Delivering Geographic Location in HIP
(draft-cao-hip-geolocation-01)

Hui Deng (denghui@chinamobile.com)
Feng Cao (fcao@cisco.com)

Agenda

- Introduction
  - Why?
  - Requirements
- Use cases
  - some use cases
- Technical approaches
  - New parameters vs. extension in Locator
- Next Step

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