

PAYLOAD  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: May 4, 2017

V. Singh  
callstats.io  
A. Begen  
Networked Media  
M. Zanaty  
Cisco  
G. Mandyam  
Qualcomm Innovation Center  
October 31, 2016

RTP Payload Format for Flexible Forward Error Correction (FEC)  
draft-ietf-payload-flexible-fec-scheme-03

Abstract

This document defines new RTP payload formats for the Forward Error Correction (FEC) packets that are generated by the non-interleaved and interleaved parity codes from a source media encapsulated in RTP. These parity codes are systematic codes, where a number of repair symbols are generated from a set of source symbols. These repair symbols are sent in a repair flow separate from the source flow that carries the source symbols. The non-interleaved and interleaved parity codes which are defined in this specification offer a good protection against random and bursty packet losses, respectively, at a cost of decent complexity. Moreover, alternate FEC codes may be used with the payload formats presented. The RTP payload formats that are defined in this document address the scalability issues experienced with the earlier specifications including RFC 2733, RFC 5109 and SMPTE 2022-1, and offer several improvements. Due to these changes, the new payload formats are not backward compatible with the earlier specifications, but endpoints that do not implement the scheme can still work by simply ignoring the FEC packets.

Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted 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 May 4, 2017.

#### Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2016 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
1.1. Parity Codes . . . . .	3
1.1.1. Use Cases for 1-D FEC Protection . . . . .	6
1.1.2. Use Cases for 2-D Parity FEC Protection . . . . .	8
1.1.3. Overhead Computation . . . . .	9
2. Requirements Notation . . . . .	9
3. Definitions and Notations . . . . .	10
3.1. Definitions . . . . .	10
3.2. Notations . . . . .	10
4. Packet Formats . . . . .	10
4.1. Source Packets . . . . .	10
4.2. Repair Packets . . . . .	10
5. Payload Format Parameters . . . . .	16
5.1. Media Type Registration - Parity Codes . . . . .	16
5.1.1. Registration of audio/flexfec . . . . .	17
5.1.2. Registration of video/flexfec . . . . .	18
5.1.3. Registration of text/flexfec . . . . .	19
5.1.4. Registration of application/flexfec . . . . .	21
5.2. Mapping to SDP Parameters . . . . .	22
5.2.1. Offer-Answer Model Considerations . . . . .	23
5.2.2. Declarative Considerations . . . . .	23
6. Protection and Recovery Procedures - Parity Codes . . . . .	24
6.1. Overview . . . . .	24
6.2. Repair Packet Construction . . . . .	24
6.3. Source Packet Reconstruction . . . . .	26
6.3.1. Associating the Source and Repair Packets . . . . .	26
6.3.2. Recovering the RTP Header . . . . .	27
6.3.3. Recovering the RTP Payload . . . . .	29
6.3.4. Iterative Decoding Algorithm for the 2-D Parity FEC	

Protection . . . . . 29

7. SDP Examples . . . . . 31

7.1. Example SDP for Flexible FEC Protection with in-band SSRC mapping . . . . . 32

7.2. Example SDP for Flex FEC Protection with explicit signalling in the SDP . . . . . 32

8. Congestion Control Considerations . . . . . 32

9. Security Considerations . . . . . 33

10. IANA Considerations . . . . . 34

11. Acknowledgments . . . . . 34

12. Change Log . . . . . 34

12.1. draft-ietf-payload-flexible-fec-scheme-03 . . . . . 34

12.2. draft-ietf-payload-flexible-fec-scheme-02 . . . . . 34

12.3. draft-ietf-payload-flexible-fec-scheme-01 . . . . . 34

12.4. draft-ietf-payload-flexible-fec-scheme-00 . . . . . 35

12.5. draft-singh-payload-1d2d-parity-scheme-00 . . . . . 35

12.6. draft-ietf-fecframe-1d2d-parity-scheme-00 . . . . . 35

13. References . . . . . 35

13.1. Normative References . . . . . 35

13.2. Informative References . . . . . 36

Authors' Addresses . . . . . 38

1. Introduction

This document defines new RTP payload formats for the Forward Error Correction (FEC) that is generated by the non-interleaved and interleaved parity codes from a source media encapsulated in RTP [RFC3550]. These payload formats may also be used for other types of FEC codes. The type of the source media protected by these parity codes can be audio, video, text or application. The FEC data are generated according to the media type parameters, which are communicated out-of-band (e.g., in SDP). Furthermore, the associations or relationships between the source and repair flows may be communicated in-band or out-of-band. Situations where adaptivity of FEC parameters is desired, the endpoint can use the in-band mechanism, whereas when the FEC parameters are fixed, the endpoint may prefer to negotiate them out-of-band.

The repair packets proposed in this document protect the source stream packets that belong to the same RTP session.

1.1. Parity Codes

Both the non-interleaved and interleaved parity codes use the eXclusive OR (XOR) operation to generate the repair symbols. In a nutshell, the following steps take place:

1. The sender determines a set of source packets to be protected by FEC based on the media type parameters.
2. The sender applies the XOR operation on the source symbols to generate the required number of repair symbols.
3. The sender packetizes the repair symbols and sends the repair packet(s) along with the source packets to the receiver(s) (in different flows). The repair packets may be sent proactively or on-demand.

Note that the source and repair packets belong to different source and repair flows, and the sender must provide a way for the receivers to demultiplex them, even in the case they are sent in the same 5-tuple (i.e., same source/destination address/port with UDP). This is required to offer backward compatibility for endpoints that do not understand the FEC packets (See Section 4). At the receiver side, if all of the source packets are successfully received, there is no need for FEC recovery and the repair packets are discarded. However, if there are missing source packets, the repair packets can be used to recover the missing information. Figure 1 and Figure 2 describe example block diagrams for the systematic parity FEC encoder and decoder, respectively.




Figure 1: Block diagram for systematic parity FEC encoder




Figure 2: Block diagram for systematic parity FEC decoder

In Figure 2, it is clear that the FEC packets have to be received by the endpoint within a certain amount of time for the FEC recovery process to be useful. In this document, we refer to the time that spans a FEC block, which consists of the source packets and the corresponding repair packets, as the repair window. At the receiver side, the FEC decoder should wait at least for the duration of the repair window after getting the first packet in a FEC block, to allow all the repair packets to arrive. (The waiting time can be adjusted if there are missing packets at the beginning of the FEC block.) The FEC decoder can start decoding the already received packets sooner; however, it should not register a FEC decoding failure until it waits at least for the duration of the repair window.

Suppose that we have a group of  $D \times L$  source packets that have sequence numbers starting from 1 running to  $D \times L$ , and a repair packet is generated by applying the XOR operation to every  $L$  consecutive packets as sketched in Figure 3. This process is referred to as 1-D non-interleaved FEC protection. As a result of this process,  $D$  repair packets are generated, which we refer to as non-interleaved (or row) FEC packets.




Figure 3: Generating non-interleaved (row) FEC packets

If we apply the XOR operation to the group of the source packets whose sequence numbers are  $L$  apart from each other, as sketched in Figure 4. In this case the endpoint generates  $L$  repair packets. This process is referred to as 1-D interleaved FEC protection, and the resulting  $L$  repair packets are referred to as interleaved (or column) FEC packets.




Figure 4: Generating interleaved (column) FEC packets

1.1.1.1. Use Cases for 1-D FEC Protection

We generate one non-interleaved repair packet out of L consecutive source packets or one interleaved repair packet out of D non-consecutive source packets. Regardless of whether the repair packet is a non-interleaved or an interleaved one, it can provide a full recovery of the missing information if there is only one packet missing among the corresponding source packets. This implies that 1-D non-interleaved FEC protection performs better when the source packets are randomly lost. However, if the packet losses occur in bursts, 1-D interleaved FEC protection performs better provided that L is chosen large enough, i.e., L-packet duration is not shorter than the observed burst duration. If the sender generates non-interleaved FEC packets and a burst loss hits the source packets, the repair operation fails. This is illustrated in Figure 5.




Figure 5: Example scenario where 1-D non-interleaved FEC protection fails error recovery (Burst Loss)

The sender may generate interleaved FEC packets to combat with the bursty packet losses. However, two or more random packet losses may hit the source and repair packets in the same column. In that case, the repair operation fails as well. This is illustrated in Figure 6. Note that it is possible that two burst losses may occur back-to-back, in which case interleaved FEC packets may still fail to recover the lost data.




