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Note Well

Any submission to the IETF intended by the Contributor for publication as all or part of an IETF Internet-Draft or RFC and any statement made within the context of an IETF activity is considered an "IETF Contribution". Such statements include oral statements in IETF sessions, as well as written and electronic communications made at any time or place, which are addressed to:

* the IETF plenary session,
* any IETF working group or portion thereof,
* the IESG or any member thereof on behalf of the IESG,
* the IAB or any member thereof on behalf of the IAB,
* any IETF mailing list, including the IETF list itself, any working group or design team list, or any other list functioning under IETF auspices,
* the RFC Editor or the Internet-Drafts function

All IETF Contributions are subject to the rules of RFC 5378 and RFC 3979 (updated by RFC 4879).

Statements made outside of an IETF session, mailing list or other function, that are clearly not intended to be input to an IETF activity, group or function, are not IETF Contributions in the context of this notice. Please consult RFC 5378 and RFC 3979 for details.

A participant in any IETF activity is deemed to accept all IETF rules of process, as documented in Best Current Practices RFCs and IESG Statements.

A participant in any IETF activity acknowledges that written, audio and video records of meetings may be made and may be available to the public.
RFC 3825 updates

• Lots of discussion, several existing drafts:
  – draft-thomson-geopriv-3825bis
  – draft-polk-geopriv-dhc-geoelement-shape-option
  – draft-polk-geopriv-3825-update
  – draft-tschofenig-geopriv-dhcp-circle

• Consensus at IETF 74 for backwards-compatible fixes

• Goal for today: Agree on (1) which changes should be included in a -bis draft, (2) -bis draft format
Agenda

• Correcting the EPSG number for WGS84
• Adding a DHCPv6 option
• Deprecating floors
• Signaling the use of uncertainty in place of resolution
• Other potential updates (time permitting)
• Draft structure
• Summary/next steps
Correcting EPSG number for WGS84

- Carl Reed indicated EPSG code for WGS84 3D is 4979, not 4327 as it appears in RFC 3825 - [http://www.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/geopriv/current/msg07156.html](http://www.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/geopriv/current/msg07156.html)
Adding a DHCPv6 option

• All recent drafts have included a v6 option
Deprecating floors

- List consensus against deprecating the floor altitude type
Signaling the use of uncertainty in place of resolution

- Existing agreement to add uncertainty
- To signal or not?
- Scenarios with/without signal:

### With signal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client</th>
<th>Server</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3825</td>
<td>3825</td>
<td>OK – No signal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3825</td>
<td>bis</td>
<td>Client rejects response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bis</td>
<td>3825</td>
<td>OK – Client can interpret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bis</td>
<td>bis</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Without signal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client</th>
<th>Server</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3825</td>
<td>3825</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3825</td>
<td>bis</td>
<td>Client misinterprets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bis</td>
<td>3825</td>
<td>Client misinterprets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bis</td>
<td>bis</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other updates
Draft structure

• List of changes (example: draft-ietf-sipping-update-pai) —or—
• Revision of current document (diff-able)
Summary/next steps