

Issues from WG last call for
draft-ietf-codec-guidelines

Section 2, point 9

9. As the developed codec stabilizes and the group feels no more changes are needed, the testing done to date is taken, along with any additional testing required to give confidence that the codec meets the requirements, and those test results form the final characterization of the codec. The process of testing is described under Section Section 3.

- Erik Norvell: Results from test that are made before the codec is stable cannot be included in a characterization of the codec.
 - Recommendation: clearly label older tests. Is “characterization” the right word?
- Christian Hoene: I would recommend to remove the sentence “and those test results form the final characterization of the codec. ” entirely, because there has been the demand and/or the interest to characterize the codec even after it has been standardized.
 - Recommendation: accept the change

Issues from WG last call for
draft-ietf-codec-opus

Padding

- Christian Hoene: “To my understanding, padding is a feature that can be easily skipped from the codec specification. It violates the layering principle and is intended only for a very specific use cases. On the other side, constant sized frames can be easily supported by keeping the codec parameters fixed.”
 - Recommendation: Keep for use in SRTP, non-RTP transport

Frame Packing (1)

- Christian Hoene: In order to support transmission over TCP, I would recommend a change of mode $c=3$: A length is given to the last frame in the packet of multiple frames.
 - Recommendation: add optional “last frame length”

Frame Packing (2)

- Christian Hoene: “... the maximal size of an Opus packet is limited to 120ms. Especially, on low rate links this might be too low. Also, on links with a high packet overhead (such as IPsec or IEEE 802.11b WLAN), this limit seems to be too.”
 - Recommendation: 120 ms ought to be too much for everyone