[MS-RTPRADEX]:
RTP Payload for Redundant Audio Data Extensions

Intellectual Property Rights Notice for Open Specifications Documentation

- **Technical Documentation.** Microsoft publishes Open Specifications documentation for protocols, file formats, languages, standards as well as overviews of the interaction among each of these technologies.
- **Copyrights.** This documentation is covered by Microsoft copyrights. Regardless of any other terms that are contained in the terms of use for the Microsoft website that hosts this documentation, you may make copies of it in order to develop implementations of the technologies described in the Open Specifications and may distribute portions of it in your implementations using these technologies or your documentation as necessary to properly document the implementation. You may also distribute in your implementation, with or without modification, any schema, IDL's, or code samples that are included in the documentation. This permission also applies to any documents that are referenced in the Open Specifications.
- **No Trade Secrets.** Microsoft does not claim any trade secret rights in this documentation.
- **Patents.** Microsoft has patents that may cover your implementations of the technologies described in the Open Specifications. Neither this notice nor Microsoft's delivery of the documentation grants any licenses under those or any other Microsoft patents. However, a given Open Specification may be covered by Microsoft Open Specification Promise or the Community Promise. If you would prefer a written license, or if the technologies described in the Open Specifications are not covered by the Open Specifications Promise or Community Promise, as applicable, patent licenses are available by contacting iplg@microsoft.com.
- **Trademarks.** The names of companies and products contained in this documentation may be covered by trademarks or similar intellectual property rights. This notice does not grant any licenses under those rights.
- **Fictitious Names.** The example companies, organizations, products, domain names, e-mail addresses, logos, people, places, and events depicted in this documentation are fictitious. No association with any real company, organization, product, domain name, email address, logo, person, place, or event is intended or should be inferred.

Reservation of Rights. All other rights are reserved, and this notice does not grant any rights other than specifically described above, whether by implication, estoppel, or otherwise.

Tools. The Open Specifications do not require the use of Microsoft programming tools or programming environments in order for you to develop an implementation. If you have access to Microsoft programming tools and environments you are free to take advantage of them. Certain Open Specifications are intended for use in conjunction with publicly available standard specifications and network programming art, and assumes that the reader either is familiar with the aforementioned material or has immediate access to it.

Preliminary Documentation. This Open Specification provides documentation for past and current releases and/or for the pre-release (beta) version of this technology. This Open Specification is final

documentation for past or current releases as specifically noted in the document, as applicable; it is preliminary documentation for the pre-release (beta) versions. Microsoft will release final documentation in connection with the commercial release of the updated or new version of this technology. As the documentation may change between this preliminary version and the final version of this technology, there are risks in relying on preliminary documentation. To the extent that you incur additional development obligations or any other costs as a result of relying on this preliminary documentation, you do so at your own risk.

Revision Summary

Date	Revision History	Revision Class	Comments
04/04/2008	0.1		Initial version
04/25/2008	0.2		Updated based on feedback
06/27/2008	1.0		Updated based on feedback
08/15/2008	1.01		Updated based on feedback
12/12/2008	2.0		Updated with latest template bug fixes (redlined)
02/13/2009	2.01		Updated with latest template bug fixes (redlined)
03/13/2009	2.02		Updated with latest template bug fixes (redlined)
07/13/2009	2.03	Major	Revised and edited the technical content
08/28/2009	2.04	Editorial	Revised and edited the technical content
11/06/2009	2.05	Editorial	Revised and edited the technical content
02/19/2010	2.06	Editorial	Revised and edited the technical content
03/31/2010	2.07	Major	Updated and revised the technical content
04/30/2010	2.08	Editorial	Revised and edited the technical content
06/07/2010	2.09	Editorial	Revised and edited the technical content
06/29/2010	2.10	Editorial	Changed language and formatting in the technical content.
07/23/2010	2.10	No change	No changes to the meaning, language, or formatting of the technical content.
09/27/2010	3.0	Major	Significantly changed the technical content.
11/15/2010	3.0	No change	No changes to the meaning, language, or formatting of the technical content.
12/17/2010	3.0	No change	No changes to the meaning, language, or formatting of the technical content.
03/18/2011	3.0	No change	No changes to the meaning, language, or formatting of

Date	Revision History	Revision Class	Comments
			the technical content.
06/10/2011	3.0	No change	No changes to the meaning, language, or formatting of the technical content.
01/20/2012	3.1	Minor	Clarified the meaning of the technical content.

