20 March 2024

IETF 119

draft-ietf-mlcodec-opus-extension

Draft Status

- No change since Prague
  - 01 is still current

Extension ID numbering

- Open question: how should (0 or 1)-byte extensions be numbered?
  - If we use one ID for both the L=0 and L=1 versions
    - Have to allocate them in pairs in IANA registry
    - Cannot signal support independently in SDP
- Question raised after last meeting: should they be (0 or 1)-byte extensions, or (1 or 2) bytes (or more)?

Extension ID numbering: Strawman Proposal

- Split Extension ID space into “Short” and “Long” extensions

Ext. Byte (B)	ID(s)	Length
0...1	0	(B & 1) → 0 = rest, 1 = coded
2...3	1	(B & 1)
4...63	a0...a59	(B & 3)
64...255	b0...b95	(B & 1) → 0 = rest, 1 = coded

Extension ID Allocation

- Short extensions (a0...a59)
  - Fixed lengths from 0...3 bytes
  - One ID per codepoint, an extension can register multiple IDs
  - SDP a=fmtp parameters:
    - MUST include all IDs registered for an extension in extensions= parameter
    - extN-* and sprop-extN-* parameter names include all IDs for that extension
      - E.g., exta0a1-duration
- Long extensions (b0...b95)
  - One ID per extension (covers both the even and odd codepoint)

Questions?

- When should we aim to go to WGLC?
- Other feedback?