INFO: You Love it, You Hate it
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Would it not be Useful to Have UA-UA Messaging?

• RFC 2976
• Generic method for one UA to send a message to another UA
• Published uses
  – RFC 3372 / 3204 (ISUP/QSIG) [BCP]
  – RFC 4322 (MSCML) [Informational]
• Myriad proprietary DTMF transport protocols
• Lots of running code
What Makes This Work?

• Both endpoints “know” about each other
  – ISUP/QSIG: Softswitch or egress media gateway paired to ingress media gateway
  – MSCML: Application Server to Controlled Media Server
  – DTMF: Media gateway connected to softswitch

• Not very much inter-vendor interoperability
  – Driven by customers demanding “you will conform to brand X’s DTMF INFO message and will always send it”
So What is the Problem?

- No negotiation
- No throttling (bad Internet actor)
- No interoperability

- Could address all issues
- No issues addressed today
Media Types for Negotiation

UAC

INVITE, Accept: application/dtmf+xml

Cool - I know I can send DTMF payload in an INFO

INVITE, Accept: application/kpml-response+xml

Cool - I know I can send DTMF. I’ll do it in an INFO

INVITE, Accept: application/sdp

Cool - I know I can send my cool SDP. I’ll do it in an INFO

And no, we will not do application/transport-info-in-sdp

UAS
Work Group Directions

- Ignore; leave well enough alone
- Document problems with INFO; document alternatives
  - Simply document (base level)
  - Restrict to legacy, noting that closed UA-UA environments will continue to work (current draft)
  - Restrict to legacy only, explicitly calling uses of INFO beyond RFC 3372 / 3204 “wrong”
- Create negotiation framework for INFO