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## 5.9 Key Issue #9: Feasibility of RTP multiplexing options for transport of XR media streams

### 5.9.1 Description

RTP originally relied on UDP multiplexing for carriage of different media streams (using different UDP ports for each stream and RTCP).

However, in practice assigning additional UDP ports has been problematic, and RTP based multiplexing is used as an alternative.

For RTP multiplexing of streams in a single RTP session, the SSRC is generally used as described in RFC 8872 [4].

In addition, combining RTCP and RTP on the same port is referred to as RTP/RTCP multiplexing.

In this case, the RTP and RTCP traffic can be multiplexed and demultiplexed using the shared second Byte of the UDP payload (i.e., the RTCP packet type and the RTP M bit & RTP payload type) as described in RFC 5761 [5].

In WebRTC the same port may be used for RTP, RTCP and different streams.

In addition, other forms of multiplexing may be used to support carriage of different streams over RTP that have been popular in the media industry (e.g. MPEG-2 based multiplexing).

For example in MPEG-2 TS over RTP [yy] the small TS packets of 188 bytes can be interleaved in an RTP packet. So in this case an RTP packet contains multiple small transport stream packets that could be audio, video or even metadata related to a television program. This would lead to RTP packet including multiple media types.

It is proposed to:

- Study and document existing options for RTP multiplexing.

- Identify the potential gaps on support of different use cases.

- Identify and document other popular ways of supporting multiplexed content in RTP transmission if any

- Study and identify how multiplexed RTP can benefit from PDU Set marking header extensions.

- Study the relevance of identifying multiplexed streams in 5GS and explore potential benefits of additional support in 5GS.

NOTE: This issue may require coordination with SA2. Additional support in 5GS refers to the multiplexed traffic detection and QoS Flow mapping in FS\_XRM\_Ph2.