

# INFO: You Love it, You Hate it

Eric Burger

# 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

UAS

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

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

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

# 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