

ECRIT  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Informational  
Expires: February 27, 2008

H. Schulzrinne  
Columbia University  
L. Liess  
Deutsche Telekom  
H. Tschofenig  
Nokia Siemens Networks  
August 26, 2007

**Location Hiding: Problem Statement and Requirements**  
**draft-schulzrinne-ecrit-location-hiding-requirements-01.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 February 27, 2008.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (C) The IETF Trust (2007).

Abstract

The emergency services architecture developed in the IETF Emergency Context Resolution with Internet Technology (ECRIT) working group describes an architecture where location information is provided by access networks to end points in order to determine the correct dial string and information to route the call to a Public Safety Answering

Point (PSAP). For determining the PSAP Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) the usage of the Location-to-Service Translation (LoST) Protocol is envisioned.

This document explores the architectural impact for the IETF emergency services architecture for situations where the Internet Access Provider (IAP) and/or the Internet Service Provider (ISP) are only willing to disclose limited or no location information.

This document provides a problem statement and lists requirements.

## Table of Contents

<a href="#">1.</a>	<a href="#">Introduction</a>	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">1.1.</a>	<a href="#">Emergency Services Architecture</a>	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">1.2.</a>	<a href="#">Location Hiding</a>	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">1.3.</a>	<a href="#">Location by Reference</a>	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	<a href="#">Terminology</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	<a href="#">Requirements</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">3.1.</a>	<a href="#">High-Level Requirements</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">3.2.</a>	<a href="#">Detailed Requirements</a>	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">3.3.</a>	<a href="#">Desirable Properties</a>	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">4.</a>	<a href="#">Security Considerations</a>	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">5.</a>	<a href="#">Acknowledgments</a>	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">6.</a>	<a href="#">References</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">6.1.</a>	<a href="#">Normative References</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">6.2.</a>	<a href="#">Informative References</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
	<a href="#">Authors' Addresses</a>	<a href="#">8</a>
	<a href="#">Intellectual Property and Copyright Statements</a>	<a href="#">9</a>



## **1. Introduction**

### **1.1. Emergency Services Architecture**

The emergency services architecture developed in the IETF Emergency Context Resolution with Internet Technology (ECRIT) working group, see [[I-D.ietf-ecrit-framework](#)], describes an architecture where location information is provided by access networks to end points in order to determine the correct dial string and information to route the call to a Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP). The Location-to-Service Translation (LoST) Protocol [[I-D.ietf-ecrit-lost](#)] allows to determine the PSAP Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) for a specific geographical location together with a service URI [[I-D.ietf-ecrit-service-urn](#)]. The basic architecture is shown in Figure 1 of [[I-D.ietf-ecrit-framework](#)] and further detailed in the message flow in Figure 2 of [[I-D.ietf-ecrit-framework](#)].

For emergency services, location information is needed for two different purposes, namely for routing an emergency call to the PSAP that is responsible for a specific geographical region (and also for requested service, such as police or ambulance) and for dispatch of the emergency personell to the scene of an accident, crime or other types of incidents.

It is very important to note that this document only discusses location hiding in the context of location information that is need for call routing. ISPs have no interest or even legal basis for hiding location information from emergency services personnel.

### **1.2. Location Hiding**

In some cases, Internet Access Providers (IAPs) and/or the Internet Service Providers (ISPs) are afraid that allowing users to access location information for non-emergency purposes or prior to an emergency call will incur additional server load and thus costs. Hence, they do not to disclose precise location information (at the quality suitable for dispatch emergency personell by the PSAP operator) or not to disclose any location information.

In some other cases IAPs and ISPs may not want to make location information available without the ability to charge for it. This is a pure business decision.

### **1.3. Location by Reference**

The work on the Location Configuration Protocol (LCP) indicated the need to provide the capability to obtain Location-by-References (LbyRs) in addition to Location-by-Value (LbyV) from a Location



Information Server (LIS).

The LCP problem statement and requirements document can be found in [[I-D.ietf-geopriv-l7-lcp-ps](#)]. The requirements for obtaining an LbyR via the LCP and the corresponding dereferencing step can be found in [[I-D.marshall-geopriv-lbyr-requirements](#)].

HTTP Enabled Location Delivery (HELD), see [[I-D.ietf-geopriv-http-location-delivery](#)], is an instantiation of the LCP concept and allows LbyVs and LbyRs to be requested.

A location reference may already satisfy the requirement for location hiding if the PSAP has the appropriate credentials to resolve the reference. This requires a trust relationship between the PSAP and the ISP.

Unfortunately, a location reference is not compatible with LoST, as LoST requires an information value rather than a reference. Also, LoST servers may be operated by the VSP, which may not have a trust relationship with the ISP.

This document explores the architectural impact for the current architecture and lists requirements.

## **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 an solution supporting location hiding, not its implementation or application.

This document reuses terminology from [[I-D.ietf-geopriv-l7-lcp-ps](#)].

## **3. Requirements**

This section presents requirements.

### **3.1. High-Level Requirements**

Req-A: There SHOULD be a way an access network can withhold detailed location information from any entity it wishes to, and specifically, the endpoint, and a VSP.



Req-B: The ISP/IAP MUST support the ability of the endpoint or the VSP to route emergency calls.

Req-C: The VSP MUST be able to validate that a call purported to be an emergency call is being routed to a bona fide URI, which is denoted by being a URI in LoST for the designated emergency service.

Req-D: Precise location information must be conveyed (either LbyR or LbyV) to the PSAP.

