

LPWAN WG

WG Chairs:

Alexander Pelov <a@ackl.io>

Pascal Thubert <pthubert@cisco.com>

AD: Suresh Krishnan
<suresh@kaloom.com>

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/>) 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

- [16:05] Administrivia [5min]
 - o Note-Well, Scribes, Agenda Bashing
 - o Status of drafts

- [16:10] Last updates of SCHC IP/UDP (Dominique) [15min]
- [16:25] SCHC YANG Data Model (Laurent) [25min]
- [16:50] LoRAWAN IID (Olivier) [10min]
- [17:00] AOB

WG progress

Milestones

Date	⇄ Milestone
Done	Submit CoAP compression mechanism to the IESG for publication as a Proposed Standard
Done	Submit IP/UDP compression and fragmentation mechanism to the IESG for publication as a Proposed Standard
Done	Submit LPWAN specification to the IESG for publication as an Informational Document
Done	Adopt CoAP compression mechanism as a WG item
Done	Adopt IP/UDP compression and fragmentation mechanism as a WG item
Done	Adopt LPWAN specifications as WG item

Document advancement

Document	Date	Status	IPR	AD / Shepherd
Active Internet-Drafts (5 hits)				
draft-ietf-lpwan-coap-static-context-hc-12 LPWAN Static Context Header Compression (SCHC) for CoAP	2019-12-10 28 pages	AD Evaluation for 75 days Submitted to IESG for Publication:Proposed Standard Reviews: iotdir		Suresh Krishnan Pascal Thubert
draft-ietf-lpwan-ipv6-static-context-hc-24 Static Context Header Compression (SCHC) and fragmentation for LPWAN, application to UDP/IPv6	2019-12-05 83 pages	RFC Ed Queue : EDIT for 28 days Submitted to IESG for Publication:Proposed Standard Reviews: genart, intdir, opsdire, secdir		Suresh Krishnan Pascal Thubert
draft-ietf-lpwan-schc-over-lorawan-05 Static Context Header Compression (SCHC) over LoRaWAN	2019-12-20 24 pages	I-D Exists WG Document		
draft-ietf-lpwan-schc-over-nbiot-01 SCHC over NB-IoT	2019-11-16 22 pages	I-D Exists WG Document		
draft-ietf-lpwan-schc-over-sigfox-01 SCHC over Sigfox LPWAN	2019-11-04 10 pages	I-D Exists WG Document		
Related Internet-Drafts (5 hits)				
draft-thubert-lpwan-schc-over-ppp-00 SCHC over PPP	2019-12-03 5 pages	I-D Exists		

Interim, January 8th, 2020

IETF 107 Meeting Req

Working Group Name:	IPv6 over Low Power Wide-Area Networks (Ippwan)	
Area Name:	Internet Area	
Number of Sessions Requested:	1	
Length of Session 1:	1.5 Hours	
Number of Attendees:	60	
Conflicts to Avoid:	Chair Conflict:	6lo roll rift core intarea raw 6man
	Technology Overlap:	detnet netconf lwig suit cbor lake
	Key Participant Conflict:	bier ace
Other WGs that included IPv6 over Low Power Wide-Area Networks in their conflict list:	intarea, babel	
Resources requested:	<i>None so far</i>	
People who must be present:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Suresh Krishnan ■ Pascal Thubert ■ Alexander Pelov 	

IETF 107 Dates

- **2019-12-16 (Monday):** Working Group and BOF scheduling begins. To request a Working Group session, use the [IETF Meeting Session Request Tool](#). If you are working on a BoF request, it is highly recommended to tell the IESG now by sending an email to iesg@ietf.org to get advance help with the request.
- **2019-12-16 (Week of):** IETF Online Registration Opens. [Register here](#).
- **2020-02-03 (Monday):** Early Bird registration and payment cut-off at UTC 23:59. [Register here](#).
- **2020-02-07 (Friday):** Cut-off date for BOF proposal requests to Area Directors at UTC 23:59. To request a BOF, please see instructions on [Requesting a BOF](#).
- **2020-02-07 (Friday):** Cut-off date for requests to schedule Working Group Meetings at UTC 23:59. To request a Working Group session, use the [IETF Meeting Session Request Tool](#).
- **2020-02-14 (Friday):** Cut-off date for Area Directors to approve BOFs at UTC 23:59.
- **2020-02-21 (Friday):** Preliminary Agenda published for comment.
- **2020-02-26 (Wednesday):** Cut-off date for requests to reschedule Working Group or BOF meetings UTC 23:59.
- **2020-02-28 (Friday):** Final agenda to be published.
- **2020-03-09 (Monday):** Internet Draft submission cut-off (for all drafts, including -00) by UTC 23:59. Upload using the [ID Submission Tool](#).
- **2020-03-09 (Monday):** Standard rate registration and payment cut-off at UTC 23:59..
- **2020-03-11 (Wednesday):** Draft Working Group agendas due by UTC 23:59. Upload using the [Meeting Materials Management Tool](#).
- **2020-03-16 (Monday):** Registration cancellation cut-off at UTC 23:59.
- **2020-03-16 (Monday):** Revised Working Group agendas due by UTC 23:59. Upload using the [Meeting Materials Management Tool](#).
- **2020-04-17 (Friday):** Proceedings submission cutoff date by UTC 23:59. Upload using the [Meeting Materials Management Tool](#).
- **2020-05-11 (Monday):** Proceedings submission corrections cutoff date by UTC 23:59.

