

Re: Future or TAPI

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Development/microsoft.public.win32.programmer.tapi/2005-05/msg00581.html>

- *From:* "Angus Comber" <angus@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 24 May 2005 22:22:42 +0100
-

Matthias

I hear what you say about modems. I thought that modems were actually full duplex and that the Unimodem driver only supported half duplex operation. There have been quite a few posts on here about people bemoaning Unimodem's lack of full duplex support... so I sort of assumed it was Unimodem at fault.

Interesting the bit about full duplex speakerphone – the little detail on the end makes a big difference!

On call progress detection, however do modems not detect a successful connection. Eg if you use AT commands in Hyperterminal to connect to another computer, the modem usually displays something like CONNECTED or CONNECTED 19200 . And when the modem disconnects it does eventually know about it. Unimodem doesn't even understand that.

Angus

"Matthias Moetje" <moetje@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message news:OJrhEa9XFHA.2128@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

> Angus,

>

> I agree with some of your points, but I disagree in some areas:

>

- > Regarding Unimodem: Call progress detection is a limitation of
- > modems, not of Unimodem. Modems don't have hardware support
- > for progress detection like professional telephony hardware has.
- > At some time I did some research on the full-duplex issue, but
- > I'm still not sure if even a voice modem exists that supports full-duplex
- > line operation. All modem specifications I have investigated only
- > mention "full duplex speakerphone" support which does not mean
- > full-duplex line operation, so what would a full-duplex Unimodem
- > driver help if there is no hardware that supports it?

Re: Future or TAPI

> So I don't believe that using AT commands will help much with your
> development. It will only make your application dependant on the
> modem chipset.
>
> Regarding wave drivers: I think the PBXs Grant mentioned are all
> VoIP based PBX systems. For conventional PBX systems (be it
> analog or ISDN) you need to know that these are able to switch
> connections but they don't have built-in line devices and they do
> not have the capability to stream multiple audio channels to a
> TAPI application. (wouldn't work anyway via the serial link which
> is often used to connect a PBX to a TAPI server)
> So again this is not a limitation of TAPI but of the hardware.
>
>> I have worked with CSTA too. From experience it tends to be available
> with
>> larger PBX's. Perhaps Microsoft was more interested in bigger companies.
>
> You may be very right here, this could be indeed the point why
> they made this decision.
>
>
> Best regards,
>
> Matthias Moetje
> -----
> TERASENS GmbH
> Ackermannstraße 3
> 80797 München
> -----
> Fon: +49 89 143370-0
> Fax: +49 89 143370-22
> e-mail: moetje at terasens dot de
> www: www.terasens.de
> -----
>
>
> "Angus Comber" <angus@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
> <news:%23UOX2S8XFHA.2124@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
>> There are a lot of things about TAPI which are annoying. Here is my
>> list.
>>
>> 1. Unimodem driver is pretty pathetic. You can't really do a lot with a
>> voice modem. Progress detection is poor as is the half duplex
>> limitation.
>> I thought about developing a basic voicemail application and still might,
>> but will use AT commands.
>>
>> 2. Vendor support is pretty good but often you have to pay for the TAPI
>> driver or what I would consider fairly basic call control features such
>> as
>> forwarding and DND are only available if you pay a licence. I would like

Re: Future or TAPI

Re: Future or TAPI

> to
>> see more advanced TAPI features from PBX manufacturers.
>>
>> 3. In my small experience wave drivers for TAPI PBX's are not available,
>> don't work or cost. Network Alchemy only had a wave driver for a
> particular
>> model, and apparently it didn't work. Wave driver for next models cost
>> quite a bit. Strange thing is that these PBX's cost less than \$1000 for
>> basic models but you pay another \$1000 for the wave driver/extended TAPI
>> support.
>>
>> Also generally getting ANY sort of developer support from vendors is like
>> pulling teeth.
>>
>> I have worked with CSTA too. From experience it tends to be available
> with
>> larger PBX's. Perhaps Microsoft was more interested in bigger companies.
>>
>> Intel don't seem too bothered about TAPI either. They now own Dialogic
> and
>> someone told me the latest cards don't even support TAPI. Or maybe their
>> latest software doesn't include a TAPI driver. Not sure.
>>
>> Having said all that, TAPI does appear to be the number one API for any
>> telephony work. does anyone else agree/disagree?
>>
>> Angus
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>> "Matthias Moetje" <moetje@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
>> news:e5yPmF6XFHA.2796@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
>> > Hello all,
>> >
>> > in case you didn't already know, I'd like to inform you that the
>> > new call control capabilities of Live Communications Server
>> > 2005 SPI in combination with Office Communicator 2005
>> > rely on a CSTA link to PBXs instead of TAPI.
>> > I don't know the reason for this decision but anyway I think
>> > it's kind of sad that MS does not seem to rely on TAPI for
>> > new products. (MS Speech Server is not built on TAPI either,
>> > although TAPI would have been an ideal platform for it).
>> >
>> > Please share your comments...
>> >
>> >
>> > Best regards,
>> >

Re: Future or TAPI

>>> Matthias Moetje
>>> -----
>>> TERASENS GmbH
>>> Ackermannstraße 3
>>> 80797 München
>>> -----
>>> Fon: +49 89 143370-0
>>> Fax: +49 89 143370-22
>>> e-mail: moetje at terasens dot de
>>> www: www.terasens.de
>>> -----
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>
>

• *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ **Re: Future or TAPI**
 ◇ From: Matthias Moetje

• *References:*

- ◆ **Future or TAPI**
 ◇ From: Matthias Moetje
- ◆ **Re: Future or TAPI**
 ◇ From: Angus Comber
- ◆ **Re: Future or TAPI**
 ◇ From: Matthias Moetje

- Prev by Date: **Re: Telephony on Voice Modems**
- Next by Date: **Re: App vs TSP Call Handle**
- Previous by thread: **Re: Future or TAPI**
- Next by thread: **Re: Future or TAPI**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**