### **3.2. Detailed Requirements**

Req-1: A business or trust relationship between an ISP and a VSP MUST NOT be assumed.

Req-2: A solution MUST consider deployment scenarios where a VSP is outside the jurisdiction of the PSAP.

Req-3: The solution MUST offer automated discovery of servers and other behavior, i.e., no manual configuration can be assumed.

Req-4: The steps needed by the endpoint for emergency calling SHOULD be no different when location is withheld vs. when location is not withheld. In particular, user agents cannot require additional configuration to discover which particular environment (hiding or no hiding) they find themselves in.

Req-5: The solution SHOULD work for non-SIP entities, without the ISP/IAP having to support these protocols.

Req-6: The solution MUST work if PSAP boundaries have holes.

Req-7: The solution MUST NOT assume the existence of Emergency Service Routing Proxies (ESRPs) per country, state and city.

Req-8: The solution MUST consider that service boundaries for different emergency services may differ, but they overlap at the location of the caller.

Req-9: UAs MUST NOT have to deduce the desired behavior by trial-and-error operations, such as LbyR resolutions, fail, as failures add latency during call setup. The solution MUST NOT significantly increase call setup latency.





Req-10: The solution MUST allow the end host to determine PSAP/ESRP URLs prior to the call, for all emergency services.

Req-11: The solution MUST allow UAs to discover at least their dial string ahead of the emergency call.

Req-12: The solution MUST have minimal impact on UAs.

Req-13: The solution MUST NOT interfere with the use of LoST for non-emergency services.

Req-14: Deleted

Req-15: Calls may reach a PSTN gateway, rather than the PSAP directly.

### **3.3. Desirable Properties**

- o The solution MUST NOT shift effort(externality), i.e., the convenience of the location-hiding ISP MUST NOT impose a burden on user agents or non-hiding ISPs/IAPs and SHOULD NOT impose a burden on VSPs.
- o The solution SHOULD minimize the impact on LoST, SIP conveyance [[I-D.ietf-sip-location-conveyance](#)] and DHCP.
- o The solution SHOULD NOT rely on DHCP for LoST configuration, as the information in the DHCP server provided by the ISP may not reach the UA, due to NATs.

## **4. Security Considerations**

This document does not raise additional security consideration beyond those mentioned in [[I-D.ietf-geopriv-17-lcp-ps](#)] and discussed in this document.

## **5. Acknowledgments**

We would like to thank the following ECRIT working group members (in no particular order) for their contributions:

- o Andrew Newton (andy@hxr.us)
- o James Winterbottom (James.Winterbottom@andrew.com)



- o Brian Rosen (br@brianrosen.net)
- o Richard Barnes (rbarnes@bbn.com)
- o Marc Linsner (mlinsner@cisco.com)
- o Barbara Stark (Barbara.Stark@BellSouth.com)
- o Andres Kuett (andres.kytt@skype.net)
- o Ted Hardie (hardie@qualcomm.com)

## **6. References**

### **6.1. Normative References**

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", March 1997.

### **6.2. Informative References**

- [I-D.ietf-geopriv-l7-lcp-ps]  
Tschofenig, H. and H. Schulzrinne, "GEOPRIV Layer 7 Location Configuration Protocol; Problem Statement and Requirements", [draft-ietf-geopriv-l7-lcp-ps-03](#) (work in progress), July 2007.
- [I-D.ietf-sip-location-conveyance]  
Polk, J. and B. Rosen, "Location Conveyance for the Session Initiation Protocol", [draft-ietf-sip-location-conveyance-08](#) (work in progress), July 2007.
- [I-D.ietf-ecrit-framework]  
Rosen, B., "Framework for Emergency Calling using Internet Multimedia", [draft-ietf-ecrit-framework-02](#) (work in progress), July 2007.
- [I-D.ietf-ecrit-lost]  
Hardie, T., "LoST: A Location-to-Service Translation Protocol", [draft-ietf-ecrit-lost-06](#) (work in progress), August 2007.
- [I-D.marshall-geopriv-lbyr-requirements]  
Marshall, R., "Requirements for a Location-by-Reference Mechanism used in Location Configuration and Conveyance", [draft-marshall-geopriv-lbyr-requirements-02](#) (work in progress), July 2007.
- [I-D.ietf-ecrit-service-urn]  
Schulzrinne, H., "A Uniform Resource Name (URN) for Emergency and Other Well-Known Services",



[draft-ietf-ecrit-service-urn-07](#) (work in progress),  
August 2007.

[I-D.ietf-geopriv-http-location-delivery]  
Barnes, M., "HTTP Enabled Location Delivery (HELD)",  
[draft-ietf-geopriv-http-location-delivery-01](#) (work in  
progress), July 2007.

#### Authors' Addresses

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](mailto:hgs+ecrit@cs.columbia.edu)  
URI: <http://www.cs.columbia.edu>

Laura Liess  
Deutsche Telekom Networks  
Deutsche Telekom Allee 7  
Darmstadt, Hessen 64295  
Germany

Phone:  
Email: [Laura.Liess@t-systems.com](mailto:Laura.Liess@t-systems.com)  
URI: <http://www.telekom.de>

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

Email: [Hannes.Tschofenig@nsn.com](mailto:Hannes.Tschofenig@nsn.com)  
URI: <http://www.tschofenig.com>



## 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](mailto:ietf-ipr@ietf.org).

## Acknowledgment

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



