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First change
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second change

### 4.4.2 One-byte RTP Header Extension Format

The RTP HE element for the RTP packet that carries only one timestamp T1 is shown below. This is the same as the **"**RTP Header Extension for Absolute Sender Time" in Annex C.1.

 0 1 2 3

 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1

 +-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+

 | 0xBE | 0xDE | length |

 +-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+

 | ID | L=2 | T1 (24 bits) |

 +-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+

The RTP HE element for the RTP packet that carries three timestamps T1, T2 and T3 is shown below.

 0 1 2 3

 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1

 +-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+

 | 0xBE | 0xDE | length |

 +-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+

 | ID | L=8 | T1 |

 +-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+

 | T2 | T3 …

 +-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+

 |

 +-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+

THIRD change (All new)

## 4.6 RTP SDES Header Extension for MID

When an RTP sender is transmitting different media streams in a multiplexed data flow, the 5GS network needs to identify the PDU’s belonging to the respective media streams, for enabling differentiated QoS handling (i.e. mapping multiplexed streams to differnet QoS Flows). The RTP SDES header extension for MID described in Annex C.2 make it possible for an RTP receiver or 5G System to associate each RTP stream with a specific identification-tag.

An RTP sender may use the BUNDLE attribute defined in RFC 9143 [23] in SDP negotiation to multiplex the media streams, particularly in case SSRC is not available before the RTP session is started. Endpoints that support the bundle mechanism for multiplexed RTP streams shall include the RTP SDES HE for MID for identifying the media streams. Endpoints that support the RTP SDES HE for MID shall support both RTP HE formats (i.e., the one-byte and the two-byte formats) according to RFC 7941 [22].

NOTE: Not every RTP packet is required to send MID information in the RTP SDES HE for MID.

If the RTP SDES HE for MID is the only RTP HE used, the endpoints shall use the 1-byte header format. If other 2-byte RTP HE elements are used in the same RTP stream, then the 2-byte header shall be used, unless the "a=extmap-allow-mixed" is successfully negotiated through SDP offer/answer, as described by RFC 8285 [11].

FOURTH change

Annex C (informative):

## C.1 RTP Header Extension for Absolute Sender Time

The information below is about the "RTP Header Extension for Absolute Sender Time" and it was retrieved from https://webrtc.googlesource.com/src/+/refs/heads/main/docs/native-code/rtp-hdrext/abs-send-time on January 31, 2024.

Absolute Send Time

The Absolute Send Time extension is used to stamp RTP packets with a timestamp showing the departure time from the system that put this packet on the wire (or as close to this as we can manage). Contact solenberg@google.com for more info.

Name: "Absolute Sender Time" ; "RTP Header Extension for Absolute Sender Time"

Formal name: <http://www.webrtc.org/experiments/rtp-hdrext/abs-send-time>

SDP "a=name": "abs-send-time" ; this is also used in client/cloud signaling.

Not unlike [RTP with TFRC](http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-avt-tfrc-profile-10#section-5)

Wire format: 1-byte extension, 3 bytes of data. total 4 bytes extra per packet (plus shared 4 bytes for all extensions present: 2 byte magic word 0xBEDE, 2 byte # of extensions). Will in practice replace the “toffset” extension so we should see no long term increase in traffic as a result.

Encoding: Timestamp is in seconds, 24 bit 6.18 fixed point, yielding 64s wraparound and 3.8us resolution (one increment for each 477 bytes going out on a 1Gbps interface).

Relation to NTP timestamps: abs\_send\_time\_24 = (ntp\_timestamp\_64 >> 14) & 0x00ffffff ; NTP timestamp is 32 bits for whole seconds, 32 bits fraction of second.

Notes: Packets are time stamped when going out, preferably close to metal. Intermediate RTP relays (entities possibly altering the stream) should remove the extension or set its own timestamp.

## C.2 RTP SDES Header Extension for MID

### C.2.1 Description

When multiple RTP media streams are multiplexed in an RTP session, each media stream can be identified using the identification-tag (the values of "mid" attribute) in the SDP information using the BUNDLE attribute defiend RFC 8843. RFC 7941 [22] has defined an RTP SDES header extension to understand the RTP senders source identity and synchronization context. RFC 9143 [23] has defined a new RTP SDES header extension for MID by extending the RTP SDES header extension to carry the RTCP MID SDES item as defined in RFC 9143, in RTP packets.

The RTP SDES header extension for MID make it possible for an RTP receiver or 5G System to associate each RTP stream with a specific "m=" section in the SDP with which a receiver has associated an identification-tag. The payload, containing the identification-tag, of the RTP SDES header extension element can be encoded using either the 1-byte or the 2-byte header according to RFC 7941 [22]. The identification-tag payload is UTF-8 encoded, as in SDP.

### C.2.2 SDP Signaling

RFC 9143 defined the extension URN in the "RTP SDES Compact Header Extensions" subregistry of the "RTP Compact Header Extensions" sub-registry. The URN for the RTP SDES Header Extension for MID is set to “**urn:ietf:params:rtp-hdrext:sdes:mid**” as defined in RFC 9143.

Below is an example:

 a=extmap:1 urn:ietf:params:rtp-hdrext:sdes:mid

End of changes