IP Telephony

Overview of IP Telephony
Media processing, RTP, RTCP
Quality of Service

Summary of course scope
Data traffic already dominates voice in volume. Therefore Data will drive the Network Architecture.

- Broadband Networks will be based on packet switching
- BB network emerges from the existing Internet
- Each step of Development pays for itself.

VoIP in action

Coded samples (G.711, G.729B, G.723.1)

Terminal determines voice coding
Delay variance is compensated at reception by buffering

Packet flow with constant spacing (e.g. 160 octets/ 20 ms)

Source

Internet

Packets arrive unevenly spaced

Destination

Delay buffer

IP Telephony Standardization is active on de-jure and de-facto fora

- ITU-T - H.3xx, H.2xx series
- ETSI - TIPHON project - Telecommunications and Internet Protocol Harmonisation over Networks

IETF working Groups
- IPTEL (IP telephony) and PINT
- MMUSIC (Multiparty Multimedia Session Control)
- SIMPLE – SIP for Instant Messaging and Presence Leveraging Extensions
- AVT – audio video transport
- ENUM – tElephone NUmber Mapping
- Megaco – media gateway control
- Rohc – robust header compression
- SIP – Session Initiation Protocol
- SIPPING – Session initiation Protocol Investigation
- SIGTRAN (ISUP and other CCS7 over IP)

VOIP - Voice over IP by IMTC - Int’l Multimedia Teleconferencing Consortium
TIPHON specifies IP Voice to PSTN/ISDN/GSM Interworking

H.323 products are available

- ITSPs are committed to H.323
- MS Netmeeting, Intel Videophone, Netscape Conference are examples of H.323 clients
- H.323 version 2 products are available
- Gateways and Gatekeepers/Call managers are available
- SIP has been taking the lead over past 2…3 years
IETF alternatives to H.323 pursue Integration of Telephony to the Web

- AVT - Audio Video transport (RTP)
- PINT worked on Click-to-Dial, Click-to-Fax, Click-to-Fax-Back “www-buttons”. The idea is to integrate www to IN
- Mmusic (now SIP group) works on SIP - idea is to use web-technology to absorb signaling
  - SIP has been adopted by 3GPP for 3G packet telephony
- Media Gateway Control (Megaco)
- SIGTRAN works on C7 over IP
- ENUM - numbering info in DNS

Roadmap to the Future

- Private VoIP networks: subs criteria in PSTN phase 1
- Peer VoIP/PSTN networking Phase 2
- Popular Vision
- Capacity & replacement & Service Mgt
- All Service IP network
- Multiple connections between SCN and IP Telephony Network
- 2005…2010

now
Interoperability Issues

- Signaling and Call control
- Quality of Service
- Telephony Routing and addressing
  - Input Information gathering
  - Alternative routing over IP
- Service Management in the hybrid network

IP Voice in Ethernet - Delay is in the Workstation (IPANA -97)

- Terminal delay:
  - HW: 8.9 ms
  - VoIP Client: 103.9 ms

- End-to-end delay:
  - Packet length: 0.02 s
  - Delay: 104.5 ms

Difference = network delay
Packet spacing difference in a campus network

- In the public Internet lack of bandwidth, congested routes/links and underdeveloped charging are blockers to IP Voice.
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Media processing path in terminals and gateways

1. Audio device driver
2. Media sub-system
   - Coding
   - Framing
   - RTP packetization
3. UDP/IP packetization
4. Network device driver
5. Physical transfer

Audio device driver
- Decoding
- Deframing
- Play-out buffer
- RTP depacketization
- UDP/IP depacketization
- Network device driver
- Physical transfer

Network interface card
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Delay in practical IP voice systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delay component</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audio HW &amp; device driver</td>
<td>0-100</td>
<td>Buffering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algorithm</td>
<td>20-37.5</td>
<td>Sample length + lookahead time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating system</td>
<td>0 - 30</td>
<td>Depends on load and implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coder</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>Predictable delay in coding algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decoding</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>Typically an easy process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framing and packetization</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>A small software delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIC and device driver</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>Has some significance especially in WLAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network</td>
<td>0 - 500</td>
<td>In LAN about 1 ms, Dimensioning Issue!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play-out buffer</td>
<td>0 - 100</td>
<td>At reception, depends on the state of the network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synchronization</td>
<td>0 - 30</td>
<td>Audio device requests for data at constant intervals that can not be synchronized with packet arrivals. Avg = half a packet time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: M.Sc thesis by Jari Selin

