

RTCP Extension for Third-party Loss Report

draft-ietf-avtcore-feedback-supression-rtp-05

Qin Wu
Frank Xia
Roni Even

Outline

- Introduction
- Changes
- Issues
- Moving Forwarding

Introduction

- Specify when feedback forwarding to avoid duplicate report does not work.
- Specify a general mechanism to deal with feedback implosion.
- Solution
 - Define RTCP extensions for third party loss report.
 - Comply with RFC4585 FB suppression rule.
 - Avoid impact on the repair of lost packet.
- Works for the RTP topologies like
 - SSM use case
 - RAMS use case
 - Transport Translator use case
 - MCU use case

Changes since 00 versions

- Address report merging for the summary report case. The text was removed from current version.
- Address FEC packet issue. How to repair packet loss is out of scope.
- Update title and abstract to focus on third party loss report
- Clarify the use of the third party loss report – based on mailing list comments.
 - Update RTP translator case and MCU case to correct the use of the third party loss report.
 - Remove multiple DS use case for being compliant with RFC5760
 - Differentiate when a third-party loss report should be used compared to a NACK
 - Explain how third party loss report is used to deal with downstream loss
 - Discuss how BRS (burst retransmission server) deal with the third party loss report

Issue – Rationale clarification

- What's the rationale to send a 3rd party loss report instead of forwarding NACK
 - Semantics difference between NACK and new message?
 - NACK is defined as a report sent from a receiver observing a packet loss while new message is defined as a report that the sender of the new message has received reports that the indicated packets were lost
 - In SSM case, one the rationale is to hide identity or existence of NACK sending system.

Moving Forward

- The current version address mailing list comments, not aware of open issues.
- Editor view: Ready for WGLC.