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SVC draft version 01: Changes

- New Subsection 6.1 "Design Principles"
- New Section 14 "NAL unit re-ordering for layered multicast"
- New Section 15, "Application Examples"
- Additional information and definitions added to at least sections 3.3, 5.1, 7 and 8
- Editorial improvements throughout the document
Open Issue 1: Signaling

• Guidance from AVT mailing list (Colin)
  – Try to come up with media independent signaling for layered codecs
• Needs to go into a new draft in MMUSIC.
• Work not started.
  – Thomas Schierl (HHI) indicated he’s willing to take the lead during/after IETF65
  – Other volunteers, please contact him or me.
• One problem: layering dependencies are not tree-structured
Signaling: layering dependencies

This is possible…

… but this as well

Possible in SVC
Not (yet) possible, but could be envisioned
Open Issue 2: Cross-Layer DON

- Cross-Layer DON, see section 14.2 of the draft
  - It may be possible to specify a working solution without DON, at the expense of
    - Document complexity
      - (at least 10 pages of text would be added)
    - Implementation complexity
    - Delay
    - We may not be able to support all scenarios
  - 16 bits per DON required => 16 bits overhead
  - Payload header contains information pertaining to more than one RTP session
  - DON concept has known IPR, see RFC 3984 IPR declarations
Decoding order problem

- **Problem**
  - Decoder needs NAL units in decoding order
  - To simplify discussion: Assume NAL unit == RTP Packet
  - In layered multicast, NAL units are conveyed in their own RTP sessions, therefore RTP sequence numbers are NOT a suitable ordering criterion
  - Time is NOT a suitable ordering criterion (just believe me :-)

- **Solution: Decoding Order Number**
  - A (16 bit?) number indicating the decoding order
  - Part of the RTP payload header and/or “Aggregation Headers”
  - Encoder/Sender responsible for creating DONs
  - Need rules for DON vs. RTP packet sequencing
  - Buys us interleaving technology without additional overhead
  - DON is NOT used for error resilience
    - RTP header info plus info in bitstreams sufficient
Open issues 3, 4, 5
Reminders to the Authors

• Need to clarify MANE, Mixers, and Translators throughout the document (consistently with RFC 3550, CCM draft).
• Packetization rules need work once previous bullet is addressed
• Alignment with JVT spec (ongoing)
New Open Issue 6: Per-packet Signaling

- Idea: To make the main scalability info, i.e. the values of DID, TL and QL as in the draft, easily accessible from the RTP packet
  - Fixed position, or
  - In the payload header structure
- For packets carrying only a single NAL unit, perhaps only additional packetization rules are required
- For aggregation (and perhaps fragmentation) packets, we may need additional header structures
- Situation still unclear, more work required
- IPR situation unclear
Thanks