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Background

• This draft talks about the codec specific parameters in SDP
• -00- version was discussed at the 64th meeting, the requirement got some interest and it is required by the WG to consider other possible solutions.
• So, several solutions are evaluated in this -01- version
solution1——Extend the SDP

• “a=fmtp” not applicable now
  – This attribute allows parameters that are specific to a particular format to be conveyed in a way that SDP doesn't have to understand them. … Format-specific parameters … given unchanged to the media tool that will use this format.

• extend the “a=fmtp” semantic and syntax?
  – e.g. a=fmtp:<codec>; <param>=<content>…

• new header?
  – e.g. a=foo:<codec> <codec level parameters>
solution2——Use SDP grouping

- RFC3388 provide the method to group different “m=” lines in SDP to support correlation of multiple media stream description.
- By using the grouping mechanism, we may give multiple “m=” lines with different codec parameters, and to specify that all of them belong to the same actual media by extend the “a=group” feature.
- Example:
  ```
  v=0
  o=Laura 289083124 289083124 IN IP4 one.example.com
  t=0 0
  c=IN IP4 224.2.17.12/127
  a=group: foo 1 2
  m=audio 30000 RTP/AVP 0
  a=mid:1
  a=ptime:20
  m=audio 30004 RTP/AVP 4
  a=mid:1
  a=ptime:30
  ```
solution3——Count on SDPng

• SDPng is more structural which support the description and extension of codec specific param more easily.
Comparison

• SDP extension
  – Easy and simple
  – But, whether it is welcome to extend SDP now a days?

• SDP grouping
  – Is powerful enough to solve such simple problem
  – Not widely supported

• SDPng
  – Very few real deployment
  – Can we wait for its application
Comments

• Which solution is suitable?
• What next for this draft?
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