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# SC Maintenance Minutes

## Tuesday 14 May AM1

**8:35** Meeting opened

* Chair reviewed IEEE PatCom slides from Opening Report (15-19-0202-00), there were no responses to the Call for Potentially Essential Patents.
* Discussion on any other issues with published standards? There were no requests for discussion.
* Changes requested to operations manual
  + Letter ballot procedures were discussed
  + Reasons for abstentions
  + Possible mitigations to voter ballot response issues:
    - Define 802.15 sets of subinterests, for which Abstain is not an expected response
      * For example, {MAC, PHY} Then, if a document does not overlap with a participant's subinterest, review is not mandated for that participant
    - Do not allow more than one Letter Ballot per month
      * or… what is a reasonable time period?
      * or… limiting page count per month?
    - Allow people to estimate their degree of expertise for a document
      * Perhaps some people hesitate to make reviews because the implication is that they have expertise equal to the document authors
    - Possible mitigations to voter ballot response issues:
    - Change OM to require TG chair to present at WNG before vote to go to LB:
      * Overview of draft
      * Segment draft into shorter sections and request volunteers to review specific sections
      * During letter ballot voting members could contact volunteer reviewers for draft comments

**10:05** Upon no further discussion nor objection, the meeting was recessed

# SC WNG minutes

## Wednesday 15 May AM2

* Tutorial on SCOS for 802.15 ([22-19-0026-00](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.22/dcn/19/22-19-0026-00-0000-tutorial-on-scos-for-802-15.pptx)) by Apurva N. Mody (BAE Systems, WhiteSpace Alliance)
  + Q:M Gillmore (Itron): Why not 802.19? R: Since this includes an IoT sensing, 802.15 seemed appropriate
    - C: B Heile (WG chair): On the process of moving this project to 802.15: significant reason is the branding of 802.15; 802.15.4 has TVWS mode; since 802.22.3 has passed the letter ballot phase and is now ready for Standards Committee ballot; PAR change could not be approved until 4 Sept so 802.15 would run the Standards Committee ballot
    - Q: Kunal Shah (Itron) would 802.15 continue all 802.22 work? R: possible but 802.15 WG would need to decide about any further effort
    - Q: M Gilmore (Itron) - 802.15 already has spectrum resource management, i.e. 802.15.4s, what would be project be labelled? R: could be called 802.15.22
    - C: P Nikolich (self) - 802.22 has 3 voting members, moving to 802.15 brings in many more technical experts
    - Straw Poll: approve moving 802.22.3 into 802.15? Yes - 19, no - 2, abstain - 22
* Discussion on 802.15 letter ballot procedures (15-19-0202-00)
  + Significant discussion on rationales for abstaining from voting yes or no on letter ballots. Numerous comments made that the diversity of the content in the drafts resulted in the individual believing that they could not vote yes since they were not competent in all areas of the draft. Follow-on comments made contradicted the previous comments by stating that there were many areas of the draft on which all individuals were competent. Consensus of the group was to remove text in the OM that either restricted the periodicity of abstaining or limiting the percentage of voters abstaining.

# SC IETF Minutes

## Monday 13 May AM2

### Meeting Objectives / Session Focus - SC IETF

**10:30:** Meeting called to order

Chair presented Opening Report (15-19-0202-00). Chair showed IEEE patent slides, there were no responses to the Call for Potentially Essential Patents.

Agenda for this meeting was to review status via the minutes from IETF 104.

* 6tisch: <https://datatracker.ietf.org/meeting/104/materials/minutes-104-6tisch-01>
  + Discussion on errors in the minimal security draft
* Core: no minutes
  + No discussion
* 6lo: (<https://datatracker.ietf.org/meeting/104/materials/minutes-104-6lo-01>)
* Roll: [minutes-104-roll](https://datatracker.ietf.org/meeting/104/materials/minutes-104-roll-00)
  + draft-ietf-roll-aodv-rpl-06
  + modifications to AODV-RPL draft based on comments received during WGLC
  + security considerations; bidirect asymm route discovery in addition to peer-to-peer route discovery
* Suit: [minutes-104-suit](https://datatracker.ietf.org/meeting/104/materials/minutes-104-suit-00)
* lp-wan: [minutes-104-lpwan](https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/minutes-104-lpwan/)
  + draft-gomez-rto-considerations-lpwan:
    - typical lpwan technologies provide a very large RTT (seconds to hours). Default timeout values for TCP and CoAP: a few seconds \* shows results of theoretical studies, on LoRaWAN and Sigfox
  + Call for adoption:
    - schc-over-sigfox  - in favor: about 10  - opposed: none
    - LoRaWAN   - in favor: about 10   - opposed: none
    - NBiot     - in favor: about 10    - opposed: none
    - YANG data model doc    - in favor: about 10     opposed: none
  + Raw: [minutes-104-paw-01](https://datatracker.ietf.org/meeting/104/materials/minutes-104-paw-01)
    - Excerpt from minutes: “We want to avoid the term deterministic, in wireless we prefer the notion of predictability. Determinism means repeatable, predictable activities.”
    - Discussion ensued as to the use cases such as LDACS
    - Should this group follow RAW?
      * Consensus was the SC IETF will follow RAW

**12:08** Meeting recessed until Wednesday, PM2

## Wednesday 15 May PM2

### Meeting Objectives / Session Focus - SC IETF

Purpose of this meeting is to discuss SCHC for 802.15.4.

IETF presentation “How to use SCHC with 802.15.4” doc 15-19-0069-03 by C Perkins.

* C Perkins lead discussion on SCHC
  + Discussion on need for FCS, 16-bit or 32-bit. 32-bit would have much smaller false rate.

Goals for next session:

* J Robert to make presentation on use case(s) for lp-wan to allow the group to determine the advantages of SCHC versus 802.15.4.

**AOB**

* None offered

SC IETF adjourned at 17:55