

# Reported errata for RFC 8824

## “Static Context Header Compression (SCHC) for the Constrained Application Protocol (CoAP)”

**Marco Tiloca**, RISE

IETF 116 meeting – Yokohama – March 30<sup>th</sup>, 2023

# 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>

# 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”.

# 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>

|               |     |   |    |      |         |          |  |
|---------------|-----|---|----|------|---------|----------|--|
| CoAP Uri-Path | var | 1 | Dw | path | equal 1 | not-sent |  |
|---------------|-----|---|----|------|---------|----------|--|

## › 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.*

```
+-----+---+---+---+-----+-----+-----+=====+
|CoAP Uri-|var| 1 |Dw| "elem"| equal| not-sent|      |
|Path     |   |   |   |       |       |       |      |
+-----+---+---+---+-----+-----+-----+=====+
```

## › 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

| Field        | FL | FP | DI | TV         | MO            | CDA           | Sent [bits] |
|--------------|----|----|----|------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|
| CoAP version | 2  | 1  | Bi | 01         | equal         | not-sent      |             |
| CoAP Type    | 2  | 1  | Dw | CON        | equal         | not-sent      |             |
| CoAP Type    | 2  | 1  | Up | [ACK, RST] | match-mapping | matching-sent | T           |

## › 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”.



# 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>

|               |     |   |    |      |         |          |  |
|---------------|-----|---|----|------|---------|----------|--|
| CoAP Uri-Path | var | 1 | Dw | path | equal 1 | not-sent |  |
|---------------|-----|---|----|------|---------|----------|--|

# 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

| Field        | FL | FP | DI | TV         | MO            | CDA           | Sent [bits] |
|--------------|----|----|----|------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|
| CoAP version | 2  | 1  | Bi | 01         | equal         | not-sent      |             |
| CoAP Type    | 2  | 1  | Dw | CON        | equal         | not-sent      |             |
| CoAP Type    | 2  | 1  | Up | [ACK, RST] | match-mapping | matching-sent | T           |

## › 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?