

Dispatch  
Internet-Draft  
Updates: RFC6442 (if approved)  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: July 3, 2017

J. Winterbottom  
Winterb Consulting Services  
R. Roland  
L. Liess  
Deutsche Telekom  
B. Chatras  
Orange Labs  
A. Hutton  
Unify  
December 30, 2016

Location Source Parameter for the SIP Geolocation Header Field  
draft-winterbottom-dispatch-locparam-02.txt

## Abstract

There are some circumstances where a geolocation header field may contain more than one location value. Knowing the identity of the node adding the location value allows the recipient more freedom in selecting the value to look at first rather than relying solely on the order of the location values.

## Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of BCP 78 and BCP 79.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <http://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

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."

This Internet-Draft will expire on July 3, 2017.

## Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2016 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to BCP 78 and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of

publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

## Table of Contents

1. Introduction . . . . .	3
2. Terminology . . . . .	3
3. Rationale . . . . .	3
4. Mechanism . . . . .	4
5. Example . . . . .	4
6. Privacy Considerations . . . . .	5
7. Security Considerations . . . . .	5
8. IANA Considerations . . . . .	5
8.1. Registration of loc-src Parameter for geolocation header field . . . . .	6
9. Acknowledgements . . . . .	6
10. References . . . . .	6
10.1. Normative References . . . . .	6
10.2. Informative References . . . . .	7
Authors' Addresses . . . . .	7

## 1. Introduction

The SIP geolocation specification [RFC6442] describes a SIP header field that is used to indicate that the SIP message is conveying location information. The specification suggests that only one location value should be conveyed. However, some communications architectures, such as 3GPP [TS23-167] and ETSI [M493], prefer to use information provided by edge-proxies or acquired through the use of core-network nodes, before using information provided solely by user equipment (UE). These solutions don't preclude the use of UE provided location but require a means of being able to distinguish the identity of the node adding the location value to the SIP message from that provided by the UE. [RFC6442] stipulates that the order of location values in the geolocation header field aligns with the order in which they were added to the header field. Whilst this order provides guidance to the recipient as to which values were added to the message earlier in the communication chain, it does not provide any indication of which node actually added the location value. Knowing the identity of the entity that added the location to the message allows the recipient to choose which location to consider first rather than relying solely on the order of the location values in the geolocation header field.

This document adds a location-source (loc-src) parameter to the location values in [RFC6442] so that the entity adding the location value to geolocation header field can identify itself using its hostname. How the entity adding the location value to the header field obtains the location information is out of scope of this document.

## 2. Terminology

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [RFC2119].

## 3. Rationale

The primary intent of the parameter defined in this specific is for use in emergency calling. There are various architectures defined for providing emergency calling using SIP-based messaging. Each has its own characteristics with corresponding pros and cons. All of them allow the UE to provide location information, however, many also attach other sources of location information to support veracity checks, provide backup information, or to be used as the primary location. This document makes no attempt to comment on these various architectures or the rationale for them wishing to include multiple location values. It does recognize that these architectures exist

and that there is a need to identify the entity adding the location information.

The parameter defined in this specification adds the location source generating the location value to increase the trustworthiness of the location information. Thus it is intended to use this parameter in trust domains where Spec(T) as described in [RFC3325] exists only. The functional architecture described within ETSI [M493] is an example of architecture where this parameter makes sense to be used.

#### 4. Mechanism

The mechanism employed adds a parameter to the location value defined in [RFC6442] that identifies the hostname of the entity adding the location value to the geolocation header field. The Augmented BNF (ABNF) [RFC5234] for this parameter is shown in Figure 1.

```
location-source = "loc-src=" (host / other-loc-src)
other-loc-src = token
```

Figure 1: Location Source

Only a fully qualified host name is valid, an IP address MUST NOT be added by an entity conforming with this specification. If a node conforming to this specification receives a geolocation header field with a loc-src parameter containing an IP address then the parameter MUST be removed.

Any proxy adding a location value to a geolocation header field SHOULD also add its host name using the loc-src parameter so that it is clearly identified as the node adding the location. A UE MUST NOT provide a loc-src parameter value. If a proxy receives a message from an untrusted source with the loc-src parameter set then it MUST remove the loc-src parameter before passing the message into a trusted network.

