

## RTP Payload Format for H.263 Moving RFC 2190 to Historic Status

### Status of This Memo

This memo provides information for the Internet community. It does not specify an Internet standard of any kind. Distribution of this memo is unlimited.

### Copyright Notice

Copyright (C) The IETF Trust (2007).

### Abstract

The first RFC that describes an RTP payload format for ITU Telecommunication Standardization Sector (ITU-T) recommendation H.263 is RFC 2190. This specification discusses why to move RFC 2190 to historic status.

### Table of Contents

1. Introduction .....	2
2. Terminology .....	2
3. Recommendation .....	2
4. Security Considerations .....	3
5. Normative References .....	3
6. Informative References .....	3

## 1. Introduction

The ITU-T recommendation H.263 [H263] specifies the encoding used by ITU-T-compliant video-conference codecs. The first version (version 1) was approved in 1996 by the ITU, and a payload format for encapsulating this H.263 bitstream in the Real-time Transport Protocol (RTP) is in RFC 2190 [RFC2190]. In 1998 the ITU approved a new version of H.263 [H263P] that is also known as H.263 plus. This version added optional features, and a new payload format is now in RFC 2429 [RFC2429]. RFC 2429 is capable of carrying encoded video bit streams that are using only the basic H.263 version 1 options.

RFC 2429 [RFC2429] states that it does not replace RFC 2190, which continues to be used by existing implementations and may be required for backward compatibility in new implementations. Implementations using the new features of the 1998 version of H.263 and later versions shall use the format described in RFC 2429.

RFC 2429 is now being revised and will include language that will make it clear that all new implementations MUST use RFC 4629 [RFC4629] for encoding of any version of H.263.

## 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] and indicate requirement levels for compliant RTP implementations.

## 3. Recommendation

RFC 2429 and RFC 4629 [RFC4629] can be used to carry new H.263 payloads even if they are using only the features defined in the 1996 version. All the H.263 features that are part of the 1996 version are also part of the 1998 version and later versions.

It is recommended that RFC 2190 be moved to historic status and that, as stated in RFC 4629 [RFC4629], new implementations use the RFC 4629 and the H263-1998 and H263-2000 Media Types.

This recommendation will come into effect at the publication or as soon as possible after the publication of RFC 4629 [RFC4629].

#### 4. Security Considerations

Security considerations for the H263 video RTP payload can be found in the RFC 4629 [RFC4629]. Using the payload specification in RFC 4629 instead of that in RFC 2190 does not affect the security consideration since both of them refer to RFC 3550 [RFC3550] and RFC 3551 [RFC3551] for security considerations.

#### 5. Normative References

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

#### 6. Informative References

[H263] International Telecommunication Union, "Video coding for low bit rate communication", ITU Recommendation H.263, March 1996.

[H263P] International Telecommunication Union, "Video coding for low bit rate communication", ITU Recommendation H.263, January 2005.

[RFC2190] Zhu, C., "RTP Payload Format for H.263 Video Streams", RFC 2190, September 1997.

[RFC2429] Bormann, C., Cline, L., Deisher, G., Gardos, T., Maciocco, C., Newell, D., Ott, J., Sullivan, G., Wenger, S., and C. Zhu, "RTP Payload Format for the 1998 Version of ITU-T Rec. H.263 Video (H.263+)", RFC 2429, October 1998.

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

[RFC3551] Schulzrinne, H. and S. Casner, "RTP Profile for Audio and Video Conferences with Minimal Control", STD 65, RFC 3551, July 2003.

[RFC4629] Ott, J., Borman, C., Sullivan, G., Wenger, S., and R. Even, Ed., "RTP Payload Format for ITU-T Rec. H.263 Video", RFC 4629, January 2007.

Author's Address

Roni Even  
Polycom  
94 Derech Em Hamoshavot  
Petach Tikva 49130  
Israel

EMail: [roni.even@polycom.co.il](mailto:roni.even@polycom.co.il)

## Full Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The IETF Trust (2007).

This document is subject to the rights, licenses and restrictions contained in BCP 78, and except as set forth therein, the authors retain all their rights.

This document and the information contained herein are provided on an "AS IS" basis and THE CONTRIBUTOR, THE ORGANIZATION HE/SHE REPRESENTS OR IS SPONSORED BY (IF ANY), THE INTERNET SOCIETY, THE IETF TRUST AND THE INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE DISCLAIM ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION HEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

## Intellectual Property

The IETF takes no position regarding the validity or scope of any Intellectual Property Rights or other rights that might be claimed to pertain to the implementation or use of the technology described in this document or the extent to which any license under such rights might or might not be available; nor does it represent that it has made any independent effort to identify any such rights. Information on the procedures with respect to rights in RFC documents can be found in BCP 78 and BCP 79.

Copies of IPR disclosures made to the IETF Secretariat and any assurances of licenses to be made available, or the result of an attempt made to obtain a general license or permission for the use of such proprietary rights by implementers or users of this specification can be obtained from the IETF on-line IPR repository at <http://www.ietf.org/ipr>.

The IETF invites any interested party to bring to its attention any copyrights, patents or patent applications, or other proprietary rights that may cover technology that may be required to implement this standard. Please address the information to the IETF at [ietf-ipr@ietf.org](mailto:ietf-ipr@ietf.org).

## Acknowledgement

Funding for the RFC Editor function is currently provided by the Internet Society.

