

6lo
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: May 17, 2018

Lijo Thomas
C-DAC
P. Akshay
Indian Institute of Science
Satish Anamalamudi
Huaiyin Institute of Technology
S.V.R.Anand
Malati Hegde
Indian Institute of Science
C. Perkins
Futurewei
November 13, 2017

Packet Delivery Deadline time in 6LoWPAN Routing Header
draft-ietf-6lo-deadline-time-00

Abstract

This document specifies a new type for the 6LoWPAN routing header containing the delivery deadline time for data packets. The deadline time enables forwarding and scheduling decisions for time critical IoT M2M applications that need deterministic delay guarantees over constrained networks and operate within time-synchronized networks.

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 <https://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 May 17, 2018.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2017 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

Internet-Draft

6Lo Delivery Deadline Time

November 2017

This document is subject to [BCP 78](#) and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<https://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	2
2.	Terminology	3
3.	6LoRHE Generic Format	3
4.	Deadline-6LoRHE	3
5.	Deadline-6LoRHE Format	4
6.	Deadline-6LoRHE in Three Network Scenarios	6
6.1.	Scenario 1: Endpoints in the same DODAG (N1) in non-storing mode.	6
6.2.	Scenario 2: Endpoints in Networks with Dissimilar L2 Technologies.	7
6.3.	Scenario 3: Packet transmission across different DODAGs (N1 to N2).	8
7.	IANA Considerations	9
8.	Security Considerations	10
9.	Acknowledgements	10
10.	References	10
10.1.	Normative References	10
10.2.	Informative References	11
	Authors' Addresses	12

[1.](#) Introduction

Low Power and Lossy Networks (LLNs) are likely to be deployed for real time industrial applications requiring end-to-end delay guarantees [[I-D.grossman-detnet-use-cases](#)]. A Deterministic Network ("detnet") typically requires some data packets to reach their receivers within strict time bounds. Intermediate nodes use the deadline information to make appropriate packet forwarding and scheduling decisions to meet the time bounds.

The draft [[I-D.ietf-roll-routing-dispatch](#)] specifies the 6LoWPAN

Routing Header (6LoRH), compression schemes for RPL routing (source routing) operation [[RFC6554](#)], header compression of RPL Packet Information [[RFC6553](#)], and IP-in-IP encapsulation. This document specifies a new Deadline-6LoRHE type for the 6LoWPAN Dispatch Page 1, so that the deadline time of data packets can be included within the

6LoWPAN routing header. This document also specifies handling of the deadline time when packets traverse through time-synchronized networks operating in different timezones or distinct reference clocks.

2. Terminology

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 document uses terminology consistent with the terminology used in [[RFC6550](#)] and [[I-D.ietf-6tisch-terminology](#)]. Also, in this document, the terms "expiration time", "delivery deadline time", and "deadline" are used interchangeably with the same meaning.

3. 6LoRHE Generic Format

Note: this section is not normative. It is included for convenience, and may be deleted in a later revision of this document. The generic header format of the 6LoRHE is specified in [[I-D.ietf-roll-routing-dispatch](#)]. Figure 1 illustrates the 6LoRHE generic format.




Figure 1: 6LoRHE format

- o Length: Length of the 6LoRHE expressed in bytes, excluding the first 2 bytes. This enables a node to skip a 6LoRHE if the Type

is not recognized/supported.

- o Type: Type of the 6LoRHE.

- o length: variable

4. Deadline-6LoRHE

The Deadline-6LoRHE (see Figure 2) is an elective 6LoRH (i.e., a 6LoRHE) that provides the Deadline time (DT) for an IPv6 datagram in a compressed form. Along with the deadline, the header can include the packet Origination Time (OT), to enable a close estimate of the

total delay incurred by a packet. The OT field is initialized by the sender using the current time at the outgoing network interface through which the packet is forwarded.

The deadline field contains the value of the delivery deadline time for the packet. The packet SHOULD be delivered to the Receiver before this time.

$$\text{packet_deadline_time} = \text{packet_origination_time} + \text{max_delay}$$

All nodes within the network SHOULD process the Deadline-6LoRHE in order to support delay-sensitive deterministic applications. The packet deadline time (DT) and origination time (OT) are represented in time units determined by a scaling parameter in the routing header. One of the time units is the Network ASN (Absolute Slot Number) which can be used in case of a time slotted synchronized network, for instance a 6TiSCH network, where global time is maintained in the units of slot lengths of a certain resolution.

