

Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF)
Request for Comments: 9036
Updates: 5222
Category: Standards Track
ISSN: 2070-1721

R. Gellens
Core Technology Consulting
June 2021

Changing the Location-to-Service Translation (LoST) Location Profiles Registry Policy

Abstract

This document changes the policy of the "Location-to-Service Translation (LoST) Location Profiles" IANA registry established by RFC 5222 from Standards Action to Specification Required. This allows standards development organizations (SDOs) other than the IETF to add new values.

Status of This Memo

This is an Internet Standards Track document.

This document is a product of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). It represents the consensus of the IETF community. It has received public review and has been approved for publication by the Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG). Further information on Internet Standards is available in Section 2 of RFC 7841.

Information about the current status of this document, any errata, and how to provide feedback on it may be obtained at <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc9036>.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2021 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to BCP 78 and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<https://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

Table of Contents

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Document Scope
- 3. Security Considerations
- 4. IANA Considerations
- 5. References
 - 5.1. Normative References
 - 5.2. Informative References
- Acknowledgements
- Author's Address

1. Introduction

The Location-to-Service Translation (LoST) Protocol [RFC5222] uses a location profile when conveying location (e.g., in a mapping request and a service boundary result). [RFC5222] established an IANA registry of location profiles [reg] with a registry policy of Standards Action. This requires a Standards Track RFC for any new registry values. The National Emergency Number Association (NENA) is

a standards development organization (SDO) that makes significant use of LoST in its emergency call specifications (e.g., [NENA-i3]) and has identified a need for additional location profiles. This document changes the registry policy to Specification Required, allowing other SDOs such as NENA to add values.

2. Document Scope

This document changes the policy of the "Location-to-Service Translation (LoST) Location Profiles" IANA registry [reg] established by [RFC5222] from Standards Action to Specification Required (as defined in [RFC8126]). This allows SDOs other than the IETF to add new values.

3. Security Considerations

No new security considerations are identified by this change in registry policy.

4. IANA Considerations

IANA has changed the policy of the "Location-to-Service Translation (LoST) Location Profiles" registry (established by [RFC5222]) to Specification Required. IANA has also added this document as a reference for the registry. The Expert Reviewer is designated per [RFC8126]. The reviewer should verify that:

- * the proposed new value is specified by the IETF, NENA, or a similar SDO in which location profiles are in scope;
- * the proposed new value has a clear need (which includes there not being an existing profile that meets the need); and
- * the profile specification is unambiguous and interoperable.

5. References

5.1. Normative References

- [reg] IANA, "Location-to-Service Translation (LoST) Location Profiles",
<<https://www.iana.org/assignments/lost-location-profiles>>.
- [RFC5222] Hardie, T., Newton, A., Schulzrinne, H., and H. Tschofenig, "LoST: A Location-to-Service Translation Protocol", RFC 5222, DOI 10.17487/RFC5222, August 2008,
<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5222>>.
- [RFC8126] Cotton, M., Leiba, B., and T. Narten, "Guidelines for Writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs", BCP 26, RFC 8126, DOI 10.17487/RFC8126, June 2017,
<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8126>>.

5.2. Informative References

- [NENA-i3] National Emergency Number Association (NENA), "Detailed Functional and Interface Standards for the NENA i3 Solution", NENA i3 Solution - Stage 3, NENA-STA-010.2-2016, September 2016,
<https://www.nena.org/page/i3_Stage3>.

Acknowledgements

Many thanks to Ted Hardie for his helpful review and suggestions and to Guy Caron for his suggestion to clarify that "clear need" includes there not being an existing profile.

Author's Address

Randall Gellens
Core Technology Consulting

United States of America

Email: rg+ietf@coretechnologyconsulting.com

URI: <http://www.coretechnologyconsulting.com>