Table of Contents

1 Introduction

This document specifies the RTP Payload for Redundant Audio Data Extensions Protocol. This protocol is a method for encoding redundant audio data for use with the Real-Time Transport Protocol (RTP) Extensions Protocol, as described in [MS-RTP]. This protocol is a proprietary extension of RTP Payload for Redundant Audio Data, as described in [RFC2198]. [RFC2198] describes a payload format for use with the Real-Time Transport Protocol (RTP).

Sections 1.8, 2, and 3 of this specification are normative and contain RFC 2119 language. Sections 1.5 and 1.9 are also normative but cannot contain RFC 2119 language. All other sections and examples in this specification are informative.

1.1 Glossary

The following terms are defined in [MS-OFCGLOS]:

codec
dual-tone multi-frequency (DTMF)
Real-Time Transport Protocol (RTP)
Session Description Protocol (SDP)

The following terms are specific to this document:

lossy network transports: A transport that cannot deliver a data payload reliably from a source to a destination.

MAY, SHOULD, MUST, SHOULD NOT, MUST NOT: These terms (in all caps) are used as described in [RFC2119]. All statements of optional behavior use either MAY, SHOULD, or SHOULD NOT.

1.2 References

References to Microsoft Open Specification documents do not include a publishing year because links are to the latest version of the documents, which are updated frequently. References to other documents include a publishing year when one is available.

1.2.1 Normative References

We conduct frequent surveys of the normative references to assure their continued availability. If you have any issue with finding a normative reference, please contact dochelp@microsoft.com. We will assist you in finding the relevant information. Please check the archive site, http://msdn2.microsoft.com/en-us/library/E4BD6494-06AD-4aed-9823-445E921C9624, as an additional source.

[MS-SDPEXT] Microsoft Corporation, "Session Description Protocol (SDP) Version 2.0 Extensions".

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

[RFC2198] Perkins, C., "RTP Payload for Redundant Audio Data", RFC 2198, September 1997, http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc2198.txt

1.2.2 Informative References

[MS-OFCGLOS] Microsoft Corporation, "Microsoft Office Master Glossary".

[MS-RTP] Microsoft Corporation, "Real-time Transport Protocol (RTP) Extensions".

1.3 Protocol Overview (Synopsis)

This protocol extends the **Real-Time Transport Protocol (RTP)** Payload for Redundant Audio Data protocol, as described in [RFC2198], by restricting an RTP audio payload to one block of redundant audio data. The redundant block of audio data is implemented in the RTP payload along with the primary block of audio data.

1.4 Relationship to Other Protocols

This protocol relies on the Real-Time Transport Protocol (RTP) Extension protocol, as described in [MS-RTP], as its transport.

This document only addresses the redundancy and thereby loss and error tolerance of audio data streams. Non-audio data redundancy is beyond the scope of this document.

1.5 Prerequisites/Preconditions

Because the Real-Time Transport Protocol (RTP) Extensions Protocol acts as a transport for this protocol, a valid RTP session is required to be established. Refer to [MS-RTP] for details.

It is further assumed that a valid **Session Description Protocol (SDP)** negotiation has been completed to bind the dynamic payload information for the redundancy data. For information about SDP, see [MS-SDPEXT].

1.6 Applicability Statement

This protocol is applicable for a real-time audio communication scenario where redundant data exchange is needed to mitigate **lossy network transports**.

This protocol does not cover all audio data redundancy. It is limited to in-band audio communication data. This protocol does not apply to redundancy for audio data such as out-of-band **dual-tone multi-frequency (DTMF)** tones. Out-of-band DTMF tones are defined as exchange of DTMF information in a separate band from the media stream.

