Considerations for Civic Addresses in PIDF-LO

draft-ietf-geopriv-civic-address-recommendations

IETF 73, November 2008, Minneapolis, MN, USA

Karl Heinz Wolf <karlheinz.wolf @ nic.at>
Alexander Mayrhofer <alexander.mayrhofer @ nic.at>
nic.at GmbH

Status

- **New WG Item**
  - Problem & Example presented in Vancouver
- **Just one recent review**
  - by Martin Thomson
- **A generic guideline for specifying PIDF-LO element usage (as discussed in Vancouver)**
- **An example mapping for Austrian civic addresses**

Motivation

- RFC 4776 asks for civic address considerations documents for individual countries
- Guideline for usage of PIDF-LO elements to avoid misinterpretations
  - Consistent (national) mapping scheme desireable
  - Document provides guidelines for creating such a mapping scheme
  - Plus an example for Austria
- Ensure interoperability, PSAPs certainly want to rely on finding location information types in a defined element
  - Never confuse a PSAP agent

"Cook book" PIDF-LO Usage

- Identify and analyze data source(s)
  - Compare element list of data source to PIDF-LO elements
- Options for elements which cannot be mapped unambiguously:
  - Concatenate several source data elements
  - Use an unused PIDF-LO element
  - WG Opinion (IETF70): Don't create fancy new CATypes
- Define which elements must be used, can be omitted or must not be used in a country

Austria Example

- Proposed solution to the house number problem:

    – Concatenate all elements in the order provided by Statistik Austria

    – Delimiter: space or semicolon (if it is essential to get the original data back)

    – House number "vor 1 - 1A" becomes: <HNO>vor;1;;-;1;A;;;;;;;;;;;</HNO> or <HNO>vor 1 – 1A</HNO>

Next Steps

- Questions?
- Reviewers from other countries?
- Examples for other countries?

alexander.mayrhofer@nic.at

karlheinz.wolf@nic.at