draft-ietf-sipcore-location-conveyance-03

26 July 10

James Polk

Brian Rosen

Jon Peterson (the new guy!)

The obvious…

- Do we really need to explain what this ID is about again…?

What changed between -02 & -03

- We removed 27 of 52 pages

- How we got this reduction?
  - We removed the parameters
    - Inserter=
    - Inserted-by
    - Used-for-routing
    - Host-id
    - Node-id
  - We changed the model to be (mostly) a Target inserted location towards a destination
    - Where if an intermediary disagrees with the location in a SIP request, it rejects it & likely includes what should be the location in the subsequent request

Open Issue: Multiple Locations

- Current draft: limited to one locationValue per SIP message
  - Proposal is to compose multiple locations in PIDF, per RFC5491 in keeping with RFC4479
  - Question: does this work?

- Basically two options: multiplex in the Geolocation header or in the PIDF body
  - May require PIDF additions to multiplex LbyR there

Multiple Locations (2)

- Header is required to required to allow intermediaries to add a body is none previously exists
  - Otherwise, the semantics of Geolocation are obscure…

424 after Header Insertion

- What if the UAC does not understand Geolocation and inserts no Geolocation header. However an intermediary (proxy-1) *does * insert a Geolocation header. Then a downstream intermediary (proxy-2) takes issue with that and returns a 424 response.

  Recommendation - there needs to be a requirement that the intermediary inserting the Geolocation header handle any 424 errors that might result from it, thus shielding the UAC from those.

Content-Location?

- ## Use Content-Location along with either of the below for the Geolocation Header?

```
If the intent is to require use of content indirection (RFC 4483), then there
is no need to support different URI schemes here.

    locationValue        =   LAQUOT cid-url RAQUOT *(SEMI geoloc-param)
                             ; cid-url from RFC 2392

?


However, it might be better to allow for a little more flexibility.

    locationValue        =   LAQUOT locationURI RAQUOT *(SEMI geoloc-param)
    locationURI          =   cid-url / absoluteURI
                             ; cid-url from RFC 2392, absoluteURI from RFC 3986
?

Either would remove specific URI schemes from being called out.
```

Privacy

- Privacy text inadequate?

  - If we're moving multiplexing down into PIDF, then privacy is dealt with as SIP normally does, via TLS and relying on white hat intermediaries, right?

  - What about RFC5606? It was taken out of this version (an oversight I think). Should it go back in? [yes, into section 4.1]

Error codes

- Geolocation-Error 'codes', 'causes', 'messages' or something else?

    – We have response codes, warn-codes, and Reason causes. Which do we pick for the Geolocation-Error header?

geo URI

- Do we explicitly allow Geo URIs [i.e., rfc5870] in the Geolocation header?
  - Does this meet the privacy and policy requirements of geopriv?
  - absoluteURI implicitly allows it already…

Backup

Open issues on the list ()

- Item# - the correct syntax for 0 or 1 of each?

```
Geolocation-header = "Geolocation" HCOLON Geolocation-value
Geolocation-value  = ( locationValue [ COMMA routing-param ] )
                           / routing-param
```

Open issues on the list ()

- Item# - Is the 'entity' attribute in the <presence> element and the From header of a SIP message need to align in some way?

Recommendation – no, this is just to hard to be done consistently

Open issues on the list ()

- Item# - we will break up the diagrams in Section 3 into 4 separate subsections for clarity.

- Item# -