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Status

- Implemented decision from last IETF to remove session table from XR MIB

- Updated RTP MIB to accommodate additional requirements and updated SNMP syntax

- Draft-ietf-avt-mib-rtp-bis-00.txt is updated RTP MIB

- Draft-ietf-avt-rtcp-xr-mib-04.txt is updated RTCP XR MIB
Structure

Sender Table

Inverse Sender Table

Receiver Table

Inverse Rcvr Table

rtpSessionTable

RTCP XR Base Param Table

RTCP XR Call Quality Table

RTCP XR History Table
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Significant changes to RTP MIB

- Can now refer to both active and completed calls
- Added a parameter to limit the number of potential entries
- Changed timestamps to Date/Time instead of Sysuptime
- Changed source/dest identifiers to Inet format
Issues - addressing/ session identification

- May be implemented in an RTP endpoint or a monitor
- Various scenarios
  - Point-to-point
  - Multi-party using ASM multicast
  - Multi-party using relay/MCU
  - Multi-party using unicast
- Currently - RTP MIB defines a session and multiple senders and receivers associated with the session
  - Ok for point to point and simple multicast

- Approach
  - ?
Issues - endpoint or monitor?

- MIB could be implemented in an endpoint or a monitor (probe)
- MIB does not identify what it is implemented by
- Suggestion to add
  - Type of device implementing MIB
  - Description and name of device?
Issues - level of implementation

- Could be
  - Report only for streams sent/received by this entity (typical endpoint)
  - Report for all media streams seen (typical probe)
  - Report for all collected RTCP reports ("collector")

- Approach
  - Use Compliance statements to build different implementation levels?
Issues - other

• Address format is currently IP
  – Ok to limit to IP?

• Replace references to “calls” with “sessions”

• Definition of active sessions?

• Session identifier - is SSRC sufficient?

• Deletion of entries (want to keep in some applications?)

• Payload type - should not be in receiverEntry?