Changing the LoST Location Profile Registry Policy
draft-ecrit-location-profile-registry-policy-01

Abstract

   This document changes the policy of the Location-to-Service
   Translation (LoST) Location Profile registry established by RFC5222
   from Standards Action to Specification Required. This allows
   standards development organizations (SDOs) other than the IETF to add
   new values.

Status of This Memo

Copyright Notice

Table of Contents

[1](#). Document Scope

   This document changes the policy of the Location-to-Service
   Translation (LoST) Location Profile registry [[reg](#)] established by
   [[RFC5222](#)] from Standards Action to Specification Required (as defined
   in [[RFC8126](#)]). This allows standards development organizations
   (SDOs) other than the IETF to add new values.

[2](#). Introduction

   The Location-to-Service Translation Protocol, LoST [[RFC5222](#)] uses a
   location profile when conveying location (e.g., in a mapping request
   and a service boundary result). [[RFC5222](#)] established an IANA
   registry of location profiles [[reg](#)], with a registry policy of
   Standards Action. This requires a standards-track RFC for any new
   registry values. The National Emergency Number Association (NENA) is
   an SDO that makes significant use of LoST in its emergency call
   specifications (e.g., [[NENA-i3](#)]) and has identified a need for
   additional location profiles. This document changes the registry
   policy to Specification Required, allowing other SDOs such as NENA to
   add values.

[3](#). Security Considerations

   No new security considerations are identified by this change in
   registry policy.

[4](#). IANA Considerations

IANA is requested to change the policy of the Location-to-Service
   Translation (LoST) Location Profile Registry (established by
   [RFC5222]) to Specification Required. The expert reviewer is
   designated by the responsible area director. The reviewer should

---

   verify that any proposed new value is specified by the IETF, NENA, or
   a similar SDO, and meets a criteria of a clear need and unambiguous,
   interoperable definition.

5. Acknowledgements

   Many thanks to Ted Hardie for his helpful review and suggestions.

6. References

6.1. Normative References

   [reg]   "Location-to-Service Translation (LoST) Location Profile
               Registry", <https://www.iana.org/assignments/lost-
               location-profiles/lost-location-profiles.xhtml>.

   [RFC5222]   Hardie, T., Newton, A., Schulzrinne, H., and H.
               Tschofenig, "LoST: A Location-to-Service Translation
               Protocol", RFC 5222, DOI 10.17487/RFC5222, August 2008,
               <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5222>.

   [RFC8126]   Cotton, M., Leiba, B., and T. Narten, "Guidelines for
               Writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs", BCP 26,
               RFC 8126, DOI 10.17487/RFC8126, June 2017,
               <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8126>.

6.2. Informative references

   [NENA-i3]   National Emergency Number Association (NENA)
               Interconnection and Security Committee, i3 Architecture
               Working Group, , "Detailed Functional and Interface
               Standards for the NENA i3 Solution", 2016,
               <https://www.nena.org/page/i3_Stage3>.

Author's Address

Randall Gellens
Core Technology Consulting
US

Email: rg+ietf@coretechnologyconsulting.com
URI: http://www.coretechnologyconsulting.com