                    Media Gateway Control Protocol (MGCP)
                          Call Flow Test Case 1
                    Christian Huitema, Flemming Andreasen

1. Status of this document

This document is an Internet-Draft and is in full conformance with all
provisions of Section 10 of RFC2026.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task
Force (IETF), its areas, and its working groups. Note that other groups
may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months
and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any
time. It is inappropriate to use Internet- Drafts as reference material
or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

To view the entire list of current Internet-Drafts, please check the
"1id-abstracts.txt" listing contained in the Internet-Drafts Shadow
Directories on ftp.is.co.za (Africa), ftp.nordu.net (Northern Europe),
ftp.nis.garr.it (Southern Europe), munnari.oz.au (Pacific Rim),
ftp.ietf.org (US East Coast), or ftp.isi.edu (US West Coast).

Abstract

The IETF Megaco working group is currently working on defining a proto-
col for controlling Media Gateways (MG) from external control elements
such as a Media Gateway Controller (MGC). Different models have been
proposed to address this problem, and in order to judge the different
models, a series of test cases will be considered.

This document explains how the Media Gateway Control Protocol (MGCP) can
be used to handle the first test case, which considers a Voice over IP
gateway with directly subtending DTMF lines placing a call to an H.323
client. The document contains an introduction with further details on
the test case, two different call flows to solve it, followed by the
conclusion of the test case. MGCP is defined in a companion document
[0].

2. Introduction

The Media Gateway Control Protocol can be used to control different
types of endpoints, such as "residential gateways", "trunking gateways"
or "packet relays". This document will show how MGCP can be used to con-
trol a residential gateway in the Megaco call flow test case 1, which
considers a Voice over IP gateway with directly subtending DTMF lines
placing a call to an H.323 client. We first present the Megaco test case
1, and we then present an example call flow for solving it. Following
that, we discuss possible optimizations to the call flow, and we then
present the conclusions reached in using MGCP to satisfy the test case.

3. Call Flow Test Case 1 - DTMF line dialing into VoIP Gateway

In this section we first present the problem statement for test case 1,
and we then present the assumptions for the test case that were made.

3.1. Problem Statement

In this section, we present the problem statement given for the Megaco
call flow test case 1. The problem is formulated as follows:

Setting: a VoIP Gateway provides service to directly subtending DTMF
lines.The standard North American dialling plan is in use: seven digits
beginning with 2-9 for a local number, 10 digits for a North American
toll number, the single digit 0 for an operator, 411 for directory
information, and 911 for emergency service. Overseas dialling is 011
followed by a variable number of digits. The subscriber actually dials
a seven-digit local number which has been assigned to a friend's H.323
client installation. The Gateway consults with an H.323 Gatekeeper to
resolve the dialled digits into the H.323 client's address, then sets up
an audio call to that client. At the end of the call the MGC component
of the Gateway is required to report to a billing system for billing
purposes the following items:

--   the time the call began (subscriber off-hook recorded)

--   the time media transfer between the calling and called parties
      began

--   the time media transfer between the calling and called parties
      ended

--   total media packets and octets respectively transmitted by the
      Gateway to the called party

--   total media packets and octets respectively received by the Gateway

from the called party

--   difference between total media packets actually received at the
     Gateway and the total number expected

--   mean interarrival jitter as calculated at the Gateway for received
     packets. (Notice I don't trust the H.323 client to report anything
     that can be used for billing.)

Call flow:

```
        Calling          Gateway              Called      Gatekeeper
           |   1. Off-hook -->|                   |              |
           |<-- 2. Dial tone  |                   |              |
           |3. First digit-->|                   |              |
           |<4. No dial tone  |                   |              |
           |5. Digit      -->|                   |              |
           ...
           |10. Digit     -->|                   |              |
           |                  |    11. Admission Request (ARQ)----> |
           |                  |<---12. Admission confirm (ACF)     |
           |                  |    13. SETUP   -->|              |
           |                  |                   |    14. ARQ  --> |
           |                  |                   |<-- 15. ACF    |
           |                  |<-- 16. ALERTING  |              |
           |<-- 17. ringback  |                   |              |
           |                  |<-- 18. CONNECT   |              |
           |<- 19. cutthrough|                   |              |
           ...
           |   20. On-hook -->|                   |              |
           |                  |    21. RELEASE -->|              |
           |                  |<-- 22. RLC       |              |
           ...
```

Notes: (numbered by the steps to which they apply)

11. Admission Request contains dialled number as an E.164 address.
     Also requests total bandwidth of 128 kbs (64 kbs in each direction
     to accommodate G.711 coded audio).

12. Admission Confirm provides call signalling address and port for the
     called H.323 client. It indicates that only 80 kbs is available.

13. To meet the bandwidth restriction, the SETUP message contains a
     fastConnect element which offers to send G.711 mu-law audio and
     receive G.729 Annex C audio or vice versa. It supplies port
     addresses at which it will receive RTP (incoming media) and RTCP
     (for the media it transmits). The SETUP message also contains a

Huitema, Andreasen   [Page 3]

Boolean indicating that the called H.323 client should not transmit
any media packets until it issues a CONNECT message.

14-15.
    The called H.323 client gets permission for its intended bandwidth
    usage.

16.   The called H.323 indicates that it is alerting the called party,
      and that it has chosen to receive G.711 mu-law and send G.729 Annex
      C. It supplies the port at which it will receive the G.711 and the
      port at which it will receive RTCP corresponding to the G.729 it
      sends out.

17.   It is assumed for this scenario that the Gateway is responsible for
      supplying ringback tone to the caller.

18.   The CONNECT message from the called H.323 client indicates that the
      called party has answered and the call has entered talking state.

19.   The Gateway must discontinue ringback tone and cut through talking
      in both directions.

20.   Assumed for this scenario that the caller is the first to hang up.

The Disengage sequences which must pass between the Gatekeeper and the
Other two H.323 entities at the end of the call are omitted, since they
are not relevant.

Assumptions

*   The description of the dialing plan does not include any restric-
      tions on the structure of the 10-digit number, and it is therefore
      assumed that the 10-digit number may start with any digit, incl.
      2-9.

*   We assume that international numbers (excluding direct-dial prefix)
      may consist of as few as 1 digit.

*   We will be using H.323 version 2.

4.   Call Flows

We present two different call flows to test case 1. The first call flow
illustrates how MGCP can be used to satisfy the test case when two
separate connections are used. The second call flow illustrates an
alternative solution where we only use one connection.

4.1. Two Connection Call Flow

The diagram below illustrates the basic call flow:

Step	User	MG	MGC	H.323 EP	GK
0		<- Ack (ready)	RQNT ->		
1 1a	Off- hook	NTFY <-	-> (off-hook recorded) Ack		
2	(dial tone)	<- Ack	RQNT ->		
3	digit				
4	(no dial tone)				
5	digit				
	...				
10	digit				
10a	(match)	NTFY <-	-> Ack		
10b		<- Ack(SDP-1)	RQNT+ CRCX-1 ->		
11			ARQ	- -	->
12			<-	- -	ACF
12a		<-	CRCX-2		
12b		Ack(SDP-2)	->		
13			SETUP	->	
14				ARQ	->
15				<-	ACF
16			<-	ALERTING	
17	(ring back)	<- Ack, Ack	RQNT + MDFY-1(SDP), MDFY-2(SDP) ->		
18			<-	CONNECT	
19	(cut- through)	<- Ack	RQNT +MDFY-2 -> (full-duplex media transfer recorded)		

DOCKET ALARM

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts

Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research

With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips

Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS
Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS
Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS
Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.