<draft-farrell-lpwan-overview> Continued

Editor: Stephen Farrell
stephen.farrell@cs.tcd.ie
(plus many contributors)

Obvious TBDs

- Shorter, crisper text (if possible)
- Check/update technology descriptions
  - Guidance from WG as to what's the minimum needed gratefully accepted
  - E.g. do we need all the RF stuff ?
- Continue gap analysis
  - Presumably using some kind of issue tracker ?
- Refine generic terminology
  - … all to the point where the WG are happy they are useful enough, and all assuming the WG want to adopt the draft

Issues (one slide for each in a 'mo)

- Decide target and timing for this
- Descriptive material in this draft vs. technology specific drafts
- Define common terminology or an LPWAN architecture ?
- How much gap analysis to include here vs. in standards-track work

Issues (one slide for each in a 'mo)

- ## Options presented are those that occurred to editor, adding more may well be a fine thing
  - Too much refinement is probably not worthwhile though

- ## Editor is quite happy with whatever the WG want, suggestions presented are just that, and can of course change over time as WG consensus determines

Issue#1 : Targets and timing

1) Send to IESG as informational RFC before standards track work sent to IESG (the usual legacy approach :-)

2) Work the text 'till the WG are happy, mostly park it while standards-track work done, then update this draft and send both to IESG together. End-game update of this draft should eliminate duplication or conflicts with standards-track text.

3) Work the text 'till the WG are happy enough, and then just let the I-D expire in the fullness of time.

4) Work the text 'till the WG are happy enough, and then make the text into a wiki at some point so folks can independently update it e.g. after the WG has closed.

Editor suggests: #2

<draft-farrell-lpwan-overview>

Issue#2 : Descriptive Material vs. LPWAN Individual Drafts

1) Work that text to the minimum useful needed independently of what specific technology proponents want to do with their own I-Ds or other specs. Don't try too hard to keep it all up-to-the-minute as long as it's still generally useful.

2) Assume specific technology proponents who want to will pursue their own I-Ds (or other specs) outside the WG (e.g. sending to ISE), eliminate text from this draft where there are overlaps and refer to other drafts/specs as appropriate.

Editor suggests: #1

<draft-farrell-lpwan-overview>

Issue#3 : Generic Terminology or LPWAN Architecture ?

1) Develop the common terminology text into a fairly complete LPWAN architecture text

2) Aim for a minimal set of common terms that are needed to get started on the standards track work. Definitions of those might move to standards-track document(s) later.

Editor suggests: #2

Issue#4 : Handling gap analysis

1) Work that text in this draft exclusively for now, then move whatever's needed into standards-track document(s) as appropriate, keep the remainder here.

2) Remove all that text, and have the WG adopt a separate gap analysis draft

Editor suggests: #1

Finally : Adopt this as WG item and go from there ?

Yes/no/more-info-needed?

Thanks