

## SDP Extensions for Fax over IP Using T.38

### Status of this Memo

This document is an Internet-Draft. 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 “lid-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).

Distribution of this document is unlimited.

### Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) The Internet Society (1998). All Rights Reserved.

#### Abstract

Fax over IP is currently using SMTP, i.e. the fax is sent as an e-mail. It would be desirable to support a fax delivery that can return status of the transmission in real time, such as whether the phone number or address was correct, whether the remote side was busy, etc. The ITU is standardizing a protocol for transferring real time fax over IP, T.38. This standard is meant to be used with the H.323 standard, but it is also possible to use it together with SIP, provided that SDP is extended to support the necessary parameters. This document defines extensions to SDP to support the use of T.38 for real-time fax.

## 1 Introduction

Fax is a popular means for transferring documents between locations. Traditionally, this has been done over the telephone network, as defined in the ITU specification T.30 [1]. Some of the reasons for the popularity of fax is that the sender of a fax gets a notification that the fax has been successfully sent, and that the receiver gets information on the senders telephone number and the time the fax was received. Another reason is that fax transmission over a telephone connection can not easily be eavesdropped. When introducing fax over IP, these benefits should be preserved. The ITU standard T.38 [2] defines how to transport the fax signals over IP. It is expected that the fax channel is set up by some other means, e.g., through H.323 or SIP. Annex D of H.323 [3] describes how H.323 supports fax over IP. In this document we will describe how SIP and SDP can do the same. It would probably be possible to even support the T.38 scope with SIP and SDP, but that is for future work.

## 2 Introduction to T.38

The ITU T.38 recommendation defines how to transfer fax in realtime between fax gateways and/or IP fax machines in an IP network. Transport of the fax signals is done either by TCP or UDP, and reliability

with UDP is achieved through error control mechanisms in T.38, which can be either parity FEC or packet redundancy. The recommendation assumes that a network connection has already been established by the two (or more) peers. This is similar to traditional fax, where a phone line is allocated before the actual fax signalling starts. The issues that are left to be handled by other mechanisms are addressing, identification, authentication, and creation of the fax connection. The fax machines must also have agreed on whether to use UDP or TCP for transport, and in case of UDP, the error control scheme to use.

### 3 Session Initiation Protocol

The Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) [4] already provides mechanisms for user (fax machine) location, caller identification, call establishment, and authentication. No additions are needed to support the use of T.38.

### 4 Extensions to SDP

The Session Description Protocol (SDP) (RFC 2327 [5]) provides mechanisms for describing sessions. The information that needs to be represented in SDP for T.38 is

- the fact that T.38 is to be used,
- whether to use TCP or UDP for transport, and
- which type of error control to be used by T.38.

Thus, the SDP message could be the following:

```
v=0
o=faxgw1 2890844526 2890842807 IN IP4 128.59.19.68
s=FAX message
e=faxsupport@company.com
t=2873397496 0
c=IN IP4 128.59.19.68
m=application 49170 udp t38
a=t38errctl:parFEC
```

In order to do this, “application/t38” needs to be registered as a MIME type according to the recommendations in [5]. The choice of TCP or UDP can already be represented in SDP, and the error control scheme should be represented as an attribute.

### 5 Security Considerations

SIP provides security mechanisms for authentication of caller, and encryption of SIP messages including the SDP payload. For the T.38 flow, IP security mechanisms, as defined in RFC 1825 [6], can be used.

## 6 Authors' Addresses

Elin Wedlund  
Switchlab  
Ericsson Telecom AB  
S-126 25 Stockholm  
SWEDEN  
electronic mail: elin.wedlund@etx.ericsson.se

Wenyu Jiang  
Dept. of Computer Science  
Columbia University  
1214 Amsterdam Avenue  
New York, NY 10027  
USA  
electronic mail: wenyu@cs.columbia.edu

Henning Schulzrinne  
Dept. of Computer Science  
Columbia University  
1214 Amsterdam Avenue  
New York, NY 10027  
USA  
electronic mail: schulzrinne@cs.columbia.edu

## References

- [1] International Telecommunication Union, "Procedures for document facsimile transmission in the general switched telephone network," Recommendation T.30, Telecommunication Standardization Sector of ITU, Geneva, Switzerland, July 1996.
- [2] International Telecommunication Union, "Procedures for real-time group 3 facsimile communication over IP networks," Recommendation T.38, Telecommunication Standardization Sector of ITU, Geneva, Switzerland, June 1998.
- [3] International Telecommunication Union, "Visual telephone systems and equipment for local area networks which provide a non-guaranteed quality of service," Recommendation H.323, Telecommunication Standardization Sector of ITU, Geneva, Switzerland, May 1996.
- [4] M. Handley, H. Schulzrinne, E. Schooler, and J. Rosenberg, "SIP: session initiation protocol," Internet Draft, Internet Engineering Task Force, Nov. 1998. Work in progress.
- [5] M. Handley and V. Jacobson, "SDP: session description protocol," RFC 2327, Internet Engineering Task Force, Apr. 1998.
- [6] R. Atkinson, "Security architecture for the internet protocol," RFC 1825, Internet Engineering Task Force, Aug. 1995.

## Full Copyright Statement

Copyright (c) The Internet Society (1998). All Rights Reserved.

This document and translations of it may be copied and furnished to others, and derivative works that comment on or otherwise explain it or assist in its implementation may be prepared, copied, published and distributed, in whole or in part, without restriction of any kind, provided that the above copyright notice and this paragraph are included on all such copies and derivative works. However, this document itself may not be modified in any way, such as by removing the copyright notice or references to the Internet Society or other Internet organizations, except as needed for the purpose of developing Internet standards in which case the procedures for copyrights defined in the Internet Standards process must be followed, or as required to translate it into languages other than English.

The limited permissions granted above are perpetual and will not be revoked by the Internet Society or its successors or assigns.

This document and the information contained herein is provided on an "AS IS" basis and THE INTERNET SOCIETY AND THE INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE DISCLAIMS ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION HEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.