

Mobile Ad hoc Networking (MANET)  
Internet-Draft  
Updates: 7188, 7631  
(if approved)  
Intended status: Experimental  
Expires: March 31, 2016

C. Dearlove  
BAE Systems Applied Intelligence  
Laboratories  
T. Clausen  
LIX, Ecole Polytechnique  
September 28, 2015

Multi-Topology Extension for the Optimized Link State Routing Protocol  
version 2 (OLSRv2)  
draft-ietf-manet-olsrv2-multitopology-07

Abstract

This specification describes an extension to the Optimized Link State Routing Protocol version 2 (OLSRv2) to support multiple routing topologies, while retaining interoperability with OLSRv2 routers that do not implement this extension.

This specification updates RFCs 7188 and 7631 by modifying and extending TLV registries and descriptions.

Status of this Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of BCP 78 and BCP 79.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <http://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on March 31, 2016.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2015 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to BCP 78 and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents

carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

## Table of Contents

1. Introduction . . . . .	4
1.1. Motivation and Experimentation . . . . .	4
2. Terminology and Notation . . . . .	5
3. Applicability Statement . . . . .	6
4. Protocol Overview and Functioning . . . . .	6
5. Parameters . . . . .	8
6. Information Bases . . . . .	9
6.1. Local Attached Network Set . . . . .	9
6.2. Link Sets . . . . .	9
6.3. 2-Hop Sets . . . . .	9
6.4. Neighbor Set . . . . .	9
6.5. Router Topology Set . . . . .	10
6.6. Routable Address Topology Set . . . . .	10
6.7. Attached Network Set . . . . .	10
6.8. Routing Sets . . . . .	11
7. TLVs . . . . .	11
7.1. Message TLVs . . . . .	11
7.1.1. MPR_TYPES TLV . . . . .	11
7.1.2. MPR_WILLING TLV . . . . .	11
7.2. Address Block TLVs . . . . .	12
7.2.1. LINK_METRIC TLV . . . . .	12
7.2.2. MPR TLV . . . . .	13
7.2.3. GATEWAY TLV . . . . .	13
8. HELLO Messages . . . . .	14
8.1. HELLO Message Generation . . . . .	14
8.2. HELLO Message Processing . . . . .	14
9. TC Messages . . . . .	15
9.1. TC Message Generation . . . . .	15
9.2. TC Message Processing . . . . .	16
10. MPR Calculation . . . . .	16
11. Routing Set Calculation . . . . .	16
12. Management Considerations . . . . .	17
13. IANA Considerations . . . . .	18
13.1. Expert Review: Evaluation Guidelines . . . . .	18
13.2. Message TLV Types . . . . .	18
13.3. Address Block TLV Types . . . . .	19
14. Security Considerations . . . . .	21
15. Acknowledgments . . . . .	21
16. References . . . . .	22
16.1. Normative References . . . . .	22
16.2. Informative References . . . . .	22
Authors' Addresses . . . . .	23

## 1. Introduction

The Optimized Link State Routing Protocol, version 2 [RFC7181] (OLSRv2) is a proactive link state routing protocol designed for use in mobile ad hoc networks (MANETs) [RFC2501]. One of the significant improvements of OLSRv2 over its Experimental precursor [RFC3626] is the ability of OLSRv2 to route over other than minimum hop routes, using a link metric.

A limitation that remains in OLSRv2 is that it uses a single link metric type for all routes. However in some MANETs it would be desirable to be able to route packets using more than one link metric type. This specification describes an extension to OLSRv2 that is designed to permit this, while maintaining maximal interoperability with OLSRv2 routers not implementing this extension.

The purpose of OLSRv2 can be described as to create and maintain a Routing Set, which contains all the necessary information to populate an IP routing table. In a similar way, the role of this extension can be described as to create and maintain multiple Routing Sets, one for each link metric type supported by the router maintaining the sets.

### 1.1. Motivation and Experimentation

Multi-topology routing is a natural extension to a link state routing protocol, as for example to OSPF (see [RFC4915]). However multi-topology routing for OLSRv2 does not yet benefit from extensive operational, or even experimental, experience. This specification is published to facilitate collecting such experience, with the intent that once suitable experimental evidence has been collected, an OLSRv2 Multi-Topology Routing Extension will be proposed for advancement onto Standards Track.

