

draft-xu-mmusic-sdp-codec- param-01

Peili Xu
xupeili@huawei.com

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?

Thanks !