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Draft Status

- No change since Prague
  - 01 is still current
Open question: how should (0 or 1)-byte extensions be numbered?

- If we use one ID for both the L=0 and L=1 versions
  - Have to allocate them in pairs in IANA registry
  - Cannot signal support independently in SDP

Question raised after last meeting: should they be (0 or 1)-byte extensions, or (1 or 2) bytes (or more)?
Extension ID numbering: Strawman Proposal

- Split Extension ID space into “Short” and “Long” extensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ext. Byte (B)</th>
<th>ID(s)</th>
<th>Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0...1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>((B &amp; 1) \rightarrow 0 = \text{rest}, 1 = \text{coded})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2...3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>((B &amp; 1))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4...63</td>
<td>a0...a59</td>
<td>((B &amp; 3))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64...255</td>
<td>b0...b95</td>
<td>((B &amp; 1) \rightarrow 0 = \text{rest}, 1 = \text{coded})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Extension ID Allocation

- Short extensions (a0...a59)
  - Fixed lengths from 0...3 bytes
  - One ID per codepoint, an extension can register multiple IDs
  - SDP a=fmtp parameters:
    • MUST include all IDs registered for an extension in extensions= parameter
    • extN-* and sprop-extN-* parameter names include all IDs for that extension
      - E.g., exta0a1-duration

- Long extensions (b0...b95)
  - One ID per extension (covers both the even and odd codepoint)
Questions?

● When should we aim to go to WGLC?
● Other feedback?