Any experiments using this protocol extension are encouraged. Reports from such experiments planned with pre-specified objectives and scenarios (including link, position and mobility information) are particularly encouraged. Results from such experiments, documenting the following, are of particular importance:

- o Operation in networks that contain both routers implementing this extension, and routers implementing only [RFC7181], in particular are there any unexpected interactions that can break the network?
- o Operation in networks with dynamic topologies, both due to mobility and due to link metric changes for reasons other than mobility.

- o Operation in realistic deployments, and details thereof, including in particular indicating how many concurrent topologies were required.
- o Behavior of routing sets, including measures of successful route establishment.

In addition, reports from experiments covering the following are also of value:

- o Which link metric types were useful, and how the metrics to associate with a given link were established.
- o How packet types were associated with link metric types (whether using DiffServ on an alternative mechanism).
- o Any data link layer issues, and any cross-layer issues, including whether NHDP link quality was used, and how.
- o Transport and higher layer issues observed, if any.
- o Resource requirements observed from running the protocol, including processing, storage, and bandwidth.
- o Network performance, including packet delivery results.
- o Any other implementation issues.

The first bullet in the latter list applies to unextended [RFC7181] as well as this extension, and potentially to other MANET routing protocols. This may also allow experimentation with link metric types that are not compromises to handle multiple traffic types.

## 2. Terminology and Notation

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "NOT RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [RFC2119].

This specification uses the terminology of [RFC5444], [RFC6130] and [RFC7181], which is to be interpreted as described in those specifications.

Additionally, this specification uses the following terminology:

Router - A MANET router that implements [RFC7181].

MT-OLSRv2 - The protocol defined in this specification as an extension to [RFC7181].

This specification introduces the notation `map[A -> B]` to represent an associative mapping. The domain of this mapping (A) is, in this specification, always a set of link metric types that the router supports: either `IFACE_METRIC_TYPES` or `ROUTER_METRIC_TYPES`, as defined in Section 5. The codomain of this mapping (B) is a set of all possible values of an appropriate type, in this specification this type is always one of:

- o boolean (true or false),
- o willingness (a 4 bit unsigned integer from 0 to 15);
- o number of hops (an 8 bit unsigned integer from 0 to 255), or
- o link metric (either a representable link metric value, as described in [RFC7181], or `UNKNOWN_METRIC`).

### 3. Applicability Statement

The protocol described in this specification is applicable to a MANET for which OLSRv2 is otherwise applicable (see [RFC7181], Section 3), but in which multiple topologies are maintained, each characterized by a different choice of link metric type. It is assumed, but outside the scope of this specification, that the network layer is able to choose which topology to use for each packet, for example using the DiffServ Code Point (DSCP) defined in [RFC2474]. This selection of topology MUST be consistent, that is each router receiving a packet must make the same choice of link metric type, in order that each packet uses a single topology. This is necessary to avoid the possibility of a packet "looping" in the network.

### 4. Protocol Overview and Functioning

The purpose of this specification is to extend OLSRv2 [RFC7181] so as to enable a router to establish and maintain multiple routing topologies in a MANET, each topology associated with a link metric type. Routers in the MANET may each form part of some or all of these topologies, and each router will maintain a Routing Set for each topology that it forms part of, allowing separate routing of packets for each topology.

MT-OLSRv2 is designed to interoperate with OLSRv2; a MANET can be created containing both routers that implement MT-OLSRv2 (MT-OLSRv2 routers) and routers that do not implement MT-OLSRv2, and may be unaware of its existence (non-MT-OLSRv2 routers). MANETs may also be created that are known to contain only MT-OLSRv2 routers. In both cases, but especially the former, management may be required to ensure that the MANET will function as required, and does not, for example, unnecessarily fragment. (Such issues already arise in an OLSRv2-based MANET using multiple interfaces.)

OLSRv2 is an extension of NHDP [RFC6130]. However the extension in this specification does not modify NHDP, it only modifies Protocol Sets that are specific to OLSRv2, or elements in Protocol Tuples that were added by OLSRv2 and which are not included in nor used by NHDP. In addition it does not use or modify the link quality mechanism in [RFC6130].

Each router implementing this specification selects a set of link metric types for each of its OLSRv2 interfaces. If all routers in the MANET implement MT-OLSRv2, then there are no restrictions within this specification on how these sets of link metrics are selected. (However the issues described in the preceding paragraph still apply.) However in MANETs containing non-MT-OLSRv2 routers, the single link metric used by these non-MT-OLSRv2 routers must be included in the set of link metrics for each OLSRv2 interface of an MT-OLSRv2 router that may be heard on an OLSRv2 interface of a non-MT-OLSRv2 router in the MANET.

