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E2MD in Short

- **E2MD:**
  - E.164 To Meta-Data mapping

- Extends ENUM to provide further information on E.164 numbers

- Why not use plain ENUM (E2U)?
  - ENUM limitation:
    Result must always be a URI indicating a resource
Some E2MD Use Cases

- Global Service Provider Identifier
- Service Capabilities
- Calling Party Name
- Meta-Data about the E.164 tree
  - Information about the numbering plan
  - Number not assigned / not in use
## Relationship to ENUM

- E2MD use cases are similar to ENUM use cases
- Both use E.164 numbers
- Both have a hierarchical delegation model
- E2MD ideas have been around for a long time
  - They are covered already by the current ENUM charter (item 4)
- There is deployed equipment and code for ENUM
  - Reusing that code simplifies E2MD deployment
Lots of comments including:

- Scope considered too large
- Registration Framework approach seen problematic
- Issues related to DNS, NAPTR and DDDS
- Private vs. public usage
- Security and Privacy issues need to be addressed

Note: Issues will be discussed after this presentation
Anaheim Conclusions

- There is wide support in favor of working on E2MD
- All arguments were known before the BoF at IETF-77
  - Nothing new came up during the BoF
  - Many of the arguments made against E2MD are actually arguments against ENUM
  - Some arguments were perceived as FUD and/or OSI Layer 9+ issues
- No WG could be formed at IETF-77
- E2MD work goes on (mailing-list, conf-calls and Wiki)
Work after IETF-77 (in short)

- E2MD proponents continued to work on E2MD
- Lots of discussions concerning the Anaheim BoF feedback
- 4 conference calls since Anaheim
- Complete re-write of the proposed charter
- Internet-Draft on problem statement to be submitted
Work after IETF-77 (Conclusions)

- Relaxed schedule to form a Working Group
  - Continue informally in Maastricht (IETF-78)
  - Formal WG-forming BoF planned for Beijing (IETF-79)
- Separated Long Term and Short Term requirements
- Focus on a limited set of use cases
- Work on an “agreeable” E2MD charter
  - Split up the problem space to make target smaller
  - Work on a subset of Services
  - Address BoF comments
  - Focus on problem statement (as opposed to solutions)
Out-of-scope Requirements

- Short term use cases no longer require:
  - A Framework approach for registration
  - Source dependent answers
  - Source URI
  - Large amount of data (in DNS)
Current Status

- **Need**
  - Five use cases demonstrate immediate need

- **Approach**
  - Adjusted original proposal
    - (aligned to BoF feedback / ditched requirements)

- **Benefit**
  - E2MD approach is a small increment to existing ENUM

- **Is the IETF the right place?**
  - Most people think yes due to close ties to ENUM
Questions?

- We are going to discuss the issues right after this presentation, please only ask clarifying question now...
Global Service Provider Identifier

- Indicates the Communication Service Provider (CSP) responsible for this number
  - AKA the “carrier-of-record” or “ITAD identifier”

- Potential uses:
  - Optimize routing
  - Advising end-users about costs when charging depends on the terminating CSP

- Not yet documented in an Internet-Draft
Returns the Calling Name (like directory name) for a given phone number.

Used in cases where this information is not available or lost:
- Calls that originate on (or transited via) the Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN)
- Calling Name to be displayed on VoIP or other Real-time Clients

See: draft-ietf-enum-cnam-08
- Indicates whether an E.164 number (or number range) is allocated or assigned for communications service.

- Lets client know that a call will fail without wasting the effort of a session setup
  - E2MD lookup is faster than SIP INVITE
  - The user can be provided with a correct announcement (or other indication)

- See: draft-ietf-enum-unused-04
Increases efficiency of overlapped dialing
  - Reduces DNS lookups and SIP INVITEs
  - Decreases frequency of timeouts
  - Could extend SIP "484 address incomplete" handling: no need for a new SIP dialogue for each dialed digit

Deployed in empty non-terminals (i.e. in the branches)

Indicates the minimum depth of the tree below this record
"You must send N more digits before any leaf-node NAPTRs will be returned"

- Designed for private ENUM, but works also in public ENUM

- See: draft-bellis-enum-send-n-02