W3C WebRTC WG Meeting

August 27, 2024 8 AM - 10 AM

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 August 2024 interim meeting of the W3C WebRTC WG, at which we will cover:
 - Captured Surface Control, moving forward with mute,
 speaker-selection, scale resolution down to, codec matching.
- Future meetings:
 - TPAC, September 23- 27, 2024
 - October 15
 - o November 19
 - December 10

TPAC 2024 Schedule

- Venue: Hilton Anaheim, California
 - Time Zone: Pacific Daylight Time (UTC -7)
- Tuesday, September 24, 2024
 - 09:00 12:30 WEBRTC WG
 - 16:30 -18:00 WEBRTC WG/SCCG Joint Meeting
- Wednesday, September 25, 2024
 - Breakout Sessions
- Thursday, September 26, 2024
 - 14:00 16:00 WEBRTC WG/MEDIA WG Joint Meeting

About this Virtual Meeting

- Meeting info:
 - https://www.w3.org/2011/04/webrtc/wiki/August_27_2024
- 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/mediacapture-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 (still) 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 (still) being recorded

- Click Raise hand to get into the speaker queue.
- Click Lower hand to get out of the speaker queue.
- Please wait for microphone access to be granted before speaking.
- If you jump the speaker queue, you will be muted.
- Please use headphones when speaking to avoid echo.
- 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 Captured Surface Control (Guido)
- 08:30 08:50 AM Moving forward with mute (Guido)
- 08:50 09:10 AM Speaker-selection (Jan-Ivar)
- 09:10 09:30 AM Scale Resolution Down *To* (Henrik)
- 09:30 09:50 AM RTCRtpParameters.codec (Jan-Ivar)
- 09:50 10:00 AM Wrapup and Next Steps (Chairs)

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.

Captured Surface Control (Guido)

Start Time: 08:10 AM

End Time: 08:30 AM

Captured Surface Control

- We recently proposed an API that allows an application to send wheel and zoom events to a captured tab
- Use case: zooming and scrolling the captured content
- Initial comments
 - The use case of the local user zooming and scrolling the captured content is appealing and worth exploring
 - The use case of a remote user zooming and scrolling raises nontrivial privacy concerns and we shouldn't focus on it at this time
 - The API should not be extended to support other user input such as keystrokes or mouse presses
 - The UA might be in a better position than the application to perform these actions

Captured Surface Control - original

```
partial interface CaptureController {
 // Scrolling
  Promise<undefined> sendWheel(CapturedWheelAction action);
 // Zooming
  static sequence<long> getSupportedZoomLevels();
  long getZoomLevel();
  Promise<undefined> setZoomLevel(long zoomLevel);
  attribute EventHandler oncapturedzoomlevelchange;
};
```

Captured Surface Control - new

```
partial interface CaptureController {
 // Scrolling
  Promise<undefined> captureWheel(HTMLElement? element);
 // Zooming
  static sequence<long> getSupportedZoomLevels();
  long getZoomLevel();
  Promise<undefined> setZoomLevel(long zoomLevel);
  attribute EventHandler oncapturedzoomlevelchange;
};
```

Captured Surface Control - Scrolling

```
const controller = new CaptureController();
const stream = await
    navigator.mediaDevices.getDisplayMedia({ controller });
const previewTile = document.querySelector('video');
previewTile.srcObject = stream;
// Start forwarding wheel events
await controller.captureWheel(previewTile);
// Stop forwarding wheel events
await controller.captureWheel(null);
```

Captured Surface Control - Scrolling

- captureController.captureWheel(element);
 - Forwards all the wheel events dispatched on element to the content associated with captureController
 - Subject to permission
 - new "captured-surface-control" permission
 - prompts the user if necessary
 - The UA takes care of the forwarding
 - Offset coordinates for the event are scaled from the size of the element to the size of the viewport of the captured surface
 - Delta values are preserved
- Main advantages: easier to use and only supports the local use case

Captured Surface Control - Zooming

```
partial interface CaptureController {
 // Scrolling
  Promise<undefined> captureWheel(HTMLElement? element);
 // Zooming
  static sequence<long> getSupportedZoomLevels();
  long getZoomLevel();
  Promise<undefined> setZoomLevel(long zoomLevel);
  attribute EventHandler oncapturedzoomlevelchange;
};
```

