W3C WebRTC WG Meeting

October 28, 2021 8:00 - 9:00 AM Pacific Time

Chairs: Bernard Aboba
Harald Alvestrand
Jan-Ivar Bruaroey

W3C WG IPR Policy

- This group abides by the W3C Patent Policy <u>https://www.w3.org/Consortium/Patent-Policy/</u>
- Only people and companies listed at https://www.w3.org/2004/01/pp-impl/47318/status are allowed to make substantive contributions to the WebRTC specs

Welcome!

- Welcome to the TPAC 2021 meeting of the W3C WebRTC WG, at which we will cover:
 - State of the WG
 - mediacapture-transform

About this Meeting

- Meeting info:
 - https://www.w3.org/2011/04/webrtc/wiki/TPAC 2021#WebRTC WG Meeting
- Link to latest drafts:
 - https://w3c.github.io/mediacapture-main/
 - https://w3c.github.io/mediacapture-extensions/
 - https://w3c.github.io/mediacapture-image/
 - https://w3c.github.io/mediacapture-output/
 - https://w3c.github.io/mediacapture-screen-share/
 - https://w3c.github.io/mediacapture-record/
 - https://w3c.github.io/webrtc-pc/
 - https://w3c.github.io/webrtc-extensions/
 - https://w3c.github.io/webrtc-stats/
 - https://w3c.github.io/mst-content-hint/
 - https://w3c.github.io/webrtc-priority/
 - https://w3c.github.io/webrtc-nv-use-cases/
 - https://github.com/w3c/webrtc-encoded-transform
 - https://github.com/w3c/webrtc-svc
 - https://github.com/w3c/webrtc-ice
- Link to Slides has been published on WG wiki
- Scribe? IRC http://irc.w3.org/ Channel: #webrtc
- The meeting is being recorded. The recording will be public.
- Volunteers for note taking?

W3C Code of Conduct

- This meeting operates under <u>W3C Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct</u>
- We're all passionate about improving WebRTC and the Web, but let's all keep the conversations cordial and professional

Virtual Interim Meeting Tips

This session is being recorded

- Type +q and -q in the Google Meet chat to get into and out of the speaker queue.
- Please use headphones when speaking to avoid echo.
- Please wait for microphone access to be granted before speaking.
- Please state your full name before speaking.
- Poll mechanism may be used to gauge the "sense of the room".

Understanding Document Status

- Hosting within the W3C repo does not imply adoption by the WG.
 - WG adoption requires a Call for Adoption (CfA) on the mailing list.
- Editor's drafts do not represent WG consensus.
 - WG drafts do imply consensus, once they're confirmed by a Call for Consensus (CfC) on the mailing list.
 - Possible to merge PRs that may lack consensus, if a note is attached indicating controversy.

Issues for Discussion Today

- 08:10 08:30 AM State of the WG (Harald)
- 08:30 08:50 AM mediacapture-transform (Chairs)
- 08:50 09:00 AM Wrap-up and Next Steps

Time control:

- A warning will be given 2 minutes before time is up.
- Once time has elapsed we will move on to the next item.

State of the WEBRTC WG (Harald)

End Time: 8:30 AM

State of the WEBRTC WG (Harald)

- What we are chartered to do
- What we have been doing
- What we need to do going forward

What we are chartered to do

- Charter from October 2020
- Focus on media and peer-to-peer comms
- Delivery and maintenance of existing specs (15 documents listed in charter)
- Future extensions work
 - Use case document
 - Direct control semantics (ORTC inspired)

What we have done (chartered)

- WEBRTC-PC 1.0 is now a REC!
- Still working on mediacapture-main to REC
- The 13 other docs are more or less dormant
- WEBRTC-NV use cases document seems stalled
- Lots of maintenance work on webrtc-pc++ (experience finds bugs)

What we have done (unchartered)

- Numerous extensions proposed
 - Tab capture manipulation
 - Raw frame access
 - Encoded frame access
 - New device picker model
 - Lots of smaller things
- A number of these have provoked controversy - some have not

Issues in Participation

A lot of debates recently have been totally dominated by browser vendors. This is not healthy; we're making APIs for the developers, not for the browser vendors.

The mailing list is basically announcement-only; real debate happens (if it happens) in github. Hard to follow?

How to Get Change - Imagined

- Detect need for functionality
- Distil need into a scenario (for WEBRTC-NV)
- Propose an extension that makes sense
- Get consensus on extension
- Win

How we try to change - current

- Detect need for functionality (inhouse)
- Develop a solution (inhouse)
- Propose solution to WG
- Discuss
- Maybe Get to agreement?

Call for editing resources!

Goal of W3C process is REC

- Consensus on specification
- Test suite avaiable
- Implementations done

Many documents are languishing

- Who needs them? Can they do the work?
- If nobody needs them can we abandon?
- If we need them, but nobody can edit?

mediacapture-transform (Chairs) End Time: 8:50 AM

A Recap of September/October

 A (successful) "Call for Consensus" (CfC) was concluded for transferable MediaStreamTracks. Summary:

https://lists.w3.org/Archives/Public/public-webrtc/2021Sep/0047.html

- At the October 14 Virtual Interim...
 - Youenn Fablet presented:
 - The state of WHATWG Streams Issues impacting media pipelines.
 - Github Issue discussions showing progress, but no running code yet.
 - Potential future meeting with WHATWG Streams Editors.
 - A comparison of transferable MediaStreamTracks and transferable WHATWG streams.
 - With transferable MSTs, streams can be created in a worker thread, rather than being created on main thread and transferred to a worker. This *may* yield more predictable performance (no data yet).
 - track.clone() offers more flexibility (e.g. ability to apply different constraints to the clone) as well as avoiding potential issues with stream.tee().
 - Jan-Ivar and Harald presented proposals for mediacapture-transform

API proposal comparison

	Mediacapture-transform proposal	Alternate proposal
Frame delivery	Streams	Streams
Exposure	Worker and Main	Worker only
Stream generator	Separate class	MediaStreamTrack+
Stream consumer	MediaStreamTrack+	Separate class
Media types	Audio and Video	Video only

The differences seem to be fairly isolated from each other, so can be discussed one by one.

"Sense of the WEBRTC WG" Poll

- Answers: Yes/No/Undecided
- Question 1: Should mediacapture-transform be based on streams?
- Question 2: Should mediacapture-transform support audio?
- Question 3: Should mediacapture-transform be exposed on main thread?

Results of the Poll

- 8 Responses
- Question 1: Should mediacapture-transform be based on streams?
 - o Yes: 6, No: 2
- Question 2: Should mediacapture-transform support audio?
 - Yes: 4, No: 3, Undecided: 1
- Question 3: Should mediacapture-transform be exposed on main thread?
 - o Yes: 3, No: 5

Discussion

Thank you

Special thanks to:

WG Participants, Editors & Chairs