Each router then determines an incoming link metric for each link metric type selected for each of its OLSRv2 interfaces. These link metrics are distributed using link metric TLVs contained in all HELLO messages sent on OLSRv2 interfaces, and in all TC messages. Both HELLO and TC messages generated by an MT-OLSRv2 router (other than one using only the single metric type used by non-MT-OLSRv2 routers) include an MPR\_TYPES Message TLV that indicates that this is an MT-OLSRv2 router and which metric types it supports (on the sending OLSRv2 interface for a HELLO message).

In addition to link and neighbor metric values for each link metric type, router MPR (multipoint relay) and MPR selector status, and advertised neighbor status, is maintained per supported neighbor metric type, for each symmetric 1-hop neighbor. Each router may choose a different willingness to be a routing MPR for each link metric type that it supports.

A network using MT-OLSRv2 will usually require greater management than one using unmodified OLSRv2. In particular, the use of multiple metric types across the MANET must be managed, by administrative

configuration or otherwise. As also for other decisions that may be made when using OLSRv2, a bad collective choice of metric type use will make the MANET anywhere from inefficient to non-functional, so care will be needed in selecting supported link metric types across the MANET.

The meanings of link metric types are at the discretion of the MANET operator, they could be used, for example, to represent packets of different types, packets in streams of different rates, or packets with different trust requirements. Note that packets will generally not be delivered to routers that do not support that link metric type, and the MANET, and the packets sent in it, will need to be managed accordingly (especially if containing any non-MT-OLSRv2 routers).

## 5. Parameters

The parameters used in [RFC7181], including from its normative references, are used in this specification with the following changes.

Each OLSRv2 interface will support a number of link metric types, corresponding to Type Extensions of the LINK\_METRIC TLV defined in [RFC7181]. The router parameter LINK\_METRIC\_TYPE, used by routers that do not implement MT-OLSRv2, and used with that definition in this specification, is replaced in routers implementing MT-OLSRv2 by an interface parameter array IFACE\_METRIC\_TYPES and a router parameter array ROUTER\_METRIC\_TYPES. Each element in these arrays is a link metric type (i.e., a type extension used by the LINK\_METRIC TLV [RFC7181]).

The interface parameter array IFACE\_METRIC\_TYPES contains the link metric types supported on that OLSRv2 interface. The router parameter array ROUTER\_METRIC\_TYPES is the union of all of the IFACE\_METRIC\_TYPES. Both arrays MUST be without repetitions.

If in a given deployment there may be any routers that do not implement MT-OLSRv2, then IFACE\_METRIC\_TYPES MUST first include LINK\_METRIC\_TYPE if that OLSRv2 interface may be able to communicate with any routers that do not implement MT-OLSRv2. In that case, ROUTER\_METRIC\_TYPES MUST also first include LINK\_METRIC\_TYPE.

In addition, the router parameter WILL\_ROUTING is extended to an array of values, one each for each link metric type in the router parameter list ROUTER\_METRIC\_TYPES.



## 6. Information Bases

The Information Bases specified in [RFC7181], which extend those specified in [RFC6130], are further extended in this specification. With the exception of the Routing Set, the extensions in this specification are the replacement of single values (boolean, willingness, number of hops, or link metric) from [RFC7181] with elements representing multiple values (associative mappings from a set of metric types to their corresponding values). The following subsections detail these extensions.

Note that, as in [RFC7181], an implementation is free to organize its internal data in any manner it chooses, it needs only to behave as if it were organized as described in [RFC7181] and this specification.

### 6.1. Local Attached Network Set

Each element `AL_dist` becomes a map[ROUTER\_METRIC\_TYPES -> number of hops].

Each element `AL_metric` becomes a map[ROUTER\_METRIC\_TYPES -> link metric].

### 6.2. Link Sets

Each element `L_in_metric` becomes a map[IFACE\_METRIC\_TYPES -> link metric].

Each element `L_out_metric` becomes a map[IFACE\_METRIC\_TYPES -> link metric].

The elements of `L_in_metric` MUST be set following the same rules that apply to the setting of the single element `L_in_metric` in [RFC7181].

### 6.3. 2-Hop Sets

Each element `N2_in_metric` becomes a map[ROUTER\_METRIC\_TYPES -> link metric].

