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Overview

› 2 technical errata
  – https://www.rfc-editor.org/errata/eid7389
  – https://www.rfc-editor.org/errata/eid7391 (*)

› 7 editorial errata
  – https://www.rfc-editor.org/errata/eid7390
  – https://www.rfc-editor.org/errata/eid7392 (*)
  – https://www.rfc-editor.org/errata/eid7393
  – https://www.rfc-editor.org/errata/eid7394 (*)
  – https://www.rfc-editor.org/errata/eid7395 (*)
  – https://www.rfc-editor.org/errata/eid7396
  – https://www.rfc-editor.org/errata/eid7397

(*) Feedback provided to the mailing list
Technical errata eid7391

› CoAP options Size1, Size2, Proxy-URI, Proxy-Scheme
   – https://www.rfc-editor.org/errata/eid7391
   – In the rule, TV should be empty (instead of “not-sent”)
   – Consistent with the intended CDA "value-sent"
   – Addressed by [1], if “Hold for document update”

› Feedback from Ana (reject)
   – The original text was: “If the field value must be sent, TV is not set, MO is set to "ignore“ and CDA is set to "value-sent". A mapping can also be used.”
   – 'not set' has been transformed into 'not-sent' during the edition. And I prefer to use this terminology that corresponds to the RFC8724.

› Follow-up: Is “not-sent” usable for TV at all?
   – Different than anywhere else in RFC 8824, see: Sections 5.2, 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3; Tables 1 and 2
   – In RFC 8724, “not-sent” is used only with CDA. When that’s the case, TV has no value.
   – My understanding: CDA = “value-sent” ➔ TV left empty

Section 5.4 says:
The SCHC Rule description MAY define sending some field values by setting the TV to "not-sent", the MO to "ignore", and the CDA to "value-sent".

It should say:
The SCHC Rule description MAY define sending some field values by describing an empty TV, with the MO set to "ignore" and the CDA set to "value-sent".

[1] draft-tiloca-lpwan-8824-update
Editorial errata eid7392

RST message with CoAP Observe
- https://www.rfc-editor.org/errata/eid7392
- RST used by a CoAP client, not by the Observe option
- OLD: Since the Observe Option MAY use a RST message
- NEW: Since the Observe extension MAY use a RST message

Feedback from Ana (reject)
- As soon as I understand CoAP RFC7252 uses Options, and in the RFC7641 Observe is also an Option, so I don’t think that the change is needed. Because Observe is not an extension.

Follow-up: What’s strange is that a CoAP option may use a message. The user is the CoAP client
- Per RFC 7641, Observe is a “protocol extension for CoAP”. Extensions are signaled/enforced with CoAP options
- Maybe there is a better, more effective rephrasing?
  - Since the client MAY use a RST message to inform a server that the Observe response is not required, ...
Editorial errata eid7394

Extra “1” in Table 3 showing a SCHC rule, column “MO”
- https://www.rfc-editor.org/errata/eid7394

Feedback from Ana (reject)
- I reject this errata, and I correct an edition error.
  In table 3, the TV should be the 1st element of the path, so it is better to replace 'path' by 'element' and remove '1' after equal.

Follow-up: Ok, but shouldn’t elem be without quotes?
- Otherwise, a match occurs only if the first element of the path is the URI-Path segment with value "elem"
Editorial errata eid7395

Discussed example of SCHC rule
- https://www.rfc-editor.org/errata/eid7395
- Based on the SCHC rule in Table 3 ...
- Type omitted if CON for downlink messages

Feedback from Ana (reject)
- In this case we are making a difference between the index of the matching-list sent in Type and the mapped index used for Code that belongs to the RFC7252 section 12.1 IANA values.

Follow-up: Yes, for the uplink – The new text should better describe the whole rule in the table
- Old text: "sending only the Type” – This suggests a behavior consistent with CDA "value-sent" (instead of "matching-sent" as per Table 3) and for both directions (while, as per Table 3, a CDA "not-sent" applies to downlink messages for the considered Type CON).
- New text: sending only a mapped Type (and only for uplink messages)
Technical errata

› CoAP option URI-Path
  – https://www.rfc-editor.org/errata/eid7389
  – Not mandatory in requests
  – Not used in responses

Section 3.1 says:
For example, the Uri-Path option is mandatory in the request, and it might not be present in the response.

It should say:
For example, the Uri-Path option can be used in the request, while it is not used in the response.

› CoAP options Size1, Size2, Proxy-URI, Proxy-Scheme
  – https://www.rfc-editor.org/errata/eid7391
  – In the rule, TV should be empty (instead of “not-sent”)
  – Consistent with the intended CDA "value-sent"
  – Addressed by [1], if “Hold for document update”

Section 5.4 says:
The SCHC Rule description MAY define sending some field values by setting the TV to "not-sent", the MO to "ignore", and the CDA to "value-sent".

It should say:
The SCHC Rule description MAY define sending some field values by describing an empty TV, with the MO set to "ignore" and the CDA set to "value-sent".

[1] draft-tiloca-lpwan-8824-update
Editorial errata (1/2)

› CoAP option name
  – https://www.rfc-editor.org/errata/eid7390
  – s/Content/Content-Format

▷ RST message with CoAP Observe
  – https://www.rfc-editor.org/errata/eid7392
  – RST used by a CoAP client, not by the Observe option

› Plural vs. singular
  – https://www.rfc-editor.org/errata/eid7393
  – s/content of the OSCORE options/content of the OSCORE option

▷ Extra “1” in Table 3 showing a SCHC rule, column “MO”
  – https://www.rfc-editor.org/errata/eid7394

Covered before
Editorial errata (2/2)

- Discussed example of SCHC rule
  - https://www.rfc-editor.org/errata/eid7395
  - Based on the SCHC rule in Table 3 ...
  - Type omitted if CON for downlink messages

- Subject-adjective pairing
  - https://www.rfc-editor.org/errata/eid7396
  - “compressed” should refer to a request, not to a CoAP client

- Clarify introduction of CoAP option OSCORE and outer options
  - https://www.rfc-editor.org/errata/eid7397
  - It should be “outer options”, in the plural
  - Outer options include the OSCORE option
  - It is specifically the OSCORE option that indicates OSCORE protection
Thank you!

Comments/questions?