draft-ietf-lpwan-ipv6-static-context-hc status

Authors:

Laurent Toutain <Laurent.Toutain@imt-atlantique.fr>

Carles Gomez <carlesgo@entel.upc.edu>

Ana Minaburo <ana@acklio.io>

Dominique Barthel <dominique.barthel@orange.com>

Juan Carlos Zuniga <juancarlos.zuniga@sigfox.com>

What has happened since IETF106?



- IETF106 LPWAN meeting on Nov 19th
- Issued -23 on Nov 28th
 - Several editorial improvements
 - App. A compression rules example update
- Carsten provided a second review, Nov 29th, on -23
 - About 60 comments/questions/edits
 - Thanks a lot, Carsten !
 - We responded to all points

What has happened since IETF106?

- Issued -24 on Dec 5th, lots of editorial improvements and also
 - Multiple compression Rules matching
 - Better use of RECOMMENDED in Integrity Checking
 - Better MUST about differentiating All-0 Fragment and ACK REQ
 - Better MUST about differentiating All-1 Fragment and Sender Abort
 - Clarified lifetime of DTag in ACK-Always/ACK-on-Error receiver
 - Clarified Attempts counter in ACK-Always receiver
 - Privacy-providing tunnel assumption in Security Considerations
- -24 approved by Suresh
- Released to RFC Editors on Dec 11th

Conclusions, next steps

- Worked hard to write a good enough specification
 - Functional
 - Efficient
 - Unambiguous
 - Understandable
 - While being mindful of elapsed time and risks associated with being late
- Now put to the test
 - schc-over-foo drafts being written, questions/comments by authors
 - Questions by implementers

Thank you!

SCHC yang data model

Ana Minaburo

Laurent Toutain

LPWAN Interim meeting 01/08/20

Yang data model

- Divided into 2 parts:
 - SCHC-ID : contains definition of types and identifier used in SCHC
 - Field-id id, MO id, CDA id
 - Type definitions for these fields
 - SCHC : defines the context model for compression and fragmentation
- Merged together when the model will be stable.

schc-id.yang

```
identity field-id-base-type {
    description "Field ID with SID";
}

identity fid-ipv6-version {
    base field-id-base-type;
    description "IPv6 version field from RFC8200";
}

identity fid-ipv6-trafficclass {
    base field-id-base-type;
    description "IPv6 Traffic Class field from RFC8200";
}

identity fid-ipv6-trafficclass-ds {
    base field-id-base-type;
    description "IPv6 Traffic Class field from RFC8200,
    DiffServ field from RFC3168";
}

identity fid-ipv6-trafficclass-ecn {
    base field-id-base-type;
    description "IPv6 Traffic Class field from RFC8200,
    ECN field from RFC3168";
}
```

```
typedef field-id-type {
    description "Field ID generic type.";
    type identityref {
        base field-id-base-type;
    }
}
```


SID	Assigned to		
10000	identity /compression-decompression-action-base-type	10037	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-coap-option-uri-port
10001	identity /compression-decompression-action-base-type/cda-appiid	10038	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-coap-option-uri-query
10002	identity /compression-decompression-action-base-type/cda-compute-checksum	10039	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-coap-tkl
10003	identity /compression-decompression-action-base-type/cda-compute-length	10040	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-coap-token
10004	identity /compression-decompression-action-base-type/cda-deviid	10041	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-coap-type
10005	identity /compression-decompression-action-base-type/cda-lsb	10042	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-coap-version
10006	identity /compression-decompression-action-base-type/cda-mapping-sent	10043	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-ipv6-appiid
10007	identity /compression-decompression-action-base-type/cda-not-sent	10044	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-ipv6-appprefix
10008	identity /compression-decompression-action-base-type/cda-value-sent	10045	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-ipv6-deviid
10009	identity /direction-indicator-base-type	10046	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-ipv6-devprefix
10010	identity /direction-indicator-base-type/di-bidirectional	10047	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-ipv6-flowlabel
10011	identity /direction-indicator-base-type/di-down	10048	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-ipv6-hoplimit
10012	identity /direction-indicator-base-type/di-up	10049	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-ipv6-nexthead
10013	identity /field-id-base-type	10050	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-ipv6-payloadlength
10014	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-coap-code	10051	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-ipv6-trafficclass
10015	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-coap-code-class	10052	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-ipv6-trafficclass-ds
10016	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-coap-code-detail	10053	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-ipv6-trafficclass-ecn
10017	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-coap-mid	10054	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-ipv6-version
10018	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-coap-option-accept	10055	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-udp-app-port
10019	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-coap-option-block1	10056	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-udp-checksum
10020	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-coap-option-block2	10057	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-udp-dev-port
10021	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-coap-option-content-format	10058	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-udp-length
10022	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-coap-option-end-option	10059	identity /field-length-base-type
10023	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-coap-option-etag	10060	identity /field-length-base-type/fl-token-length
10024	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-coap-option-if-match	10061	identity /field-length-base-type/fl-variable
10025	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-coap-option-if-none-match	10062	identity /matching-operator-base-type
10026	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-coap-option-location-path	10063	identity /matching-operator-base-type/mo-equal
10027	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-coap-option-location-query	10064	identity /matching-operator-base-type/mo-ignore
10028	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-coap-option-max-age	10065	identity /matching-operator-base-type/mo-matching
10029	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-coap-option-no-response	10066	identity /matching-operator-base-type/mo-msb
10030	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-coap-option-observe		
10031	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-coap-option-proxy-scheme		
10032	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-coap-option-proxy-uri		
10033	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-coap-option-size1		
10034	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-coap-option-size2		
10035	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-coap-option-uri-host		
10036	identity /field-id-base-type/fid-coap-option-uri-path		

