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Note Well

Any submission to the IETF intended by the Contributor for publication as all or part of an IETF Internet-Draft or RFC and any statement made within the context of an IETF activity is considered an "IETF Contribution". Such statements include oral statements in IETF sessions, as well as written and electronic communications made at any time or place, which are addressed to:

- The IETF plenary session
- The IESG, or any member thereof on behalf of the IESG
- Any IETF mailing list, including the IETF list itself, any working group or design team list, or any other list functioning under IETF auspices
- Any IETF working group or portion thereof
- The IAB or any member thereof on behalf of the IAB
- The RFC Editor or the Internet-Drafts function

All IETF Contributions are subject to the rules of RFC 5378 and RFC 3979 (updated by RFC 4879). Statements made outside of an IETF session, mailing list or other function, that are clearly not intended to be input to an IETF activity, group or function, are not IETF Contributions in the context of this notice.

Please consult RFC 5378 and RFC 3979 for details.

A participant in any IETF activity is deemed to accept all IETF rules of process, as documented in Best Current Practices RFCs and IESG Statements.

A participant in any IETF activity acknowledges that written, audio and video records of meetings may be made and may be available to the public.
Agenda bash - Thursday

15:20  AVTCore Status Update (Chairs, 15)
15:35  Sending Multiple Media Streams in a Single RTP Session (Magnus, 10)
15:45  Grouping RTCP Reception Statistics and Other Feedback (Magnus, 10)
15:55  Circuit Breakers for Unicast Sessions (Zaheduzzaman Sarker, 30)
16:25  Payload Status Update (Chairs, 10)
16:35  RTP Payload Format for Opus Speech and Audio Codec (JM Valin, 15)
16:50  End
Document Status

• RFC Published
  – RFC 7022 (draft-ietf-avtcore-6222bis).
  – RFC 7007 (draft-ietf-avtcore-avp-codecs)

• In Publication states:

• RFC Ed queue
  – draft-ietf-avtcore-idms-13

• IESG processing
  – draft-ietf-avt-srtp-not-mandatory-14 – AD Evaluation
  – draft-ietf-avtcore-rtp-security-options-08 – AD Evaluation
  – draft-ietf-avtcore-srtp-aes-gcm-10 – AD Evaluation
Document Status

• Other working group documents
  – draft-ietf-avtcore-aria-srtp-05
    • Write up in progress for publication request
    • Needs some updates to resolve minor issues
  – draft-ietf-avtcore-srtp-ekt-01
    • In WG Last Call – please review and send feedback
  – draft-ietf-avtcore-clksrc-07
    • Second WGLC to verify changes- looks ready for publication.
  – draft-ietf-avtcore-leap-second-05
    • Write up in progress for publication request
    • Needs some updates to resolve minor issues
Document Status

- Other working group documents
  - draft-ietf-avtcore-rtp-topologies-update-01
    - Was updated before the meeting
    - Changes include renaming Source Projection Middlebox to Selective Forwarding Middlebox and De-composite Endpoint to Split Component Endpoint
    - Need reviewers
Guideline for dynamic payload type number usage policy
draft-wu-avtcore-dynamic-pt-usage-02

• Objective
  – provides guidelines for payload type number usage policy when dynamic payload type allocation is used
  – updates closed IANA registry "RTP Payload types (PT) for standard audio and video encodings".

• Motivation
  – Based on the MMUSIC session in Berlin and the open issue in section 3.2.1.2 of draft-roach-mmusic-unified-plan-00, clarification on which payload types from the range 0-95 can be used for dynamic mapping and in what order is needed.
  – Dale R. Worley proposed to update the IANA registry to reflect RFC5761 on the Mmusic list
    • RFC3551 provides some guideline for the choice of payload type values
    • IANA registry for RTP payload type is created only based on RFC3551.
    • RFC5761 applies additional constriction to the payload type arrange besides
      – If multiplexing RTP and RTCP onto a single port is used, payload type values in the range 64-95 MUST NOT be used
    • Therefore IANA registry needs to be updated
      – Add reference to RFC5761
      – Update payload type range 64-95
To do (1) - IANA registries Update

- Proposed Action A:
  - Add reference to RFC5761 for RTP payload type registry
  - Update RTP payload type registry as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PT</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Audio/Video</th>
<th>Clock</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Channels</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reserved—may be used for dynamic mapping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[RFCxxxx]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reserved—may be used for dynamic mapping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[RFCxxxx]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Reserved—may be used for dynamic mapping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[RFCxxxx]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64-65</td>
<td>Reserved—may be used for dynamic mapping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[RFCxxxx]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-71</td>
<td>Reserved for RTCP conflict avoidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[RFC5761]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72-82</td>
<td>Reserved already used by RTCP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[RFC5761]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83-95</td>
<td>Reserved for RTCP conflict avoidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[RFC5761]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96-127</td>
<td>dynamic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[RFC3557]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Open issue
  - Where to put such proposed action?
    - Email drafted by AD and AVTCore chairs
    - A Document or A RFC?
To Do (2) – Additional guideline for Dynamic payload type usage policy

• There was debate on whether to have additional guideline for dynamic payload type usage policy
  – Order of Dynamic payload type number allocation
  – Using deprecated values 64,65 for dynamic payload type number allocation
  – How to differentiate between the cases when RTP and RTCP are multiplexed or not?
    • If application knows RTP and RTCP multiplexing is used, the range [66-95] can be used.

• Action B
  – Having a document to provide such additional guidelines?
Current Milestone Review

- Oct 2013 - Submit an Overview of RTP Security Solutions as Informational
- Oct 2013 - Submit RTP Clock Source Signaling as Proposed Standard
- Oct 2013 - RTP and Leap Seconds as proposed standard
- Nov 2013 - Submit Multiple Media Types in an RTP Session for publication as proposed standard
- Nov 2013 - Submit RTP Congestion Control: Circuit Breakers for Unicast Sessions for publication as proposed standard
- Dec 2013 - Submit in band keying mechanism for SRTP draft for Proposed Standard
- Dec 2013 - Submit SRTP Cryptographic Transform(s) on the ARIA algorithm and corresponding key-management profiles for Security Descriptions, MIKEY and DTLS-SRTP for publication as proposed standard
- Dec 2013 - Submit Guidelines for using the Multiplexing Features of RTP for Informational
- Mar 2014 - Submit Update to RTP Topologies (RFC 5117) for Informational
- Two new ones in AD review
  - Apr 2014 - Submit Update to the RTP Specification (RFC3550) regarding Sending Multiple Media Streams in a Single RTP Session as proposed standard
  - Apr 2014 - Submit Update to the RTP Specification (RFC3550) regarding Sending Multiple Media Streams in a Single RTP Session: Grouping RTCP Reception Statistics and Other Feedback as proposed standard