

ECRIT  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Informational  
Expires: January 2, 2008

S. Norreys  
BT Group  
H. Tschofenig  
Nokia Siemens Networks  
H. Schulzrinne  
Columbia University  
July 1, 2007

Requirements for Authority-to-Individuals Communication for Emergency  
Situations

draft-norreys-ecrit-authority2individuals-requirements-00.txt

Status of this Memo

By submitting this Internet-Draft, each author represents that any applicable patent or other IPR claims of which he or she is aware have been or will be disclosed, and any of which he or she becomes aware will be disclosed, in accordance with [Section 6 of BCP 79](#).

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/1id-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 January 2, 2008.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (C) The IETF Trust (2007).

Abstract

Public safety agencies need to provide information to the general public before and during large-scale emergencies. While many aspects of such systems are specific to national or local jurisdictions, emergencies span such boundaries and notifications need to reach

visitors from other jurisdictions. This document summarizes requirements for protocols to alert individuals within a defined geographic area.

Table of Contents

[1.](#) Introduction . . . . . [3](#)  
[2.](#) Terminology . . . . . [4](#)  
[3.](#) Requirements . . . . . [5](#)  
[4.](#) IANA Considerations . . . . . [7](#)  
[5.](#) Security considerations . . . . . [7](#)  
[6.](#) Acknowledgments . . . . . [8](#)  
[7.](#) References . . . . . [8](#)  
    [7.1.](#) Normative References . . . . . [8](#)  
    [7.2.](#) Informative References . . . . . [8](#)  
Authors' Addresses . . . . . [8](#)  
Intellectual Property and Copyright Statements . . . . . [10](#)

## 1. Introduction

During large-scale emergencies, public safety authorities need to reliably communicate with citizens in the affected areas, to provide warnings, indicate whether citizens should evacuate and how, and to dispel misinformation. Accurate information can reduce the impact of such emergencies.

Traditionally, emergency alerting has used church bells, sirens, loudspeakers, radio and television to warn citizens and to provide information. However, techniques such as sirens and bells provide limited information content; loud speakers cover only very small areas and are often hard to understand, even for those not hearing impaired or fluent in the local language. Radio and television offer larger information volume, but are hard to target geographically and do not work well to address the "walking wounded" or other pedestrians. Both are not suitable for warnings, as many of those needing the information will not be listening or watching at any given time, particularly during work/school and sleep hours.

This problem has recently been illustrated by the London underground bombing on July 7, 2006, as described in a government report [ref]. The UK authorities could only use broadcast media and could not, for example, easily announce to the "walking wounded" where to assemble.

This document summarizes key requirements for IP-based protocols to enhance and complement existing authority-to-citizen warning systems. These protocols may either directly reach the citizen or may be used to trigger more traditional alerts, such as, among many others, displays in subway stations, electronic bill boards, or SMS.

Public safety authorities need to reach, with an appropriate message, as many affected people as possible within the area impacted by the emergency, including not just residents, but also workers and travelers who may only be in the area temporarily.

In addition, people around the immediately affected area should be able to receive information and differentiated instructions, such as warnings to avoid travel or to clear roads.

Emergency alerts may be issued once for an emergency or authorities may repeat or update information during an event.

Some messages are addressed to all individuals within a certain geographic area. Other messages may target only specific individuals or groups of individuals, such as medical personnel or those particularly susceptible to an incident.

Machine-parseable alerts may also be used to trigger automated behaviors, such as closing vents during a chemical spill or activating sirens or other warning systems in commercial buildings.

At least initially, mobile and stationary devices may not have the appropriate capabilities to receive such warnings. Thus, protocols need to be designed to allow gatewaying to traditional systems, e.g., the PSTN.

We assume an event notification model, i.e., individuals subscribe to warnings that affect their current location. As a mobile device moves, the subscription may need to be updated. Thus, location information needs to be available during the subscription process.

Users may want to subscribe to warnings that do not affect their current location. For example, parents may want to be alerted of emergencies affecting the school attended by their children and adult children may need to know about emergencies affecting elderly parents.

Some technologies may also support network-level broadcast or multicast.

## [2.](#) Terminology

The keywords "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](#)], with the

important qualification that, unless otherwise stated, these terms apply to the design of a protocol conveying emergency alerts and early warning messages, not its implementation or application.

This document reuses the terminology introduced by [[3GPP-TR-22.968](#)] and modifies it to fit to IETF terminology:

#### Notification Area:

Notification area is an area where warning notifications are sent.

#### Public Warning System:

A public warning system delivers warning notifications provided by warning notification providers to IP-capable end hosts within notification areas.

#### Warning Notification:

Warning notifications notify recipients of the occurrence of current or pending public safety-related events and additionally may provide users with instructions on what to do and where to get help for the duration of the emergency.