Figure 6: Example scenario where 1-D interleaved FEC protection fails error recovery (Periodic Loss)

1.1.2. Use Cases for 2-D Parity FEC Protection

In networks where the source packets are lost both randomly and in bursts, the sender ought to generate both non-interleaved and interleaved FEC packets. This type of FEC protection is known as 2-D parity FEC protection. At the expense of generating more FEC packets, thus increasing the FEC overhead, 2-D FEC provides superior protection against mixed loss patterns. However, it is still possible for 2-D parity FEC protection to fail to recover all of the lost source packets if a particular loss pattern occurs. An example scenario is illustrated in Figure 7.




Figure 7: Example scenario #1 where 2-D parity FEC protection fails error recovery

2-D parity FEC protection also fails when at least two rows are missing a source and the FEC packet and the missing source packets (in at least two rows) are aligned in the same column. An example loss pattern is sketched in Figure 8. Similarly, 2-D parity FEC protection cannot repair all missing source packets when at least two columns are missing a source and the FEC packet and the missing source packets (in at least two columns) are aligned in the same row.






Figure 8: Example scenario #2 where 2-D parity FEC protection fails error recovery

### 1.1.3. Overhead Computation

The overhead is defined as the ratio of the number of bytes belonging to the repair packets to the number of bytes belonging to the protected source packets.

Generally, repair packets are larger in size compared to the source packets. Also, not all the source packets are necessarily equal in size. However, if we assume that each repair packet carries an equal number of bytes carried by a source packet, we can compute the overhead for different FEC protection methods as follows:

- o 1-D Non-interleaved FEC Protection: Overhead = 1/L
- o 1-D Interleaved FEC Protection: Overhead = 1/D
- o 2-D Parity FEC Protection: Overhead = 1/L + 1/D

where L and D are the number of columns and rows in the source block, respectively.

## 2. Requirements Notation

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

### 3. Definitions and Notations

#### 3.1. Definitions

This document uses a number of definitions from [RFC6363].

#### 3.2. Notations

- o L: Number of columns of the source block.
- o D: Number of rows of the source block.
- o bitmask: Run-length encoding of packets protected by a FEC packet. If the bit  $i$  in the mask is set to 1, the source packet number  $N + i$  is protected by this FEC packet. Here,  $N$  is the sequence number base, which is indicated in the FEC packet as well.

### 4. Packet Formats

This section defines the formats of the source and repair packets.

#### 4.1. Source Packets

The source packets MUST contain the information that identifies the source block and the position within the source block occupied by the packet. Since the source packets that are carried within an RTP stream already contain unique sequence numbers in their RTP headers [RFC3550], we can identify the source packets in a straightforward manner and there is no need to append additional field(s). The primary advantage of not modifying the source packets in any way is that it provides backward compatibility for the receivers that do not support FEC at all. In multicast scenarios, this backward compatibility becomes quite useful as it allows the non-FEC-capable and FEC-capable receivers to receive and interpret the same source packets sent in the same multicast session.

#### 4.2. Repair Packets

The repair packets MUST contain information that identifies the source block they pertain to and the relationship between the contained repair symbols and the original source block. For this purpose, we use the RTP header of the repair packets as well as another header within the RTP payload, which we refer to as the FEC header, as shown in Figure 9.

Note that all the source stream packets that are protected by a particular FEC packet need to be in the same RTP session.




Figure 9: Format of repair packets

The RTP header is formatted according to [RFC3550] with some further clarifications listed below:

- o Marker (M) Bit: This bit is not used for this payload type, and SHALL be set to 0.
- o Payload Type: The (dynamic) payload type for the repair packets is determined through out-of-band means. Note that this document registers new payload formats for the repair packets (Refer to Section 5 for details). According to [RFC3550], an RTP receiver that cannot recognize a payload type must discard it. This provides backward compatibility. If a non-FEC-capable receiver receives a repair packet, it will not recognize the payload type, and hence, will discard the repair packet.
- o Sequence Number (SN): The sequence number has the standard definition. It MUST be one higher than the sequence number in the previously transmitted repair packet. The initial value of the sequence number SHOULD be random (unpredictable, based on [RFC3550]).
- o Timestamp (TS): The timestamp SHALL be set to a time corresponding to the repair packet's transmission time. Note that the timestamp value has no use in the actual FEC protection process and is usually useful for jitter calculations.
- o Synchronization Source (SSRC): The SSRC value SHALL be randomly assigned as suggested by [RFC3550]. This allows the sender to multiplex the source and repair flows on the same port, or multiplex multiple repair flows on a single port. The repair flows SHOULD use the RTCP CNAME field to associate themselves with the source flow.

In some networks, the RTP Source, which produces the source packets and the FEC Source, which generates the repair packets from the source packets may not be the same host. In such scenarios, using the same CNAME for the source and repair flows means that the RTP Source and the FEC Source MUST share the same CNAME (for this specific source-repair flow association). A common CNAME may be produced based on an algorithm that is known both to the RTP and FEC Source [RFC7022]. This usage is compliant with [RFC3550].

Note that due to the randomness of the SSRC assignments, there is a possibility of SSRC collision. In such cases, the collisions MUST be resolved as described in [RFC3550].

The format of the FEC header is shown in Figure 10.




Figure 10: Format of the FEC header

The FEC header consists of the following fields:

- o The R bit MUST be set to 1 to indicate a retransmission packet, and MUST be set to 0 for repair packets.

- o The F field (1 bit) indicates the type of the mask. Namely:

F bit	Use
0	flexible mask
1	packets indicated by offset M and N

Figure 11: F-bit values

- o The P, X, CC, M and PT recovery fields are used to determine the corresponding fields of the recovered packets.
- o The Length recovery (16 bits) field is used to determine the length of the recovered packets.
- o The TS recovery (32 bits) field is used to determine the timestamp of the recovered packets.
- o The SSRC count (8 bits) field describes the number of SSRCs protected by the FEC packet. 0 is not a valid value, and the packet MUST be ignored.
- o The Reserved (24 bits) field are reserved for future use. It MUST be set to zero by senders and ignored by receivers (see [RFC6709], Section 4.2).
- o The SSRC\_i (32 bits) field describes the SSRC of the packets protected by this particular FEC packet. If a FEC packet contains protects multiple SSRCs (indicated by the SSRC Count > 1), there will be multiple blocks of data containing the SSRC, SN base and Mask fields.
- o The SN base\_i (16 bits) field indicates the lowest sequence number, taking wrap around into account, of the source packets for a particular SSSRC (indicated in SSRC\_i) protected by this repair packet.
- o If the F-bit is set to 0, it represents that the source packets of all the SSRCs protected by this particular repair packet are indicated by using a flexible bitmask. Mask is a run-length encoding of packets for a particular SSRC\_i protected by the FEC packet. Where a bit j set to 1 indicates that the source packet with sequence number (SN base\_i + j + 1) is protected by this FEC packet.

- o The k-bit in the bitmasks indicates if it is 15-, 46-, or a 109-bitmask. k=0 denotes that there is one more k-bit set, and k=1 denotes that it is the last block of bit mask. While parsing the header, the current count of the number of k-bit gives the size of the bit mask  $v = \text{count}(k)$ . Size of next bitmask =  $2^{(v+3)}-1$ .
- o Editor's note: If we limit the number of k-bits to 3, we could essentially remove the last k-bit.
- o




Figure 12: Protocol format for F=0

- o If the F-bit is set to 1, it represents that the source packets of all the SSRCs protected by this particular repair packet are indicated by using fixed offsets.




Figure 13: Protocol format for F=1

Consequently, the following conditions occur for M and N values:

- If  $M > 0, N = 0$ , is Row FEC, and no column FEC will follow  
Hence,  $FEC = SN, SN+1, SN+2, \dots, SN+(M-1), SN+M$ .
- If  $M > 0, N = 1$ , is Row FEC, and column FEC will follow.  
Hence,  $FEC = SN, SN+1, SN+2, \dots, SN+(M-1), SN+M$ .  
and more to come
- If  $M > 0, N > 1$ , indicates column FEC of every M packet  
in a group of N packets starting at SN base.  
Hence,  $FEC = SN+(M \times 0), SN+(M \times 1), \dots, SN+(M \times N)$ .

Figure 14: Interpreting the M and N field values

By setting R to 1, F to 1, this FEC protects only one packet, i.e., the FEC payload carries just the packet indicated by SN Base\_i, which is effectively retransmitting the packet.

Note that the parsing of this packet is different. The sequence number (SN base\_i) replaces the length recovery in the FEC packet. The SSRC\_count which would be 1, M and N would be set to 0, and the reserved bits from the FEC header are removed. By doing this, we save 64 bits.




Figure 15: Protocol format for Retransmission

The details on setting the fields in the FEC header are provided in Section 6.2.

