

# Monitoring Architectures for RTP

## draft-ietf-avtcore-monarch-03

Qin Wu (sunseawq@huawei.com)  
G. Hunt (r.geoff.hunt@gmail.com )  
P. Arden (philip.arden@bt.com)

# Outline

- Introduction
- Changes
- Issues
- Follow Up

# Introduction

- Discuss what RTP monitoring architecture comprises
- Provide 3 guidelines on how to define XR Block
  - Using small block
  - Avoid identity information repetition
  - Correlating RTP source with the non-RTP data
- Give an example of XR Block based on rules to be defined
- How monitoring architecture applies to [RFC 5117](#) topologies

# Changes since hunt-avtcore-monarch-02

- Remove monitoring methodology introduced from avt-monarch.
- Remove interaction with management application
- Address Block namespace restriction.
- Allow declaring Monitor explicitly.
- Modify RTP monitoring architecture to be consistent with definition of monitoring in RFC3550.
- Remove the example of Identity block(i.e., figure 2)

# Changes since hunt-avtcore-monarch-02

- Explain how to reduce the identity information repetition
  - Separate identity information correlation issue from identity information repetition issue
  - Clarify the downside of Identity Information duplication
- Explain how to correlate identity information with the non-RTP data
  - Clarify why Correlating RTCP XR with the non-RTP data
- Update identity information
  - Remove redundant parameters from Identity information
  - Add necessary parameters

# Issue-Correlating RTP source with non-RTP protocols

- How to transport such correlation?
  - New RTCP SDES block type or new XR Block type ?
  - Such correlation describe the source, rather than providing a quality report
  - However the source is about how to measure the stream to get the quality report therefore relevant to the quality report.
  - Which transport is chosen is not in the scope of this document

# Issue-What should be included in the identity information

- Is there a need to report the CNAME using identity information?
  - this is redundant with RTCP SDES information
- The sequence number of the first packet is not enough
  - the sequence number space is restricted by 16 bits.
  - Suggestion: include a count of sequence number cycles, similar to RFC3611

# Issue-Using tag or using SSRC for grouping

- Using tag to associate identity block with other small blocks doesn't reduce size of RTCP if
  - Each RTCP XR packet contains one or more identity block
  - Each identity block contain SSRC.
- Both tag and SSRC can be used to categorize small blocks into several group
  - Using SSRC enables grouping per stream
  - Using tag can provides more subtle granularity for grouping, e.g.,
    - Group subset of XR blocks with the same SSRC based on a tag.
- Is there a need for tag at all?

# Follow Up

- Address the issues discussed in this meeting
- Expect to have a new version ready for WGLC in August