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***AMS-0027 - Some more questions on AMS information flow***

This contribution was a continuation of the kind of questions found in AVD-3996. The intent is to gain a better understanding of how AMS is to work.

(2.1) "High-level" application information (e.g., application type) is collected and stored at the container. How about lower-layer information (e.g., codecs)? Is it simply relayed by the Container? We had some dialog with some stating a preference for having the container exchange only high-level capabilities and low-level capabilities initially. What is the value of exchanging low-level capabilities at the outset? It should not be up to the remote application to select a specific application, anyway. The user will want to select or indicate preferred devices and low-level capabilities can be negotiated after the applications are invoked.

(2.2) Applications like the infamous "flashing lamp" application needs to know about other applications registered to the *same* Container. What level of information does the Container convey vs. what the applications discover themselves directly between applications? This would be the same: the Container would exchange only high-level information. The "flashing lamp" would learn about invocation of an audio or video application, for example, by subscribing to events.

(2.3) Are the exchange of capabilities proxied by the Container or is there a direct interface between two communicating applications? It was generally felt that the Container would proxy those capabilities. Having a direct interface complicates the architecture and it also takes away the ability of network elements to enforce certain policies (e.g., to restrict use of certain video codecs).

(2.4) How is bandwidth usage negotiated / advertised? SIP advertises the total bandwidth for the conference (b=TIAS) and might be used by intermediary devices to enforce policy. An H.323 Gatekeeper manages bandwidth for call, as well. For H.323, the endpoint will advertise the total bandwidth to its Gatekeeper in and ARQ and make subsequent modifications through the BRQ message. AMS devices, though, are distributed and may be using multiple access technologies. As such, a similar approach to either H.323 or SIP may not have the same value. We've not had a lot of discussion on bandwidth advertisement / negotiation. Further consideration needs to be given to this topic. There was a question on how the bandwidth for the session is determined in case of NGN. Mr. Okubo undertakes to report back the case being considered at TTC, Japan.

Due to lack of time, we did not finish reviewing this contribution. The balance of the document is related to application handover and will be considered at the next meeting.