Comparison of CoAP Security Protocols

draft-ietf-iotops-security-protocol-comparison-09

John Preuß Mattsson, Ericsson

Francesca Palombini, Ericsson

Mališa Vučinić, INRIA

Status

- Complete wglc in April (v-06), got updated following reviews (v-08)
- Kept alive (v-09)
- Submitted for publication June 25th
- AD review received June 26th (Thanks Med!)
- With the authors to answer Med’s review

AD Review - summary

https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/iotops/pFOuwIAKEs7I384b92KxZKNBN5E/

1. Request for more motivation around the need for this RFC
2. Add a new Operational Considerations section on network operations
3. Clarify terminology used
4. Clean-up the references: remove expired/individual I-Ds + add normative references
5. Soften some of the language around unstable specs (cTLS)

Normative references?

"Normative references specify documents that must be read to understand or implement the technology in the new RFC, or whose technology must be present for the technology in the new RFC to work.

…

- *Note 3: The normative/informative distinction is relevant in any document that amounts to a technical specification, even if its intended status is Experimental or Informational."*

[IESG statement]

Normative references are not needed: we are not defining a technology.

Few examples of Informational RFCs with no Normative references:

- RFC 9794 - **Terminology for Post-Quantum Traditional Hybrid Schemes**
- RFC 9583 - **Application Scenarios for the Quantum Internet**
- RFC 9378 - **In Situ Operations, Administration, and Maintenance (IOAM) Deployment**

What’s next?

- Answer Med’s review, submit v-10
- IETF Last Call