

draft-ietf-sipcore-location-conveyance
for geopriv at IETF78

28 July 10

James Polk

Brian Rosen

Jon Peterson (the new guy!)

Summary

- Changes from -02 to -03 discussed for ~90 min in SIPCORE (Monday)
- We removed 27 of 52 pages
- How we got this reduction?
 - We removed the parameters
 - Inserter=
 - Inserted-by
 - Used-for-routing
 - Host-id
 - Node-id
 - We changed the model to be (mostly) a Target inserted location towards a destination
 - Where if an intermediary disagrees with the location in a SIP request, it rejects it & likely includes what should be the location in the subsequent request

Issues Arose with -03

- There were several issues raised about text reduction, most active was about the single locationValue model
- Solution in -03, to include 1 locationValue
 - With the ability to have a composed PIDF contain more than 1 location about the same Target
 - Issue with inability for SIP intermediary to add a location URI towards destination when value existed
 - In -04, we will relax this to “SHOULD NOT add location when already present” but allow a second location, and have the consequences articulated

More agreements from SIPCORE

- We agreed to stipulate that if a Geolocation header exists, and an intermediary adds location to the PIDF, that the intermediary is now responsible for the whole location in that request
 - A “you break it, you bought it” philosophy
- Further, if a Geolocation doesn't exist, and intermediary includes location, that the intermediary owns the 424 if one is sent

More agreements from SIPCORE

- Privacy text will be more robust
 - Omitted RFC 5606 inadvertently
- The idea of including GEO URIs is in flux
 - because there is no “priv” of Geopriv
- Other changes from the SIPCORE list have already been incorporated