

Network Working Group
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Informational
Expires: April 18, 2013

X. Marjou
P. Philippe
France Telecom Orange
October 15, 2012

Video codec for WebRTC.
draft-marjou-rtcweb-video-codec-00

Abstract

In the context of WebRTC, there is currently no consensus on the video codec(s) that need to be mandatory to implement. This draft gives some arguments in favor of H.264.

Status of this Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted to IETF in full conformance with the provisions of BCP 78 and BCP 79.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <http://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on April 18, 2013.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2012 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to BCP 78 and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Terminology	3
3. Rationale and Position	3
4. Security Considerations	4
5. IANA Considerations	4
6. Acknowledgements	4
7. References	4
7.1. Normative references	4
7.2. Informative references	4
Authors' Addresses	4

1. Introduction

In the context of WebRTC, there is currently no consensus on the video codec(s) that need to be mandatory to implement.

In order to reach a consensus, the RTCWEB chairs have solicited internet-drafts naming proposed mandatory-to-implement video codecs (c.f. [rtcweb-mail]).

This draft gives some arguments in favor of H.264.

2. Terminology

In this document, the key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" are to be interpreted as described in RFC 2119 [RFC2119].

3. Rationale and Position

Many videoconferencing systems exist today (e.g. fact sheets of services at [h264-ftob]), mainly for professional services but also for individual consumers.

We believe that WebRTC, when used as a mean to interconnect Web browsers to these existing services, can be a driver for enabling more users to access them.

As an example, all Orange video conferencing systems operate using the H.264/AVC technology. H.264/AVC benefits from many available implementations, tuned for different architectures, and has clear licensing conditions. VP8 has no footprint in this market, independent implementations are rare, licensing conditions are not yet clarified (free license offered from one patent owner while MPEG LA operates a Patent Pool with at least 12 members (c.f. [press-article])).

With this current status, it is believed that incorporating the mandatory to implement video codec having the bigger footprint will permit a better adoption and interconnection of WebRTC to existing services leading to a successful standard.

Hence we strongly support H.264/AVC to be part of the mandatory to implement codecs.

4. Security Considerations

None.

5. IANA Considerations

None.

6. Acknowledgements

7. References

7.1. Normative references

[RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, March 1997.

7.2. Informative references

[h264-ftob]
Orange, "<http://www.orange-business.com/en/mnc2/collaboration/conferencing/index.jsp>".

[press-article]
streamingmedia.com, "<http://www.streamingmedia.com/Articles/Editorial/Featured-Articles/WebM-Patent-Fight-Ahead-for-Google-76781.aspx>".

[rtcweb-mail]
IETF, "<http://www.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/rtcweb/current/msg05070.html>".

Authors' Addresses

Xavier Marjou
France Telecom Orange
2, avenue Pierre Marzin
Lannion 22307
France

Email: xavier.marjou@orange.com

Pierrick Philippe
France Telecom Orange
2, avenue Pierre Marzin
Lannion 22307
France

Email: pierrick.philippe@orange.com

