

ecrit
Internet-Draft
Updates: [5222](#) (if approved)
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: September 26, 2021

R. Gellens
Core Technology Consulting
March 25, 2021

Changing the LoST Location Profile Registry Policy
draft-ietf-ecrit-location-profile-registry-policy-02

Abstract

This document changes the policy of the Location-to-Service Translation (LoST) Location Profile IANA 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

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 September 26, 2021.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2021 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

Internet-Draft

LoST-Validation

March 2021

the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

Table of Contents

1.	Document Scope	2
2.	Introduction	2
3.	Security Considerations	2
4.	IANA Considerations	2
5.	Acknowledgements	3
6.	References	3
6.1.	Normative References	3
6.2.	Informative references	3
	Author's Address	3

[1.](#) Document Scope

This document changes the policy of the Location-to-Service Translation (LoST) Location Profile IANA 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 per [RFC8126]. The reviewer should verify that:

- o the proposed new value is specified by the IETF, NENA, or a similar SDO in which location profiles are in scope;
- o the proposed new value has a clear need (which includes there not being an existing profile that meets the need);
- o the profile specification is unambiguous and interoperable.

5. Acknowledgements

Many thanks to Ted Hardie for his helpful review and suggestions, and to Guy Caron for his suggestion to clarify that "clear need" includes there not being an existing profile.

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>

Gellens

Expires September 26, 2021

[Page 3]