

SIP Location Conveyance

draft-ietf-sip-location-conveyance-03

**James Polk
Brian Rosen
10 July 2006**

Location Conveyance

- Goal is to **push**, or transmit the UAC's physical location to another SIP element
- Along the way, define SIP as a Geopriv "Using Protocol", per RFC 3693
- Incorporate the Geopriv defined PIDF-LO (RFC 4119) into SIP Messaging

Changes to -03 (now in appendix)

- general clean-up of some of the sections
- removed the message examples from the UPDATE, MESSAGE and REGISTER sections
- removed the "unknown" option tag
- clarified the location option tag usage in Supported, Require, Unsupported, and not with Proxy-Require, and why not.
- Articulated how a UAS concludes a UAC understands this extension, yet does not know its location to provide to the UAS.

Changes to -03 (now in appendix)

- Section 4, the basic operation section, added a basic message flow.
- Also added a message routing flow.
- Corrected text regarding an Unsupported header being in a 424 response. It belongs in a 420 response. (Section 5.1)
- Corrected the Location header BNF (I hope)
- Corrected text in Section 5 that read like this document was an update to RFC 3261

Open issues to Resolve

- **Move the requirements into an appendix (that will stay in the doc when made an RFC)**
- **Carve out a basic operation section, without normative text**
 - **Match each scenario discussed in Section 1 with an example flow.**
- **Rearrange Sections 4 & 5 into per element behaviors**
- **Reduce the text in Section 2 (an artifact of the in_a_header vs. in_a_body discussion)**

Open issues not sure about

- **Suggestion: list all methods this doc covers, and the ones it doesn't – in the Abstract**
- **Suggestion: S/MIME message body always used initially, and to allow a back-off to less secure communication if there is an error**
- **Suggestion: expanding the Location header to allow a base64, PIDF-LO equivalent header value (possibly with dozens of header fields in the same Location header)**
 - This goes against past guidance (from both chairs and ADs)
- **Should location be allowed in responses?**
- **Should there be a new requirement that HTTP is required to be used by a location receiver to dereference location?**

What's next?

- Get more reviews
- Rev doc soon