The delay experienced by packets in the network is a useful metric for network diagnostics and performance monitoring. Whenever the packets crosses into a network using a different reference clock, the Origination Time field is updated to represent the same Origination Time as expressed using the reference clock of the outgoing interface into the new network. This is the same as the current time when the packet is transmitted into the new network, minus the delay already experienced by the packet, say 't'. In effect, to the newly entered network, the packet will appear to have originated 't' time units earlier with respect to the reference clock of the new network.

01 : Time represented in seconds
10 : Network ASN
11 : Reserved

EXP (3 bits) : Multiplication factor expressed as exponent of 10.

The value of the DT field is multiplied by 10 to this power, to get the actual deadline time in the units represented by TU. The default value of EXP is 000, so that the DT field is unaffected.

Rsv (3 bits) : Reserved

DT Value (8..64-bit) : Deadline Time value

OT Value (8..64-bit) : Origination Time value

Whenever a sender initiates the IP datagram, it includes the Deadline-6LoRHE along with other 6LoRH information.

Example: Consider a 6TiSCH network with time-slot length of 10ms. Let the current ASN when the packet is originated be 54400, and the maximum allowable delay (max_delay) for the packet delivery is 1 second from the packet origination, then:

$$\text{deadline_time} = \text{packet_origination_time} + \text{max_delay}$$

= 54400 + 100 (in Network ASNs)

= 55000(Network ASNs)

Deadline-6LoRHE encoding with '0' flag set to 1 :

DTL = 001, OTL = 001, TU = '10', EXP = 2, DT = 0x22B, OT = 0x22A

6. Deadline-6LoRHE in Three Network Scenarios

In this section, Deadline-6LoRHE operation is described for 3 network scenarios. Figure 3 depicts a constrained time-synchronized LLN that has two subnets N1 and N2, connected through LBRs [[I-D.ietf-6lo-backbone-router](#)] with different reference clock times T1 and T2.




Figure 4: End points within same DODAG(subnet N1)

At the tunnel endpoint of IPv6-in-IPv6 encapsulation, the Deadline-6LoRHE is copied back from the outer header to inner header, and the inner IP packet is delivered to 'R'.

6.2. Scenario 2: Endpoints in Networks with Dissimilar L2 Technologies.

In scenario 2, shown in Figure 5, the Sender 'S' (belonging to DODAG 1) has IP datagram to be routed to a Receiver 'R' over a time-synchronized IPv6 network. For the route segment from 'S' to 6LBR, 'S' includes a Deadline-6LoRHE. Subsequently, 6LR will perform hop-by-hop operation to forward the packet towards the 6LBR. Once the IP datagram reaches 6LBR of DODAG1, it encodes the deadline time (and, if available, the origination time) into the In-band OAM header extension, [[I-D.brockners-inband-oam-data](#)] and passes the datagram to the IPv6 layer for further routing.




Figure 5: Packet transmission in Dissimilar L2 Technologies or Internet

The IP datagram is routed to another time synchronized deterministic network following its own distinct reference clock, so the deadline time in In-band OAM has to be updated according to the measurement of the current time in the new network.

6.3. Scenario 3: Packet transmission across different DODAGs (N1 to N2).

Consider the scenario depicted in Figure 6, in which the Sender 'S' (belonging to DODAG 1) has an IP datagram to be sent to Receiver 'R' belonging to another DODAG (DODAG 2). The operation of this scenario can be decomposed into combination of case 1 and case 2 scenarios. For the route segment from 'S' to 6LBR, 'S' includes the Deadline-6LoRHE. Subsequently, each 6LR will perform hop-by-hop operation to forward the packet towards the 6LBR. Once the IP datagram reaches 6LBR1 of DODAG1, it applies the same rule as described in Case 2 while routing the packet to LBR2 over a (likely) time synchronized wired backhaul. The wired side of LBR2 can be mapped to receiver of Case 2. Once the packet reaches LBR2, it updates the Deadline-6LoRHE by adding the current time of DODAG2. Further, it generates an IPv6-in-IPv6 encapsulated packet when sending the packet downstream to the Receiver [[I-D.ietf-roll-useofrplinfo](#)].

Internet-Draft

6Lo Delivery Deadline Time

November 2017

6LoRH Type	Value
Deadline-6LoRHE	TBD

Figure 7: Deadline-6LoRHE type

8. Security Considerations

The security considerations of [RFC4944], [RFC6282] and [RFC6553] apply. Using a compressed format as opposed to the full in-line format is logically equivalent and does not create an opening for a new threat when compared to [RFC6550], [RFC6553] and [RFC6554].

