6lo working group Internet-Draft

Intended status: Standards Track

Expires: February 2, 2015

C. Bormann Universitaet Bremen TZI August 01, 2014

# RPL Mesh Header draft-bormann-6lo-rpl-mesh-00

#### Abstract

This short draft provides a straw man for the RPL Mesh Header.

#### Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of  $\underline{\mathsf{BCP}}$  78 and  $\underline{\mathsf{BCP}}$  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 <a href="http://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/">http://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/</a>.

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 February 2, 2015.

### Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2014 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to  $\underline{\mathsf{BCP}}$  78 and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents

(<a href="http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info">http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info</a>) 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

<u>1</u> .	Introduction	2
1	<u>.1</u> . Terminology	2
	Idea	
	IANA considerations	
<u>4</u> .	Security considerations	<u>3</u>
<u>5</u> .	References	4
5	<u>.1</u> . Normative References	4
<u>5</u>	<u>.2</u> . Informative References	4
Auth	nor's Address	4

#### 1. Introduction

[I-D.thubert-6man-flow-label-for-rpl] defines a way to carry RPL information in a flow label. The present draft shows how to carry the same information in a RPL Mesh Header, in a slightly more efficient way.

# 1.1. Terminology

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in <a href="RFC 2119">RFC 2119</a> [RFC2119].

# 2. Idea

(Insert definitions from [I-D.thubert-6man-flow-label-for-rpl] here.)

Where [I-D.thubert-6man-flow-label-for-rpl] would carry the [RFC6553] information in a flow label:

the RPL Mesh header carries it in a Mesh header, depending on whether Rank and Inst both fit into 4 bits (S=0) or not (S=1):

Internet-Draft RPL Mesh Header August 2014

```
2
             1
                                        3
\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & 0 & 1 \\ \end{smallmatrix}
|0 1 0 0 0 1 0 U | Rank | Inst | (continuation)...
1
                           2
                                        3
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
|0 1 0 0 0 1|1|U| Rank
                   Inst | (continuation)...
```

Figure 1: RPL Mesh Header: Short and Long Version

The U bit controls whether an [RFC6282] IPHC dispatch follows (U=0, Figure 2) or an [RFC4944] FRAG1 fragment header (U=1, Figure 3). In both cases, the first three bits of the dispatch are replaced by the 0, R, and F bits from [I-D.thubert-6man-flow-label-for-rpl].

Figure 2: continuation for U=0

Figure 3: continuation for U=1

#### 3. IANA considerations

This draft requests IANA to assign the following four dispatch types in the "IPv6 Low Power Personal Area Network Parameters" registry:

01 0001SU

# 4. Security considerations

The security considerations of  $[\underline{\mathsf{RFC4944}}]$ ,  $[\underline{\mathsf{RFC6282}}]$ , and  $[\underline{\mathsf{RFC6553}}]$  apply.

# 5. References

#### **5.1.** Normative References

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", <u>BCP 14</u>, <u>RFC 2119</u>, March 1997.
- [RFC6282] Hui, J. and P. Thubert, "Compression Format for IPv6 Datagrams over IEEE 802.15.4-Based Networks", RFC 6282, September 2011.
- [RFC6553] Hui, J. and JP. Vasseur, "The Routing Protocol for Low-Power and Lossy Networks (RPL) Option for Carrying RPL Information in Data-Plane Datagrams", <u>RFC 6553</u>, March 2012.

# 5.2. Informative References

[I-D.thubert-6man-flow-label-for-rpl]

Thubert, P., "The IPv6 Flow Label within a RPL domain",

draft-thubert-6man-flow-label-for-rpl-03 (work in

progress), May 2014.

Author's Address

Carsten Bormann Universitaet Bremen TZI Postfach 330440 Bremen D-28359 Germany

Phone: +49-421-218-63921

Email: cabo@tzi.org