Each element `N2_out_metric` becomes a map[ROUTER\_METRIC\_TYPES -> link metric].

### 6.4. Neighbor Set

Each element `N_in_metric` becomes a map[ROUTER\_METRIC\_TYPES -> link metric].

Each element `N_out_metric` becomes a map[ROUTER\_METRIC\_TYPES -> link

metric].

Each element `N_will_routing` becomes a map[ROUTER\_METRIC\_TYPES -> willingness].

Each element `N_routing_mpr` becomes a map[ROUTER\_METRIC\_TYPES -> boolean].

Each element `N_mpr_selector` becomes a map[ROUTER\_METRIC\_TYPES -> boolean].

Each element `N_advertised` becomes a map[ROUTER\_METRIC\_TYPES -> boolean].

#### 6.5. Router Topology Set

Each element `TR_metric` becomes a map[ROUTER\_METRIC\_TYPES -> link metric].

Note that some values of `TR_metric` may now take the value UNKNOWN\_METRIC. When used to construct a Routing Set, where just the corresponding link metric value from this mapping is used, Router Topology Tuples whose corresponding value from `TR_metric` is UNKNOWN\_METRIC are ignored.

#### 6.6. Routable Address Topology Set

Each element `TA_metric` becomes a map[ROUTER\_METRIC\_TYPES -> link metric].

Note that some values of `TA_metric` may now take the value UNKNOWN\_METRIC. When used to construct a Routing Set, where just the corresponding link metric value from this mapping is used, Routable Address Topology Tuples whose corresponding value from `TA_metric` is UNKNOWN\_METRIC are ignored.

#### 6.7. Attached Network Set

Each element `AN_dist` becomes a map[ROUTER\_METRIC\_TYPES -> number of hops].

Each element `AN_metric` becomes a map[ROUTER\_METRIC\_TYPES -> link metric].

Note that some values of `AN_metric` may now take the value UNKNOWN\_METRIC. When used to construct a Routing Set, where just the corresponding link metric value from this mapping is used, Attached Network Tuples whose corresponding value from `AN_metric` is

UNKNOWN\_METRIC are ignored.

## 6.8. Routing Sets

There is a separate Routing Set for each link metric type in ROUTER\_METRIC\_TYPES.

## 7. TLVs

This specification makes the following additions and extensions to the TLVs defined in [RFC7181].

### 7.1. Message TLVs

One new Message TLV is defined in this specification, and one existing Message TLV is extended by this specification.

#### 7.1.1. MPR\_TYPES TLV

The MPR\_TYPES TLV is used in both HELLO messages sent over OLSRv2 interfaces and TC messages. A message MUST NOT contain more than one MPR\_TYPES TLV.

The presence of this TLV in a message is used to indicate that the router supports MT-OLSRv2, in the same way that the presence of the MPR\_WILLING TLV is used to indicate that the router supports OLSRv2, as specified in [RFC7181]. For this reason, the MPR\_TYPES TLV has been defined with the same Type as the MPR\_WILLING TLV, but with Type Extension = 1.

This TLV may take a Value field of any size. Each octet in its Value field will contain a link metric type that is supported, either on any OLSRv2 interface, when included in a TC message, or on the OLSRv2 interface on which an including HELLO message is sent. These octets MAY be in any order, except that if there may be any routers in the MANET not implementing MT-OLSRv2, then the first octet MUST be LINK\_METRIC\_TYPE.

#### 7.1.2. MPR\_WILLING TLV

The MPR\_WILLING TLV, which is used in HELLO messages, is specified in [RFC7181], and extended in this specification as enabled by [RFC7188].

The interpretation of this TLV, specified by [RFC7181], and which uses all of its single octet Value field, is unchanged. That interpretation uses bits 0-3 of its Value field to specify its

willingness to be a flooding TLV, and bits 4-7 of its Value field to be a routing TLV. Those latter bits are, when using this specification, interpreted as its willingness to be a routing TLV using the link metric type LINK\_METRIC\_TYPE.

The extended use of this message TLV, as defined by this specification, defines additional 4 bit sub-fields of the Value field, starting with bits 4-7 of the first octet and continuing with bits 0-3 of the second octet, to represent willingness to be a routing MPR using the link metric types specified in this OLSRv2 interface's IFACE\_METRIC\_TYPES parameter, ordered as reported in the included MPR\_TYPES Message TLV. Note that this means that the link metric type LINK\_METRIC\_TYPE will continue to occupy bits 4-7 of the first octet. (If there is no such TLV included, then the router does not support MT-OLSRv2, and only the first octet of the Value field will be used.)

