

geopriv  
Internet-Draft  
Expires: August 19, 2005

B. Rosen  
Emergicom  
N. Abbott  
Telcordia  
February 15, 2005

NENA Requirements for Extensions to PIDF-LO  
draft-rosen-nena-geopriv-requirements-00.txt

Status of this Memo

This document is an Internet-Draft and is subject to all provisions of [Section 3 of RFC 3667](#). 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 become aware will be disclosed, in accordance with [RFC 3668](#).

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 August 19, 2005.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2005).

Abstract

The National Emergency Number Association (NENA)'s mission is to foster the technological advancement, availability, and implementation of a universal emergency telephone number system in North America. In our efforts to support emergency calls coming over the Internet, we have identified several issues with the present

Internet-Draft

NENA Requirements

February 2005

definition of the PIDF-LO object. We present our requirements to address these shortcomings.

## Table of Contents

<a href="#">1.</a>	Requirements notation . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	Additional Requirements . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	Security Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">4.</a>	References . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
	Authors' Addresses . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
	Intellectual Property and Copyright Statements . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>

## 1. Requirements notation

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](#)].

## [2.](#) Additional Requirements

- Req-1: When location is forged, responder resources are inappropriately dispatched. The location must be authenticated by its source and verified by the PSAP. This implies a digital signature on the location object. There are implications when location is presented to an entity in a form other than PIDF-LO. For example, if an endpoint learns its location from DHCP, the source of the location must sign it in such a way that it can be transported by DHCP, converted to PIDF-LO, transported by a using protocol, and subsequently have the digital signature validated.
- Req-2: If there is more than one set of location information is provided in the PIDF-LO, guidelines/policy are needed to assist in selecting the appropriate location information to be used for emergency call routing and dispatch.
- Req-3: Two community names must be supported (postal and legal).
- Req-4: The "DateTimeStamp" defined in PIDF-LO is insufficient for our needs. We need to know when the location was determined. That may or not be when the PIDF-LO document was created.
- Req-5: Confidence and Uncertainty must be expanded. Two single component values are proving to be insufficient. We will bring a proposal to improve the ability to specify these quantities.
- Req-6: "Placetype" must be expanded (does this really need to go to SIMPLE?)
- Req-7: If there is more than one set of location information is provided in the PIDF-LO, guidelines/policy are needed to assist in selecting the appropriate location information to be

used for emergency call routing and dispatch.

Req-8: It is desirable to have fall-back location information that can be used to determine default routing of emergency calls (e.g., if the specific location information is not currently represented in the available routing data base).

Req-9: Other information, e.g., associated with the "caller" or the caller's location, may also be useful to the emergency responder, but which is more appropriately maintained by the user, than by a provider of physical, geographical location information. A mechanism to include or refer to such additional information is needed. (This may really need to be considered by SIMPLE?) However, such information may need to build on the privacy mechanisms defined by Geopriv for location information. For example, emergency responders today may have access to information about disabilities of potential callers in a particular location that will assist emergency responders in taking special response measures. Examples of the kind of information that might be helpful include:

- \* Life Support System in use
- \* Oxygen in use
- \* Mobility Impaired
- \* Blind
- \* Hearing Impaired
- \* Teletypewriter
- \* Speech Impaired
- \* Developmentally disabled..

Internet-Draft

NENA Requirements

February 2005

### [3.](#) Security Considerations

None.

### [4.](#) References

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

### Authors' Addresses

Brian Rosen  
Emergicom  
470 Conrad Dr

Mars, PA 16046  
US

Phone: +1 724 382 1051  
Email: br@brianrosen.net

Nadine Abbott  
Telcordia  
One Telcordia Drive, Room 4B655  
Piscataway, NJ 08854  
US

Phone: +1-732-699-6109  
Email: nabbott@telcordia.com

## 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 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](mailto: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 (2005). 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.