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The obvious…

• Do we really need to explain what this ID is about again…?
What changed between -02 & -03

• 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
Open Issue: Multiple Locations

• Current draft: limited to one locationValue per SIP message
  – Proposal is to compose multiple locations in PIDF, per RFC5491 in keeping with RFC4479
  – Question: does this work?

• Basically two options: multiplex in the Geolocation header or in the PIDF body
  – May require PIDF additions to multiplex LbyR there
Multiple Locations (2)

• Header is required to allow intermediaries to add a body is none previously exists
  – Otherwise, the semantics of Geolocation are obscure…
424 after Header Insertion

• What if the UAC does not understand Geolocation and inserts no Geolocation header. However an intermediary (proxy-1) *does* insert a Geolocation header. Then a downstream intermediary (proxy-2) takes issue with that and returns a 424 response.

Recommendation - there needs to be a requirement that the intermediary inserting the Geolocation header handle any 424 errors that might result from it, thus shielding the UAC from those.
Content-Location?

• Use Content-Location along with either of the below for the Geolocation Header?

If the intent is to require use of content indirection (RFC 4483), then there is no need to support different URI schemes here.

$\text{locationValue} = \text{LAQUOT cid-url RAQUOT *(SEMI geoloc-param)}$

; cid-url from RFC 2392

However, it might be better to allow for a little more flexibility.

$\text{locationValue} = \text{LAQUOT locationURI RAQUOT *(SEMI geoloc-param)}$

locationURI = cid-url / absoluteURI

; cid-url from RFC 2392, absoluteURI from RFC 3986

Either would remove specific URI schemes from being called out.
Privacy

• Privacy text inadequate?

  – If we’re moving multiplexing down into PIDF, then privacy is dealt with as SIP normally does, via TLS and relying on white hat intermediaries, right?

  – What about RFC5606? It was taken out of this version (an oversight I think). Should it go back in? [yes, into section 4.1]
Error codes

• Geolocation-Error ‘codes’, ‘causes’, ‘messages’ or something else?

  – We have response codes, warn-codes, and Reason causes. Which do we pick for the Geolocation-Error header?
geo URI

• Do we explicitly allow Geo URIs [i.e., rfc5870] in the Geolocation header?
  – Does this meet the privacy and policy requirements of geopriv?
  – absoluteURI implicitly allows it already…
Backup
Open issues on the list ()

- **Item#** - the correct syntax for 0 or 1 of each?

  Geolocation-header = "Geolocation" HCOLON Geolocation-value
  Geolocation-value = ( locationValue [ COMMA routing-param ] )
  / routing-param
Open issues on the list()

• Item# - Is the 'entity' attribute in the <presence> element and the From header of a SIP message need to align in some way?

  Recommendation – no, this is just too hard to be done consistently
Open issues on the list ()

• Item# - we will break up the diagrams in Section 3 into 4 separate subsections for clarity.

• Item# -