

Thursday, 22 March 2018 at 14:15-15:00 (Park Suite)

Jabber: Jonathan Lennox

Note taker: Bo Burman, Rachel Huang

14:15 Payload WG status update, Chairs

No comments

14:20 RTP Payload Format for Flexible FEC, Mo Zanaty

draft-ietf-payload-flexible-fec-scheme-06

Bernard: We have been involved in implementation and the most confusing part relates to SDP and how you signal both this retransmission and the old RFC 4588 rtx. When you're offering rtx and this, what does the answers mean e.g. if you answer with both? Is the payload type order significant?

Mo: All of the variants of flexfec are mandatory.

Jonathan: While mandatory to receive and understand, it is not mandatory to send. With flexfec, you don't have to bind FEC and source RTP streams.

Bernard: There are only 3 SDP parameters. Are those the only ones needed?

Mo: How sender decides how much FEC to send is not specified but decided by e.g. RTCP reporting.

Jonathan: Maybe clarify with W3C?

Bernard: I'm one of the chairs and I'm confused.

Mo: One update is to clarify that all three variants are mandatory to support and receive. Guidance on sending is out of scope. For interaction with RFC 4588 interaction, we could add that regular SDP prioritization applies.

Jonathan: If you also negotiated RTCP FB, I expect that retransmission would be used in the session. Is there an equivalent to RFC 4588 window time (rtx-time)?

Mo: Yes. This could obsolete 4588

Roni (from floor): If you want to support rtx the only option you have is to offer it separately.

Bernard: What do you do if you don't want to use any rtx? If you drop 4588 in the answer, would you then not use rtx?

Jonathan: Yes. If you don't want to use retransmission at all even with flexfec, you could avoid negotiating RTCP FB with it.

Mo: Maybe make that a should in the document.

Action Item: need clarifying text on the usage of RFC4588 with flexible fec.

Roni: Will re-start WGLC and the action item will be part of the WGLC comments.

14:35 RTP Payload Format for VP9 Video, Jonathan Lennox

draft-ietf-payload-vp9-05

Stephan Wenger: Please make scalability terminology defined by the payload format, like "access unit", aligned with what you will use in AV1.

Jonathan: This is shipping with Chrome, so solicit review from payload experts. **Mo volunteers to review.**

Stephan W: What do you plan with the normative VP9 reference?

Jonathan: Version 0.6 is the official Google specification.

14:45 RTP Payload Format for TSVCS Codec, Victor Demjanenko

draft-demjanenko-payload-tsvcs-00

Roni: Would PAYLOAD want to take on this work as WG draft and take this draft as starting point?

Colin: No objection.

Roni: Will confirm the decision with the

Colin: Suggest registering rate as a mandatory parameter.

14:50 RTP Payload Format for the TETRA Audio Codec, Andreas Reisenbauer

draft-df-stecker-expertenforum-payload-tetra-00

Andreas: One reason to specify this is that we expect renewal cycle including TETRA until 2025, before mission-critical push-to-talk is in place from 3GPP.

Roni: The WG has no problem accepting more work.

Mo: Is TETRA in widespread use or TETRA over RTP in widespread use?

Andreas: TETRA is used, not over RTP.

Mo: What is it used over today?

Andreas: Today it is using circuit-switched, 8 TETRA channels over a 64 kbps circuit.

Roni: Objection to adopt this work?

Colin: No objection, but the document format is a bit unusual. Also suggestion mentioning circuit breaker and congestion control.

Roni: Confirm decision on the list.

14:55 End