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Status

• New WG Item
  – Problem & Example presented in Vancouver
• Just one recent review
  – by Martin Thomson
• A generic guideline for specifying PIDF-LO element usage (as discussed in Vancouver)
• An example mapping for Austrian civic addresses
Motivation

• RFC 4776 asks for civic address considerations documents for individual countries

• Guideline for usage of PIDF-LO elements to avoid misinterpretations
  – Consistent (national) mapping scheme desireable
  – Document provides guidelines for creating such a mapping scheme
  – Plus an example for Austria

• Ensure interoperability, PSAPs certainly want to rely on finding location information types in a defined element
  – Never confuse a PSAP agent
“Cook book” PIDF-LO Usage

• Identify and analyze data source(s)
  – Compare element list of data source to PIDF-LO elements

• Options for elements which cannot be mapped unambiguously:
  – Concatenate several source data elements
  – Use an unused PIDF-LO element
  – WG Opinion (IETF70): Don’t create fancy new CATypes

• Define which elements must be used, can be omitted or must not be used in a country
Austria Example

- Proposed solution to the house number problem:
  - Concatenate all elements in the order provided by Statistik Austria
  - Delimiter: space or semicolon (if it is essential to get the original data back)
  - House number “vor 1 - 1A” becomes:
    <HNO>vor;1;;-;1;A;;;;</HNO> or <HNO>vor 1 – 1A</HNO>
Next Steps

• Questions?
• Reviewers from other countries?
• Examples for other countries?
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