If the number of link metric types in this OLSRv2 interface's IFACE\_METRIC\_TYPES parameter is even, then there will be an unused 4 bit sub-field in bits 4-7 of the last octet of a full sized Value field. These bits will not be used, they SHOULD all be cleared ('0').

If the Value field in an MPR\_WILLING TLV is shorter than its full length, then, as specified in [RFC7188], missing Value octets, i.e., missing willingness values, are considered as zero, i.e., as WILL\_NEVER. This is the correct behavior. (In particular it means that an OLSRv2 router that is not implementing MT-OLSRv2 will not act as a routing MPR for any link metric that it does not recognize.)

## 7.2. Address Block TLVs

New Type Extensions are defined for the LINK\_METRIC TLV defined in [RFC7181], and the Value fields of the MPR TLV and the GATEWAY TLV, both defined in [RFC7181], are extended, as enabled by [RFC7188].

### 7.2.1. LINK\_METRIC TLV

The LINK\_METRIC TLV is used in HELLO messages and TC messages. This TLV is unchanged from the definition in [RFC7181].

Only a single Type Extension was specified by [RFC7181] (link metric type) 0 as defined by administrative action. This specification extends this range to 0-7. This specification will work with any combination of Type Extensions both within and without that range (assuming that the latter are defined as specified in [RFC7181]).

### 7.2.2. MPR TLV

The MPR TLV is used in HELLO messages, and indicates that an address with which it is associated is of a symmetric 1-hop neighbor that has been selected as an MPR.

The Value field of this address block TLV is, in [RFC7181], defined to be one octet long, with the values 1, 2 and 3 defined. [RFC7188] redefines this Value field to be a bitfield where bit 7 (the lsb) denotes flooding status, bit 6 denotes routing MPR status, and bits 5-0 are unallocated (respecting the semantics of the bits/values 1, 2 and 3 from [RFC7181]).

This specification, as enabled by [RFC7188], extends the MPR TLV to have a variable-length Value field. For interoperability with a router not implementing MT-OLSRv2, the two least significant bits of the first octet in the Value field of this TLV MUST be the TLV Value of the MPR TLV, generated according to [RFC7181].

Subsequent bits (in increasing significance within an octet, then continuing with the least significant bit in the next octet, if required) in the TLV Value field indicate which link metric types, for which the corresponding address is selected as a routing MPR, link metric types (including the first) being indicated in, and used in the same order as, the Value field of an MPR\_TYPES Message TLV, excluding the link metric type LINK\_METRIC\_TYPE, which already occupies the second bit.

### 7.2.3. GATEWAY TLV

The GATEWAY TLV is used in TC messages to indicate that a network address is of an attached network.

The Value field of this address block TLV is, in [RFC7181] defined to be one octet long, containing the number of hops to that attached network.

This specification, as enabled by [RFC7181], allows the extension the GATEWAY TLV to have a variable-length Value field when the number of hops to each attached network is different for different link metric types. For interoperability with a router not implementing MT-OLSRv2, the first octet in the Value field of this TLV MUST be the TLV Value of the GATEWAY TLV generated according to [RFC7181].

Any subsequent octets in the TLV Value field indicate the number of hops to the attached network for each other link metric type, link metric types (including the first) being indicated in the Value field of an MPR\_TYPES Message TLV.

Type	Value
GATEWAY	Number of hops to attached network for each link metric type.

Table 1: GATEWAY TLV definition

## 8. HELLO Messages

The following changes are made to the generation and processing of HELLO messages compared to that described in [RFC7181] by routers that implement MT-OLSRv2.

### 8.1. HELLO Message Generation

A generated HELLO message to be sent on an OLSRv2 interface (whose `IFACE_METRIC_TYPES` parameter will be that used) is extended by:

- o Adding an `MPR_TYPES` Message TLV. The Value octets will be the link metric types in `IFACE_METRIC_TYPES`. This TLV MAY be omitted if the only link metric type included would be `LINK_METRIC_TYPE`.
- o Extending the `MPR_WILLING` Message TLV Value field to report the willingness values from the `WILL_ROUTING` parameter list that correspond to the link metric types in `IFACE_METRIC_LIST`, in the same order as reported in the `MPR_TYPES` TLV, each value (also including one representing `WILL_FLOODING`) occupying 4 bits.
- o Including `LINK_METRIC` Address Block TLVs that report all values in `L_in_metric`, `L_out_metric`, `N_in_metric` and `N_out_metric` elements that are not equal to `UNKNOWN_METRIC`, with the TLV Type Extension being the link metric type, and otherwise following the rules for such inclusions specified in [RFC7181].
- o Including `MPR` Address Block TLVs such that for each link metric type in `IFACE_METRIC_TYPES`, and for the choice of flooding MPRs, the indicated addresses MUST be of the MPRs in an MPR set as specified for a single link metric type in [RFC7181].

