

**Title:** LS on Introducing the Privacy Mechanism in Stage 2  
**Response to:** LS (S3-030649) on Introducing the Privacy Mechanism in Stage 2 from WG SA3

**Source:** CN1  
**To:** SA3  
**Cc:** SA2

**Contact Person:**

**Name:** Keith Drage  
**Tel. Number:** +44 1793 776249  
**E-mail Address:** drage@lucent.com

**Attachments:** None

---

**1. Overall Description:**

WG CN1 thanks WG SA3 for their liaison in S3-030649.

WG CN1 would like to clarify the appropriate IETF references made in the proposed CR.

RFC 3323 specifies the essential capabilities of the privacy function, and specifies a number of optional privacy capabilities, i.e. header (RFC 3323 subclause 5.1), session (RFC 3323 subclause 5.2) and user (RFC 3323 subclause 5.3). None of these options are currently specified in 3GPP TS 24.229, and the complete implementation of these options cannot occur with SIP proxy capabilities.

The essential capabilities of the privacy function can be regarded as:

- the definition of the privacy header and its syntax
- the operation of the "none" value such that the user requests that a privacy service apply no privacy functions to this message, regardless of any pre-provisioned profile for the user or default behavior of the service. User agents can specify this option when they are forced to route a message through a privacy service which will, if no Privacy header is present, apply some privacy functions which the user does not desire for this message. Intermediaries MUST NOT remove or alter a Privacy header whose priv-value is 'none'. User agents MUST NOT populate any other priv-values (including 'critical') in a Privacy header that contains a value of 'none'.
- the operation of the "critical" value such that the user asserts that the privacy services requested for this message are critical, and that therefore, if these privacy services cannot be provided by the network, this request should be rejected. Criticality cannot be managed appropriately for responses.

RFC 3325 (in addition to defining the P-Asserted-Identity header and the P-Preferred-Identity header, defines the privacy option "id" that is currently specified within 3GPP TS 24.229.

Any specification of the privacy capability therefore requires references to both RFC 3323 (for the coding of the header and the operation of "none" and "critical") and RFC 3325 (for the operation of the "id" privacy option.

**2. Actions:**

To WG SA3 group.

**ACTION:** WG CN1 asks WG SA3 to revise the CR to make the appropriate references to RFCs as indicated by the discussion above.

### 3. Date of Next TSG-CN1 Meetings:

CN1_33	16 <sup>th</sup> – 20 <sup>th</sup> February 2004	TBD, USA (NA friends of 3GPP)
CN1_34	10 <sup>th</sup> – 14 <sup>st</sup> May 2004	TBD, Croatia (EF3)