It should be noted that a mask-based approach (similar to the ones specified in [RFC2733] and [RFC5109]) may not be very efficient to indicate which source packets in the current source block are associated with a given repair packet. In particular, for the applications that would like to use large source block sizes, the size of the mask that is required to describe the source-repair packet associations may be prohibitively large. The 8-bit fields proposed in [SMPTE2022-1] indicate a systematized approach. Instead the approach in this document uses the 8-bit fields to indicate packet offsets protected by the FEC packet. The approach in [SMPTE2022-1] is inherently more efficient for regular patterns, it does not provide flexibility to represent other protection patterns (e.g., staircase).

## 5. Payload Format Parameters

This section provides the media subtype registration for the non-interleaved and interleaved parity FEC. The parameters that are required to configure the FEC encoding and decoding operations are also defined in this section. If no specific FEC code is specified in the subtype, then the FEC code defaults to the parity code defined in this specification.

### 5.1. Media Type Registration - Parity Codes

This registration is done using the template defined in [RFC6838] and following the guidance provided in [RFC3555].



Note to the RFC Editor: In the following sections, please replace "XXXX" with the number of this document prior to publication as an RFC.

#### 5.1.1.1. Registration of audio/flexfec

Type name: audio

Subtype name: flexfec

Required parameters:

- o rate: The RTP timestamp (clock) rate. The rate SHALL be larger than 1000 Hz to provide sufficient resolution to RTCP operations. However, it is RECOMMENDED to select the rate that matches the rate of the protected source RTP stream.
- o repair-window: The time that spans the source packets and the corresponding repair packets. The size of the repair window is specified in microseconds.

Optional parameters:

- o L: indicates the number of columns of the source block that are protected by this FEC block and it applies to all the source SSRCs. L is a positive integer.
- o D: indicates the number of rows of the source block that are protected by this FEC block and it applies to all the source SSRCs. D is a positive integer.
- o ToP: indicates the type of protection applied by the sender: 0 for 1-D interleaved FEC protection, 1 for 1-D non-interleaved FEC protection, and 2 for 2-D parity FEC protection. The ToP value of 3 is reserved for future uses.

Encoding considerations: This media type is framed (See Section 4.8 in the template document [RFC6838]) and contains binary data.

Security considerations: See Section 9 of [RFCXXXX].

Interoperability considerations: None.

Published specification: [RFCXXXX].

Applications that use this media type: Multimedia applications that want to improve resiliency against packet loss by sending redundant data in addition to the source media.

Fragment identifier considerations: None.

Additional information: None.

Person & email address to contact for further information: Varun Singh <varun@callstats.io> and IETF Audio/Video Transport Payloads Working Group.

Intended usage: COMMON.

Restriction on usage: This media type depends on RTP framing, and hence, is only defined for transport via RTP [RFC3550].

Author: Varun Singh <varun@callstats.io>.

Change controller: IETF Audio/Video Transport Working Group delegated from the IESG.

Provisional registration? (standards tree only): Yes.

#### 5.1.2. Registration of video/flexfec

Type name: video

Subtype name: flexfec

Required parameters:

- o rate: The RTP timestamp (clock) rate. The rate SHALL be larger than 1000 Hz to provide sufficient resolution to RTCP operations. However, it is RECOMMENDED to select the rate that matches the rate of the protected source RTP stream.
- o repair-window: The time that spans the source packets and the corresponding repair packets. The size of the repair window is specified in microseconds.

Optional parameters:

- o L: indicates the number of columns of the source block that are protected by this FEC block and it applies to all the source SSRCS. L is a positive integer.
- o D: indicates the number of rows of the source block that are protected by this FEC block and it applies to all the source SSRCS. D is a positive integer.

- o ToP: indicates the type of protection applied by the sender: 0 for 1-D interleaved FEC protection, 1 for 1-D non-interleaved FEC protection, and 2 for 2-D parity FEC protection. The ToP value of 3 is reserved for future uses.

Encoding considerations: This media type is framed (See Section 4.8 in the template document [RFC6838]) and contains binary data.

Security considerations: See Section 9 of [RFCXXXX].

Interoperability considerations: None.

Published specification: [RFCXXXX].

Applications that use this media type: Multimedia applications that want to improve resiliency against packet loss by sending redundant data in addition to the source media.

Fragment identifier considerations: None.

Additional information: None.

Person & email address to contact for further information: Varun Singh <varun@callstats.io> and IETF Audio/Video Transport Payloads Working Group.

Intended usage: COMMON.

Restriction on usage: This media type depends on RTP framing, and hence, is only defined for transport via RTP [RFC3550].

Author: Varun Singh <varun@callstats.io>.

Change controller: IETF Audio/Video Transport Working Group delegated from the IESG.

Provisional registration? (standards tree only): Yes.

#### 5.1.3. Registration of text/flexfec

Type name: text

Subtype name: flexfec

Required parameters:

- o rate: The RTP timestamp (clock) rate. The rate SHALL be larger than 1000 Hz to provide sufficient resolution to RTCP operations.

However, it is RECOMMENDED to select the rate that matches the rate of the protected source RTP stream.

- o repair-window: The time that spans the source packets and the corresponding repair packets. The size of the repair window is specified in microseconds.

Optional parameters:

- o L: indicates the number of columns of the source block that are protected by this FEC block and it applies to all the source SSRCs. L is a positive integer.
- o D: indicates the number of rows of the source block that are protected by this FEC block and it applies to all the source SSRCs. D is a positive integer.
- o ToP: indicates the type of protection applied by the sender: 0 for 1-D interleaved FEC protection, 1 for 1-D non-interleaved FEC protection, and 2 for 2-D parity FEC protection. The ToP value of 3 is reserved for future uses.

Encoding considerations: This media type is framed (See Section 4.8 in the template document [RFC6838]) and contains binary data.

Security considerations: See Section 9 of [RFCXXXX].

Interoperability considerations: None.

Published specification: [RFCXXXX].

Applications that use this media type: Multimedia applications that want to improve resiliency against packet loss by sending redundant data in addition to the source media.

Fragment identifier considerations: None.

Additional information: None.

Person & email address to contact for further information: Varun Singh <vvarun@callstats.io> and IETF Audio/Video Transport Payloads Working Group.

Intended usage: COMMON.

Restriction on usage: This media type depends on RTP framing, and hence, is only defined for transport via RTP [RFC3550].

Author: Varun Singh <varun@callstats.io>.

Change controller: IETF Audio/Video Transport Working Group delegated from the IESG.

Provisional registration? (standards tree only): Yes.

#### 5.1.4. Registration of application/flexfec

Type name: application

Subtype name: flexfec

Required parameters:

- o rate: The RTP timestamp (clock) rate. The rate SHALL be larger than 1000 Hz to provide sufficient resolution to RTCP operations. However, it is RECOMMENDED to select the rate that matches the rate of the protected source RTP stream.
- o repair-window: The time that spans the source packets and the corresponding repair packets. The size of the repair window is specified in microseconds.

Optional parameters:

- o L: indicates the number of columns of the source block that are protected by this FEC block and it applies to all the source SSRCS. L is a positive integer.
- o D: indicates the number of rows of the source block that are protected by this FEC block and it applies to all the source SSRCS. D is a positive integer.
- o ToP: indicates the type of protection applied by the sender: 0 for 1-D interleaved FEC protection, 1 for 1-D non-interleaved FEC protection, and 2 for 2-D parity FEC protection. The ToP value of 3 is reserved for future uses.

Encoding considerations: This media type is framed (See Section 4.8 in the template document [RFC6838]) and contains binary data.

Security considerations: See Section 9 of [RFCXXXX].

Interoperability considerations: None.

Published specification: [RFCXXXX].

Applications that use this media type: Multimedia applications that want to improve resiliency against packet loss by sending redundant data in addition to the source media.

Fragment identifier considerations: None.

Additional information: None.

Person & email address to contact for further information: Varun Singh <varun@callstats.io> and IETF Audio/Video Transport Payloads Working Group.

Intended usage: COMMON.

Restriction on usage: This media type depends on RTP framing, and hence, is only defined for transport via RTP [RFC3550].

Author: Varun Singh <varun@callstats.io>.

Change controller: IETF Audio/Video Transport Working Group delegated from the IESG.

Provisional registration? (standards tree only): Yes.

## 5.2. Mapping to SDP Parameters

Applications that are using RTP transport commonly use Session Description Protocol (SDP) [RFC4566] to describe their RTP sessions. The information that is used to specify the media types in an RTP session has specific mappings to the fields in an SDP description. In this section, we provide these mappings for the media subtypes registered by this document. Note that if an application does not use SDP to describe the RTP sessions, an appropriate mapping must be defined and used to specify the media types and their parameters for the control/description protocol employed by the application.

