LPWAN WG

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

AD: Eric Vyncke
<evyncke@cisco.com>

Webex

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)

I E T F

Reminder:

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

* Please contribute to the minutes at: https://codimd.ietf.org/notes-ietf-interim-2020-lpwan-17-lpwan?both
** 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   [10min]
  o Note-Well, Scribes, Agenda Bashing
  o WG Status, IETF 109 News
[16:15] SCHC over LoRaWAN   [15min]
[16:30] CoAP over SCHC
[15min] [16:45] Open Bar / AOB
  [QS]

WG Status

Milestones

Date	Milestone
Jul 2021	Produce a Standards Track document to enable operations, administration and maintenance (OAM) to the LPWAN device, including support for delayed or proxied liveness verification (Ping)
Feb 2021	Produce a Standards Track document to define the generic data models to formalize the compression and fragmentation contexts for LPWANs
Dec 2020	Produce Standard Track documents to apply SCHC IPv6/UDP over the baseline technologies
May 2020	Perform SCHC Maintenance, including enabling SCHC mechanisms for Upper layer Protocols

Documents advancement

LPWAN

Document	Date	Status	IPR	Shepherd
Active Internet-Drafts (5 hits)				
draft-ietf-lpwan-coap-static-context-hc-16 **LPWAN Static Context Header Compression (SCHC) for CoAP**	2020-10-20 31 pages	IESG Evaluation::AD Followup for 131 days Submitted to IESG for Publication: Proposed Standard Reviews: genart, iotdir, opsdir, secdir, tsvart		Éric Vyncke ✉ Pascal Thubert ✉
draft-ietf-lpwan-schc-over-lorawan-13 **Static Context Header Compression (SCHC) over LoRaWAN**	2020-10-30 28 pages	Approved-announcement to be sent::Revised I-D Needed for 19 days Submitted to IESG for Publication: Proposed Standard Reviews: genart, iotdir, opsdir, secdir, tsvart	1	Éric Vyncke ✉ Dominique Barthel ✉
draft-ietf-lpwan-schc-over-nbiot-03 **SCHC over NB-IoT**	2020-07-13 23 pages	I-D Exists WG Document		Éric Vyncke ✉
draft-ietf-lpwan-schc-over-sigfox-04 **SCHC over Sigfox LPWAN**	2020-11-02 14 pages	I-D Exists WG Document		Éric Vyncke ✉
draft-ietf-lpwan-schc-yang-data-model-03 **Data Model for Static Context Header Compression (SCHC)**	2020-07-10 42 pages	I-D Exists WG Document		Éric Vyncke ✉

Status: draft-ietf-lpwan-schc-over-lorawan

Editors:

Ivaylo Petrov (ivaylo@ackl.io)

Olivier Gimenez (ogimenez@semtech.com)

Next Steps

- V16 published 20/10/2020
  - Changes has been presented on the interim-2020-lpwan-15
  - Waiting for the IESG Feedback

Version 16

- Thanks to all the reviewers
- Status: Has a DISCUSS. Has enough positions to pass once DISCUSS positions are resolved.

Changes from v15 to v16

– Section 5.X not discuss CoAP Options but in-passing references to Section 3.1

  • The section has been verified with the corresponding refences to section 3.1

    – New Text : the URI-Path option is mandatory in the request, and it <u>may not be</u> present in the response. (instead of: it is not present)

    – Content-Format is allowed in both request and response. Has been changed

    – The Accept option examples has been split into two different examples

      » New text : For example, the URI-Path option is mandatory in the request, and it may not be present in the response. A request may contain an Accept option, and the response may include a Content-Format option. In comparison, IPv6 and UDP returning path swap the value of some fields in the header.

Changes from v15 to v16

– Security considerations: separate in two usages a) with LPWAN and b) without LPWAN L2 security

- New Text: When applied on top of LPWAN technologies, the Security Considerations of SCHC header compression [rfc8724] are valid for SCHC CoAP header compression. <u>When other technologies are used, an integrity protection mechanism must be defined to carry SCHC compressed packets.</u> When CoAP uses OSCORE, the security considerations defined in [rfc8613] does not change when SCHC header compression is applied.

Changes from v15 to v16

– Francesca comment: New options are not included: provide indication how they might be handled, rules guidance for them, ex: always send them as full residuals; or some other behavior but give guidance to support them.

- We have added the following new text, at the end of Section 5:

If a new option is introduced in CoAP, a new Field ID has to be assigned in the Rules to allow its compression. Otherwise, if no Rule describes this Option the SCHC compression is not possible and the CoAP header is sent without compression.

Changes from v15 to v16

– Introduction: "CoAP is an End-to-End protocol…" It's not entirely clear to me that this is true, given that CoAP proxies are a first-class protocol feature. OSCORE is probably fair to describe as end-to-end, but CoAP itself may not be.

– We have changed to this new text :

"CoAP is an application protocol, so CoAP compression requires to install common rules between the two SCHC instances."

Changes from v15 to v16

- – Section 2 figures and description are not consistent

- – New section 2 has been written but figures has been kept

- – Nits: Has been corrected

Thank you

LPWAN

- Questions?

AOB ?