### 8.2. HELLO Message Processing

On receipt of a HELLO message on an OLSRv2 interface, a router implementing MT-OLSRv2 MUST, in addition to the processing described in [RFC7181]:

1. If in this deployment there may be any routers that do not implement MT-OLSRv2, the HELLO message contains an MPR\_TYPES Message TLV, and the first link metric type that it reports is not LINK\_METRIC\_TYPE, then the HELLO message MUST be silently discarded.
2. Determine the list of link metric types supported by the sending router on its corresponding OLSRv2 interface, either from an MPR\_TYPES Message TLV or, if not present, the single link metric type LINK\_METRIC\_TYPE.
3. For those link metric types supported by both routers, set the appropriate L\_out\_metric, N\_in\_metric, N\_out\_metric, N\_will\_routing, N\_mpr\_selector, N\_advertised, N2\_in\_metric and N2\_out\_metric values as described for single such elements in [RFC7181].
4. For any other metric types supported by the receiving router only (i.e. in IFACE\_METRIC for the receiving OLSRv2 interface), set the elements listed in the previous point to their default values, i.e., UNKNOWN\_METRIC, WILL\_NEVER (not WILL\_DEFAULT), or false.

## 9. TC Messages

The following changes are made to the generation and processing of TC messages compared to that described in [RFC7181] by routers that implement MT-OLSRv2.

### 9.1. TC Message Generation

A generated TC message is extended by:

- o Adding an MPR\_TYPES TLV. The value octets will be the link metric types in ROUTER\_METRIC\_TYPES. This MAY be omitted if the only link metric type included would be LINK\_METRIC\_TYPE.
- o Including LINK\_METRIC TLVs that report all values of N\_out\_metric that are not equal to UNKNOWN\_METRIC, with the TLV Type Extension being the link metric type, and otherwise following the rules for such inclusions specified in [RFC7181].
- o When not all the same, including a number of hops per reported (in an MPR\_TYPES Message TLV) link metric type in the Value field of each GATEWAY TLV included, in the same order as reported in the MPR\_TYPES TLV.

## 9.2. TC Message Processing

On receipt of a TC message, a router implementing this extension MUST, in addition to the processing specified in [RFC7181]:

- o If in this deployment there may be any routers that do not implement MT-OLSRv2, the TC message contains an MPR\_TYPES Message TLV, and the first link metric type that it reports is not LINK\_METRIC\_TYPE, then the TC message MUST be silently discarded.
- o Set the appropriate TR\_metric, TA\_metric, AN\_dist and AN\_metric elements using the rules for setting the single elements of those types specified in [RFC7181].
- o For any other metric types supported by the receiving router that do not have an advertised outgoing neighbor metric of that type, set the corresponding elements of TR\_metric, TA\_metric and AN\_metric to UNKNOWN\_METRIC. (The corresponding element of AN\_dist may be set to any value.)

## 10. MPR Calculation

Routing MPRs are calculated for each link metric type in ROUTER\_METRIC\_TYPES. Links to symmetric 1-hop neighbors via OLSRv2 interfaces that do not support that link metric type are not considered. The determined status (routing MPR or not routing MPR) for each link metric type is recorded in the relevant element of N\_routing\_mpr.

Each router may make its own decision as to whether or not to use a link metric, or link metrics, for flooding MPR calculation, and if so which and how. This decision MUST be made in a manner that ensures that flooded messages will reach the same symmetric 2-hop neighbors as would be the case for a router not supporting MT-OLSRv2.

Note that it is possible that a 2-Hop Tuple in the Information Base for a given OLSRv2 interface does not support any of the link metric types that are in the router's corresponding IFACE\_METRIC\_TYPES, but nevertheless that 2-Hop Tuple MUST be considered when determining flooding MPRs.

