

GEOPRIV
Internet-Draft
Expires: September 18, 2004

H. Schulzrinne
Columbia U.
March 20, 2004

Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol (DHCPv4 and DHCPv6) Option for
Civic Addresses
draft-ietf-geopriv-dhcp-civil-02

Status of this Memo

By submitting this Internet-Draft, I certify that any applicable patent or other IPR claims of which I am aware have been disclosed, and any of which I become aware will be disclosed, in accordance with [RFC 3667](#).

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), its areas, and its working groups. Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts.

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."

The list of current Internet-Drafts can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/ietf/lid-abstracts.txt>.

The list of Internet-Draft Shadow Directories can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html>.

This Internet-Draft will expire on September 18, 2004.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2004). All Rights Reserved.

Abstract

This document specifies a Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol (DHCPv4 and DHCPv6) option for the civic (country, community and street) location of the client or the DHCP server.

Internet-Draft

DHCP Civic

March 2004

Table of Contents

1.	Terminology	3
2.	Introduction	4
3.	Format of the DHCP Civic Location Option	6
3.1	Overall Format for DHCPv4	6
3.2	Overall Format for DHCPv6	6
3.3	Element Format	7
3.4	Civic Address Components	7
4.	Example	11
5.	Security Considerations	12
6.	IANA Considerations	13
	Normative References	14
	Informative References	15
	Author's Address	15
A.	Acknowledgments	16
	Intellectual Property and Copyright Statements	17

Internet-Draft

DHCP Civic

March 2004

1. Terminology

In this document, the key words "MUST", "MUSTNOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALLNOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULDNOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" are to be interpreted as described in [RFC 2119](#) [[1](#)] and indicate requirement levels for compliant implementations.

[2](#). Introduction

Many end system services can benefit by knowing the approximate location of the end device. In particular, IP telephony devices need to know their location to contact the appropriate emergency response agency and to be found by emergency responders.

There are two common ways to identify the location of an object, either through geospatial coordinates or by so-called civic address. Geospatial coordinates indicate longitude, latitude and altitude, while civic addresses indicate a street address.

A related draft [[13](#)] describes a DHCPv4 [[2](#)] option for conveying geospatial information to a device. This draft describes how DHCPv4 and DHCPv6 [[5](#)] can be used to convey the civic location to devices. Both can be used simultaneously, increasing the chance to deliver accurate and timely location information to emergency responders.

End systems that obtain location information via the mechanism described here then use other protocol mechanisms to communicate this information to the emergency call center or to convey it as part of presence information.

Civic information is useful since it often provides additional, human-usable information particularly within buildings. Also, compared to geospatial information, it is readily obtained for most occupied structures and can often be interpreted even if incomplete. For example, for many large university or corporate campuses,

geocoding information to building and room granularity may not be readily available.

Unlike geospatial information, the format for civic information differs from country to country. Thus, this draft establishes an IANA registry for civic location data fields. The initial set of data fields is derived from standards published by the United States National Emergency Number Association (NENA) [[15](#)]. It is anticipated that other countries can reuse many of the data elements.

The same civic address information can often be rendered in multiple languages and scripts. For example, Korean addresses are often shown in Hangul, Latin and Kanji, while some older cities have multiple language variants (Munich, Muenchen and Monaco, for example). Since DHCPv4 and DHCPv6 do not currently support a mechanism to query for a specific script or language, the DHCP server SHOULD provide all common renderings to the client and MUST provide at least the rendering in the language and script appropriate to the location indicated. For example, for use in presence information, the target may be visiting from a foreign country and want to convey the

information in a format suitable for watchers in its home country. For emergency services, the rendering in the local language is likely to be most appropriate. To provide multiple renderings, the client repeats sequences of address elements, prefixing each with 'language' and/or 'script' element (see [Section 3.3](#)). The language and script remain in effect for subsequent elements until overridden by another language or script element.

The DHCP long-options mechanism described in [RFC 3396](#) [[8](#)] MUST be used if the civic address option exceeds the maximum DHCP option size of 255 octets.

3.1 Overall Format for DHCPv4

[illegible]

Code TBD: The code for this DHCP option is TBD by IANA.

What: See above ([Section 3.1](#)).

Civic address element: See above ([Section 3.1](#)).

3.3 Element Format

For both DHCPv4 and DHCPv6, each civic address element has the following format:

0										1										2										3									
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1								
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+										+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+										+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+										+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+									
CAType										CALength										CValue										...									
+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+										+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+										+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+										+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+									

CAtype: A one-octet descriptor of the data civic address value.

CAlength: The length, in octets, of the CAvalue, not including the CAlength field itself. Data SHOULD be encoded in mixed case, following the customary spelling.

CAvalue: The civic address value, encoded as UTF-8 [6], and written in uppercase letters where applicable. The script indication is written in mixed-case, with the first letter a capital letter.

Elements SHOULD be included in numeric order from lowest to highest of their CAType if the server only provides one language and script rendition. In general, an element is labeled in its language and script by the most recent 'language tag' (CAType = 0) element preceding it. Since not all elements depend on the script and language, a client accumulates the elements by CAType and then selects the most desirable language and script rendition if there are multiple elements for the same CAType.