Questions - CoAP identityref

- Do you agree to divide fields into sub-fields (coap-code-class, coap-code-detail,...) ?
- CoAP option naming space:
 - Carsten proposes to reserve the whole space to link the option repository to the id
 - How can we do that in Yang ?
 - What size we reserve ?
 - Largest one in IANA : 2053 OCF-Content-Format-Version [[Michael Koster](#)]

0-255 IETF Review or IESG Approval

256-2047 Specification Required

2048-64999 Expert Review

65000-65535 Experimental use (no operational use)

- LT: may be a waste of space, what procedure when new option created ?
- CoAP End Option (0xFF) is treated as an option
 - Conflict if Core uses this value for a specific option.

SCHC model

```

module: schc
  +--rw schc
    +--rw version?   uint64
    +--rw rule* [rule-id rule-length]
    +--rw rule-id    uint32
    +--rw rule-length rule-length-type
    +--rw (nature)?
      +--:(fragmentation)
      | +--rw dtag-size?   uint8
      | +--rw wsize?     uint8
      | +--rw fcsize?    uint8
      | +--rw (mode)?
      |   +--:(no-ack)
      |   +--:(ack-always)
      |   +--:(ack-on-error)
      |   +--rw ack-method? enumeration
  
```

```

+--:(compression)
+--rw entry* [field-id field-position direction-indicator]
+--rw field-id          schc-id:field-id-type
+--rw field-length?    schc-id:field-length-type
+--rw field-position   int8
+--rw direction-indicator schc-id:direction-indicator-type
+--rw target-values* [position]
| +--rw numerical?   uint64
| +--rw string?     string
| +--rw position    uint8
+--rw mo?           schc-id:matching-operator-type
+--rw mo-value* [position]
| +--rw numerical?   uint64
| +--rw string?     string
| +--rw position    uint8
+--rw cda?         schc-id:cda-type
+--rw cda-value* [position]
  +--rw numerical?   uint64
  +--rw string?     string
  +--rw position    uint8
  
```

Open questions - a version number ?

- Added a version for the context
 - Can be useful to check version between a device and core
 - Not a key to simplify queries (don't recopy version in each query)
 - How to structure the version number ? a int or int.int.int ? a identityref ?

Open questions - fragmentation TBD

- Fragmentation is not defined here
 - Use openSCHC table ?
 - How to implement profile (technology dependant)
 - What are the technologies (SF, LoRaWAN DRx, NB-IoT, ...)

Open questions (Compression)

- Target value:

- Generalization of the matching-list

- If a single value has position 0

- Pos + value:

- value : int64 or string
- Can be only a number (for compactness representation)
- Int64 can be too small (i.e. IPv6 address)
 - Yang uses strings for 128 bit identifiers
 - No bit arrays in yang data types

```
grouping target-values-struct {  
  leaf numerical {  
    type uint64;  
  }  
  leaf string {  
    type string;  
  }  
  leaf position {  
    type uint8;  
  }  
}
```

Open Questions (Compression)

- MO and CDA have an argument entry:
 - Currently no usage for CDA
 - Structured as a TV
 - Several arguments
 - Limitation is one argument is also a list of arguments.
 - Who cares ?

LPWAN interim LoRaWAN IID

08/01/2020

Olivier Gimenez

Current IID proposition

1. `key = LoRaWAN AppSKey`
2. `cmac = aes128_cmac(key, devEui)`
3. `IID = cmac[0..7]`

Potential issue: LoRa Alliance might refuse to reuse AppSKey

Other proposition

- Based on RFC7217 where the IID is "stable for each subnet":
- $RID = F(\text{Prefix}, \text{Net_Iface}, \text{Network_ID}, \text{DAD_Counter}, \text{secret_key})$, where `Net_Iface` can be `DevEUI` and `Network_ID` the LoRaWAN netid.
- How `secret_key` is setup ?
- Potential issue: will not change over time

AOB ?