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What if we already know our peer...

...and there are many CoAP-over-GATT devices around?

“know”: by URI, by AS/audience, by advertised resources?
Changes to -04

- Use two separate characteristics for inbound and outbound traffic.
- Define semantics of service data field in advertisement field.
- `coap+gatt://001122334455.ble.arpa/`
- `...arpa?`
Why go with .arpa?

- We already have two kinds of natural identifiers: BLE MACs (useful to some, unavailable to others) and self-described names (transported in service data field)
  
  \[
  \text{coap+gatt://001122334455.ble.arpa/}
  \]
  
  \[
  \text{coap+gatt://34373131.ble-sd.arpa/ ("arbitrary" length, as unique as .local)}
  \]

- While RFC 3986 leaves it open, practically there’s only one structure on “host names”.
  Just being in that name space doesn’t mean name resolution is involved.

- \[
  \text{coap+gatt://host.example.com/}
  \]
  
  \[
  \text{coap://001122334455.ble.arpa/?}
  \]
  
  Possible with ”BLE” records (no intention to pursue) and draft transport-indication draft (Proxy-Scheme but no Uri-Host, not anticipating much need for this on such links).
For further exploration, possibly in a later add-on
Based on a slide from IETF116

- Multicast by CoAP messages in beacons?
- SCHC retconning of non-CoAP attributes. ("Turn the temperature into a CoAP addressable resource").

Postponed until there is need for it.
Roadmap

Unchanged since IETF116 – but now with a more concrete address proposal

- Update implementations, re-run tests.
- Keep using CoAP-over-GATT as driver for transport-indication (could also pick -over-WebSockets or t2trg-slipmux)
- Explore this in the WG? (Implementation report to arrive at one of the next interims)
Thanks

Comments?

Questions?