#### Warning Notification Provider:

A warning notification provider is an agency such as a branch of government or a public transport agency that provides warning notifications. A private institution, such as a university, hospital or enterprise, may also provide such warnings to people located within their facilities.

### [3.](#) Requirements

The objective of these requirements is to allow authorities dealing with an emergency situation to communicate adequately with effected people in a timely fashion.

Req-1:

The protocol mechanisms MUST provide real-time message delivery.

Req-2:

The protocol mechanisms MUST deliver messages within a pre-planned time frame in the future, as agencies may want to prepare announcements for predictable or likely events.

Req-3:

The protocol mechanisms MUST convey sufficient details of the emergency situation.

Req-4:

The protocol mechanisms MUST provide the public with sufficient instructions to take appropriate actions.

Req-5:

The protocol mechanisms MUST allow targeting notifications to specific individuals, groups of individuals or specific geographic regions. Different regions or groups may receive different instructions for the same emergency. (For example, people very

close to a chemical spill may be asked to evacuate, while those further away may be asked to close windows.)

Req-6

Early warning notifications MAY be given preferential processing and delivery treatment.

Req-7

The protocol mechanisms MUST allow delivery of messages simultaneously to a large audience.

Req-8

The protocol mechanisms MAY provide an option to return a receipt on reading message. Message alert confirmation SHOULD NOT be required.

Req-9:

An emergency notification system MUST be independent of the underlying access network technology.

Req-10:

Protocol mechanisms MUST allow to tailor the message to the language preferences of the receiver and/or deliver multiple versions in different languages within the same message, so that the recipient can choose the most appropriate one.

Req-11:

A solution MUST support delivery of notification messages (e.g., with different media types) to those with special needs, such as hearing and vision impaired.

Req-12:

A user SHOULD be able to indicate the preferred method of communication to the public warning service, such as notification by email, different instant messaging protocols or automated voice calls.

Req-13:

A solution MUST prevent misuse of the emergency infrastructure by unauthorized entities.

Req-14:

Emergency notification systems SHOULD identify the message and

notification originator, preferably in a cryptographically secure manner.

Req-15:

A solution MUST offer sufficient details of the emergency situation.

Req-16:

A solution MUST support integrity protection of early warning notifications.

Req-17:

A solution MUST provide a mechanism for testing authority-to-individuals early warning messages just as test support is provided by individuals-to-authority emergency services.

Req-18:

Devices should be able to recognize alerts that requires that the device override user interface configurations such as vibrate-only mode. (For example, a school closing advisory due to snow may not require such an immediate alert in the middle of the night.)

#### [4.](#) IANA Considerations

This document does not require actions by IANA.

#### [5.](#) Security considerations

This document outlines requirements and security security requirements are a part of them.

#### [6.](#) Acknowledgments

This document reuses requirements captured outside the IETF, namely ETSI (with [[ETSI-TS-102-182](#)]), and the 3GPP (with [[3GPP-TR-22.968](#)]). We would like to thank the authors of these specifications for their work. Note, however, that only a small subset of the requirements have been reflected that do not relate to specific deployments, user interface aspects, detailed regulatory requirements, management and operational considerations, and non-IP specific technologies.

## [7.](#) References

### [7.1.](#) Normative References

[RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.

### [7.2.](#) Informative References

[3GPP-TR-22.968]  
    , ., "3GPP TR 22.968, V1.0.0 (2007-04), 3rd Generation Partnership Project; Technical Specification Group Services and System Aspects; Study for requirements for a Public Warning System (PWS) Service (Release 8)", December 2006.

[ETSI-TS-102-182]  
    , ., "ETSI TS 102 182, V1.2.1 (2006-12), Technical Specification, Emergency Communications (EMTEL); Requirements for communications from authorities/ organizations to individuals, groups or the general public during emergencies", December 2006.

## Authors' Addresses

Steve Norreys  
BT Group  
1 London Road  
Brentwood, Essex CM14 4QP  
UK

Phone: +44 1277 32 32 20  
Email: [steve.norreys@bt.com](mailto:steve.norreys@bt.com)

Hannes Tschofenig  
Nokia Siemens Networks  
Otto-Hahn-Ring 6  
Munich, Bavaria 81739  
Germany

Email: Hannes.Tschofenig@nsn.com  
URI: <http://www.tschofenig.com>

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

Phone: +1 212 939 7004  
Email: hgs+ecrit@cs.columbia.edu  
URI: <http://www.cs.columbia.edu>

---

Internet-Draft      Authority-to-Individuals Requirements

July 2007

## Full Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The IETF Trust (2007).

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.

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, THE IETF TRUST 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.

## Intellectual Property

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 procedures with respect to rights in RFC 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.

#### Acknowledgment

Funding for the RFC Editor function is provided by the IETF Administrative Support Activity (IASA).

Norreys, et al.

Expires January 2, 2008

[Page 10]