

6lo
Internet-Draft
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: July 26, 2016

P. Thubert, Ed.
Cisco
C. Bormann
Uni Bremen TZI
L. Toutain
IMT-TELECOM Bretagne
R. Cragie
ARM
January 23, 2016

6LoWPAN Routing Header
[draft-ietf-6lo-routing-dispatch-04](#)

Abstract

This specification introduces a new 6LoWPAN dispatch type for use in 6LoWPAN Route-Over topologies, that initially covers the needs of RPL ([RFC6550](#)) data packets compression. Using this dispatch type, this specification defines a method to compress RPL Option ([RFC6553](#)) information and Routing Header type 3 ([RFC6554](#)), an efficient IP-in-IP technique and is extensible for more applications.

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 July 26, 2016.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2016 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	3
2.	Terminology	6
3.	Using the Page Dispatch	6
3.1.	New Routing Header Dispatch (6LoRH)	6
3.2.	Placement Of 6LoRH headers	6
3.2.1.	Relative To Non-6LoRH Headers	7
3.2.2.	Relative To Other 6LoRH Headers	7
4.	6LoWPAN Routing Header General Format	8
4.1.	Elective Format	8
4.2.	Critical Format	9
4.3.	Compressing Addresses	9
4.3.1.	Coalescence	10
4.3.2.	DODAG Root Address Determination	10
5.	The Routing Header Type 3 (RH3) 6LoRH Header	11
5.1.	RH3-6LoRH General Operation	13
5.2.	The Design Point of Popping Entries	13
5.3.	Compression Reference	14
5.4.	Popping Headers	15
5.5.	Forwarding	16
6.	The RPL Packet Information 6LoRH	16
6.1.	Compressing the RPLInstanceID	18
6.2.	Compressing the SenderRank	18
6.3.	The Overall RPI-6LoRH encoding	19
7.	The IP-in-IP 6LoRH Header	21
8.	Security Considerations	22
9.	IANA Considerations	22
9.1.	Reserving Space in 6LoWPAN Dispatch Page 1	22
9.2.	New 6LoWPAN Routing Header Type Registry	23
10.	Acknowledgments	23
11.	References	23
11.1.	Normative References	23
11.2.	Informative References	24
Appendix A.	Examples	25
A.1.	Examples Compressing The RPI	25

A.2.	Example Of Downward Packet In Non-Storing Mode	27
A.3.	Example of RH3-6LoRH life-cycle	28
	Authors' Addresses	30

[1.](#) Introduction

The design of Low Power and Lossy Networks (LLNs) is generally focused on saving energy, a very constrained resource in most cases. The other constraints, such as the memory capacity and the duty cycling of the LLN devices, derive from that primary concern. Energy is often available from primary batteries that are expected to last for years, or is scavenged from the environment in very limited quantities. Any protocol that is intended for use in LLNs must be designed with the primary concern of saving energy as a strict requirement.

Controlling the amount of data transmission is one possible venue to save energy. In a number of LLN standards, the frame size is limited to much smaller values than the IPv6 maximum transmission unit (MTU) of 1280 bytes. In particular, an LLN that relies on the classical Physical Layer (PHY) of IEEE 802.15.4 [[IEEE802154](#)] is limited to 127 bytes per frame. The need to compress IPv6 packets over IEEE 802.15.4 led to the 6LoWPAN Header Compression [[RFC6282](#)] work (6LoWPAN-HC).

Innovative Route-over techniques have been and are still being developed for routing inside a LLN. In a general fashion, such techniques require additional information in the packet to provide loop prevention and to indicate information such as flow identification, source routing information, etc.

For reasons such as security and the capability to send ICMP errors back to the source, an original packet must not be tampered with, and any information that must be inserted in or removed from an IPv6 packet must be placed in an extra IP-in-IP encapsulation. This is the case when the additional routing information is inserted by a router on the path of a packet, for instance a mesh root, as opposed to the source node. This is also the case when some routing information must be removed from a packet that flows outside the LLN. When to use [RFC 6553](#), 6554 and IPv6-in-IPv6

[[I-D.robles-roll-useofrplinfo](#)] details different cases where [RFC 6553](#), [RFC 6554](#) and IPv6-in-IPv6 encapsulation is required to set the bases to help defining the compression of RPL routing information in LLN environments.

When using [[RFC6282](#)] the outer IP header of an IP-in-IP encapsulation may be compressed down to 2 octets in stateless compression and down to 3 octets in stateful compression when context information must be added.




Figure 1: LOWPAN_IPHC base Encoding ([RFC6282](#)).

The Stateless Compression of an IPv6 addresses can only happen if the IPv6 address can be deduced from the MAC addresses, meaning that the IP end point is also the MAC-layer endpoint. This is generally not the case in a RPL network which is generally a multi-hop route-over (i.e., operated at Layer-3) network. A better compression, which does not involve variable compressions depending on the hop in the mesh, can be achieved based on the fact that the outer encapsulation is usually between the source (or destination) of the inner packet and the root. Also, the inner IP header can only be compressed by [[RFC6282](#)] if all the fields preceding it are also compressed. This specification makes the inner IP header the first header to be compressed by [[RFC6282](#)], and keeps the inner packet encoded the same way whether it is encapsulated or not, thus preserving existing implementations.

As an example, the Routing Protocol for Low Power and Lossy Networks [[RFC6550](#)] (RPL) is designed to optimize the routing operations in constrained LLNs. As part of this optimization, RPL requires the addition of RPL Packet Information (RPI) in every packet, as defined in [Section 11.2 of \[RFC6550\]](#).