The mapping of the media type specification for "non-interleaved-parityfec" and "interleaved-parityfec" and their parameters in SDP is as follows:

- o The media type (e.g., "application") goes into the "m=" line as the media name.
- o The media subtype goes into the "a=rtpmap" line as the encoding name. The RTP clock rate parameter ("rate") also goes into the "a=rtpmap" line as the clock rate.

- o The remaining required payload-format-specific parameters go into the "a=fmtp" line by copying them directly from the media type string as a semicolon-separated list of parameter=value pairs.

SDP examples are provided in Section 7.

#### 5.2.1. Offer-Answer Model Considerations

When offering 1-D interleaved parity FEC over RTP using SDP in an Offer/Answer model [RFC3264], the following considerations apply:

- o Each combination of the L and D parameters produces a different FEC data and is not compatible with any other combination. A sender application may desire to offer multiple offers with different sets of L and D values as long as the parameter values are valid. The receiver SHOULD normally choose the offer that has a sufficient amount of interleaving. If multiple such offers exist, the receiver may choose the offer that has the lowest overhead or the one that requires the smallest amount of buffering. The selection depends on the application requirements.
- o The value for the repair-window parameter depends on the L and D values and cannot be chosen arbitrarily. More specifically, L and D values determine the lower limit for the repair-window size. The upper limit of the repair-window size does not depend on the L and D values.
- o Although combinations with the same L and D values but with different repair-window sizes produce the same FEC data, such combinations are still considered different offers. The size of the repair-window is related to the maximum delay between the transmission of a source packet and the associated repair packet. This directly impacts the buffering requirement on the receiver side and the receiver must consider this when choosing an offer.
- o There are no optional format parameters defined for this payload. Any unknown option in the offer MUST be ignored and deleted from the answer. If FEC is not desired by the receiver, it can be deleted from the answer.

#### 5.2.2. Declarative Considerations

In declarative usage, like SDP in the Real-time Streaming Protocol (RTSP) [RFC2326] or the Session Announcement Protocol (SAP) [RFC2974], the following considerations apply:

- o The payload format configuration parameters are all declarative and a participant MUST use the configuration that is provided for the session.
- o More than one configuration may be provided (if desired) by declaring multiple RTP payload types. In that case, the receivers should choose the repair flow that is best for them.

## 6. Protection and Recovery Procedures - Parity Codes

This section provides a complete specification of the 1-D and 2-D parity codes and their RTP payload formats.

### 6.1. Overview

The following sections specify the steps involved in generating the repair packets and reconstructing the missing source packets from the repair packets.

### 6.2. Repair Packet Construction

The RTP header of a repair packet is formed based on the guidelines given in Section 4.2.

The FEC header includes 12 octets (or upto 28 octets when the longer optional masks are used). It is constructed by applying the XOR operation on the bit strings that are generated from the individual source packets protected by this particular repair packet. The set of the source packets that are associated with a given repair packet can be computed by the formula given in Section 6.3.1.

The bit string is formed for each source packet by concatenating the following fields together in the order specified:

- o The first 64 bits of the RTP header (64 bits).
- o Unsigned network-ordered 16-bit representation of the source packet length in bytes minus 12 (for the fixed RTP header), i.e., the sum of the lengths of all the following if present: the CSRC list, extension header, RTP payload and RTP padding (16 bits).

By applying the parity operation on the bit strings produced from the source packets, we generate the FEC bit string. The FEC header is generated from the FEC bit string as follows:

- o The first (most significant) 2 bits in the FEC bit string are skipped. The MSK bits in the FEC header are set to the appropriate value, i.e., it depends on the chosen bitmask length.



- o The next bit in the FEC bit string is written into the P recovery bit in the FEC header.
- o The next bit in the FEC bit string is written into the X recovery bit in the FEC header.
- o The next 4 bits of the FEC bit string are written into the CC recovery field in the FEC header.
- o The next bit is written into the M recovery bit in the FEC header.
- o The next 7 bits of the FEC bit string are written into the PT recovery field in the FEC header.
- o The next 16 bits are skipped.
- o The next 32 bits of the FEC bit string are written into the TS recovery field in the FEC header.
- o The next 16 bits are written into the length recovery field in the FEC header.
- o Depending on the chosen MSK value, the bit mask of appropriate length will be set to the appropriate values.

As described in Section 4.2, the SN base field of the FEC header MUST be set to the lowest sequence number of the source packets protected by this repair packet. When MSK represents a bitmask (MSK=00,01,10), the SN base field corresponds to the lowest sequence number indicated in the bitmask. When MSK=11, the following considerations apply: 1) for the interleaved FEC packets, this corresponds to the lowest sequence number of the source packets that forms the column, 2) for the non-interleaved FEC packets, the SN base field MUST be set to the lowest sequence number of the source packets that forms the row.

The repair packet payload consists of the bits that are generated by applying the XOR operation on the payloads of the source RTP packets. If the payload lengths of the source packets are not equal, each shorter packet MUST be padded to the length of the longest packet by adding octet 0's at the end.

Due to this possible padding and mandatory FEC header, a repair packet has a larger size than the source packets it protects. This may cause problems if the resulting repair packet size exceeds the Maximum Transmission Unit (MTU) size of the path over which the repair flow is sent.

### 6.3. Source Packet Reconstruction

This section describes the recovery procedures that are required to reconstruct the missing source packets. The recovery process has two steps. In the first step, the FEC decoder determines which source and repair packets should be used in order to recover a missing packet. In the second step, the decoder recovers the missing packet, which consists of an RTP header and RTP payload.

In the following, we describe the RECOMMENDED algorithms for the first and second steps. Based on the implementation, different algorithms MAY be adopted. However, the end result MUST be identical to the one produced by the algorithms described below.

Note that the same algorithms are used by the 1-D parity codes, regardless of whether the FEC protection is applied over a column or a row. The 2-D parity codes, on the other hand, usually require multiple iterations of the procedures described here. This iterative decoding algorithm is further explained in Section 6.3.4.

#### 6.3.1. Associating the Source and Repair Packets

We denote the set of the source packets associated with repair packet  $p^*$  by set  $T(p^*)$ . Note that in a source block whose size is  $L$  columns by  $D$  rows, set  $T$  includes  $D$  source packets plus one repair packet for the FEC protection applied over a column, and  $L$  source packets plus one repair packet for the FEC protection applied over a row. Recall that 1-D interleaved and non-interleaved FEC protection can fully recover the missing information if there is only one source packet missing in set  $T$ . If there are more than one source packets missing in set  $T$ , 1-D FEC protection will not work.

##### 6.3.1.1. Signaled in SDP

The first step is associating the source and repair packets. If the endpoint relies entirely on out-of-band signaling ( $MSK=11$ , and  $M=N=0$ ), then this information may be inferred from the media type parameters specified in the SDP description. Furthermore, the payload type field in the RTP header, assists the receiver distinguish an interleaved or non-interleaved FEC packet.

Mathematically, for any received repair packet,  $p^*$ , we can determine the sequence numbers of the source packets that are protected by this repair packet as follows:

$$p^*_{snb} + i * X_1 \text{ (modulo 65536)}$$

where  $p^*_{snb}$  denotes the value in the SN base field of  $p^*$ 's FEC header,  $X_1$  is set to L and 1 for the interleaved and non-interleaved FEC packets, respectively, and

$$0 \leq i < X_2$$

where  $X_2$  is set to D and L for the interleaved and non-interleaved FEC packets, respectively.

#### 6.3.1.2. Using bitmasks

When using fixed size bitmasks (16-, 48-, 112-bits), the SN base field in the FEC header indicates the lowest sequence number of the source packets that forms the FEC packet. Finally, the bits marked by "1" in the bitmask are offsets from the SN base and make up the rest of the packets protected by the FEC packet. The bitmasks are able to represent arbitrary protection patterns, for example, 1-D interleaved, 1-D non-interleaved, 2-D, staircase.

#### 6.3.1.3. Using M and N Offsets

When value of M is non-zero, the 8-bit fields indicate the offset of packets protected by an interleaved ( $N>0$ ) or non-interleaved ( $N=0$ ) FEC packet. Using a combination of interleaved and non-interleaved FEC packets can form 2-D protection patterns.

Mathematically, for any received repair packet,  $p^*$ , we can determine the sequence numbers of the source packets that are protected by this repair packet are as follows:

When  $N = 0$ :

$p^*_{snb}, p^*_{snb}+1, \dots, p^*_{snb}+(M-1), p^*_{snb}+M$

When  $N > 0$ :

$p^*_{snb}, p^*_{snb}+(M \times 1), p^*_{snb}+(M \times 2), \dots, p^*_{snb}+(M \times (N-1)), p^*_{snb}+(M \times N)$

#### 6.3.2. Recovering the RTP Header

For a given set T, the procedure for the recovery of the RTP header of the missing packet, whose sequence number is denoted by SEQNUM, is as follows:

1. For each of the source packets that are successfully received in T, compute the 80-bit string by concatenating the first 64 bits of their RTP header and the unsigned network-ordered 16-bit representation of their length in bytes minus 12.