Voice quality starts to degrade, when one way end-to-end delay > 150ms

MOS
Perceived subjective quality

150 ms
150 ms Delay

Quality can be measured e.g. based on the E-model or using MOS – measurements. MOS - Mean Opinion Score.
Packetization of voice samples in ATM cells

- Length of voice packet depends on coding method and the length of voice frame
- Packet overhead includes ATM headers and padding, which is needed in order not to increase packet delay.

Packet header and padding overhead is significant

Percentage of voice payload when samples are carried over IP, UDP and RTP protocols, and IP is carried over ATM

Source: Veikko Brax (Lic. thesis)
Why voice over IP, when ISDN/GSM work perfectly well?

NB: Voice brings currently ca. 90% of operator revenues!

- Integration of voice and data networks creates new services.
- Maintaining two networks is expensive.
- Data traffic grows >30%/year, voice = 5%/y, volumes are approximately equal now. If trend continues, in 2010 share of voice will be 10%, data will be 90% of all traffic.
- Cost of transmission is in free fall: xDSL, SDH, WDM - this trend is difficult to take advantage of using circuit switching: only one sample (8 bits) can be switched at a time cmp. E.g. 20 ms sample => 1 Gbit router is less expensive than an exchange with a 1 Gbit switch fabric.
- Terminals can do more -> consumer market economy helps.

User view on VOIP

- Cost
- User driven service development
- Personalization
- Mobility

![Diagram showing different networks and their connections](image-url)
Real time Services in IP

RTP (RFC 1889)
RTCP - “-“ -
Telephony over IP

TCP is not suitable for real time services

Applications include
- Audio and video conferencing
- Shared workspaces
- Telephony
- Games
- Remote medicine
- ...

TCP is point-to-point - not suitable for multicast
TCP has retransmission for lost segments --> out of order delivery
No mechanism for associating timing info with segments
Variable delay has to be compensated at reception by delay buffer

Constant flow of packets (e.g. 160 octets each 20 ms)

Source

Internet

Packets arrive unevenly spaced

Time Delay Buffer

Destination

Packet arrival process is characterised by delay jitter and packet spacing difference

Delay jitter = Maximum variance in packet delay in a session

Example: fastest packet arrive in 1 ms
slowest arrive in 8 ms.
Delay jitter is 7 ms.

Packet spacing difference is measured based on receiver clock only:

Spacing difference = [(t_i - t_{i-1}) - (t_j - t_{j-1})]
Soft real time communications tolerate some loss but need the following

- Low jitter and Low latency
- Ability to integrate real-time and non-real-time services
- Adaptability to changing network and traffic conditions
- Performance for large networks and large number of connections
- Modest buffering requirements in the network
- Effective capacity utilization
- Low processing overhead per packet

RTP - Real time protocol is a “sub-layer” library on top of UDP

- RTP leaves recovery from loss to the application
- Instead of retransmission e.g. more compact coding may be chosen
- RTP provides sequencing
RTP supports the transfer of real time data among participants of a session

- Session is defined by
  - RTP port number (dest port in UDP header of all receivers)
  - RTCP - Real time control protocol port number
  - Participant IP addresses - multicast address or a set of unicast addresses
- For session set-up e.g H.323 or SIP - Session Initiation Protocol can be used

RTP transport model includes sources, relays and receivers

- A mixer will combine sources - e.g. add voice signals from all conference participants
- A translator may translate from one video format to another
- The relay will mark itself as the synchronisation source
**RTP header**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Payload type</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **V=2** = version
- **P** - Padding - indicates that last octet of payload = nrof preceeding padding octets
- **X** - Extension - there is an experimental extension header
- **CC** - CSRC count - Nrof CSRC identifiers following the fixed header
- **M** - Marker - e.g. End of video frame, Beginning of talk spurt
- **Payload type** - format of RTP payload.
- **Seq. nr** - each source starts at a random nr and +=1 for each packet - determines order of packets with the same timestamp
- **Timestamp** - value of local clock at source at generation of first octet of payload
- SSRC and CSRC identifiers are generated at random

