Operational Considerations for Streaming Media

draft-ietf-mops-streaming-opcons
Status update @2021-11 mops, IETF 112
Jake Holland

Last call "passed"

- One comment in support (thanks Glenn!), none opposed:
  https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/mops/zZm70vlADUzBcG1Bgt1eWmE1hfU/
- Wanted to confirm in person
  - Did we miss anything that needs to be there?

Closed Issues

40 closed issues:

https://github.com/ietf-wg-mops/draft-ietf-mops-streaming-opcons/issues?q=is%3Aissue+is%3Aclosed

☐ ⊘ **Ultra Low-Latency Capabilities**		💬 9
#90 by kenyonja was closed on Sep 14		
☐ ⊘ **Segment size and keyframe intervals**		💬 6
#86 by GrumpyOldTroll was closed on Aug 24		
☐ ⊘ **Considerations on cloud-based encoding, packaging and origin workflows** `stay tuned`		💬 11
#81 by acbegen was closed on Aug 18		
☐ ⊘ **Remove note in Sec 5**	⑂ 1	
#79 by SpencerDawkins was closed on Jul 6		
☐ ⊘ **Section on consequences of poor bitrate choice?** `documentation`		💬 13
#77 by GrumpyOldTroll was closed on Sep 14		
☐ ⊘ **Review ACKs section**	⑂ 1	💬 1
#72 by SpencerDawkins was closed on Jul 6		

...

2 Open Issues

- Add section on DNS?
  https://github.com/ietf-wg-mops/draft-ietf-mops-streaming-opcons/issues/87
- Mention "Comparative Latency Under Load…
  https://github.com/ietf-wg-mops/draft-ietf-mops-streaming-opcons/issues/88

Add section on DNS? #87

SpencerDawkins commented on Aug 18   Member

So, now that I've slept on this (sort of), I was leaning toward adding at least a sentence or two about DNS-based ad-blockers, because that was a topic I THOUGHT I understood, but apparently not in much depth. ISTM that the question I SHOULD have asked, is "that's a fascinating question. Is there anything that a media provider can do differently, if we describe the issue?"

ISTM that if what we say would be actionable for the designated audience, it makes sense to say it in the draft.

GrumpyOldTroll commented on Aug 21   Member

If a player implementer is aware of the potential for trouble from a change in hostname for a stream, they could run that request a little early as a mitigation to give time for the DNS to settle out, or to do any kind of pre-request to an upcoming non-recently-used hostname or something. Also the operator could chose to run server-side ads instead. (That might not be an exhaustive list, but it's at least a couple examples.)
Maybe also worth mentioning it can be more of an issue if you're running a tight latency budget. But yeah, I think it's at least somewhat actionable for operators if the issue is on their radar.

Mention "Comparative Latency Under Load .. Broadband CPE"

SpencerDawkins commented on Aug 11   Member   Author   ☺   ⋯

Not sure this fits in the document, but someone should be looking at this who is awake (and we were not awake by TSVAREA at the last IETF 111 meeting slot).

Jake anecdote about WebEx conversation where speech was noticeably buffered and then suddenly released in a burst.

Might be worth adding a comment in passing that there are many sources of jitter and buffering - can't get lower latency than the network can give you.

👤 **SpencerDawkins** assigned **GrumpyOldTroll** and **SpencerDawkins** and unassigned **SpencerDawkins** on Aug 11

SpencerDawkins commented on Aug 24   Member   Author   ☺   ⋯

This is on my list ...

Anything Else?

- Any remaining concerns before advancing that didn't make it to the list?