2. For the repair packet in T, compute the FEC bit string from the first 80 bits of the FEC header.
3. Calculate the recovered bit string as the XOR of the bit strings generated from all source packets in T and the FEC bit string generated from the repair packet in T.
4. Create a new packet with the standard 12-byte RTP header and no payload.
5. Set the version of the new packet to 2. Skip the first 2 bits in the recovered bit string.
6. Set the Padding bit in the new packet to the next bit in the recovered bit string.
7. Set the Extension bit in the new packet to the next bit in the recovered bit string.
8. Set the CC field to the next 4 bits in the recovered bit string.
9. Set the Marker bit in the new packet to the next bit in the recovered bit string.
10. Set the Payload type in the new packet to the next 7 bits in the recovered bit string.
11. Set the SN field in the new packet to SEQNUM. Skip the next 16 bits in the recovered bit string.
12. Set the TS field in the new packet to the next 32 bits in the recovered bit string.
13. Take the next 16 bits of the recovered bit string and set the new variable Y to whatever unsigned integer this represents (assuming network order). Convert Y to host order. Y represents the length of the new packet in bytes minus 12 (for the fixed RTP header), i.e., the sum of the lengths of all the following if present: the CSRC list, header extension, RTP payload and RTP padding.
14. Set the SSRC of the new packet to the SSRC of the source RTP stream.

This procedure recovers the header of an RTP packet up to (and including) the SSRC field.

### 6.3.3. Recovering the RTP Payload

Following the recovery of the RTP header, the procedure for the recovery of the RTP payload is as follows:

1. Append Y bytes to the new packet.
2. For each of the source packets that are successfully received in T, compute the bit string from the Y octets of data starting with the 13th octet of the packet. If any of the bit strings generated from the source packets has a length shorter than Y, pad them to that length. The padding of octet 0 MUST be added at the end of the bit string. Note that the information of the first 8 octets are protected by the FEC header.
3. For the repair packet in T, compute the FEC bit string from the repair packet payload, i.e., the Y octets of data following the FEC header. Note that the FEC header may be 12, 16, 32 octets depending on the length of the bitmask.
4. Calculate the recovered bit string as the XOR of the bit strings generated from all source packets in T and the FEC bit string generated from the repair packet in T.
5. Append the recovered bit string (Y octets) to the new packet generated in Section 6.3.2.

### 6.3.4. Iterative Decoding Algorithm for the 2-D Parity FEC Protection

In 2-D parity FEC protection, the sender generates both non-interleaved and interleaved FEC packets to combat with the mixed loss patterns (random and bursty). At the receiver side, these FEC packets are used iteratively to overcome the shortcomings of the 1-D non-interleaved/interleaved FEC protection and improve the chances of full error recovery.

The iterative decoding algorithm runs as follows:

1. Set num\_recovered\_until\_this\_iteration to zero
2. Set num\_recovered\_so\_far to zero
3. Recover as many source packets as possible by using the non-interleaved FEC packets as outlined in Section 6.3.2 and Section 6.3.3, and increase the value of num\_recovered\_so\_far by the number of recovered source packets.

4. Recover as many source packets as possible by using the interleaved FEC packets as outlined in Section 6.3.2 and Section 6.3.3, and increase the value of num\_recovered\_so\_far by the number of recovered source packets.
5. If num\_recovered\_so\_far > num\_recovered\_until\_this\_iteration  
 ---num\_recovered\_until\_this\_iteration = num\_recovered\_so\_far  
 ---Go to step 3  
 Else  
 ---Terminate

The algorithm terminates either when all missing source packets are fully recovered or when there are still remaining missing source packets but the FEC packets are not able to recover any more source packets. For the example scenarios when the 2-D parity FEC protection fails full recovery, refer to Section 1.1.2. Upon termination, variable num\_recovered\_so\_far has a value equal to the total number of recovered source packets.

Example:

Suppose that the receiver experienced the loss pattern sketched in Figure 16.




Figure 16: Example loss pattern for the iterative decoding algorithm

The receiver executes the iterative decoding algorithm and recovers source packets #1 and #11 in the first iteration. The resulting pattern is sketched in Figure 17.

```

+----+      +----+ +----+ +----+ +----+ +----+
|  1  |      X   |  3  | |  4  | |R_1|
+----+      +----+ +----+ +----+ +----+

+----+ +----+ +----+ +----+ +----+
|  5  | |  6  | |  7  | |  8  | |R_2|
+----+ +----+ +----+ +----+ +----+

+----+      +----+ +----+ +----+ +----+
|  9  |      X   | 11  | | 12  | |R_3|
+----+      +----+ +----+ +----+ +----+

+----+ +----+ +----+ +----+
|C_1| |C_2| |C_3| |C_4|
+----+ +----+ +----+ +----+

```

Figure 17: The resulting pattern after the first iteration

Since the if condition holds true, the receiver runs a new iteration. In the second iteration, source packets #2 and #10 are recovered, resulting in a full recovery as sketched in Figure 18.

```

+----+ +----+ +----+ +----+ +----+
|  1  | |  2  | |  3  | |  4  | |R_1|
+----+ +----+ +----+ +----+ +----+

+----+ +----+ +----+ +----+ +----+
|  5  | |  6  | |  7  | |  8  | |R_2|
+----+ +----+ +----+ +----+ +----+

+----+ +----+ +----+ +----+ +----+
|  9  | | 10  | | 11  | | 12  | |R_3|
+----+ +----+ +----+ +----+ +----+

+----+ +----+ +----+ +----+
|C_1| |C_2| |C_3| |C_4|
+----+ +----+ +----+ +----+

```

Figure 18: The resulting pattern after the second iteration

## 7. SDP Examples

This section provides two SDP [RFC4566] examples. The examples use the FEC grouping semantics defined in [RFC5956].

### 7.1. Example SDP for Flexible FEC Protection with in-band SSRC mapping

In this example, we have one source video stream and one FEC repair stream. The source and repair streams are multiplexed on different SSRCs. The repair window is set to 200 ms.

```
v=0
o=mo 1122334455 1122334466 IN IP4 fec.example.com
s=FlexFEC minimal SDP signalling Example
t=0 0
m=video 30000 RTP/AVP 96 98
c=IN IP4 143.163.151.157
a=rtpmap:96 VP8/90000
a=rtpmap:98 flexfec/90000
a=fmtp:98; repair-window=200ms
```

### 7.2. Example SDP for Flex FEC Protection with explicit signalling in the SDP

In this example, we have one source video stream (ssrc:1234) and one FEC repair streams (ssrc:2345). We form one FEC group with the "a=ssrc-group:FEC-FR 1234 2345" line. The source and repair streams are multiplexed on different SSRCs. The repair window is set to 200 ms.

```
v=0
o=ali 1122334455 1122334466 IN IP4 fec.example.com
s=2-D Parity FEC with no in band signalling Example
t=0 0
m=video 30000 RTP/AVP 100 110
c=IN IP4 233.252.0.1/127
a=rtpmap:100 MP2T/90000
a=rtpmap:110 flexfec/90000
a=fmtp:110 L:5; D:10; ToP:2; repair-window:200000
a=ssrc:1234
a=ssrc:2345
a=ssrc-group:FEC-FR 1234 2345
```

## 8. Congestion Control Considerations

FEC is an effective approach to provide applications resiliency against packet losses. However, in networks where the congestion is a major contributor to the packet loss, the potential impacts of using FEC SHOULD be considered carefully before injecting the repair



flows into the network. In particular, in bandwidth-limited networks, FEC repair flows may consume most or all of the available bandwidth and consequently may congest the network. In such cases, the applications MUST NOT arbitrarily increase the amount of FEC protection since doing so may lead to a congestion collapse. If desired, stronger FEC protection MAY be applied only after the source rate has been reduced [I-D.singh-rmcat-adaptive-fec].

In a network-friendly implementation, an application SHOULD NOT send/receive FEC repair flows if it knows that sending/receiving those FEC repair flows would not help at all in recovering the missing packets. However, it MAY still continue to use FEC if considered for bandwidth estimation instead of speculatively probe for additional capacity [Holmer13][Nagy14]. It is RECOMMENDED that the amount of FEC protection is adjusted dynamically based on the packet loss rate observed by the applications.