**RTCP - RTP Control Protocol provides feedback among participants of the session**

- **SDES** - Source Description
- **SR** - Sender report [data rates, quality of transm]
- **RR** - Receiver report [loss, excessive jitter]
- **BYE**

- RTCP packets may be multicast in parallel to RTP using another UDP port
- RTCP source is identified by plain text
- Few participants: RTCP reports are sent once in 5s
  Rate of reports is reduced to max 5% of session traffic if there are more participants
RTCP fixed header is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>RC/SC</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Length</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SSRC of sender (or CSRC)

V = 2 = version, P = Padding, same as RTP
RC - Reception report block count in SR or RR
SC - Source item count in SDES or BYE
PT - RTCP packet type [RR, SR, SDES, BYE]
Length - length of this packet in 32 bit words - 1
SSRC - same as in RTP

Sender Report carries sender info and reception report blocks

Sender information is

- NTP timestamp (MS word)
- NTP timestamp (LS word)
- RTP timestamp
- Sender’s packet count
- Sender’s octet count

- SSRC_i (SSRC of source)
- Fraction lost
- Cum nrof packets lost
- Ext highest seq nr received
- Interarrival jitter
- Time of last sender report
- Delay since last sender report

SSRC identifies source

- NTP is the wallclock time when sending this report (used for round-trip time measurement)
- RTP timestamp let relate this report to RTP stream
- Packet and octet counts run from beginning of session

SR is sent by party who is both sender and receiver!
Average inter-arrival jitter for a source is estimated as follows

\[ S(i) = \text{Timestamp from RTP data packet } i \]
\[ R(i) = \text{Time of arrival of data packet } i \text{ in RTP timestamp units} \]
\[ D(i) = (R(i) - R(i-1)) - (S(i) - S(i-1)) \]
\[ J(i) = \text{Estimate of Inter-arrival jitter up to the receipt of RTP packet } i \]

\[ J(i) = \frac{15}{16} \times J(i-1) + \frac{1}{16} \times |D(i)| \]

- Receivers use the estimate of Jitter to adjust the play-out delay
- According to measurements the above exponential average is not always optimal

RTCP other packets

- RR are made of the fixed header + reception report blocks (see SR format lower part)
- SDES can carry
  - CNAME - Canonical Name
  - NAME - Real user name of the source
  - Email address of the source
  - Phone number of the source
  - TOOL - name of the tool used by the source
How to provide SCN-like QoS over IP?

- Integrated Services (use RSVP to make reservations in routers for each call!) changes Routers into SCN-Exchange-like systems. Does not scale well.
- DiffServ
  - mark voice packets with higher than BE priority at ingress
  - priority queuing in transit nodes
  - How to prevent voice from blocking BE traffic?
  - How to do Service Management?
  - Voice packets have high overhead - how to minimize?
- Overprovisioning

How is IP Telephony different from Circuit switched telephony?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circuit Telephony</th>
<th>IP Telephony</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voice sample = 8 bits</td>
<td>Voice in 10...40 ms samples, Bits in a sample can be switched in parallel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A- and μ-law PCM voice standard</td>
<td>No single coding standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference connection gives network design guidelines =&gt; end-to-end delay is under control</td>
<td>End-to-End delay is big challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wire-line telephones are dumb. Cellular phones are pretty smart</td>
<td>Terminals are intelligent - consumer market economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call control is tied to the voice path - IN is used to add service processing on the side.</td>
<td>Call control is separate from voice path - first find out whether parties want and can talk, if yes, set-up the voice path</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Using today’s technology IP Telephony is not less expensive in replacement nor green field investments in Corporate networks!
How realistic is the idea of replacing CSN with VOIP?

- There is more data traffic now than Voice traffic.
  - Data is growing much faster than Voice
  - Voice revenue is still 90% of operator’s networking revenue.
  - Voice is fast becoming mobile
- CSN networking product development has stopped. All R&D effort in telephony goes to VOIP telephony
- Replacement Scenario in Finland: PSTN can be replaced, required max link capacities are 2.5…10Gbit/s. Next FUNET upgrade is to links of 10…40Gbit/s and FUNET is just the University Network!
- PCs are still lousy phones!