1.7 Versioning and Capability Negotiation

Supported Transports: This protocol is implemented on top of the Real-Time Transport Protocol (RTP) Extension protocol as the transport mechanism.

Protocol Versions: This protocol, as a payload format of RTP, does not provide for versioning information within the scope of the protocol itself. However, as a part of the RTP payload, any versioning information on the RTP level applies.

Security and Authentication Methods: This document does not describe any security or authentication methods. Security and authentication is dependent on the security method, authentication method, or both methods used by the Real-Time Transport Protocol (RTP) Extensions protocol.

Localization: None.

1.8 Vendor-Extensible Fields

None.

1.9 Standards Assignments

None.

2 Messages

2.1 Transport

Because this protocol uses the Real-Time Transport Protocol (RTP) Extensions protocol as its transport, a successful RTP session MUST be established with valid redundancy payload information negotiated.

This MUST be done with the Session Description Protocol, as specified in [MS-SDPEXT].

2.2 Message Syntax

The structure and syntax of this protocol is defined within the RFC for RTP Payload for Redundant Audio Data, as specified in [RFC2198] section 3. This protocol does not cover all audio data redundancy. It is limited to in-band audio communication data. This protocol MUST NOT be used to carry audio data redundancy for audio data such as out-of-band DTMF tones.

The deviation from [RFC2198] is as follows:

[RFC2198] section 2 provides for one or more redundant audio blocks for each RTP payload. This protocol description allows for only one redundant block for every RTP payload. Therefore, each RTP payload MUST NOT contain more than two blocks total: one redundancy block and one primary block.

[RFC2198] section 2 describes the mechanism for including the redundancy information in the RTP packet header. This protocol does not support redundant information in the RTP header. The RTP header MUST NOT contain redundant information. It MUST be made part of a dynamic RTP payload type and negotiate as such during SDP negotiation.

While [RFC2198] section 2 allows for static typing of payload types, systems interoperating with implementation of this protocol MUST negotiate for dynamic redundancy payload type using SDP to enable redundancy.

2.2.1 Redundant Block

See [RFC2198] section 3 for a detailed description of the redundant block layout.

3 Protocol Details

3.1 Receiver Details

This protocol can be described using a Sender and Receiver model. This section details the behavioral difference between the protocol specified by [RFC2198] and this protocol implementation.

The Receiver side of this protocol MUST negotiate using SDP for a dynamic payload type binding for the redundancy data. The payload type binding MUST be symmetrical. This means the receive payload type and send payload type MUST be the same. Asymmetrical payload type information MUST NOT be used.

3.1.1 Abstract Data Model

None.

3.1.2 Timers

None.

3.1.3 Initialization

Receivers MUST negotiate a dynamic payload type for the redundancy data as specified in [MS-SDPEXT] section 3.1.5.3. Receivers MUST NOT expect redundancy data to be part of the RTP extended header structure.

3.1.4 Higher-Layer Triggered Events

None.

3.1.5 Message Processing Events and Sequencing Rules

None.

3.1.6 Timer Events

None.

3.1.7 Other Local Events

None.

3.2 Sender Details

This protocol can be described using a Sender and Receiver model.

This section details the behavioral difference between the protocol specified by [RFC2198] and this protocol implementation.

The Sender side of this protocol MUST negotiate using SDP for a dynamic payload type binding for the redundancy data.

Distance is defined as the number of RTP packets succeeding the primary block for which the redundancy block applies. For example, if RTP packet X contains primary block A, and RTP packet X + n contains the redundancy block for primary block A, that redundancy block has a distance of n. The redundancy data block MUST NOT have a distance greater than 3.

There MUST NOT be more than one redundancy block per RTP packet. At most two blocks are allowed per RTP packet: one primary block and one redundancy block.

All redundant audio data from the Sender MUST be the same encoding, or **codec**, as the primary audio block. This requirement deviates from [RFC2198] where secondary, tertiary, and other codecs are supported.

The primary audio block and redundant audio block MUST use the same codec.

