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Goals for this sessions

1. Separate RTP roles of SRC within CS vs. RS
2. RTP session usage by SRC
3. Expand recommendations for UA
4. Discuss future of this draft
Independent Sessions

- RTP models for **CS** ≠ those for **RS**
- **CS** = Existing session to be recorded
- **RS** = Session established with the recorder

- RTP models for **CS** ≠ those for **RS**
RTP Model for **SBC (CS)** vs. **SRC (RS)**

- SBC might act as RTP forwarding or transcoding translator
- Yet SRC might act as RTP endpoint or mixer
SRC Using Multiple m-lines

- CS CNAME -> RS CNAME
- CS SSRCs -> RS SSRCs

If SRS does not support, it rejects some m-lines and SRC needs to choose another option.
SRC Using SSRC Multiplexing

- CS CNAME -> RS CNAME
- CS SSRCs -> RS SSRCs

If SRS does not support, SRC finds out through RTCP receiver reports and chooses another option
SRC Using Mixing

- CS CNAME -> RS CNAME
- CS SSRCs -> RS CSRCs

If SRS does not support, it relies on metadata
Does SRC need to know?
Multiple CNAMEs per Participant

What to do about it?

1. Include list of CNAMEs in Participant metadata
2. Use SDP attribute to group them
3. Don’t allow it
4. Don’t worry about it
5. ...
Recommendations for UAs

- Most of the draft focuses on the SRC and SRS
- Loss handling touches on UAs a bit
- We have the concept of a recording aware UA
- Should be add recommendations for recording aware UAs?
Next Steps

- draft-eckel-siprec-rtp-rec exists as a standalone document
- This was done purposely to facilitate development and discussion of RTP related SIPREC functionality
- Plan of record is to incorporate into draft-ietf-siprec-protocol eventually
- Is now the appropriate time?
- Alternatively, do we adopt as its own working group draft?