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# Introduction

In the October 2009 Q1/16 Experts Meeting (Geneva, 26 October – 6 November 2009), an Ad hoc group was formed in order to progress the work on H.264 Annex G/SVC signalling support in H.241 through electronic correspondence. In subsequent meetings the AHG was asked to review signalling proposals. The AHG has not met since the Geneva 14-25 March 2011 meeting.

# H.241 signaling draft

In the Geneva 14-25 March 2011 meeting, Q1/16 experts agreed to use [T09-SG16-C-0551](http://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T09-SG16-C-0551) as a starting point, with a goal of providing text for review at the 2011 SG16 meeting. [Q1-K04](http://ftp3.itu.int/av-arch/lbc-site/2009-2012/1107_Andover/q1k04.doc) will be presented at the Andover 18-22 July 2011 meeting.

# RTP Payload Format for SVC

As part of the standardization of SVC signaling, it is necessary to either define an RTP payload format, or to provide a normative reference to an RFC. Providing a normative reference to an RFC is preferred. The IETF published RFC 6190 - *RTP Payload Format for Scalable Video Coding* (<http://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc6190>) in May 2011.

# Conclusion

The work on SVC signaling has progressed since the March 2011 meeting. The ad hoc group could continue to review signaling. Alternatively, Q1 could ask the H.241 editor to work directly with the interested contributors via the mailing list.
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