

Status Update on E2MD

by **Bernie Höneisen**

Ucom Standards Track Solutions GmbH
<http://ucom.ch/>

bernie@ietf.hoeneisen.ch

IETF-78, ENUM WG meeting
27 July 2010
Maastricht, The Netherlands

Table of Content

- E2MD in Short
 - Use Cases
- Relationship to ENUM
- Results of the BoF at IETF-77
 - After BoF Work
 - Current Status
 - Q & A

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

Feedback E2MD BoF at IETF-77

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...

Backup Slides

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

cnam

- 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



unused

- 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

send-n (1/2)

- 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

send-n (2/2)

- "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