The RPL Option for Carrying RPL Information in Data-Plane Datagrams [[RFC6553](#)] specification indicates how the RPI can be placed in a RPL Option for use in an IPv6 Hop-by-Hop header.

This representation demands a total of 8 bytes, while in most cases the actual RPI payload requires only 19 bits. Since the Hop-by-Hop header must not flow outside of the RPL domain, it must be inserted in packets entering the domain and be removed from packets that leave the domain. In both cases, this operation implies an IP-in-IP encapsulation.




Figure 2: IP-in-IP Encapsulation within the LLN.

Additionally, in the case of the Non-Storing Mode of Operation (MOP), RPL requires a Routing Header type 3 (RH3) as defined in the IPv6 Routing Header for Source Routes with RPL [[RFC6554](#)] specification, for all packets that are routed down a RPL graph. With Non-Storing

RPL, even if the source is a node in the same LLN, the packet must first reach up the graph to the root so that the root can insert the RH3 to go down the graph. In any fashion, whether the packet was originated in a node in the LLN or outside the LLN, and regardless of whether the packet stays within the LLN or not, as long as the source of the packet is not the root itself, the source-routing operation also implies an IP-in-IP encapsulation at the root in order to insert the RH3.

6TiSCH [[I-D.ietf-6tisch-architecture](#)] specifies the operation of IPv6 over the TimeSlotted Channel Hopping [[RFC7554](#)] (TSCH) mode of operation of IEEE 802.15.4. The architecture requires the use of both RPL and the 6lo adaptation layer over IEEE 802.15.4. Because it inherits the constraints on frame size from the MAC layer, 6TiSCH cannot afford to allocate 8 bytes per packet on the RPI. Hence the requirement for 6LoWPAN header compression of the RPI.

An extensible compression technique is required that simplifies IP-in-IP encapsulation when it is needed, and optimally compresses existing routing artifacts found in RPL LLNs.

This specification extends the 6lo adaptation layer framework ([[RFC4944](#)],[[RFC6282](#)]) so as to carry routing information for route-over networks based on RPL. The specification includes the formats necessary for RPL and is extensible for additional formats.

[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](#)].

The Terminology used in this document is consistent with and incorporates that described in 'Terminology in Low power And Lossy Networks' [[RFC7102](#)] and [[RFC6550](#)].

The terms Route-over and Mesh-under are defined in [[RFC6775](#)].

Other terms in use in LLNs are found in [[RFC7228](#)].

The term "byte" is used in its now customary sense as a synonym for "octet".

[3.](#) Using the Page Dispatch

The 6LoWPAN Paging Dispatch [[I-D.ietf-6lo-paging-dispatch](#)] specification extends the 6lo adaptation layer framework ([[RFC4944](#)], [[RFC6282](#)]) by introducing a concept of "context" in the 6LoWPAN parser, a context being identified by a Page number. The specification defines 16 Pages.

This draft operates within Page 1, which is indicated by a Dispatch Value of binary 11110001.

[3.1.](#) New Routing Header Dispatch (6LoRH)

This specification introduces a new 6LoWPAN Routing Header (6LoRH) to carry IPv6 routing information. The 6LoRH may contain source routing information such as a compressed form of RH3, as well as other sorts of routing information such as the RPI and IP-in-IP encapsulation.

The 6LoRH is expressed in a 6LoWPAN packet as a Type-Length-Value (TLV) field, which is extensible for future use.

This specification uses the bit pattern 10xxxxxx in Page 1 for the new 6LoRH Dispatch. [Section 4](#) describes how RPL artifacts in data packets can be compressed as 6LoRH headers.

[3.2.](#) Placement Of 6LoRH headers

[3.2.1.](#) Relative To Non-6LoRH Headers

In a zone of a packet where Page 1 is active (i.e., once a Page 1 Paging Dispatch is parsed and no subsequent Paging Dispatch has been parsed, the parsing of the packet MUST follow this specification if the 6LoRH Bit Pattern [Section 3.1](#) is found.

With this specification, the 6LoRH Dispatch is only defined in Page

1, so it MUST be placed in the packet in a zone where the Page 1 context is active.

Because a 6LoRH header requires a Page 1 context, it MUST always be placed after any Fragmentation Header and/or Mesh Header [[RFC4944](#)].

A 6LoRH header MUST always be placed before the LOWPAN_IPHC as defined in 6LoWPAN Header Compression [[RFC6282](#)]. It is designed in such a fashion that placing or removing a header that is encoded with 6LoRH does not modify the part of the packet that is encoded with LOWPAN_IPHC, whether there is an IP-in-IP encapsulation or not. For instance, the final destination of the packet is always the one in the LOWPAN_IPHC whether there is a Routing Header or not.

[3.2.2.](#) Relative To Other 6LoRH Headers

IPv6 [[RFC2460](#)] defines chains of headers that are introduced by an IPv6 header and terminated by either another IPv6 header (IP-in-IP) or an Upper Layer Protocol ULP) header. When an outer header is stripped from the packet, the whole chain goes with it. When one or more header(s) are inserted by an intermediate router, that router normally chains the headers and encapsulates the result in IP-in-IP.

With this specification, the chains of headers MUST be compressed in the same order as they appear in the uncompressed form of the packet. This means that if there is more than one nested IP-in-IP encapsulations, the first IP-in-IP encapsulation, with all its chain of headers, is encoded first in the compressed form.