3.4 Civic Address Components

Since each country has different administrative hierarchies, with often the same (English) names, this specification adopts a simple hierarchical notation that is then instantiated for each country. We assume that five levels are sufficient for sub-national divisions

above the street level.

All elements are OPTIONAL and can appear in any order. Abbreviations do not need a trailing period.

CAtype	label	description
1	A1	national subdivisions (state, region, province, prefecture)
2	A2	county, parish, gun (JP), district (IN)
3	A3	city, township, shi (JP)
4	A4	city division, borough, city district, ward, chou (JP)
5	A5	neighborhood, block
6	A6	street

Table 1

For specific countries, the administrative sub-divisions are described below.

CA (Canada): The mapping to NENA designations is shown in parentheses. A1=province (STA); A2=county (CNA); A3=city or town (MCN); A6=street (STN).

DE (Germany): A1=state (Bundesstaat); A2=county (Regierungsbezirk); A3=city (Stadt, Gemeinde); A6=street (Strasse). Street suffixes (STS) are used only for designations that are a separate word (e.g., Marienthaler Strasse).

JP (Japan): A1=metropolis (To, Fu) or prefecture (Ken, Do); A2=city (Shi) or rural area (Gun); A3=ward (Ku) or village (Mura); A4=town (Chou or Machi); A5=city district (Choume); A6=block (Banchi or Ban).

Internet-Draft

DHCP Civic

March 2004

KR (Korea): A1=province (Do); A2=county (gun); A3=city or village (ri); A4=urban district (gu); A5=neighborhood (dong); A6=street (no, ro, ga or gil).

US (United States): The mapping to NENA designations is shown in parentheses. A1=state (STA), using the the two-letter state and possession abbreviations recommended by the United States Postal Service Publication 28 [14], [Appendix B](#); A2=county (CNA); A3=civic community name (city or town) (MCN); A6=street (STN). A4 and A5 are not used. The civic community name (MCN) reflects the political boundaries. These may differ from postal delivery assignments for historical or practical reasons.

Additional CA types appear in many countries and are simply omitted where they are not needed or known:

CAtype	NENA	Description	Examples
0		language	i-default [3]
16	PRD	leading street direction	N
17	POD	trailing street suffix	SW
18	STS	street suffix	AVE, PLATZ
19	HNO	house number	123
20	HNS	house number suffix	A, 1/2
21	LMK	landmark or vanity address	SHADELAND CRESCENT APTS
22	LOC	additional location information	APT 17
23	NAM	name (residence and	JOE'S BARBERSHOP

		office occupant)	
24	ZIP	postal/zip code	10027-1234

25		placetype	office
26		floor	4
27		room number	450F
128		script	Latn
255		reserved	

The CA types labeled in the second column correspond to items from the NENA "Recommended Formats & Protocols For ALI Data Exchange, ALI Response & GIS Mapping" [15], but are applicable to most countries. The "NENA" column refers to the data dictionary name in Exhibit 18 of [15].

The "language" item (CAtype 0) optionally identifies the language used for presenting the address information, drawing from the tags for identifying languages in [7]. If omitted, the default value for this tag is "i-default" [3].

The "script" item (CAtype 128) optionally identifies the script used for presenting the address information, drawing from the tags for identifying scripts in ISO 15924 [11]. If omitted, the default value for this tag is "Latn".

The NAM object is used to aid user location ("Joe Miller" "Alice's Dry Cleaning"). It does not identify the person using a communications device, but rather the person or organization associated with the address.

For POD and PRD, in English-speaking countries, the abbreviations N, E, S, W, and NE, NW, SE, SW should be used.

STS designates a street suffix. In the United States (US), the abbreviations recommended by the United States Postal Service Publication 28 [14], [Appendix C](#), SHOULD be used.

The "type of place" item (CAtype 25) describes the type of place described by the civic coordinates. For example, it describes whether it is a home, office, street or other public space. The values are drawn from the items in the rich presence [16] document. This information makes it easy, for example, for the DHCP client to then populate the presence information. Since this is an IANA-registered token, the language and script designations do not apply for this element.

[4](#). Example

Rather than showing the precise byte layout of a DHCP option, we show a symbolic example below, representing the civic address of the Munich city hall in Bavaria, Germany. The city and state name are also conveyed in English and Italian in addition to German; the other items are assumed to be common across all languages. All languages use the latin script.

+-----+-----+		
CAtype	CAvalue	
+-----+-----+		
0	de	
128	Latn	
1	Bayern	
2	Oberbayern	
3	M=U+00FCnchen	
6	Marienplatz	
19	8	
21	Rathaus	
24	80331	

25	public
0	en
1	Bavaria
3	Munich
0	it
1	Baviera
3	Monaco

5. Security Considerations

The information in this option may be used for a variety of tasks. In some cases, integrity of the information may be of great importance. In such cases, DHCP authentication in [RFC3118](#) [4] SHOULD be used to protect the integrity of the DHCP options.