In multicast scenarios, it may be difficult to optimize the FEC protection per receiver. If there is a large variation among the levels of FEC protection needed by different receivers, it is RECOMMENDED that the sender offers multiple repair flows with different levels of FEC protection and the receivers join the corresponding multicast sessions to receive the repair flow(s) that is best for them.

Editor's note: Additional congestion control considerations regarding the use of 2-D parity codes should be added here.

## 9. Security Considerations

RTP packets using the payload format defined in this specification are subject to the security considerations discussed in the RTP specification [RFC3550] and in any applicable RTP profile. The main security considerations for the RTP packet carrying the RTP payload format defined within this memo are confidentiality, integrity and source authenticity. Confidentiality is achieved by encrypting the RTP payload. Integrity of the RTP packets is achieved through a suitable cryptographic integrity protection mechanism. Such a cryptographic system may also allow the authentication of the source of the payload. A suitable security mechanism for this RTP payload format should provide confidentiality, integrity protection, and at least source authentication capable of determining if an RTP packet is from a member of the RTP session.

Note that the appropriate mechanism to provide security to RTP and payloads following this memo may vary. It is dependent on the application, transport and signaling protocol employed. Therefore, a single mechanism is not sufficient, although if suitable, using the

Secure Real-time Transport Protocol (SRTP) [RFC3711] is recommended. Other mechanisms that may be used are IPsec [RFC4301] and Transport Layer Security (TLS) [RFC5246] (RTP over TCP); other alternatives may exist.

## 10. IANA Considerations

New media subtypes are subject to IANA registration. For the registration of the payload formats and their parameters introduced in this document, refer to Section 5.

## 11. Acknowledgments

Some parts of this document are borrowed from [RFC5109]. Thus, the author would like to thank the editor of [RFC5109] and those who contributed to [RFC5109].

Thanks to Bernard Aboba , Rasmus Brandt , Roni Even , Stefan Holmer , Jonathan Lennox , and Magnus Westerlund for providing valuable feedback on earlier versions of this draft.

## 12. Change Log

Note to the RFC-Editor: please remove this section prior to publication as an RFC.

### 12.1. draft-ietf-payload-flexible-fec-scheme-03

FEC packet format changed as per discussions in IETF96, Berlin.

Removed section on non-parity codes and flexfec-raptor.

### 12.2. draft-ietf-payload-flexible-fec-scheme-02

FEC packet format changed as per discussions in IETF94, Tokyo.

Added section on non-parity codes.

Registration of application/flexfec-raptor.

### 12.3. draft-ietf-payload-flexible-fec-scheme-01

FEC packet format changed as per discussions in IETF93, Prague.

Replaced non-interleaved-parityfec and interleaved-parity-fec with flexfec.

SDP simplified for the case when association to RTP is made in the FEC header and not in the SDP.

#### 12.4. draft-ietf-payload-flexible-fec-scheme-00

Initial WG version, based on draft-singh-payload-ld2d-parity-scheme-00.

#### 12.5. draft-singh-payload-ld2d-parity-scheme-00

This is the initial version, which is based on draft-ietf-fecframe-ld2d-parity-scheme-00. The following are the major changes compared to that document:

- o Updated packet format with 16-, 48-, 112- bitmask.
- o Updated the sections on: repair packet construction, source packet construction.
- o Updated the media type registration and aligned to RFC6838.

#### 12.6. draft-ietf-fecframe-ld2d-parity-scheme-00

- o Some details were added regarding the use of CNAME field.
- o Offer-Answer and Declarative Considerations sections have been completed.
- o Security Considerations section has been completed.
- o The timestamp field definition has changed.

### 13. References

#### 13.1. Normative References

[RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.

[RFC3264] Rosenberg, J. and H. Schulzrinne, "An Offer/Answer Model with Session Description Protocol (SDP)", RFC 3264, DOI 10.17487/RFC3264, June 2002, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3264>>.

- [RFC3550] Schulzrinne, H., Casner, S., Frederick, R., and V. Jacobson, "RTP: A Transport Protocol for Real-Time Applications", STD 64, RFC 3550, DOI 10.17487/RFC3550, July 2003, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3550>>.
- [RFC3555] Casner, S. and P. Hoschka, "MIME Type Registration of RTP Payload Formats", RFC 3555, DOI 10.17487/RFC3555, July 2003, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3555>>.
- [RFC4566] Handley, M., Jacobson, V., and C. Perkins, "SDP: Session Description Protocol", RFC 4566, DOI 10.17487/RFC4566, July 2006, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4566>>.
- [RFC5956] Begen, A., "Forward Error Correction Grouping Semantics in the Session Description Protocol", RFC 5956, DOI 10.17487/RFC5956, September 2010, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5956>>.
- [RFC6363] Watson, M., Begen, A., and V. Roca, "Forward Error Correction (FEC) Framework", RFC 6363, DOI 10.17487/RFC6363, October 2011, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6363>>.
- [RFC6709] Carpenter, B., Aboba, B., Ed., and S. Cheshire, "Design Considerations for Protocol Extensions", RFC 6709, DOI 10.17487/RFC6709, September 2012, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6709>>.
- [RFC6838] Freed, N., Klensin, J., and T. Hansen, "Media Type Specifications and Registration Procedures", BCP 13, RFC 6838, DOI 10.17487/RFC6838, January 2013, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6838>>.
- [RFC7022] Begen, A., Perkins, C., Wing, D., and E. Rescorla, "Guidelines for Choosing RTP Control Protocol (RTCP) Canonical Names (CNAMEs)", RFC 7022, DOI 10.17487/RFC7022, September 2013, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7022>>.

## 13.2. Informative References

- [Holmer13] Holmer, S., Shemer, M., and M. Paniconi, "Handling Packet Loss in WebRTC", Proc. of IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP 2013), 9 2013.

- [I-D.singh-rmcat-adaptive-fec]  
Varun, V., Nagy, M., Ott, J., and L. Eggert, "Congestion Control Using FEC for Conversational Media", draft-singh-rmcat-adaptive-fec-03 (work in progress), March 2016.
- [Nagy14] Nagy, M., Singh, V., Ott, J., and L. Eggert, "Congestion Control using FEC for Conversational Multimedia Communication", Proc. of 5th ACM International Conference on Multimedia Systems (MMSys 2014) , 3 2014.
- [RFC2326] Schulzrinne, H., Rao, A., and R. Lanphier, "Real Time Streaming Protocol (RTSP)", RFC 2326, DOI 10.17487/RFC2326, April 1998, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2326>>.
- [RFC2733] Rosenberg, J. and H. Schulzrinne, "An RTP Payload Format for Generic Forward Error Correction", RFC 2733, DOI 10.17487/RFC2733, December 1999, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2733>>.
- [RFC2974] Handley, M., Perkins, C., and E. Whelan, "Session Announcement Protocol", RFC 2974, DOI 10.17487/RFC2974, October 2000, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2974>>.
- [RFC3711] Baugher, M., McGrew, D., Naslund, M., Carrara, E., and K. Norrman, "The Secure Real-time Transport Protocol (SRTP)", RFC 3711, DOI 10.17487/RFC3711, March 2004, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3711>>.
- [RFC4301] Kent, S. and K. Seo, "Security Architecture for the Internet Protocol", RFC 4301, DOI 10.17487/RFC4301, December 2005, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4301>>.
- [RFC5109] Li, A., Ed., "RTP Payload Format for Generic Forward Error Correction", RFC 5109, DOI 10.17487/RFC5109, December 2007, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5109>>.
- [RFC5246] Dierks, T. and E. Rescorla, "The Transport Layer Security (TLS) Protocol Version 1.2", RFC 5246, DOI 10.17487/RFC5246, August 2008, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5246>>.
- [SMPTE2022-1]  
SMPTE 2022-1-2007, , "Forward Error Correction for Real-Time Video/Audio Transport over IP Networks", 2007.

Authors' Addresses

Varun Singh  
CALLSTATS I/O Oy  
Runeberginkatu 4c A 4  
Helsinki 00100  
Finland

Email: [varun.singh@iki.fi](mailto:varun.singh@iki.fi)  
URI: <http://www.callstats.io/>

Ali Begen  
Networked Media  
Konya  
Turkey

Email: [ali.begen@networked.media](mailto:ali.begen@networked.media)

Mo Zanaty  
Cisco  
Raleigh, NC  
USA

Email: [mzanaty@cisco.com](mailto:mzanaty@cisco.com)

Giridhar Mandyam  
Qualcomm Innovation Center  
5775 Morehouse Drive  
San Diego, CA 92121  
USA

Phone: +1 858 651 7200  
Email: [mandyam@qti.qualcomm.com](mailto:mandyam@qti.qualcomm.com)

INTERNET-DRAFT  
Intended Status: Standard Track  
Expires: May 2, 2017

Q. Wei  
R. Huang  
H. Zheng  
Huawei  
October 29, 2016

RTP Payload Format for HTTP Adaptive Streaming  
draft-wei-payload-has-over-rtp-01

Abstract

This document introduces a new RTP payload format for encapsulating the HTTP Adaptive Streaming (HAS) data into RTP, so that current RTP schemes can be leveraged into OTT video delivery services. For example, operators can easily deliver OTT live content through multicast eliminating the impact of live content consumption peaks.