9. Acknowledgements

The authors thank Pascal Thubert for suggesting the idea and encouraging the work. Thanks to Shwetha Bhandari's suggestions which were instrumental in extending the timing information to heterogeneous networks. The authors acknowledge the 6TiSCH WG members for their inputs on the mailing list. Special thanks to Jerry Daniel, Shalu Rajendran, Seema Kumar, Avinash Mohan and Anita Varghese for their support and valuable feedback.

10. References

10.1. Normative References

[I-D.ietf-6tisch-terminology]

Palattella, M., Thubert, P., Watteyne, T., and Q. Wang, "Terminology in IPv6 over the TSCH mode of IEEE 802.15.4e", [draft-ietf-6tisch-terminology-09](#) (work in progress), June 2017.

[I-D.ietf-roll-routing-dispatch]

Thubert, P., Bormann, C., Toutain, L., and R. Cragie, "6LoWPAN Routing Header", [draft-ietf-roll-routing-dispatch-05](#) (work in progress), October 2016.

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.
- [RFC4944] Montenegro, G., Kushalnagar, N., Hui, J., and D. Culler, "Transmission of IPv6 Packets over IEEE 802.15.4 Networks", [RFC 4944](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4944, September 2007, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4944>>.

- [RFC6282] Hui, J., Ed. and P. Thubert, "Compression Format for IPv6 Datagrams over IEEE 802.15.4-Based Networks", [RFC 6282](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6282, September 2011, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6282>>.
- [RFC6550] Winter, T., Ed., Thubert, P., Ed., Brandt, A., Hui, J., Kelsey, R., Levis, P., Pister, K., Struik, R., Vasseur, JP., and R. Alexander, "RPL: IPv6 Routing Protocol for Low-Power and Lossy Networks", [RFC 6550](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6550, March 2012, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6550>>.
- [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", [RFC 6553](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6553, March 2012, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6553>>.
- [RFC6554] Hui, J., Vasseur, JP., Culler, D., and V. Manral, "An IPv6 Routing Header for Source Routes with the Routing Protocol for Low-Power and Lossy Networks (RPL)", [RFC 6554](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6554, March 2012, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6554>>.

[10.2.](#) Informative References

- [I-D.brockners-inband-oam-data]
Brockners, F., Bhandari, S., Pignataro, C., Gredler, H., Leddy, J., Youell, S., Mizrahi, T., Mozes, D., Lapukhov, P., Chang, R., and d. daniel.bernier@bell.ca, "Data Fields for In-situ OAM", [draft-brockners-inband-oam-data-07](#) (work in progress), July 2017.

[I-D.grossman-detnet-use-cases]

Grossman, E., Gunther, C., Thubert, P., Wetterwald, P., Raymond, J., Korhonen, J., Kaneko, Y., Das, S., and Y. Zha, "Deterministic Networking Use Cases", [draft-grossman-detnet-use-cases-01](#) (work in progress), November 2015.

[I-D.ietf-6lo-backbone-router]

Thubert, P., "IPv6 Backbone Router", [draft-ietf-6lo-backbone-router-04](#) (work in progress), July 2017.

[I-D.ietf-roll-useofrplinfo]

Robles, I., Richardson, M., and P. Thubert, "When to use [RFC 6553](#), 6554 and IPv6-in-IPv6", [draft-ietf-roll-useofrplinfo-19](#) (work in progress), October 2017.

Lijo Thomas, et al.

Expires May 17, 2018

[Page 11]

Internet-Draft

6lo Delivery Deadline Time

November 2017

[I-D.vilajosana-6tisch-minimal]

Vilajosana, X. and K. Pister, "Minimal 6TiSCH Configuration", [draft-vilajosana-6tisch-minimal-00](#) (work in progress), October 2013.

Authors' Addresses

Lijo Thomas
C-DAC
Trivandrum 695033
India

Email: lijo@cdac.in

P.M. Akshay
Indian Institute of Science
Bangalore 560012
India

Email: akshaypm@ece.iisc.ernet.in

Satish Anamalamudi
Huaiyin Institute of Technology

No.89 North Beijing Road, Qinghe District
Huaiian
China

Email: satishnaidu80@gmail.com

S.V.R Anand
Indian Institute of Science
Bangalore 560012
India

Email: anand@ece.iisc.ernet.in

Malati Hegde
Indian Institute of Science
Bangalore 560012
India

Email: malati@ece.iisc.ernet.in

Lijo Thomas, et al.

Expires May 17, 2018

[Page 12]

Internet-Draft

6to Delivery Deadline Time

November 2017

Charles E. Perkins
Futurewei
2330 Central Expressway
Santa Clara 95050
Unites States

Email: charliep@computer.org