[6](#). IANA Considerations

This document requests that IANA register a new DHCPv4 and DHCPv6 option code for the Civic Address .

This document establishes a new IANA registry for CAtypes designating civic address components. According to [RFC 2434](#) [[12](#)], this registry operates under the "Specification Required" rules. The IANA registration needs to include the following information:

CAType: Numeric identifier, assigned by IANA.

Brief description: Short description identifying the meaning of the element.

Reference to published specification: A stable reference to an RFC or other permanent and readily available reference, in sufficient detail so that interoperability between independent implementations is possible.

Country-specific considerations: If applicable, notes whether the element is only applicable or defined for certain countries.

Schulzrinne	Expires September 18, 2004	[Page 13]
-------------	----------------------------	-----------

Internet-Draft	DHCP Civic	March 2004
----------------	------------	------------

Normative References

- [1] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [2] Droms, R., "Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol", [RFC 2131](#), March 1997.

- [3] Alvestrand, H., "IETF Policy on Character Sets and Languages", [BCP 18](#), [RFC 2277](#), January 1998.
- [4] Droms, R. and W. Arbaugh, "Authentication for DHCP Messages", [RFC 3118](#), June 2001.
- [5] Droms, R., Bound, J., Volz, B., Lemon, T., Perkins, C. and M. Carney, "Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol for IPv6 (DHCPv6)", [RFC 3315](#), July 2003.
- [6] Yergeau, F., "UTF-8, a transformation format of ISO 10646", STD 63, [RFC 3629](#), November 2003.
- [7] Alvestrand, H., "Tags for the Identification of Languages", [BCP 47](#), [RFC 3066](#), January 2001.
- [8] Lemon, T. and S. Cheshire, "Encoding Long Options in the Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol (DHCPv4)", [RFC 3396](#), November 2002.
- [9] Mealling, M., "The IETF XML Registry", [BCP 81](#), [RFC 3688](#), January 2004.
- [10] Sugano, H. and S. Fujimoto, "Presence Information Data Format (PIDF)", [draft-ietf-impp-cpim-pidf-08](#) (work in progress), May 2003.
- [11] International Organization for Standardization, ISO., "Information and documentation - Codes for the representation of names of scripts", February 2004.

- [12] Narten, T. and H. Alvestrand, "Guidelines for Writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs", [BCP 26](#), [RFC 2434](#), October 1998.
- [13] Polk, J., Schnizlein, J. and M. Linsner, "Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol Option for Coordinate-based Location Configuration Information", [draft-ietf-geopriv-dhcp-lci-option-03](#) (work in progress), December 2003.
- [14] United States Postal Service, "Postal Addressing Standards", November 2000.
- [15] National Emergency Number Association, "NENA Recommended Formats and Protocols For ALI Data Exchange, ALI Response and GIS Mapping", NENA NENA-02-010, January 2002.
- [16] Schulzrinne, H., Gurbani, V., Kyzivat, P. and J. Rosenberg, "RPID: Rich Presence: Extensions to the Presence Information Data Format (PIDF)", [draft-ietf-simple-rpid-02](#) (work in progress), March 2004.

Author's Address

Henning Schulzrinne
Columbia University
Department of Computer Science
450 Computer Science Building
New York, NY 10027
US

Phone: +1 212 939 7042
EMail: hgs+simple@cs.columbia.edu
URI: <http://www.cs.columbia.edu>

[Appendix A](#). Acknowledgments

Harald Alvestrand, Stefan Berger and Rohan Mahy provided helpful comments.

Internet-Draft

DHCP Civic

March 2004

Intellectual Property Statement

The IETF takes no position regarding the validity or scope of any Intellectual Property Rights or other rights that might be claimed to pertain to the implementation or use of the technology described in this document or the extent to which any license under such rights might or might not be available; nor does it represent that it has made any independent effort to identify any such rights. Information on the IETF's procedures with respect to rights in IETF Documents can be found in [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

Copies of IPR disclosures made to the IETF Secretariat and any assurances of licenses to be made available, or the result of an attempt made to obtain a general license or permission for the use of such proprietary rights by implementers or users of this specification can be obtained from the IETF on-line IPR repository at <http://www.ietf.org/ipr>.

The IETF invites any interested party to bring to its attention any copyrights, patents or patent applications, or other proprietary rights that may cover technology that may be required to implement this standard. Please address the information to the IETF at ietf-ipr@ietf.org.

Disclaimer of Validity

This document and the information contained herein are provided on an "AS IS" basis and THE CONTRIBUTOR, THE ORGANIZATION HE/SHE REPRESENTS OR IS SPONSORED BY (IF ANY), THE INTERNET SOCIETY AND THE INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE DISCLAIM ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION HEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2004). This document is subject

to the rights, licenses and restrictions contained in [BCP 78](#), and except as set forth therein, the authors retain all their rights.

Acknowledgment

Funding for the RFC Editor function is currently provided by the Internet Society.