

MEGACO Working Group  
Internet Draft  
June 1999

Matt Holdrege (Liaison)  
Multiservice Switching Forum  
Media Control Group

Multiservice Switching Forum requirements input to MEGACO  
<[draft-ietf-megaco-msf-followup-00.txt](#)>

Status of this Memo

This document is an Internet-Draft and is in full conformance  
with all provisions of [Section 10 of RFC2026](#).

This document is an Internet-Draft. Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), its areas, and its working groups. Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

The list of current Internet-Drafts can be accessed at  
<http://www.ietf.org/ietf/1id-abstracts.txt>

The list of Internet-Draft Shadow Directories can be accessed at  
<http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html>.

To view the entire list of current Internet-Drafts, please check the "1id-abstracts.txt" listing contained in the Internet-Drafts Shadow Directories on ftp.is.co.za (Africa), ftp.nordu.net (Northern Europe), ftp.nis.garr.it (Southern Europe), munnari.oz.au (Pacific Rim), ftp.ietf.org (US East Coast), or ftp.isi.edu (US West Coast).

Copyright Notice

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (1999). All Rights Reserved.

Abstract:

This document serves as input into the IETF MEGACO requirements process. It includes requirements as input by MSF members and refined by the MSF Media Control group and requests clarifications of requirements currently being considered at IETF. This document has been prepared in response to a document prepared by Nancy Greene, one of the IETF Megaco Requirements editors. This is a followup to a response from MEGACO.

Disclaimer:

This is a representation of the preliminary requirements generated

by the Multiservice Switching Forum/Media Control Working Group. This document has been approved by the Working Group for liaison distribution to the IETF. However, this document in no way binds any of the member organizations to the ideas presented. It should also be noted that this work is incomplete and a draft. It is being submitted now to meet the MEGACO WG timelines. The MSF will revisit this work in the future and may add, change or delete its requirements.

## Introduction:

MSF submitted a document entitled "Multiservice Switching Forum requirements input to MEGACO" to the IETF MEGACO group as Internet draft [draft-ietf-megaco-msf-reqs-01.txt](#) for consideration. Most of the requirements proposed in [draft-ietf-megaco-msf-reqs-01.txt](#) have been incorporated in the latest MEGACO requirements draft [draft-ietf-megaco-reqs-03](#). Nancy Greene, one of the editors of [draft-ietf-megaco-reqs-03](#) provided a document detailing how the requirements in [draft-ietf-megaco-msf-reqs-01.txt](#) are addressed in [draft-ietf-megaco-reqs-03](#).

This document requests the addition of requirements into the next IETF MEGACO requirements draft that the MSF Media Control WG does not feel were not adequately addressed in [draft-ietf-megaco-reqs-03](#). This document also requests clarification on some requirements that are currently in [draft-ietf-megaco-reqs-03](#).

## Requirements:

### Requirement 1:

The original MSF document [draft-ietf-megaco-msf-reqs-01.txt](#) stated:  
Report: The protocol shall allow the request and notification of mid-call trigger events.

The current version of [draft-ietf-megaco-reqs-03](#) states: 5.4 c.  
Allow reporting of detected events on the MG to the MGC. The protocol should provide the means to minimize the messaging required report commonly-occurring event sequences.

We would like the MEGACO requirements document to include the following requirement: Report: The protocol shall allow the MGC to request the arming of a mid-call trigger even after the call has been set up.

### Requirement 2:

The original MSF requirement in [draft-ietf-megaco-msf-reqs-01.txt](#) read: Function: The Protocol shall allow the recovery or redistribution of traffic without call/packet loss.

The IETF response indicated: Not added - no call/packet loss is too strict a requirement.

We would like to modify the original requirement to read: Function: The Protocol shall allow the recovery or redistribution of traffic without call loss.

We hope that the restated requirement can be included in the IETF MEGACO requirements document.

Requirement 3:

The requirements draft [draft-ietf-megaco-reqs-03.txt](#) states: 8. d. Support scalability from very small to very large MGs: The protocol must support MGs with capacities ranging from one to a few tens of thousands of terminations.

We would like to modify the requirement to read: 8. d. Support scalability from very small to very large MGs: The protocol must support MGs with capacities ranging from one to millions of terminations.

#### Clarifications:

We would like to require the following clarifications:

Clarification 1: The IETF draft [draft-ietf-megaco-reqs-03.txt](#) states:

5.7. c. Provide the mechanism for the MGC to specify that the MG report accounting information automatically at end of call, in mid-call upon request, at specific time intervals as specified by the MGC and at unit usage thresholds as specified by the MGC.

5.7. e. Allow the MGC to have some control over which statistics are reported, to enable it to manage the amount of information transferred.

We would like the requirements to clarify the difference between accounting information and statistics. The current requirements have ambiguity regarding these two terms.

The MSF view of the terms: Statistics - aggregate information, usage measurements and counters Accounting - per call information, call detail record information (e.g. AMA). This information may be subjected to more rigorous auditing than statistical information as well as regulatory review.

#### Clarification 2:

The IETF draft [draft-ietf-megaco-reqs-03.txt](#) states:

d. Specifically support collection of:

- \* start and stop time, by media flow,
- \* volume of content carried (e.g. number of packets/cells transmitted, number received with and without error, interarrival jitter), by media flow,
- \* QOS statistics, by media flow.

We would like to understand the reasoning behind collecting the specific type of statistics indicated in [draft-ietf-megaco-reqs-03.txt](#) compared to other information (e.g. type of resources like echo cancellers, codecs etc. used.)

Author's Address

Matt Holdrege

Ascend Communications

1701 Harbor Bay Parkway

Alameda, CA 94502

matt@ascend.com