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), its areas, and its working groups. Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts.

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."

The list of current Internet-Drafts can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/lid-abstracts.html>

The list of Internet-Draft Shadow Directories can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html>

Copyright and License Notice

Copyright (c) 2016 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. Existing Technologies . . . . .	3
3.1 HTTP Adaptive Streaming . . . . .	3
3.2 Multicast Adaptive Bit Rate (Multicast-ABR) . . . . .	4
4. HAS Over RTP Use Scenarios . . . . .	5
5. Overview of HTTP Adaptive Streaming over RTP . . . . .	5
6. HTTP Adaptive Streaming Payload . . . . .	7
6.1 RTP Payload Format for HAS Content . . . . .	7
6.2 Use Existing RTP Payload Format for HAS Content . . . . .	10
6.3 Manifest file and Initial Information Consideration . . . . .	10
7. Payload Format Parameters . . . . .	11
7.1 Media Type Definition . . . . .	11
7.2 SDP Signaling . . . . .	12
8. Congestion Control . . . . .	12
9. Security Considerations . . . . .	12
10. IANA Considerations . . . . .	12
11. Acknowledgments . . . . .	13
12. References . . . . .	13
12.1 Normative References . . . . .	13
12.2 Informative References . . . . .	13
Authors' Addresses . . . . .	13



## 1. Introduction

Video consumption has exploded over the last few years as more and more consumers are watching live Over-the-Top (OTT) content on smartphones, tablets, PCs and other IP connected devices. Since OTT video services rely on HTTP adaptive streaming (HAS) technology, e.g., DASH and HTTP Live Streaming (HLS), to deliver content, so every time a user requests a piece of content, a stream is sent throughout the entire network. If a significant number of users are requesting content, the operator's bandwidth is drained. It is usually difficult for operators to predict the popularity of live video content, especially for some major sporting events. For such an event, millions of users will be watching the content simultaneously, and causing peak traffic in the network. Even when Content Delivery Network (CDN) is used to help distribute the traffic load over network edge nodes, it might still not be sufficient. Since CDNs cannot be deployed close enough to the users, its scalability is in question. Furthermore, using CDN may also incur a very high expense, especially for the new video services like 4K live, or VR live. All of this leads to a poor Quality of Experience (QoE) for the users, and a high cost for the service providers. The most effective solution is to use multicast technology, even for OTT live content delivery. Through multicast technology, operators can stream live content only once in their network, regardless of the number of viewers watching, which eliminates the impact of live content consumption peaks.

This document introduces a new RTP payload format for encapsulating the HAS data into RTP, so that current RTP schemes can be leveraged into OTT video delivery services. For example, operators can easily deliver OTT live content through multicast to eliminating the impact of live content consumption peaks.

## 2. Terminology

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

## 3. Existing Technologies

### 3.1 HTTP Adaptive Streaming

HTTP adaptive streaming has become a popular approach in video commercial deployments. The multimedia content is captured, divided into small segments, and stored on an HTTP server. The consuming user first obtains the manifest file, e.g., the Media Presentation Description (MPD), which describes a manifest of the available

segments information, corresponding bitrates, their URL addresses, and other characteristics. Based on this, the consuming user selects the appropriate encoded alternative and starts streaming of the content by fetching the segments using HTTP GET requests in unicast.

MPEG developed the specification, known as MPEG Dynamic Adaptive Streaming over HTTP (DASH) [DASH], to standardize the MPD and the segment formats. Other private mechanisms like Apple's HTTP Live Streaming (HLS) [HLS] are also popular.

HAS is a typical client pull model. All the manifest files, HAS segments, and etc., are pulled from the HTTP server one after another by the clients issuing HTTP requests.

HTTP adaptive streaming is very efficient for the usage of Video on Demand (VOD). However, when delivering live content simultaneously to millions of users, this becomes quite a problem. The peak bandwidth in video consumption is simply too much for an operator to handle since each viewer counts as a separate unicast session. As live OTT multi-screen video consumption shows no signs of slowing down, a traditional unicast delivery method is becoming too expensive in terms of bandwidth and investments that must be made to maintain the network. Partnering with a CDN provider only helps optimize the traffic on the backbone for known content. Additional infrastructure investment is still required at the edge of the network to absorb the load, but is too costly of an undertaking and would only be a temporary solution, as there would always be a need for more servers when live OTT consumption increases.

### 3.2 Multicast Adaptive Bit Rate (Multicast-ABR)

Operators are seeking ways to improve the quality of services available, while also creating more balanced and effective delivery of data to enhance the operators' cost-efficiency, and reduce wastage across increasingly constrained bandwidths. Multicast-ABR, specified in [CableLabs], is one of the innovations.

Multicast-ABR leverages HTTP streaming into multicast by keeping the different alternatives in separate multicast groups, so that smart network nodes or clients are able to select an appropriate rate by joining the correct multicast and delivering these segments to clients. And multicast-ABR uses NACK-Oriented Reliable Multicast (NORM) [RFC5740] to deliver HTTP adaptive streaming data in multicast.

Multicast-ABR is a low cost and easy to deploy solution that allows operators to see multicast gains on all in-home devices leveraging their TV Everywhere infrastructure. However, using NORM to convey

HTTP adaptive streaming data has 3 shortcomings: Firstly, NORM has no fast channel change (FCC) mechanisms, like [RFC6285], so that changing different video resolutions may take some time and cause video frame freeze. Secondly, some telecom operators only have IPTV multicast platform, which may not support NORM protocol. Thirdly, NORM is not aware of the media timing in a way that RTP is as RTP is nature to handle multimedia.

Based on this, using RTP to deliver HTTP adaptive streaming data could be an alternative.

#### 4. HAS Over RTP Use Scenarios

Network operators running IPTV have already built up an RTP over IP multicast infrastructure to deliver IPTV content. With the introduction of HAS payload for RTP, network operators can reuse the existing infrastructure for the delivery of OTT content using HAS. The benefit is that it can greatly reduce the investment for IPTV headend devices and simplify the whole architecture.

From the perspective of OTT content providers, HAS over RTP will provide them with another means other than CDN for content delivery. OTT content providers can deliver their in high-demand videos through multicast, thus ensuring the Quality of Experience (QoE) for the end users. This would not only help save the bandwidth for network operators, but also provide them with more opportunities for revenue. They can offer the multicast as a service to OTT providers.

#### 5. Overview of HTTP Adaptive Streaming over RTP

Figure 1 shows the architecture for HTTP adaptive streaming over RTP, which is similar to the ones defined in Multicast-ABR.




Figure 1: HTTP Adaptive Streaming over RTP with Multicast

In the above figure, a HAS Consumer can access the Content Source using HTTP as normal. This memo considers only the operation of the Multicast Gateway, the packetisation of HAS content within Multicast RTP, the operation of the Multicast Consumer that receives that content, and the operation of the Unicast Consumer that receives the content by Unicast RTP. A Multicast Gateway receives the unicast HAS streams of various bitrates from the Content Source, and converts each unicast stream to multicast to pass on a specific multicast group. Multicast Consumers subscribe to a multicast group to receive data from the specific bit-rate stream. Unicast Consumers don't support multicast but unicast RTP. Therefore, an intermediate node M2U (multicast-to-unicast) can be introduced to help terminate the multicast and convert the stream back to unicast for further delivery.

Multicast Gateway: It is responsible for converting the HAS streams from unicast to multicast, and providing the multicast service to its receivers. It will directly pass through the live

content.

HAS Consumer: It is a standard HAS end point. It could be an application, or just a user device.

Multicast Consumer: It is an end point supporting HAS RTP by receiving the content in multicast.

Unicast Consumer: It is an end point supporting HAS RTP by receiving the content in unicast.

M2U: It stands for multicast-to-unicast. It helps convert multicast to unicast if the consumer doesn't support multicast.

HAS over RTP will be used throughout Multicast Server, M2U, Multicast Consumer, and Unicast Consumer.

6. HTTP Adaptive Streaming Payload

This section specifies the format of the RTP payload of HTTP adaptive streaming data. The structure of the payload is illustrated as Figure 2. This payload format uses the fields of the header in a manner consistent with that specification.