In the compressed form of a packet that has RH3 or HbH headers after the inner IPv6 header (e.g. if there is no IP-in-IP encapsulation), these headers are placed in the 6LoRH form before the 6LOWPAN-IPHC that represents the IPv6 header [Section 3.2.1](#). If this packet gets encapsulated and some other RH3 or HbH headers are added as part of the encapsulation, placing the 6LoRH headers next to one another may present an ambiguity on which header belong to which chain in the uncompressed form.

In order to disambiguate the headers that follow the inner IPv6 header in the uncompressed form from the headers that follow the

outer IP-in-IP header, it is REQUIRED that the compressed IP-in-IP

header is placed last in the encoded chain. This means that the 6LoRH headers that are found after the last compressed IP-in-IP header are to be inserted after the IPv6 header that is encoded with the 6LOWPAN-IPHC when decompressing the packet.

With regards to the relative placement of the RH3 and the RPI in the compressed form, it is a design point for this specification that the RH3 entries are consumed as the packet progresses down the LLN [Section 5.2](#). In order to make this operation simpler in the compressed form, it is REQUIRED that in the compressed form, the addresses along the source route path are encoded in the order of the path, and that the compressed RH3 are placed before the compressed RPI.

[4.](#) 6LoWPAN Routing Header General Format

The 6LoRH uses the Dispatch Value Bit Pattern of 10xxxxxx in Page 1.

The Dispatch Value Bit Pattern is split in two forms of 6LoRH:

Elective (6LoRHE) that may be skipped if not understood

Critical (6LoRHC) that may not be ignored

[4.1.](#) Elective Format

The 6LoRHE uses the Dispatch Value Bit Pattern of 101xxxxx. A 6LoRHE may be ignored and skipped in parsing. If it is ignored, the 6LoRHE is forwarded with no change inside the LLN.




Figure 3: Elective 6LoWPAN Routing Header.

Length:

Length of the 6LoRHE expressed in bytes, excluding the first 2 bytes. This enables a node to skip a 6LoRHE header that it does not support and/or cannot parse, for instance if the Type is not recognized.

Type:

Type of the 6LoRHE

One possible reference is the root of the RPL DODAG that is being traversed. It is used to compress an outer IP-in-IP header, and if

Internet-Draft

the root is the source of the packet, the technique allows to fully elide the source address in the compressed form of the IP header. If the root is not the encapsulator, then the encapsulator address may still be compressed using the root as reference. How the address of the root is determined is discussed in [Section 4.3.2](#).

the packet. That state is stored in an abstract context table and some form of index is found in the packet to obtain the compression information from the context table.

With [[RFC6282](#)], the state is provided to the stack by the 6LoWPAN Neighbor Discovery Protocol (NDP) [[RFC6775](#)]. NDP exchanges the context through 6LoWPAN Context Option in Router Advertisement (RA) messages. In the compressed form of the packet, the context can be signaled in a Context Identifier Extension.

With this specification, the compression information is provided to the stack by RPL, and RPL exchanges it through the DODAGID field in the DAG Information Object (DIO) messages, as described in more details below. In the compressed form of the packet, the context can be signaled in by the InstanceID in the RPI.

With RPL [[RFC6550](#)], the address of DODAG root is known from the DODAGID field of the DIO messages. For a Global Instance, the RPLInstanceID that is present in the RPI is enough information to identify the DODAG that this node participates to and its associated root. But for a Local Instance, the address of the root MUST be explicit, either in some device configuration or signaled in the packet, as the source or the destination address, respectively.

When implicit, the address of the DODAG root MUST be determined as follows:

If the whole network is a single DODAG then the root can be well-known and does not need to be signaled in the packets. But RPL does not expose that property and it can only be known by a configuration applied to all nodes.

Else, the router that encapsulates the packet and compresses it with this specification MUST also place an RPI in the packet as prescribed by [[RFC6550](#)] to enable the identification of the DODAG. The RPI must be present even in the case when the router also places an RH3 header in the packet.

It is expected that the RPL implementation provides an abstract context table, indexed by Global RPLInstanceID, that provides the address of the root of the DODAG that this nodes participates to for that particular Instance.

5. The Routing Header Type 3 (RH3) 6LoRH Header

Encoding {#RH3-6LoRH-encoding}

The Routing Header type 3 (RH3) 6LoRH (RH3-6LoRH) header is a Critical 6LoWPAN Routing Header that provides a compressed form for the RH3, as defined in [RFC6554] for use by RPL routers. Routers that need to forward a packet with a RH3-6LoRH are expected to be RPL routers and are expected to support this specification. If a non-RPL router receives a packet with a RH3-6LoRH, this means that there was a routing error and the packet should be dropped so the Type cannot be ignored.

Thubert, et al.

Expires July 26, 2016

[Page 11]

Internet-Draft

6LoWPAN Routing Header

January 2016

```

      0                               1
    0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|1|0|0|  Size  |6LoRH Type 0..4| Hop1 | Hop2 |   | HopN |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
```

Size indicates the number of compressed addresses

Figure 6: The RH3-6LoRH.

The 6LoRH Type indicates the compression level used in a given RH3-6LoRH header.

One or more 6LoRH header(s) MAY be placed in a 6LoWPAN packet.

It results that all addresses in a given RH3-6LoRH header MUST be compressed in an identical fashion, down to using the identical number of bytes per address. In order to get different degrees of compression, multiple consecutive RH3-6LoRH headers MUST be used.

Type 0 means that the address is compressed down to one byte, whereas Type 4 means that the address is provided in full in the RH3-6LoRH with no compression. The complete list of Types of RH3-6LoRH and the corresponding compression level are provided in Figure 7:

6LoRH Type	Length of compressed IPv6 address (bytes)
0	1
1	2
2	4
3	8
4	16

Figure 7: The RH3-6LoRH Types.

