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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 ***

* Please contribute to the minutes at: https://codimd.ietf.org/notes-ietf-interim-2021-lpwan-09-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 [15min]
  o Note-Well, Scribes, Agenda Bashing
  o WG Status

[16:20] Data Model for SCHC [15min]
  Discussion on features

[16:35] AUTH-48 for RFC-to-be 8824 [20min]
  Status (Ana + Eric)
## WG Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Milestone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2022</td>
<td>Produce a Standards Track document for SCHC over NBIOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-ietf-lpwan-schc-over-nbiot/">draft-ietf-lpwan-schc-over-nbiot</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2021</td>
<td>Produce a Standards Track document for SCHC over SigFox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-ietf-lpwan-schc-over-sigfox/">draft-ietf-lpwan-schc-over-sigfox</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 2021</td>
<td>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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2021</td>
<td>Produce a Standards Track document to define the generic data models to formalize the compression and fragmentation contexts for LPWANs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2020</td>
<td>Produce Standard Track documents to apply SCHC IPv6/UDP over the baseline technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2020</td>
<td>Perform SCHC Maintenance, including enabling SCHC mechanisms for Upper layer Protocols</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Document advancement

### Active Internet-Drafts (5 hits)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>IPR</th>
<th>AD / Shepherd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>draft-ietf-lpwan-architecture-00</td>
<td>2021-05-18</td>
<td>I-D Exists, WG Document: Informational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPWAN Static Context Header Compression (SCHC) Architecture</td>
<td>2021-05-08</td>
<td>RFC Ed Queue AUTH48, AUTH48, for 84 days, Proposed Standard Reviews: genart, iotidr, opsdir, secdir, tsvar</td>
<td>Pascal Thuibert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPWAN Static Context Header Compression (SCHC) for CoAP</td>
<td>2021-02-22</td>
<td>I-D Exists, WG Document Feb 2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>draft-ietf-lpwan-schc-over-nblos-04</td>
<td>2021-02-02</td>
<td>I-D Exists, WG Document Oct 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHC over NB-IoT</td>
<td>2021-01-19</td>
<td>I-D Exists, WG Document Feb 2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>draft-ietf-lpwan-schc-over-sigfox-05</td>
<td>2021-01-19</td>
<td>I-D Exists, WG Document Feb 2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHC over Sigfox LPWAN</td>
<td>2021-01-19</td>
<td>I-D Exists, WG Document Feb 2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>draft-lpwan-schc-yang-data-model-04</td>
<td>2021-01-19</td>
<td>I-D Exists, WG Document Feb 2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Model for Static Context Header Compression (SCHC)</td>
<td>2021-01-19</td>
<td>I-D Exists, WG Document Feb 2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RFCs (5 hits)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RFC</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>IPR</th>
<th>AD / Shepherd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RFC 8576</td>
<td>2018-05</td>
<td>Informational RFC</td>
<td>Suresh Krishnan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Power Wide Area Network (LPWAN) Overview</td>
<td>2020-04</td>
<td>Proposed Standard RFC</td>
<td>Suresh Krishnan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFC 8724</td>
<td>2020-04</td>
<td>Proposed Standard RFC</td>
<td>Pascal Thuibert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHC: Generic Framework for Static Context Header Compression and Fragmentation</td>
<td>2021-04</td>
<td>Proposed Standard RFC</td>
<td>Dominique Barthel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFC 9011</td>
<td>2021-04</td>
<td>Proposed Standard RFC</td>
<td>Éric Vyncke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static Context Header Compression and Fragmentation (SCHC) over LoRaWAN</td>
<td>2021-04</td>
<td>Proposed Standard RFC</td>
<td>Éric Vyncke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Action items

• (All) Consider RFC 5856 and RFC 6920
• (Carsten) Kick off OSCORE discussion on passing SCHC Rules with security context
IETF 111

- Meetings will be middle of the CEST night – Or past that
- We have interims – 5 interims – Scheduled between now and then
- Should we ask for an official meeting?
draft-ietf-lpwan-schc-yang-data-model-04

Laurent Toutain (laurent.toutain@imt-atlantique.fr)
Ana Minaburo (ana@ackl.io)
draft-ietf-lpwan-coap-static-context-hc-19
AUTH-48

Ana Minaburo (ana@ackl.io)
Laurent Toutain (laurent@imt-atlantique.fr)
Ricardo Andreasen (randreasen@fi.uba.ar)
Status

• AUTH-48
• RFC8824
  • Thanks Eric
  • Thanks RFC-Editor
Title

• Currently:
  • LPWAN Static Context Header Compression (SCHC) for CoAP
    • Low-Power Wide-Area Network (LPWAN) Static Context Header Compression and fragmentation (SCHC) for the Constrained Application Protocol (CoAP)

• Suggested (full abbreviated)
  • LPWAN SCHC for COAP
USE of SCHC compression as noun

• Currently as a noun
  • SCHC compression
  • Does follow RFC8724 where SCHC (Static Context Header Compression and Fragmentation)?
  • Or does SCHC compression means: Static Context Header Compression compression?
Section 3. DI make the difference

• Does it mean “determine the difference between header types “
• Or something else?

• => Identify Request or Response descriptions, using DI as decision maker
• The field description MAY define both request/response header and target values in the same Rule, using the DI (direction indicator) to indicate the header type
Verify new changes from Editor

• Approve the latest changes base on our answers
AOB ?