

Minutes of the GEOPRIV Working Group Session at the 59th IETF Meeting

Chairs:

Andrew Newton
Allison Mankin
Randall Gellens

Scribes:

Ted Hardie
Scott Hollenbeck
Randall Gellens

Jabber Logs:

<http://www.xmpp.org/ietf-logs/geopriv@ietf.xmpp.org/2004-03-04.html>

Presentations:

<http://ecotroph.net/blojsom/blog/geopriv/meetings/?permalink=90D9FBF0E678B46F4864A940534143C1.txt>

- 1) James Polk mentions that draft-ietf-sipping-location-requirements-00.txt may meet GEOPRIV's milestone for a SIP Using Protocol draft. He requests that the working group look it over. Andy Newton will ask the question of the working group mailing list.
- 2) Henning Schulzrinne discusses the DHCP Civil draft (draft-ietf-geopriv-dhcp-civil-01.txt). He notes that it is complimentary to the group's DHCP LI draft, points out changes to it, and feels that it is close to working group last call. James Polk indicates that it is "LCI" (location configuration information) instead of "LO" (location object). A request is made of "new", non-US participants to be check that the address format is useable. A concern is brought by Allison Mankin on the work load impact this draft may have for the IANA. Henning notes that it would not be too high at all.
- 3) Jon Peterson presents draft-ietf-geopriv-pres-00.txt. Jon notes that it will be updated again to make it less SIMPLE centric.
- 4) Jon Peterson presents draft-ietf-geopriv-pidf-lo-02.txt. Jon notes that the requirements section has been removed. Hannes Tschofenig points out that it is difficult to understand which GEOPRIV requirements are met by PIDF-LO and which are met by a using protocol, and he suggests documenting this in draft-ietf-geopriv-pres-00.txt. Jon disagrees with the suggestion because it would make that draft protocol centric, which is a non-goal. James suggests covering the requirements in draft-ietf-sipping-location-requirements-00.txt, with both Henning and Jon objecting. This is followed by a discussion regarding a new SIPPING requirement for a source type of location information. It is mentioned that requirements for the source type are not fully known and waiting on them would hold up PDIF-LO. Jon suggests that this could be added as an extension. Andy asks that the discussion of this issue be taken to the list.

- 5) Henning presents the Common Policy drafts (draft-ietf-geopriv-policy-01.txt and draft-ietf-geopriv-common-policy-00.txt). There is some confusion regarding distribution/retention rules. The room has few comments and Henning asks the group to review the drafts and send comments to the list.
- 6) Watanabe-san and Kurisu-san present the GLI system (<http://www.gli.jp>). There are no comments or questions from the room.
- 7) Farid Adrangi presents draft-adrangi-radiusext-location-information-attribute-00.txt. The room discusses the implications of RADIUS trust models on the privacy of location objects. There are many concerns about the trust model inherent in RADIUS relationships not being relative to the privacy of the end user.
- 8) Hannes presents draft-jones-radius-geopriv-00.txt and discusses the merging of the two drafts. Again there is concern from the room about the privacy concerns of end users and concern regarding the bonding of user identities and authentication mechanisms. There is also concern about special casing requirements for this work and the necessity to properly analyze use cases. It is also mentioned that the verbose XML will degrade performance of RADIUS and there will be a need for compression.