In the case of a RH3-6LoRH header, the TSE field is used as a Size, which encodes the number of hops minus 1; so a Size of 0 means one hop, and the maximum that can be encoded is 32 hops. (If more than 32 hops need to be expressed, a sequence of RH3-6LoRH elements can be employed.) It results that the Length in bytes of a RH3-6LoRH header is:

$$2 + \text{Length_of_compressed_IPv6_address} * (\text{Size} + 1)$$

[5.1.](#) RH3-6LoRH General Operation

In the non-compressed form, when the root generates or forwards a packet in non-Storing Mode, it needs to include a Routing Header type 3 (RH3) [[RFC6554](#)] to signal a strict source-route path to a final destination down the DODAG. All the hops along the path, but the first one, are encoded in order in the RH3. The last entry in the RH3 is the final destination and the destination in the IPv6 header is the first hop along the source-route path. The intermediate hops perform a swap and the Segment-Left field indicates the active entry in the Routing Header [[RFC2460](#)]. The current destination of the packet, which is the termination of the current segment, is indicated at all times by the destination address of the IPv6 header.

The handling of the RH3-6LoRH is different: there is no swap, and a forwarding router that corresponds to the first entry in the first RH3-6LoRH upon reception of a packet effectively consumes that entry when forwarding. This means that the size of a compressed source-

routed packet decreases as the packet progresses along its path and that the routing information is lost along the way. This also means that an RH3 encoded with 6LoRH is not recoverable and cannot be protected.

When compressed with this specification, all the remaining hops MUST be encoded in order in one or more consecutive RH3-6LoRH headers. Whether or not there is a RH3-6LoRH header present, the address of the final destination is indicated in the LoWPAN_IPHC at all times along the path. Examples of this are provided in [Appendix A](#).

The current destination (termination of the current segment) for a compressed source-routed packet is indicated in the first entry of the first RH3-6LoRH. In strict source-routing, that entry MUST match an address of the router that receives the packet.

The last entry in the last RH3-6LoRH is the last router on the way to the final destination in the LLN. It is typically a RPL parent of the final destination, but it can also be a router acting at 6LR [[RFC6775](#)] for the destination host.

[5.2](#). The Design Point of Popping Entries

In order to save energy and to optimize the chances of transmission success on lossy media, it is a design point for this specification that the entries in the RH3 that have been used are removed from the packet. This creates a discrepancy from the art of IPv6 where Routing Header are mutable but recoverable.

With this specification, the packet can be expanded at any hop into a valid IPv6 packet, including a RH3, and compressed back. But the packet as decompressed along the way will not carry all the consumed addresses that packet would have if it had been forwarded in the uncompressed form.

It is noted that:

The value of keeping the whole RH in an IPv6 header is for the receiver to reverse it to use the symmetrical path on the way back.

It is generally not a good idea to reverse a routing header. The RH may have been used to stay away from the shortest path for some reason that is only valid on the way in (segment routing).

There is no use of reversing a RH in the present RPL specifications.

P2P RPL reverses a path that was learned reactively, as a part of the protocol operation, which is probably a cleaner way than a reversed echo on the data path.

Reversing a header is discouraged by [\[RFC2460\]](#) for RH0 unless it is authenticated, which requires an Authentication Header (AH). There is no definition of an AH operation for RH3, and there is no indication that the need exists in LLNs.

It is noted that AH does not protect the RH on the way. AH is a validation at the receiver with the sole value of enabling the receiver to reversing it.

A RPL domain is usually protected by L2 security and that secures both RPL itself and the RH in the packets, at every hop. This is a better security than that provided by AH.

In summary, the benefit of saving energy and lowering the chances of loss by sending smaller frames over the LLN are seen as overwhelming compared to the value of possibly reversing the header.

[5.3.](#) Compression Reference

In order to optimize the compression of IP addresses present in the RH3 headers, this specification requires that the 6LoWPAN layer identifies an address that is used as reference for the compression. With this specification, the Compression Reference for addresses found in an RH3 header is the source of the IPv6 packet.

With RPL [\[RFC6550\]](#), an RH3 header may only be present in Non-Storing mode, and it may only be placed in the packet by the root of the DODAG, which must be the source of the resulting IPv6 packet [\[RFC2460\]](#). In this case, the address used as Compression Reference

is that the address of the root, and it can be implicit when the address of the root is.

The Compression Reference MUST be determined as follows:

The reference address may be obtained by configuration. The configuration may indicate either the address in full, or the identifier of a 6LoWPAN Context that carries the address [[RFC6775](#)], for instance one of the 16 Context Identifiers used in LOWPAN-IPHC [[RFC6282](#)].

Else, and if there is no IP-in-IP encapsulation, the source address in the IPv6 header that is compressed with LOWPAN-IPHC is the reference for the compression.

Else, and if the IP-in-IP compression specified in this document is used and the Encapsulator Address is provided, then the Encapsulator Address is the reference.

[5.4.](#) Popping Headers

Upon reception, the router checks whether the address in the first entry of the first RH3-6LoRH one of its own addresses. In that case, router MUST consume that entry before forwarding, which is an action of popping from a stack, where the stack is effectively the sequence of entries in consecutive RH3-6LoRH headers.

Popping an entry of an RH3-6LoRH header is a recursive action performed as follows:

If the Size of the RH3-6LoRH header is 1 or more, indicating that there are at least 2 entries in the header, the router removes the first entry and decrements the Size (by 1).