3.2.1 Abstract Data Model

None

3.2.2 Timers

None.

3.2.3 Initialization

The Sender MUST negotiate a dynamic payload type for the redundancy data.

3.2.4 Higher-Layer Triggered Events

None.

3.2.5 Message Processing Events and Sequencing Rules

None.

3.2.6 Timer Events

None.

3.2.7 Other Local Events

None.

4 Protocol Examples

Refer to [RFC2198] section 7 for examples of this protocol structure.

5 Security

5.1 Security Considerations for Implementers

There are no additional protocol security considerations beyond what is described in [RFC2198].

5.2 Index of Security Parameters

None.

6 Appendix A: Product Behavior

The information in this specification is applicable to the following Microsoft products or supplemental software. References to product versions include released service packs:

- Microsoft® Office Communications Server 2007
- Microsoft® Office Communicator 2007
- Microsoft® Office Communications Server 2007 R2
- Microsoft® Office Communicator 2007 R2
- Microsoft® Lync™ Server 2010
- Microsoft® Lync™ 2010
- Microsoft® Lync Server 15 Technical Preview
- Microsoft® Lync 15 Technical Preview

Exceptions, if any, are noted below. If a service pack or Quick Fix Engineering (QFE) number appears with the product version, behavior changed in that service pack or QFE. The new behavior also applies to subsequent service packs of the product unless otherwise specified. If a product edition appears with the product version, behavior is different in that product edition.

Unless otherwise specified, any statement of optional behavior in this specification that is prescribed using the terms SHOULD or SHOULD NOT implies product behavior in accordance with the SHOULD or SHOULD NOT prescription. Unless otherwise specified, the term MAY implies that the product does not follow the prescription.

7 Change Tracking

This section identifies changes that were made to the [MS-RTPRADEX] protocol document between the June 2011 and January 2012 releases. Changes are classified as New, Major, Minor, Editorial, or No change.

The revision class **New** means that a new document is being released.

The revision class **Major** means that the technical content in the document was significantly revised. Major changes affect protocol interoperability or implementation. Examples of major changes are:

- A document revision that incorporates changes to interoperability requirements or functionality.
- An extensive rewrite, addition, or deletion of major portions of content.
- The removal of a document from the documentation set.
- Changes made for template compliance.

The revision class **Minor** means that the meaning of the technical content was clarified. Minor changes do not affect protocol interoperability or implementation. Examples of minor changes are updates to clarify ambiguity at the sentence, paragraph, or table level.

The revision class **Editorial** means that the language and formatting in the technical content was changed. Editorial changes apply to grammatical, formatting, and style issues.

The revision class **No change** means that no new technical or language changes were introduced. The technical content of the document is identical to the last released version, but minor editorial and formatting changes, as well as updates to the header and footer information, and to the revision summary, may have been made.

Major and minor changes can be described further using the following change types:

- New content added.
- Content updated.
- Content removed.
- New product behavior note added.
- Product behavior note updated.
- Product behavior note removed.
- New protocol syntax added.
- Protocol syntax updated.
- Protocol syntax removed.
- New content added due to protocol revision.
- Content updated due to protocol revision.
- Content removed due to protocol revision.
- New protocol syntax added due to protocol revision.

- Protocol syntax updated due to protocol revision.
- Protocol syntax removed due to protocol revision.
- New content added for template compliance.
- Content updated for template compliance.
- Content removed for template compliance.
- Obsolete document removed.

Editorial changes are always classified with the change type **Editorially updated.**

Some important terms used in the change type descriptions are defined as follows:

- **Protocol syntax** refers to data elements (such as packets, structures, enumerations, and methods) as well as interfaces.
- **Protocol revision** refers to changes made to a protocol that affect the bits that are sent over the wire.

The changes made to this document are listed in the following table. For more information, please contact protocol@microsoft.com.

Section	Tracking number (if applicable) and description	Major change (Y or N)	Change type
6 Appendix A: Product Behavior	Updated the products list.	N	Content updated.

8 Index

V