Figure 2: Packet Structure with RTP Header

There are two ways in which HAS content can be encoded in RTP packets: The HAS Payload can be a new RTP Payload Format, specially designed to carry HAS Content in RTP. Alternatively, an existing RTP payload format can be used if the HAS Content uses a codec with an existing format. We describe a new RTP payload format for HAS content in section 6.1, and discuss using existing formats in Section 6.2.

6.1 RTP Payload Format for HAS Content

The format of RTP header is specified in [RFC3550] and is shown as Figure 3 for convenience.






Figure 3: RTP Header Defined in [RFC3550]

The RTP header information to be set according to this RTP payload format is set as followings:

Marker bit (M): 1 bits

The marker bit set "1" SHALL indicate the last RTP packet of the media segment, carried in the current RTP stream. This is in line with the normal use of the M bit in video formats to allow an efficient playout buffer handling.

Payload Type (PT): 7 bits

The assignment of an RTP payload type for this new packet format is outside of the scope of this document and will not be specified here. The assignment of a payload type has to be performed either through the profile used or in a dynamic way.

Sequence Number (SN): 16 bits


Set and used in accordance with [RFC3550].

Timestamp: 16 bits

The RTP timestamp is set to the sampling timestamp of the content. The clock rate is specified dynamically through non-RTP means. If no clock rate is signaled, 90 kHz MUST be used.

When a media segment is encapsulated into several RTP packets, each of them shares the same timestamp.

The format of the HAS payload is illustrated in Figure 4.






Figure 4: Format for HTTP Adaptive Streaming Payload

Fragmentation (F): 1 bit

If the fragmentation is set, it indicates the received packet is a part of a decodable fragment and can not be decoded correctly until the whole decodable segment is received. The different parts belong to the same decodable segment are ordered by their sequence numbers, and share the same timestamp.

If the fragmentation is set, URL length field and URL field will be omitted.

RSV : 7 bits

These bits are reserved for future use. They MUST be set to zero by senders and ignored by receivers.

Length: 16 bits

The size of the RTP payload in bytes, excluding the RTP header but including the payload header.

URL length: 8 bits

The size of the URL field in bytes, including the URL length.

Offset: 32 bits

The offset of this fragment in current decodable segment.

URL: bits defined by URL length.

This field indicates the URL of the content. Examples would be "/PLTV/88888888/224/3221225484/3221225484.mpd", or "Stream\_1\_1944000". It facilitates associating the content with HTTP request so that receivers can easily turn it into HAS scheme when receiving it. It is used to relate the RTP packet with

corresponding HAS segment specified in the manifest.

Basically, it is required to split application data into RTP packets so that each packet is usable, no matter what is lost. This is possible when the multicast server has the ability and is authorized to access the HAS content. However, when OTT content is encrypted to the multicast server, the frame boundary that can be decoded independently is hardly figured out. Accordingly, one fragment of the HAS segment lost will lead to the whole segment undecodable, and the receivers joining the multicast randomly cannot view the content immediately. In this case, mechanisms like FEC [RFC5109], or retransmission [RFC4585] MUST be used to alleviate packet losses. And FCC [RFC6285] SHOULD be used to ensure endpoints who joins the multicast randomly can view the content immediately.

Another possible way to do smart fragmenting is to extend the manifest files, e.g. MPD, to allow the OTT content providers indicate the fragmentation points where independently decodable application data can be extracted. Thus, the multicast server bridging HAS into RTP would fetch the extended manifest file, then use these hints to determine how to fragment each segment into RTP packets. Since DASH is the standard in MPEG, this method requires the work in MPEG to specify the extended fragmentation points.

## 6.2 Use Existing RTP Payload Format for HAS Content

It is also possible to use existing RTP payload format to transport HAS content. For example, if the HAS content is H.264, the multicast gateway will parse the HAS segments to find the boundaries, extract the NAL units, and generates RTP packets using H.264 RTP format [RFC6184]. This approach has its advantage that the resulting RTP stream will be more robust to packet loss, since it uses a loss tolerant encoding, and will use a standard RTP payload format, that many existing RTP clients can decode.

However, it has several limitations: It is only possible when the multicast server has the ability and is authorized to access the HAS content; It will complicate the multicast gateway; And also the multicast gateway is required to support multiple existing RTP formats to enable flexibility since HAS content usually uses container, e.g., MP4 [MPEG-4 Part 14], which can support multiple encodings.

## 6.3 Manifest file and Initial Information Consideration

HAS comes with manifest files to describe the segments and initial information to setup the session. Since these data needs reliable ways to delivery, we do not consider transporting them in-band over



RTP with HAS segments. In fact, the end devices may not need the manifest files as HAS over RTP is a push model and allows some packets to be dropped. When the manifest files and initial information are needed, they can be acquired using out of band method like HTTP or SDP. Especially when the receiver joins the multicast, it's better to obtain the manifest or initial information by out of band ways in advance.

## 7. Payload Format Parameters

This section specifies the media type and the parameters identifying this RTP payload format.

### 7.1 Media Type Definition

This registration is done using the template defined in [RFC6838] and following [RFC4855].

Type name: video

Subtype name: HAS

Required parameter:

has-type: This parameter indicates the HTTP adaptive streaming protocol. The value of has-type MUST be in the range of 0 to 7, inclusive. The detailed value can be seen as following.

HSPT=0: DASH  
HSPT=1: Http Live Streaming (HLS)  
HSPT=2-6: Reserved  
HSPT=7: Profile-specific HTTP adaptive streaming

Optional parameters:

bitrate: This parameter can be used to signal receiver the bitrate of the stream. How to use it is up to the receiver. The value of this parameter is an integer in units of kilo-bits per second.

Encoding considerations: This media type is framed in RTP and contains binary data; see Section 4.8 of [RFC6838].

Security considerations: See section 7 of RFCXXXX.

Published specification: N/A

Additional information: None

File extensions: none

Macintosh file type code: none

Object identifier or OID: none

Person & email address to contact for further information: Rachel Huang (rachel.huang@huawei.com)

Intended usage: COMMON

Author: See Authors' Addresses section of RFCxxxx.

Change controller: IETF Audio/Video Transport Payloads working group delegated from the IESG.

## 7.2 SDP Signaling

TBD.

Negotiation of the new RTP payload is required. Further details will be provided in the next versions.

## 8. Congestion Control

Current DASH clients do congestion control individually. When using multicast to transport HAS data, it is expected that multicast receivers have the ability to dynamically join the corresponding multicast group based on different network conditions. Multicast receivers share the same stream in one multicast group, but HAS receivers compete each other with different streams, which means the congestion control mechanisms used in HAS don't work for multicast.

However, it is expected that HAS over RTP for multicast is deployed in a managed network, hence the congestion can be well controlled. In the future, when it is deployed on the Internet, a new congestion control mechanism may be required to coordinate the multicast receivers with same congestion problem, so that they can share the stream to obtain the best quality they can have.

## 9. Security Considerations

TBD.

## 10. IANA Considerations

TBD.

## 11. Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the following individuals who help to review this document and provide very valuable comments: Colin Perkins, Roni Even, Yuping Jiang.

## 12. References

### 12.1 Normative References

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

[RFC3550] Schulzrinne, H., Casner, S., Frederick, R., and V. Jacobson, "RTP: A Transport Protocol for Real-Time Applications", STD 64, RFC 3550, July 2003.

[CableLabs] "IP Multicast Adaptive Bit Rate Architecture Technical Report" <http://www.cablelabs.com/wp-content/uploads/specdocs/OC-TR-IP-MULTI-ARCH-V01-1411121.pdf>

### 12.2 Informative References

[RFC5740] Adamson, B., Bormann, C., Handley, M., and J. Macker "NACK-Oriented Reliable Multicast (NORM) Transport Protocol", RFC 5740, November 2009.

[RFC6285] Steeg, B., Begen, A., Caenegem, T., and Z. Vax "Unicast-Based Rapid Acquisition of Multicast RTP Sessions", RFC 6285, June 2011.

[DASH] ISO/IEC 23009-1:2014 Information technology -- Dynamic adaptive streaming over HTTP (DASH) -- Part 1: Media presentation description and segment format.

[HLS] Pantos, R. and W. May, "HTTP Live Streaming", <https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-pantos-http-live-streaming-20>, September 2016.

[MPEG-4 Part 14] "Information technology - Coding of audio-visual objects - Part 14:MP4 file format", ISO/IEC 14496-14, November 2003.

## Authors' Addresses

Qikun Wei

Huawei

Email: weiqikun@huawei.com

Rachel Huang  
Huawei

Email: rachel.huang@huawei.com

Hui Zheng  
Huawei

Email: marvin.zhenghui@huawei.com

Yong Xia  
China SARFT

Email: xiayong@abs.ac.cn