Else (meaning that this is the last entry in the RH3-6LoRH header), and if there is no next RH3-6LoRH header after this then the RH3-6LoRH is removed.

Else, if there is a next RH3-6LoRH of a Type with a larger or equal value, meaning a same or lesser compression yielding same or larger compressed forms, then the RH3-6LoRH is removed.

Else, the first entry of the next RH3-6LoRH is popped from the next RH3-6LoRH and coalesced with the first entry of this RH3-6LoRH.

At the end of the process, if there is no more RH3-6LoRH in the packet, then the processing node is the last router along the source route path.

[5.5.](#) Forwarding

When receiving a packet with a RH3-6LoRH, a router determines the IPv6 address of the current segment endpoint.

If strict source routing is enforced and thus router is not the segment endpoint for the packet then this router **MUST** drop the packet.

If this router is the current segment endpoint, then the router pops its address as described in [Section 5.4](#) and continues processing the packet.

If there is still a RH3-6LoRH, then the router determines the new segment endpoint and routes the packet towards that endpoint.

Otherwise the router uses the destination in the inner IP header to forward or accept the packet.

The segment endpoint of a packet **MUST** be determined as follows:

The router first determines the Compression Reference as discussed in [Section 4.3.1](#).

The router then coalesces the Compression Reference with the first entry of the first RH3-6LoRH header as discussed in [Section 5.3](#). If the type of the RH3-6LoRH header is type 4 then the coalescence is a full override.

Since the Compression Reference is an uncompressed address, the coalesced IPv6 address is also expressed in the full 128bits.

An example of this operation is provided in [Appendix A.3](#).

[6.](#) The RPL Packet Information 6LoRH

[\[RFC6550\]](#), [Section 11.2](#), specifies the RPL Packet Information (RPI) as a set of fields that are placed by RPL routers in IP packets for the purpose of Instance Identification, as well as Loop Avoidance and Detection.

In particular, the SenderRank, which is the scalar metric computed by a specialized Objective Function such as [\[RFC6552\]](#), indicates the

Rank of the sender and is modified at each hop. The SenderRank field

is used to validate that the packet progresses in the expected direction, either upwards or downwards, along the DODAG.

RPL defines the RPL Option for Carrying RPL Information in Data-Plane Datagrams [[RFC6553](#)] to transport the RPI, which is carried in an IPv6 Hop-by-Hop Options Header [[RFC2460](#)], typically consuming eight bytes per packet.

With [[RFC6553](#)], the RPL option is encoded as six octets, which must be placed in a Hop-by-Hop header that consumes two additional octets for a total of eight octets. To limit the header's range to just the RPL domain, the Hop-by-Hop header must be added to (or removed from) packets that cross the border of the RPL domain.

The 8-byte overhead is detrimental to LLN operation, in particular with regards to bandwidth and battery constraints. These bytes may cause a containing frame to grow above maximum frame size, leading to Layer 2 or 6LoWPAN [[RFC4944](#)] fragmentation, which in turn leads to even more energy expenditure and issues discussed in LLN Fragment Forwarding and Recovery [[I-D.thubert-6lo-forwarding-fragments](#)].

An additional overhead comes from the need, in certain cases, to add an IP-in-IP encapsulation to carry the Hop-by-Hop header. This is needed when the router that inserts the Hop-by-Hop header is not the source of the packet, so that an error can be returned to the router. This is also the case when a packet originated by a RPL node must be stripped from the Hop-by-Hop header to be routed outside the RPL domain.

For that reason, this specification defines an IP-in-IP-6LoRH header in [Section 7](#), but it must be noted that removal of a 6LoRH header does not require manipulation of the packet in the LOWPAN_IPHC, and thus, if the source address in the LOWPAN_IPHC is the node that inserted the IP-in-IP-6LoRH header then this situation alone does not mandate an IP-in-IP-6LoRH header.

Note: A typical packet in RPL non-storing mode going down the RPL graph requires an IP-in-IP encapsulation of the RH3, whereas the RPI is usually (and quite illegally) omitted, unless it is important to indicate the RPLInstanceID. To match this structure, an optimized

IP-in-IP 6LoRH header is defined in [Section 7](#).

As a result, a RPL packet may bear only an RPI-6LoRH header and no IP-in-IP-6LoRH header. In that case, the source and destination of the packet are specified by the LOWPAN_IPHC.

As with [[RFC6553](#)], the fields in the RPI include an 'O', an 'R', and an 'F' bit, an 8-bit RPLInstanceID (with some internal structure), and a 16-bit SenderRank.

The remainder of this section defines the RPI-6LoRH header, which is a Critical 6LoWPAN Routing Header that is designed to transport the RPI in 6LoWPAN LLNs.

[6.1](#). Compressing the RPLInstanceID

RPL Instances are discussed in [[RFC6550](#)], [Section 5](#). A number of simple use cases do not require more than one instance, and in such cases, the instance is expected to be the global Instance 0. A global RPLInstanceID is encoded in a RPLInstanceID field as follows:

```

  0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
+---+---+---+---+
|0|      ID      | Global RPLInstanceID in 0..127
+---+---+---+---+
```

Figure 8: RPLInstanceID Field Format for Global Instances.

For the particular case of the global Instance 0, the RPLInstanceID field is all zeros. This specification allows to elide a RPLInstanceID field that is all zeros, and defines a I flag that, when set, signals that the field is elided.

