http://groups.google.com/d/topic/comp.dcom.modems/m3ufre6XIEo/discussion

comp.dcom.modems >

T2500's and v.32bis -- rumors?

8 posts by 7 authors

Jiro Nakamura

3/14/91

Has anyone heard anything about whether Telebit will start supporting
T2500's with v.32bis? I bounced a message off mod...@telebit.com and
this is what they said:
>Subject: Re: V.32bis availability with T2500's
>Jiro,
>Telebit will be releasing a V.32bis modem within this year. Sorry I don't
>have a specific date. We will also offer an upgrade program. There is not
>an official press release.

        :-(I wonder what type of upgrade it will be. Does the 68000 in
the T2500 have enough horsepower to run v.32bis? Or maybe the DSP chip?
Hmmm.....
        I hope I haven't gotten techie in trouble, BTW. (Chances that
Telebit reads USENET are... ?) I do hope that we can get v.32bis and
cheaply. Telebit *should* show the world that it is totally behind
CCITT standards. I also think that PEP needs a little boost and should
become full duplex.
        If Telebit gets UUCP spoofing running over v.32bis with v.42bis
(just as it already runs over v.32 with MNP (why not v.42bis????)), then
I don't see that PEP will remain a viable communications standard unless
it gets upgraded. Who knows? Maybe Hayes or USRobotics will finally wake
up and start doing protocol spoofing on their own.

        - Jiro Nakamura
        ji...@shaman.com

Disclaimer: Just a happy customer of Telebit who doesn't want them to go
down the drain. Not affiliated with them in any way, except I own a T2500.

--
Jiro Nakamura   ji...@shaman.com
Shaman Consulting   (607) 253-0687 VOICE
"Bring your dead, dying shamans here!"   (607) 253-7809 FAX/Modem

Click here to Reply

Dmitry V. Volodin

3/15/91

In <1991Mar14.0...@shaman.com> ji...@shaman.com (Jiro Nakamura) writes:

>   If Telebit gets UUCP spoofing running over v.32bis with v.42bis
>(just as it already runs over v.32 with MNP (why not v.42bis????)), then
>I don't see that PEP will remain a viable communications standard unless
>it gets upgraded. Who knows? Maybe Hayes or USRobotics will finally wake
>up and start doing protocol spoofing on their own.

You American egocentrist. Just try to run all that nice V.32 thingies
here in Moscow to get what the Real Life is. :-)

--
Dmitry V. Volodin <d...@hq.demos.su> |
fax: +7 095 233 5016 | Call me Dima ('Dee-...)
phone: +7 095 231 2129 |