## 11. Routing Set Calculation

A Routing Set is calculated for each link metric type in ROUTER\_METRIC\_TYPES. The calculation may be as for [RFC7181], except that where an element is now represented by a map, the value from the



map for the selected link metric type is used. Where this is a link metric of value UNKNOWN\_METRIC, that protocol Tuple is ignored for the calculation.

## 12. Management Considerations

MT-OLSRv2 may require greater management than unextended OLSRv2. In particular a MANET using MT-OLSRv2 requires the following management considerations:

- o Deciding which link metric, and hence which Routing Set to use, for received packets, hence how to use the Routing Sets to configure the network layer (IP). All routers MUST make the same decision for the same packet. An obvious approach is to map each DiffServ Code Point (DSCP) [RFC2474] to a single link metric. (This may be a many to one mapping.)
- o Selecting which link metrics to support on each OLSRv2 interface and implementing that decision. (Different interfaces may have different physical and data link layer properties, and this may inform the selection of link metrics to support, and their values.) If the MANET may contain non-MT-OLSRv2 routers, which is also subject to management, then the rules for link metric assignment to OLSRv2 interfaces in this specification for that case MUST be followed.
- o Ensuring that the MANET is sufficiently connected, by ensuring that, for example, sufficiently many routers implement each metric type required (this being easier in, for example, a denser network). Note that if there is any possibility that there are any routers not implementing MT-OLSRv2, then the MANET will be connected, to the maximum extent possible, using the link metric type LINK\_METRIC\_TYPE, but this will only serve to deliver packets that use that link metric type.
- o Non-MT-OLSRv2 routers SHOULD be managed so as not produce packets that will be routed by a topology that they are not part of. However if they were to do so then such packets will be routed until either they reach their destination, or they reach an MT-OLSRv2 router. In the latter case the packet will then either be dropped (if that MT-OLSRv2 router is not part of that topology, or is not aware of the destination within that topology) or will be routed by that topology to the destination. Such a packet will not loop.
- o If a packet is created for a destination that is not part of the corresponding topology then it may or may not be delivered (if the

originating router is a non-MT-OLSRv2 router) or will not be transmitted (if the originating router is an MT-OLSRv2 router). Routers SHOULD be managed so that this does not occur.

### 13. IANA Considerations

This specification adds one new Message TLV, allocated as a new Type Extension to an existing Message TLV, using a new name. It also modifies the Value field of an existing Message TLV, and of an existing Address Block TLV. Finally, this specification makes additional allocations from the LINK\_METRIC Address Block TLV Type registry.

#### 13.1. Expert Review: Evaluation Guidelines

For the registry where an Expert Review is required, the designated expert SHOULD take the same general recommendations into consideration as are specified by [RFC5444] and [RFC7631].

#### 13.2. Message TLV Types

This specification modifies the Message TLV Type 7, replacing Table 4 of [RFC7631] by Table 2, changing the description of the Type Extension MPR\_WILLING and adding the Type Extension TLV\_TYPES. Each of these TLVs MUST NOT be included more than once in a Message TLV Block.

Type Extension	Name	Description	Reference
0	MPR_WILLING	First (most significant) half octet of Value field specifies the originating router's willingness to act as a flooding MPR; subsequent half octets specify the originating router's willingness to act as a routing MPR, either for the link metric types reported in an MPR_TYPES TLV (in the same order), or (if no MPR_TYPES TLV is present) for the single administratively agreed link metric type	[RFC7181] [RFC7631] This specification
1	MPR_TYPES	The link metric types supported on this OLSRv2 interface of this router (one octet each).	This specification
2-223 224-255		Unassigned Reserved for Experimental Use	[RFC7181]

Table 2: Type 7 Message TLV Type Extensions

## 13.3. Address Block TLV Types

Table 7 of [RFC7188] is replaced by Table 3.

Bit	Value	Name	Description
First octet bit 7	First octet 0x01	Flooding	If set then the neighbor with that network address has been selected as flooding MPR
From first octet bit 6	From first octet 0x02	Routing	If set then the neighbor with that network address has been selected as routing MPR, either for the link metric types reported in an MPR_TYPES TLV (in the same order), or (if no MPR_TYPES TLV is present) then (first octet bit 6, value 0x02) for the single administratively agreed link metric type

Table 3: MPR TLV Bit Values

Table 14 of [RFC7631] is replaced by Table 4. The only changes are to the Description and the References for the GATEWAY TLV.

