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Introduction

• Why?
  – geo-location of mobile users can help to provide new intelligent Location-based Services, such as localized advertisement, social networking, emergency services, …
  – HIP supports mobility
  – Available standardized geo-location data formats and security framework

(Right things, Right time) + Right places
Requirements

• The distributed model as peer connections must be outlined
• The centralized model as rendezvous services must be outlined
• The mechanism must be extensible for carrying current various geo-location formats and potential future formats
• The security mechanism for protecting geo-location privacy must be addressed
• ......
Use cases

• Scenario 1: sharing geo-location in setting up peer connections (most simple)
• Scenario 2: carrying geo-location in the registration with rendezvous servers
• Scenario 3: distributing geo-location from rendezvous servers
• Scenario 4: updating geo-location in peer connections
• Scenario 5: updating geo-location to rendezvous servers
Technical approaches

VS.

• New parameters
  – GEOLOC
  – GEOLOC_REQ

• Pros and cons

• Extension in LOCATOR
  – Defined in rfc 5206 for alternate address

• Pros and cons
Next Step

• More comments and inputs are welcome!
  – Some feedback in HIP mailing alias
  – GEOPRIV WG is aware of this I-D too

• Working group item?
Backup

- the issues of extending LOCATOR for delivering geo-location
  - Incompatible fields:
    - “length” limit: 1020 Octets (NOT ENOUGH!)
    - P-bit doesn’t make any sense
  - No corresponding request for LOCATOR
    - New request parameter needed to be added ONLY for geo-location
  - Need to extend LOCATOR’s scope beyond alternative address