Bernhard Kroenung

3/14/91

Translate message to English

ji...@shaman.com (Jiro Nakamura) writes:

```
>(just as it already runs over v.32 with MNP (why not v.42bis????)), then
>I don't see that PEP will remain a viable communications standard unless
>it gets upgraded. Who knows? Maybe Hayes or USRobotics will finally wake
>up and start doing protocol spoofing on their own.

There are rumors that Telebit expands the PEP-Standard to 23kbit ...

What about T3000 ?

   Ciao
     Bernhard
--
Bernhard Kroenung, Bahnhofstr. 8, D-W6408 Ebersburg/Rhoen, Germany +49 6656 386
ho...@rhoen.in-berlin.de            X.400 : kro...@jlug-gw.uni-giessen.dbp.de

                 Fachhochschule Fulda : e-mail demnaext

Greg Andrews

3/15/91

In article <1991Mar14.0...@shaman.com> ji...@shaman.com (Jiro Nakamura) writes:
>
>Has anyone heard anything about whether Telebit will start supporting
>T2500's with v.32bis? I bounced a message off mod...@telebit.com and
>this is what they said:
>

>  [contents deleted - they said a new modem would be available this year]

>
>        :-(   I wonder what type of upgrade it will be. Does the 68000 in
>the T2500 have enough horsepower to run v.32bis? Or maybe the DSP chip?
>Hmmm.....

No.  That's also the reason PEP hasn't been updated much in the past
two or three years.

>        I hope I haven't gotten techie in trouble, BTW. (Chances that
>Telebit reads USENET are... ?)

Nah.  The tech didn't reveal anything he wasn't supposed to.  The chances
Telebit reads Usenet in an official capacity are low, but a couple of folks
contribute from their own private accounts.  (blush)

>I do hope that we can get v.32bis and cheaply. Telebit *should* show the
>world that it is totally behind CCITT standards. I also think that PEP
>needs a little boost and should become full duplex.

If Telebit weren't interested in CCITT standards, there wouldn't have
been a T2500, T1500, or T1600.  As mod...@telebit.com said, a V.32bis
modem is forthcoming - it just won't be the T2500.

>        If Telebit gets UUCP spoofing running over v.32bis with v.42bis
>(just as it already runs over v.32 with MNP (why not v.42bis????)), then
>I don't see that PEP will remain a viable communications standard unless
>it gets upgraded. Who knows? Maybe Hayes or USRobotics will finally wake
>up and start doing protocol spoofing on their own.
>

Why no protocol spoofing in V.42?  Simple - the CCITT wasn't registering
extensions to the V.42 protocol when Telebit wanted to add protocol support.
Microcom was willing, so it was implemented in MNP mode.  There are some
"unregistered" extension codes available, but only at the risk of colliding
with someone else's private V.42 extension...  Telebit will keep checking
with the CCITT so spoofing can be added to V.42 mode also.

It's been pointed out before that a windowed protocol like uucp doesn't
really need spoofing when you're running a full duplex modulation.  Uucp
spoofing doesn't gain much in the way of speed over V.32 or V.32bis links
the way it does over PEP.  Still, there are advantages in other areas.
The modems can disable an inappropriate flow control method (XON/XOFF)
when the spoofing modem kicks in, solving those types of problems.  Error
recovery can be quicker, since the modems handle the error in the link
protocol (MNP) rather than the computers dealing with it at a higher level.
This means a broken packet may not need to have that packet **and all the
rest of the packets in the window** re-transmitted across the phone line,
```

Protocol spoofing over a full duplex modulation will help the most with the old stop-and-wait protocols like Xmodem, Ymodem, and the original Kermit. Spoofing can make those protocols run as fast as windowed types.

```
--
.-------------------------------------------.
| Greg Andrews         |   gandrews@netcom.COM |
 -------------------------------------------'
```

Ken Mandelberg

3/16/91

In article <28407@netcom.COM>, gandrews@netcom.COM (Greg Andrews) writes:
> >
>
>
> Why no protocol spoofing in V.42? Simple - the CCITT wasn't registering
> extensions to the V.42 protocol when Telebit wanted to add protocol support.
> Microcom was willing, so it was implemented in MNP mode. There are some
> "unregistered" extension codes available, but only at the risk of colliding
> with someone else's private V.42 extension... Telebit will keep checking
> with the CCITT so spoofing can be added to V.42 mode also.
>

I had been wondering why on the T1600 the "remote access" commands only work in MNP mode and not V.42. I guess the reason may be the same as suggested above for spoofing.

****

By the way, I think its obvious why the upgrade path from the T2500 to V.32bis can't be just firmware or a new daughter board, and will probably be just some sort of discount on a new modem. The serial side of the T2500 (on the motherboard) is apparently stuck at 19.2K max. It doesn't seem to make much sense to signal at 14.4K with typically 2 fold and more compression, if you can't push it out of the back of the modem at better than 19.2K. (If Telebit could have increased the serial rate with firmware surely they would have already done that to be competitive even with the current V.32/V.42BIS modems).

I think the more interesting question is will the T1600 get V.32BIS with new firmware.

```
--
Ken Mandelberg      | k...@mathcs.emory.edu          PREFERRED
Emory University    | {rutgers,gatech}!emory!km       UUCP
Dept of Math and CS | km@emory.bitnet                 NON-DOMAIN BITNET
Atlanta, GA 30322   | Phone: Voice (404) 727-7963, FAX 727-5611
```

Greg Andrews

3/16/91

In article <71...@emory.mathcs.emory.edu> k...@mathcs.emory.edu (Ken Mandelberg) writes:
>In article <28407@netcom.COM>, gandrews@netcom.COM (Greg Andrews) writes:
> >
> > Why no protocol spoofing in V.42? Simple - the CCITT wasn't registering
> > extensions to the V.42 protocol when Telebit wanted to add protocol support.
>

>I had been wondering why on the T1600 the "remote access" commands only work
>in MNP mode and not V.42. I guess the reason may be the same as suggested
>above for spoofing.
>

Exactly right.