Captured Surface Control - Zooming

- The Zooming use case is trickier, because it involves UI and applications prefer to build all their UI elements to guarantee a consistent user experience over letting the UA create the UI
- Proposal: Make remote control require transient user activation for all setZoomLevel() calls.
 - Mitigates the issue well enough that it's impractical to use it for remote control
 - Easy to understand, specify and implement
 - The requirement is reasonable for applications
 - This does not work for sendWheel

Discussion (End Time: 08:30)

•

Moving Forward with Mute (Guido)

Start Time: 08:30 AM

End Time: 08:50 AM

Moving forward with Mute

- We have discussed mute recently and made progress in some areas:
 - Synchronizing mute state (including UI) across Application, UA and OS is a good fit for the Media Session API
 - This also includes unmute requests from the application
- There are still areas that need improvement
 - Better interoperability between implementations

Moving forward with Mute

- The spec includes language that is roughly equivalent to:
 - Track muted -> no frames (or black frames)
 - Good fit for the user manually muting the track with hardware switches, or UA/OS controls
 - Chromium uses this definition for audio. IIUC, Safari and Firefox for video and audio.
 - No frames (or black frames?) -> track muted
 - Fits cases when the track temporarily stops sending frames, but there is no underlying failure
 - Indirectly works for manual mutes (as long as no frames)
 - Chromium uses this definition for video.

Better handling of the no-frames case

- Ideally, we would use the first part of the definition only, but:
 - The language has been in the spec for years and there is an implementation (Chromium) that followed it just as long
 - Developers have expressed that they find the direct no-frames signal useful, even if it is not caused by a user mute
- Proposal
 - Leave the spec language as is
 - Add a boolean attribute isSendingFrames (name subject to discussion) to MediaStreamTrackVideoStats

Better handling of the no-frames case

Advantages

- Provide developers the signal they currently get with Chromium's current version of the muted attribute
- Makes it easier for Chromium to start using the first part of the definition without creating compatibility problems with applications that rely on the no-frames definition
- Improved interoperability across browsers (making muted more useful)
- A similar signal can be inferred by an application by looking at the frame counter in MediaStreamTracksVideoStats and using timeouts, but having a boolean with the same properties as the old muted attribute makes it more ergonomic, especially for existing applications that already use the existing signal.

What about black frames?

- For video tracks, zero-information content can mean black frames or no frames.
- Applications can (and do) detect black frames by just analyzing them
- On some platforms, there are system APIs that make it possible to detect that the camera is producing black frames due to specific reasons (e.g., due to laptop lid down, or OS setting)
- Proposal:
 - Add two fields to MediaStreamTrackVideoStats
 - systemBlackFrames Black frame counter
 - lastFrameWasSystemBlack Makes it easier for applications to detect the condition without using timeouts
 - Mark the track muted when this condition is detected
 - Black frames are zero-information content, no spec change expected since the causes are user action)

What about black frames?

- Advantages
 - Apps can detect black frames more efficiently
 - The mute signal together with the stat can help the application provide more accurate information to the user

Proposed IDL

```
partial interface MediaStreamTracksVideoStats {
    readonly attribute unsigned boolean isSendingFrames;
    readonly attribute unsigned long long systemBlackFrames;
    readonly attribute unsigned boolean lastFrameWasSystemBlack;
}
```

Discussion (End Time: 08:50)

•

Speaker-selection (Jan-Ivar)

Start Time: 08:50 AM

End Time: 09:10 AM

For Discussion Today

mediacapture-output:

- <u>Issue 142</u> / <u>PR 143</u>: Why prompt for a subset of stored speakers or speakers setSinkId already accepts?
- <u>Issue 133:</u> The first "audiooutput" MediaDeviceInfo returned from enumerateDevices() is not the default device when the default device is not exposed

Issue 142: Why prompt for a subset of stored speakers?

How a persisted speaker id was exposed in a past session shouldn't matter.

PR 143 updates step 5 of the <u>selectAudioOutput()</u> algorithm:

- 5. If deviceId is not "" and matches an audio output device id previously exposed by selectAudioOutput or enumerateDevices() in an earlier browsing session, the user agent MAY decide, based on its previous decision of whether to persist this id or not for this set of origins, to run the following sub steps:
 - 1. Let *device* be the device identified by *deviceId*, if available.
 - 2. If *device* is available, resolve *p* with either *deviceld* or a freshly rotated device id for *device*, and abort the in-parallel steps.