[6.2](#). Compressing the SenderRank

The SenderRank is the result of the DAGRank operation on the rank of the sender; here the DAGRank operation is defined in [[RFC6550](#)], [Section 3.5.1](#), as:

$\text{DAGRank}(\text{rank}) = \text{floor}(\text{rank}/\text{MinHopRankIncrease})$

If MinHopRankIncrease is set to a multiple of 256, the least significant 8 bits of the SenderRank will be all zeroes; by eliding those, the SenderRank can be compressed into a single byte. This idea is used in [RFC6550] by defining DEFAULT_MIN_HOP_RANK_INCREASE as 256 and in [RFC6552] that defaults MinHopRankIncrease to DEFAULT_MIN_HOP_RANK_INCREASE.

This specification allows to encode the SenderRank as either one or two bytes, and defines a K flag that, when set, signals that a single byte is used.

[6.3.](#) The Overall RPI-6LoRH encoding

The RPI-6LoRH header provides a compressed form for the RPL RPI. Routers that need to forward a packet with a RPI-6LoRH header are expected to be RPL routers that support this specification. If a non-RPL router receives a packet with a RPI-6LoRH header, there was a routing error and the packet should be dropped. Thus the Type field MUST NOT be ignored.

Since the I flag is not set, the TSE field does not need to be a length expressed in bytes. In that case the field is fully reused for control bits that encode the O, R and F flags from the RPI, as well as the I and K flags that indicate the compression format.

The Type for the RPI-6LoRH is 5.

The RPI-6LoRH header is immediately followed by the RPLInstanceID field, unless that field is fully elided, and then the SenderRank, which is either compressed into one byte or fully in-lined as two bytes. The I and K flags in the RPI-6LoRH header indicate whether the RPLInstanceID is elided and/or the SenderRank is compressed. Depending on these bits, the Length of the RPI-6LoRH may vary as described hereafter.

0																1																2
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1											

Figure 11: Eliding the RPLInstanceID.

In Figure 12, the RPLInstanceID is not the Global RPLInstanceID 0, and the MinHopRankIncrease is a multiple of 256:

```

0                               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
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|1|0|0|0|R|F|0|1| 6LoRH Type=5 | RPLInstanceID | SenderRank |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
I=0, K=1

```

Figure 12: Compressing SenderRank.

In Figure 13, the RPLInstanceID is not the Global RPLInstanceID 0, and both bytes of the SenderRank are significant:

```

0                               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
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|1|0|0|0|R|F|0|0| 6LoRH Type=5 | RPLInstanceID | Sender-...
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
...-Rank |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+
I=0, K=0

```

Figure 13: Least compressed form of RPI-6LoRH.

7. The IP-in-IP 6LoRH Header

The IP-in-IP 6LoRH (IP-in-IP-6LoRH) header is an Elective 6LoWPAN Routing Header that provides a compressed form for the encapsulating IPv6 Header in the case of an IP-in-IP encapsulation.

An IP-in-IP encapsulation is used to insert a field such as a Routing Header or an RPI at a router that is not the source of the packet. In order to send an error back regarding the inserted field, the address of the router that performs the insertion must be provided.

The encapsulation can also enable the last router prior to

header is transported in a RH3-6LoRH header as the first address of the list.

With RPL, the destination address in the IP-in-IP header is implicitly the root in the RPL graph for packets going upwards, and the destination address in the IPHC for packets going downwards. If the implicit value is correct, the destination IP address of the IP-in-IP encapsulation can be elided.

If the final destination of the packet is a leaf that does not support this specification, then the chain of 6LoRH headers must be stripped by the RPL/6LR router to which the leaf is attached. In that example, the destination IP address of the IP-in-IP header cannot be elided.

In the special case where a 6LoRH header is used to route 6LoWPAN fragments, the destination address is not accessible in the IPHC on all fragments and can be elided only for the first fragment and for packets going upwards.

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 is believed to not create an opening for a new threat when compared to [[RFC6550](#)], [[RFC6553](#)] and [[RFC6554](#)].

9. IANA Considerations

9.1. Reserving Space in 6LoWPAN Dispatch Page 1

This specification reserves Dispatch Value Bit Patterns within the 6LoWPAN Dispatch Page 1 as follows:

101xxxxx: for Elective 6LoWPAN Routing Headers

100xxxxx: for Critical 6LoWPAN Routing Headers.

[9.2.](#) New 6LoWPAN Routing Header Type Registry

This document creates an IANA registry for the 6LoWPAN Routing Header Type, and assigns the following values:

0..4: RH3-6LoRH [RFCthis]

5: RPI-6LoRH [RFCthis]

6: IP-in-IP-6LoRH [RFCthis]

[10.](#) Acknowledgments

The authors wish to thank Tom Phinney, Thomas Watteyne, Tengfei Chang, Martin Turon, James Woodyatt, Samita Chakrabarti, Jonathan Hui, Gabriel Montenegro and Ralph Droms for constructive reviews to the design in the 6lo Working Group. The overall discussion involved participants to the 6MAN, 6TiSCH and ROLL WGs, thank you all. Special thanks to the chairs of the ROLL WG, Michael Richardson and Ines Robles, and Brian Haberman, Internet Area A-D, and Adrian Farrel, Routing Area A-D, for driving this complex effort across Working Groups and Areas.

[11.](#) References

[11.1.](#) Normative References

[I-D.ietf-6lo-paging-dispatch]

Thubert, P., "6LoWPAN Paging Dispatch", [draft-ietf-6lo-paging-dispatch-01](#) (work in progress), January 2016.

