, H., "RTP: A Transport Protocol for Real-Time Applications", <u>RFC 3550</u>, July 2003.
- [RFC3611] Friedman, T., Caceres, R., and A. Clark, "RTP Control Protocol Extended Reports (RTCP XR)", November 2003.
- [RFC4566] Handley, M., Jacobson, V., and C. Perkins, "SDP: Session Description Protocol", July 2006.

9.2. Informative References

[BGDISCARD]

Hunt, G., "RTCP XR Report Block for Burst Gap Discard metric Reporting",

ID <u>draft-ietf-xrblock-rtcp-xr-burst-gap-discard-06</u>,
October 2012.

- [MEASI] Hunt, G., "Measurement Identity and information Reporting
 using SDES item and XR Block",
 ID draft-ietf-xrblock-rtcp-xr-meas-identity-10,
 August 2012.
- [MONARCH] Wu, Q., "Monitoring Architectures for RTP",

 ID <u>draft-ietf-avtcore-monarch-22</u>, September 2012.
- [RFC4588] Rey, J., "RTP Retransmission Payload Format", <u>RFC 4588</u>, July 2006.
- [RFC5109] Li, A., "RTP Payload Format for Generic Forward Error Correction", <u>RFC 5109</u>, July 2006.
- [RFC5725] Begen, A., "RTCP XR Report Block for Post-Repair Loss metric Reporting", <u>RFC 5725</u>, February 2010.
- [RFC6390] Clark, A. and B. Claise, "Framework for Performance Metric Development", <u>RFC 6390</u>, October 2011.
- [RTPDUP] Begen, A. and C. Perkins, "Duplicating RTP Streams", ID <u>draft-ietf-avtext-rtp-duplication-00</u>, July 2012.

<u>Appendix A</u>. Change Log

Note to the RFC-Editor: please remove this section prior to publication as an RFC.

A.1. draft-ietf-xrblock-rtcp-xr-discard-08

The following are the major changes compared to previous version:

- o Outdated reference update.
- o Editorial changes based on comments that applied to PDV and Delay drafts.

Authors' Addresses

Alan Clark Telchemy Incorporated 2905 Premiere Parkway, Suite 280 Duluth, GA 30097 USA

Email: alan.d.clark@telchemy.com

Glen Zorn Network Zen 77/440 Soi Phoomjit, Rama IV Road Phra Khanong, Khlong Toie Bangkok 10110 Thailand

Phone: +66 (0) 87 502 4274 Email: gwz@net-zen.net

Qin Wu Huawei 101 Software Avenue, Yuhua District Nanjing, Jiangsu 210012 China

Email: sunseawq@huawei.com