Type Extension	Name	Description	References
0	GATEWAY	Specifies that a given network address is reached via a gateway on the originating router. The number of hops is indicated by the Value field, one octet per link metric type reported in an MPR_TYPES Message TLV (in the same order) or (if no MPR_TYPES Message TLV is present) using a single octet	[RFC7181] This specification
1-223		Unassigned	
224-255		Reserved for Experimental Use	[RFC7631]

Table 4: Type 10 Address Block TLV Type Extensions

Table 13 of [RFC7181] is replaced by Table 5. The only change is to allocate 8 Type Extensions as assigned by administrative action, in order to support administratively determined multi-topologies.

Name	Type	Type Extension	Description	Allocation Policy
LINK_METRIC	7	0-7	Link metric meaning assigned by administrative action.	
LINK_METRIC	7	8-223	Unassigned.	Expert Review
LINK_METRIC	7	224-255	Unassigned.	Experimental Use

Table 5: Address Block TLV Type assignment: LINK\_METRIC

#### 14. Security Considerations

This extension to OLSRv2 allows a router to support more than one link metric type for each link advertised in HELLO and TC messages, and for routers to support different sets of types. Link metric values of additional types are reported by the inclusion of additional TLVs in the messages sent by a router, which will report known values of all supported types.

HELLO and TC message processing is then extended simply to record, for each supported type, all of the received link metric values for each link. Protocol internal processing (specifically MPR set and shortest path calculations) then operate as specified in [RFC7181] for each link metric type that the router supports.

Consequently the security considerations, including the security architecture and the mandatory security mechanisms, from [RFC7181] are directly applicable to MT-OLSRv2.

Furthermore, this extension does not introduce any additional vulnerabilities over those of [RFC7181], because each link metric type is used independently, and each one could have been the single link metric type supported by an implementation of [RFC7181] receiving the same information, as received information of an unsupported type is ignored by all routers.

#### 15. Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank (in alphabetical order): Juliusz Chroboczek (University of Paris Diderot), Alan Cullen (BAE Systems),

Susan Hares (Huawei) and Henning Rogge (FGAN) for discussions and suggestions.

## 16. References

### 16.1. Normative References

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, March 1997.
- [RFC5444] Clausen, T., Dearlove, C., Dean, J., and C. Adjih, "Generalized MANET Packet/Message Format", RFC 5444, February 2009.
- [RFC6130] Clausen, T., Dean, J., and C. Dearlove, "Mobile Ad Hoc Network (MANET) Neighborhood Discovery Protocol (NHDP)", RFC 6130, April 2011.
- [RFC7181] Clausen, T., Dearlove, C., Jacquet, P., and U. Herberg, "The Optimized Link State Routing Protocol version 2", RFC 7181, April 2014.
- [RFC7188] Dearlove, C. and T. Clausen, "Optimized Link State Routing Protocol version 2 (OLSRv2) and MANET Neighborhood Discovery Protocol (NHDP) Extension TLVs", RFC 7188, April 2014.
- [RFC7631] Dearlove, C. and T. Clausen, "TLV Naming in the MANET Generalized Packet/Message Format", RFC 7631, January 2015.

### 16.2. Informative References

- [RFC2474] Nichols, K., Blake, S., Baker, F., and D. Black, "Definition of the Differentiated Services Field (DS Field) in the IPv4 and IPv6 Headers", RFC 2474, December 1998.
- [RFC2501] Macker, J. and S. Corson, "Mobile Ad hoc Networking (MANET): Routing Protocol Performance Issues and Evaluation Considerations", RFC 2501, January 1999.
- [RFC3626] Clausen, T. and P. Jacquet, "The Optimized Link State Routing Protocol", RFC 3626, October 2003.
- [RFC4915] Psenak, P., Mirtorabi, S., Roy, A., Nguyen, L., and P. Pillay-Esnault, "Multi-Topology (MT) Routing in OSPF",

RFC 4915, June 2007.

Authors' Addresses

Christopher Dearlove  
BAE Systems Applied Intelligence Laboratories  
West Hanningfield Road  
Great Baddow, Chelmsford  
United Kingdom

Phone: +44 1245 242194  
Email: [chris.dearlove@baesystems.com](mailto:chris.dearlove@baesystems.com)  
URI: <http://www.baesystems.com/>

Thomas Heide Clausen  
LIX, Ecole Polytechnique

Phone: +33 6 6058 9349  
Email: [T.Clausen@computer.org](mailto:T.Clausen@computer.org)  
URI: <http://www.ThomasClausen.org/>