>
>By the way, I think its obvious why the upgrade path from the T2500 to
>V.32bis can't be just firmware or a new daughter board, and will
>probably be just some sort of discount on a new modem. The serial side
>of the T2500 (on the motherboard) is apparently stuck at 19.2K max. It
>doesn't seem to make much sense to signal at 14.4K with typically 2
>fold and more compression, if you can't push it out of the back of the
>modem at better than 19.2K. (If Telebit could have increased the serial
>rate with firmware surely they would have already done that to be

Even so, a replacement for the 68000 wouldn't help much if the DSP
processor couldn't handle the modulation. Both the 68000 and the
32010 were changed (along with most of the support chips).

>
>I think the more interesting question is will the T1600 get V.32BIS
>with new firmware.
>

I can't tell at this point. Nobody's made an announcement about the
T1600 and V.32bis. Tech support usually hears about it the same time
everyone else does to minimize leaks.

--
.---.
| Greg Andrews | gandrews@netcom.COM |
'---'

Paul Nash

3/17/91

Thus spake d...@hq.demos.su (Dmitry V. Volodin):

> In <1991Mar14.0...@shaman.com> ji...@shaman.com (Jiro Nakamura) writes:

> >I don't see that PEP will remain a viable communications standard unless
> >it gets upgraded.
>

> You American egocentrist. Just try to run all that nice V.32 thingies
> here in Moscow to get what the Real Life is. :-)

I agree. V.32 (and especially V.32bis) might be nice, but if you
want to know what PEP is all about, wait until you have a phone line
that won't support V.22bis (2400 bps) reliably. I had one until
a year ago, and I could get about 4800 bps with PEP, while my V.22bis
modems (Octocomm, Racal and others) all dropped back to V.22 _if they
could connect at all_.

Also, for trans-Atlantic (or trans-almost-anything) links, there is
nothing (IMNASHO) to beat a Trailblazer. I hope that Telebit can
stay alive, 'cos I want some more T2500s (or whatever their newer
PEP modem will be).

Paul Nash   Free Range Computer Systems cc
paul@frcs.UUCP   ...!uunet!m2xenix!frcs!paul

MINIXUG-ONLINE System Manager

3/22/91

paul@frcs.UUCP (Paul Nash) wrote:
>> You American egocentrist. Just try to run all that nice V.32 thingies
>> here in Moscow to get what the Real Life is. :-)
>
> I agree. V.32 (and especially V.32bis) might be nice, but if you
> want to know what PEP is all about, wait until you have a phone line
> that won't support V.22bis (2400 bps) reliably. I had one until
> a year ago, and I could get about 4800 bps with PEP, while my V.22bis
> modems (Octocomm, Racal and others) all dropped back to V.22 _if they
> could connect at all_.

I have such a line here. I have an UUCP link to a machine, about 70
miles from here (also in Holland..). He has to poll me at _1200_ bps
to get things over at all, and, most of the time, even that fails...
I set him up with my private T-1000 (I have a CellBlazer for this network
machine :-), and that solved _all_ problems. He experienced the joy of
a Telebit talking PEP at 863cps eff. , where V.XYZ failed completely...
No need to say, that his order for a TB is in the mail... :-)

> Also, for trans-Atlantic (or trans-almost-anything) links, there is
> nothing (IMNASHO) to beat a Trailblazer. I hope that Telebit can
> stay alive, 'cos I want some more T2500s (or whatever their newer
> PEP modem will be).

Being the European backbone of a hobbyist network (see header :-), I
have many national, international and trans-atlantice (and, even
trans-pacific: Japan and Aussie) links. Telebit won my modem contest
with ease- all other modems gave up sooner or later....

Fred van Kempen
wal...@uwalt.nl.mugnet.org