[IEEE802154]

IEEE standard for Information Technology, "IEEE std. 802.15.4, Part. 15.4: Wireless Medium Access Control (MAC) and Physical Layer (PHY) Specifications for Low-Rate Wireless Personal Area Networks", 2015.

[RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate

Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.

[RFC2460] Deering, S. and R. Hinden, "Internet Protocol, Version 6 (IPv6) Specification", [RFC 2460](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC2460, December 1998, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2460>>.

Internet-Draft

6LoWPAN Routing Header

January 2016

- [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, <<http://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, <<http://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, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6550>>.
- [RFC6552] Thubert, P., Ed., "Objective Function Zero for the Routing Protocol for Low-Power and Lossy Networks (RPL)", [RFC 6552](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6552, March 2012, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6552>>.
- [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, <<http://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, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6554>>.
- [RFC7102] Vasseur, JP., "Terms Used in Routing for Low-Power and Lossy Networks", [RFC 7102](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7102, January 2014, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7102>>.
- [RFC7228] Bormann, C., Ersue, M., and A. Keranen, "Terminology for Constrained-Node Networks", [RFC 7228](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7228, May 2014, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7228>>.

11.2. Informative References

Thubert, et al.

Expires July 26, 2016

[Page 24]

Internet-Draft

6LoWPAN Routing Header

January 2016

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

Thubert, P., "An Architecture for IPv6 over the TSCH mode of IEEE 802.15.4", [draft-ietf-6tisch-architecture-09](#) (work in progress), November 2015.

[I-D.robles-roll-useofrplinfo]

Robles, I., Richardson, M., and P. Thubert, "When to use [RFC 6553](#), 6554 and IPv6-in-IPv6", [draft-robles-roll-useofrplinfo-02](#) (work in progress), October 2015.

[I-D.thubert-6lo-forwarding-fragments]

Thubert, P. and J. Hui, "LLN Fragment Forwarding and Recovery", [draft-thubert-6lo-forwarding-fragments-02](#) (work in progress), November 2014.

[RFC6775] Shelby, Z., Ed., Chakrabarti, S., Nordmark, E., and C. Bormann, "Neighbor Discovery Optimization for IPv6 over Low-Power Wireless Personal Area Networks (6LoWPANs)", [RFC 6775](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6775, November 2012, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6775>>.

[RFC7554] Watteyne, T., Ed., Palattella, M., and L. Grieco, "Using IEEE 802.15.4e Time-Slotted Channel Hopping (TSCH) in the Internet of Things (IoT): Problem Statement", [RFC 7554](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7554, May 2015, <<http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7554>>.

Appendix A. Examples

A.1. Examples Compressing The RPI

The example in Figure 15 illustrates the 6LoRH compression of a classical packet in Storing Mode in all directions, as well as in non-Storing mode for a packet going up the DODAG following the default route to the root. In this particular example, a

fragmentation process takes place per [[RFC4944](#)], and the fragment headers must be placed in Page 0 before switching to Page 1:

```
+ - ... -+- ... -++ ... +- ... +-+ ... -++++-+-+...
|Frag type|Frag hdr |11110001| RPI- |IP-in-IP| LOWPAN-IPHC | ...
|RFC 4944 |RFC 4944 | Page 1 | 6LoRH | 6LoRH |           |
+ - ... -+- ... -++ ... +- ... +-+ ... -++++-+-+...
                                     <- RFC 6282 ->
                                     No RPL artifact
```

Figure 15: Example Compressed Packet with RPI.

In Storing Mode, if the packet stays within the RPL domain, then it is possible to save the IP-in-IP encapsulation, in which case only the RPI is compressed with a 6LoRH, as illustrated in Figure 16 in the case of a non-fragmented ICMP packet:

```
+ - ... -+-+ ... -++-+-+ ... -++-+-+ ... -++++-+-+...
|11110001| RPI-6LoRH | NH = 0      | NH = 58 | ICMP message ...
|Page 1  | type 5   | 6LOWPAN-IPHC | (ICMP) | (no compression)
+ - ... -+-+ ... -++-+-+ ... -++-+-+ ... -++++-+-+...
                                     <- RFC 6282 ->
                                     No RPL artifact
```

Figure 16: Example ICMP Packet with RPI in Storing Mode.

The format in Figure 16 is logically equivalent to the non-compressed format illustrated in Figure 17:

```
+ -+-+ ... -+-+ ... -++-+-+ ... -++++-+-+...
| IPv6 Header | Hop-by-Hop | RPI in      | ICMP message ...
| NH = 58     | Header    | RPL Option  |
+ -+-+ ... -+-+ ... -++-+-+ ... -++++-+-+...
```

Figure 17: Uncompressed ICMP Packet with RPI.

For a UDP packet, the transport header can be compressed with 6LoWPAN HC [[RFC6282](#)] as illustrated in Figure 18:

```
+ - ... -+- ... -++-+-+ ... +-+ ... +-+ ... -++++-+-+...
```

```

|11110001| RPI-6LoRH | NH = 1      |11110|C| P | Compressed |UDP ...
|Page 1   | type 5    | 6LOWPAN-IPHC | UDP |   |   | UDP header |Payload
+- ...   +- ...   -+-+-+- ... -+-+-+- ... -+-+-+- ... -+-+-+- ...
                        <-          RFC 6282          ->
                        No RPL artifact

```

Figure 18: Uncompressed ICMP Packet with RPI.