Issue 133: First audiooutput in enumerateDevices() is not the default device when the default device is unexposed

enumerateDevices() says the first speakers are the system default speakers:

4. If *device* is the system default audio output, prepend *deviceInfo* to *otherDeviceList*. Otherwise, append *deviceInfo* to *otherDeviceList*.

Websites therefore assume they can do this:

But speakers aren't exposed by default so it might be a different one!

This makes it hard to write apps. E.g. some omit a way to reset to default "".

Issue 133: First audiooutput in enumerateDevices() is not the default device when the default device is unexposed

Proposals: If at least one other audio output is exposed, but the one that is currently the system default is not, prepend an entry for it that looks like this:

```
A: {kind: "audiooutput", label: [UA defined], groupId: "", deviceId: ""}
B: {kind: "audiooutput", label: [UA defined], groupId: "", deviceId: "default"}
```

Pros of A: Works with setSinkId(""). No change needed.

Pros of B: avoids selectAudioOutput({deviceId: ""}) which always prompts

Label is up to UA — e.g. might be "" or "System default speakers".

Discussion (End Time: 09:10)

•

webrtc-extensions#159

Scale Resolution Down *To* (Henrik)

Start Time: 09:10 AM

End Time: 09:30 AM

#159: Scale Resolution Down To (Henrik)

The scaleResolutionDownTo API was discussed in May 2023 Virtual Interim.

Recap:

- It's like scaleResolutionDownBy but expressed in absolute terms ("send 360p") instead of absolute terms ("downscale by 2" + frame being 720p).
- Motivation:
 - When disabling top layer(s) we want to do the expensive effects processing on a 360p track instead of a 720p track.
 - Today, changing track resolution on the fly triggers reconfiguration.
 Adjusting scaling factors is inherently racy! Avoiding race = glitchy.

There was overall support, I promised to follow-up with details... 1y ago :)

#159: Scale Resolution Down To (Henrik)

Proposal:

```
dictionary RTCRect { unsigned long width, height; } // Or DOMRect but ignore x,y?
dictionary RTCRtpEncodingParameters {
    RTCRect scaleResolutionDownTo;
};
```

Keep it simple:

- Never upscale, only downscale (if needed).
- Never change aspect ratio (scale down until both sides fit).
- Orientation agnostic (adjust 1280x720 to 720x1280 internally if needed).

API already exists in C++ as <u>requested_resolution</u> (% fixing some bugs!).

Just surface it to JS with a new name.

Discussion (End Time: 09:30)

•

RTCRtpParameters.codec (Jan-Ivar)

Start Time: 09:30 AM

End Time: 09:50 AM

Issue 2987: RTCRtpParameters.codec matching is probably too strict

TL;DR: Try to align with implementation

The spec needs an RTP stream "selecting codec" algorithm. codec hand-waves:

"Optional value selecting which codec is used for this encoding's RTP stream. If absent, the user agent can chose to use any negotiated codec."

WPT expects setting .codec based on static getCapabilities, and then negotiating, will cause that codec to be used IF it matches (but how closely?) the remote SDP.

There's no explicit prose around doing this in the spec right now, but it definitely seems to be the intent. The WPT also expects .codec to be automatically unset if the remote SDP does not contain a match (there's definitely nothing in the spec about this).

Issue 2987: RTCRtpParameters.codec matching is probably too strict

Do we allow UA to clear this parameter.codec (singular) after negotiation?

```
{ mimeType: 'video/vp9', clockRate: 90000, sdpFmtpLine: 'max-fs=12288;max-fr=60' }
```

...because the closest match in the negotiated parameters.codecs (plural) is this?

```
 \{ \ mimeType: \ 'video/vp9', \ clockRate: \ 90000, \ sdpFmtpLine: \ 'max-fs=12288; max-fr=30', \ payloadType: \ 120 \ \}
```

If so, then UAs are free to chose any negotiated codec anyway, and might take codec as a hint, and at least send VP9. But having it work in some browsers and not others would surprise → poor interop. Should we standardize something here?

Instead of clearing, why not let UA update the codec parameter to the 2nd codec?

Discussion (End Time: 09:50)

•

Wrapup and Next Steps

Start Time: 09:50 AM

End Time: 10:00 AM

Next Steps

Content goes here

Thank you

Special thanks to:

WG Participants, Editors & Chairs