RFC 2833 Open Issues

draft-ietf-avt-rfc2833bis-05.txt

Tom Taylor

taylor@nortelnetworks.com

Brief Summary Of Status

- **Comments received on -04:**
  - **make negotiation of event support backward compatible with RFC 2833**
  - **request for metering pulse event**
  - **error in presentation of R2 backward signals**
  - **request for discussion of what to do if marker event report is lost**
  - **request for accounting of changes from RFC 2833**

- **Major contribution of -05 was to clean up previous work**
  - **did add one more trunk event: metering pulse**
  - **added analysis of changes from original RFC 2833.**
    - Lots of normative changes!

Backward Compatibility (and lack thereof)

Are these acceptable?

- Compliance no longer requires support of DTMF events
  - SHOULDs added for offer-answer signalling
  - for backward compatibility, SHOULD assume DTMF support if no "events" parameter provided
- A number of trunk events discarded, alternative means of signalling them indicated
- Clear incompatibility around assignment of event codes 138-139

Code	Old event	New event
138	MF K0 or KP (start-of-pulsing)	MF Code 11 (No. 5) or KP3P or ST3P (NA MF)
139	MF K1	MF KP (R1) or KP1 (No. 5)

"E" Bit Exception

Section 2.5.1.2:

"Sending of a packet with the "E" bit set is OPTIONAL if the packet reports two events which are defined as mutually exclusive states, or if the final packet for one state is immediately followed by a packet reporting a mutually exclusive state. (For events defined as states, the appearance of a mutually exclusive state implies the end of the previous state.)"

- In general the end of an event has to be indicated by setting the "E" bit in the payload indicating that event. Is the exception described above worth the bother?

Recommendation: get rid of the exception.

Undefined Tone Events

A fair number of undefined tone events in section 3.4. Possible to provide an intuitive definition of some of them based on tone name, but others are complete mysteries.

Does it make sense to standardize codepoints, the application of which is unspecified?

Recommendation: get rid of the undefined codepoints.

Summing Up

Lots of new material over RFC 2833:

- **clarifications for existing text**
- **new events**
- **the idea of "state" events**

RFC 2833 is 30 pages long. 2833bis approaches 80 pages.

- **Is the extra bulk worth it, or should it be pruned?**
- **What is the view on readiness for WGLC?**