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Note Well

This is a reminder of IETF policies in effect on various topics such as patents or code of conduct. It is only meant to point you in the right direction. Exceptions may apply. The IETF's patent policy and the definition of an IETF "contribution" and "participation" are set forth in BCP 79; please read it carefully.

As a reminder:

- By participating in the IETF, you agree to follow IETF processes and policies.
- If you are aware that any IETF contribution is covered by patents or patent applications that are owned or controlled by you or your sponsor, you must disclose that fact, or not participate in the discussion.
- As a participant in or attendee to any IETF activity you acknowledge that written, audio, video, and photographic records of meetings may be made public.
- Personal information that you provide to IETF will be handled in accordance with the IETF Privacy Statement.
- As a participant or attendee, you agree to work respectfully with other participants; please contact the ombudsteam ([https://www.ietf.org/contact/ombudsteam/](https://www.ietf.org/contact/ombudsteam/)) if you have questions or concerns about this.

Definitive information is in the documents listed below and other IETF BCPs. For advice, please talk to WG chairs or ADs:

BCP 9 (Internet Standards Process)
BCP 25 (Working Group processes)
BCP 25 (Anti-Harassment Procedures)
BCP 54 (Code of Conduct)
BCP 78 (Copyright)
BCP 79 (Patents, Participation)

https://www.ietf.org/privacy-policy/ (Privacy Policy)
Reminder:

Minutes are taken *
This meeting might be recorded **
Presence is logged ***

* Scribe; please contribute online to the minutes at: https://etherpad.tools.ietf.org/p/lpwan
** Recordings and Minutes are public and may be subject to discovery in the event of litigation.
*** From the Webex login
## Agenda bashing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17:05</td>
<td>Opening, agenda bashing (Chairs) • Note-Well, Scribes, Agenda Bashing • Status of drafts</td>
<td>5mn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:10</td>
<td>SCHC WGLC completion (Dominique)</td>
<td>20mn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30</td>
<td>SCHC next steps (chairs)</td>
<td>10mn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:40</td>
<td>Rechartering text (open discussion)</td>
<td>20mn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:00</td>
<td>AOB</td>
<td>0mn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Note

• As always, all changes can be checked out at
  https://github.com/lp-wan/ip-compression/commits/master
  – Itemized commits
  – (hopefully) explicit commit messages
  – on-line diffs available
Changes to GitHub since -17

• One commit on Nov 4th
  – A few editorial changes following comments by Shoichi during Hackathon
Optional MIC?

- Discussed Nov 6\textsuperscript{th} at IETF103 LPWAN meeting in Bangkok
  - Suresh: do not anticipate roadblocks at IESG, document the issue and the resolution (ML and Ticket), this will be pointed to in the shepherd’s review

- **Ticket #32** reopened Nov 6\textsuperscript{th}
  - New entries by Dominique, Ana and Juan Carlos, also copied on the mailing list
Webinar to LoRa Alliance

• Delivered Nov 16th
  – General intro about LPWAN work at IETF
  – Presentation of the new Ack-on-Error fragmentation mode

• Well received, a few questions

• Contact established

• Slides available?
WGLC for -17

- Launched Nov 12\textsuperscript{th}, closed Nov 27\textsuperscript{th}
- Focus on the Fragmentation section
- One review received, thank you Charlie!
  - Covers both Compression and Fragmentation
  - Many editorial comments, several technical ones
  - A second delivery announced
  - We had an 1h phone call to make sure we correctly understand the comments
- Not acted on the comments yet
  - We were forming our opinion while expecting other reviews
Target Value type

- Target Value (TV) is the value used to match against the packet header field. The Target Value can be of any type (integer, strings, etc.). It can be a single value or a more complex structure (array, list, etc.), such as a JSON or a CBOR structure.

- Question applies to other columns of table
- Does this draft intend to specify this?
  - To an interoperable level?
  - To a conversational level?
- Where is this specified?
Profile requirements section

• Profile currently described in Terminology
• Currently, Appendix D lists what parameters/options need to be specified in a Profile
  – Non-normative guideline for authors of other documents
• Recommendation by Charlie to create a Profile requirement section upfront
  – Normative?
  – This section would forward-reference parameters/options not introduced yet. Including parameters that implementers may not want to know about (fragmentation is optional)
Next steps

• Come to a conclusion regarding the Rule table
  – Target Value type, Field ID
  – Specification in a Data Model? Which document? With a reference from this document?
  – Does interoperability goal include Rules description?

• Come to a decision regarding optional MIC

• Implement editorial changes following WGLC

• Shoot for -18 next week
Thank you!
SCHC Next Steps

WG Chairs:
Alexander Pelov <a@ackl.io>
Pascal Thubert <pthubert@cisco.com>
SCHC Next Steps

• Architecture Document
• YANG Data Model
• SCHC-over-FOO
• Interops
Rechartering Discussion

WG Chairs:
Alexander Pelov <a@ackl.io>
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1. Produce a Standards Track document to enable the compression and fragmentation of a CoAP-messages over LPWA networks. This will be achieved through stateful mechanisms, for a relevant subset of the possible CoAP interactions (TBD as part of the work).

2. Produce a Standards Track document to define the generic data models to formalize the compression and fragmentation contexts.

3. Produce Standard Track documents to apply SCHC IPv6/UDP over the baseline technologies.

4. Produce a Standards Track document to enable operations, administration and maintenance (OAM) to the LPWAN device, including support for delayed or proxyed liveliness verification (Ping).

5. ? IPv4 ? Other ?