#### 5. Example

The following example shows a SIP INVITE message containing a geolocation header field with two location values. The first location value points to a PIDF-LO in the SIP body using a content-indirection (cid:) URI per [RFC4483] and this is provided by the UE. The second location value is an https URI the provided by a proxy which identifies itself using the loc-src parameter.

```
INVITE sips:bob@biloxi.example.com SIP/2.0
Via: SIP/2.0/TLS pc33.atlanta.example.com;branch=z9hG4bK74bf9
Max-Forwards: 70
To: Bob <sips:bob@biloxi.example.com>
From: Alice <sips:alice@atlanta.example.com>;tag=9fxced76sl
Call-ID: 3848276298220188511@atlanta.example.com
Geolocation: <cid:target123@atlanta.example.com>,
              <https://lis.example.com:8222/y77syc7cuecbh>;
              loc-src=edgeproxy.example.com
Geolocation-Routing: yes
Accept: application/sdp, application/pdf+xml
CSeq: 31862 INVITE
Contact: <sips:alice@atlanta.example.com>
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary=boundary1
Content-Length: ...
```

Figure 2: Example Location Request.

## 6. Privacy Considerations

This document doesn't change any of the privacy considerations described in [RFC6442]. While the addition of the loc-src parameter does provide an indicator of the entity that added the location in the signaling path this provides little more exposure than a proxy identity being added to the record-route header field.

## 7. Security Considerations

This document introduces the ability of a proxy or middle box to insert a host name indicating the that they added the specific location value to the geolocation header field. The intent is for this field to be used by the location recipient in the event that the SIP message contains multiple location values. As a consequence this parameter should only be used by the location recipient in a trusted network.

The use of this parameter is not restricted to a specific architecture but using multiples locations and loc-src may end in compatibility issues. [RFC6442] already addresses the issue of multiples locations. To avoid problems of wrong interpretation of loc-src the value may be discarded when passed to an other domain.

## 8. IANA Considerations

### 8.1. Registration of loc-src Parameter for geolocation header field

This document calls for IANA to register a new SIP header parameter as per the guidelines in [RFC3261], which will be added to header sub-registry under <http://www.iana.org/assignments/sip-parameters>.

Header Field: geolocation

Parameter Name: loc-src

### 9. Acknowledgements

NONE

### 10. References

#### 10.1. Normative References

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.
- [RFC3261] Rosenberg, J., Schulzrinne, H., Camarillo, G., Johnston, A., Peterson, J., Sparks, R., Handley, M., and E. Schooler, "SIP: Session Initiation Protocol", RFC 3261, DOI 10.17487/RFC3261, June 2002, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3261>>.
- [RFC3325] Jennings, C., Peterson, J., and M. Watson, "Private Extensions to the Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) for Asserted Identity within Trusted Networks", RFC 3325, DOI 10.17487/RFC3325, November 2002, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3325>>.
- [RFC5234] Crocker, D., Ed. and P. Overell, "Augmented BNF for Syntax Specifications: ABNF", STD 68, RFC 5234, DOI 10.17487/RFC5234, January 2008, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5234>>.
- [RFC6442] Polk, J., Rosen, B., and J. Peterson, "Location Conveyance for the Session Initiation Protocol", RFC 6442, DOI 10.17487/RFC6442, December 2011, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6442>>.

## 10.2. Informative References

- [M493] European Telecommunications Standards Institute,  
"Functional architecture to support European requirements  
on emergency caller location determination and transport",  
ES 203 178, V 1.1.1, Februar 2015.
- [RFC4483] Burger, E., Ed., "A Mechanism for Content Indirection in  
Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) Messages", RFC 4483,  
DOI 10.17487/RFC4483, May 2006,  
<<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4483>>.
- [TS23-167] 3rd Generation Partnership Project, "3rd Generation  
Partnership Project; Technical Specification Group  
Services and System Aspects; IP Multimedia Subsystem (IMS)  
emergency sessions", TS 23.167, V 12.1.0, March 2015.

## Authors' Addresses

James Winterbottom  
Winterb Consulting Services  
Gwynneville, NSW 2500  
AU

Phone: +61 448 266004  
Email: [a.james.winterbottom@gmail.com](mailto:a.james.winterbottom@gmail.com)

Roland Jesske  
Deutsche Telekom  
Heinrich-Hertz Str, 3-7  
Darmstadt 64295  
Germany

Email: [r.jesske@telekom.de](mailto:r.jesske@telekom.de)  
URI: [www.telekom.de](http://www.telekom.de)

Laura Liess  
Deutsche Telekom  
Heinrich-Hertz Str, 3-7  
Darmstadt 64295  
Germany

Email: [l.liess@gmail.com](mailto:l.liess@gmail.com)

Bruno Chatras  
Orange Labs  
38-40 rue du General Leclerc  
Issy Moulineaux Cedex 9 F-92794  
France

Email: [bruno.chatras@orange.com](mailto:bruno.chatras@orange.com)

Andrew Hutton  
Unify  
Technology Drive  
Nottingham NG9 1LA  
UK

Email: [andrew.hutton@unify.com](mailto:andrew.hutton@unify.com)