If the packet is received from the Internet in Storing Mode, then the root is supposed to encapsulate the packet to insert the RPI. The resulting format would be as represented in Figure 19:

```

+-+-+-+ ... -+-+- ... -+-+- ... -+-+-+-+ ... -+-+-+...
|11110001| RPI-6LoRH | IP-in-IP | NH=1 |11110CPP| Compressed | UDP
|Page 1   |           | 6LoRH   | IPHC | UDP     | UDP header | Payload
+-+-+-+ ... -+-+- ... -+-+- ... -+-+-+-+ ... -+-+-+...
                        <-          RFC 6282          ->
                        No RPL artifact

```

Figure 19: RPI inserted by the root in Storing Mode.

A.2. Example Of Downward Packet In Non-Storing Mode

The example illustrated in Figure 20 is a classical packet in non-Storing mode for a packet going down the DODAG following a source routed path from the root. Say that we have 4 forwarding hops to reach a destination. In the non-compressed form, when the root generates the packet, the last 3 hops are encoded in a Routing Header type 3 (RH3) and the first hop is the destination of the packet. The intermediate hops perform a swap and the hop count indicates the current active hop [RFC2460], [RFC6554].

When compressed with this specification, the 4 hops are encoded in RH3-6LoRH when the root generates the packet, and the final destination is left in the LOWPAN-IPHC. There is no swap, and the forwarding node that corresponds to the first entry effectively consumes it when forwarding, which means that the size of the encoded packet decreases and that the hop information is lost.

If the last hop in a RH3-6LoRH is not the final destination then it removes the RH3-6LoRH before forwarding.

In the particular example illustrated in Figure 20, all addresses in the DODAG are assigned from a same /112 prefix and the last 2 octets encoding an identifier such as a IEEE 802.15.4 short address. In that case, all addresses can be compressed to 2 octets, using the root address as reference. There will be one RH3_6LoRH header, with, in this example, 3 compressed addresses:

```

+---+---+---+---+ ... +---+---+ ... +---+---+ ... +---+---+ ... +---+---+---+ ... +-...
|11110001|RH3-6LoRH|RPI-6LoRH|IP-in-IP|NH=1|11110CPP|UDP|UDP
|Page 1  |Type1 S=2|          |6LoRH  |IPHC|UDP  |hdr|load
+---+---+---+---+ ... +---+---+ ... +---+---+ ... +---+---+ ... +---+---+---+ ... +-...
          <-8bytes->                                <- RFC 6282 ->
                                                    No RPL artifact

```

Figure 20: Example Compressed Packet with RH3.

One may note that the RPI is provided. This is because the address of the root that is the source of the IP-in-IP header is elided and inferred from the InstanceID in the RPI. Once found from a local context, that address is used as Compression Reference to expand addresses in the RH3-6LoRH.

With the RPL specifications available at the time of writing this draft, the root is the only node that may incorporate a RH3 in an IP packet. When the root forwards a packet that it did not generate, it has to encapsulate the packet with IP-in-IP.

But if the root generates the packet towards a node in its DODAG, then it should avoid the extra IP-in-IP as illustrated in Figure 21:

Step 1 popping BBBB the first entry of the next RH3-6LoRH
Step 2 next is if larger value (2 vs. 1) the RH3-6LoRH is removed

```
Type 3 RH3-6LoRH Size = 0   AAAA AAAA AAAA AAAA
Type 2 RH3-6LoRH Size = 1               CCCC CCCC
                                         DDDD DDDD
```

Step 3: recursion ended, coalescing BBBB with the first entry
Type 3 RH3-6LoRH Size = 0 AAAA AAAA AAAA BBBB

Step 4: routing based on next segment endpoint to B

Figure 22: Processing at Node A.

Packet as received by node B

```
-----
Type 3 RH3-6LoRH Size = 0   AAAA AAAA AAAA BBBB
Type 2 RH3-6LoRH Size = 1               CCCC CCCC
                                         DDDD DDDD
```

Step 1 popping CCCC CCCC, the first entry of the next RH3-6LoRH
Step 2 removing the first entry and decrementing the Size (by 1)

```
Type 3 RH3-6LoRH Size = 0   AAAA AAAA AAAA BBBB
Type 2 RH3-6LoRH Size = 0               DDDD DDDD
```

Step 3: recursion ended, coalescing CCCC CCCC with the first entry
Type 3 RH3-6LoRH Size = 0 AAAA AAAA CCCC CCCC

Step 4: routing based on next segment endpoint to C

Figure 23: Processing at Node B.

Packet as received by node C

Type 3 RH3-6LoRH Size = 0 AAAA AAAA CCCC CCCC
Type 2 RH3-6LoRH Size = 0 DDDD DDDD

Step 1 popping DDDD DDDD, the first entry of the next RH3-6LoRH

Step 2 the RH3-6LoRH is removed

Type 3 RH3-6LoRH Size = 0 AAAA AAAA CCCC CCCC

Step 3: recursion ended, coalescing DDDD DDDDD with the first entry

Type 3 RH3-6LoRH Size = 0 AAAA AAAA DDDD DDDD

Step 4: routing based on next segment endpoint to D

Figure 24: Processing at Node C.

Packet as received by node D

Type 3 RH3-6LoRH Size = 0 AAAA AAAA DDDD DDDD

Step 1 the RH3-6LoRH is removed.

Step 2 no more header, routing based on inner IP header.

Figure 25: Processing at Node D.

Authors' Addresses

Pascal Thubert (editor)
Cisco Systems
Building D - Regus
45 Allee des Ormes
BP1200
MOUGINS - Sophia Antipolis 06254
FRANCE

Phone: +33 4 97 23 26 34
Email: pthubert@cisco.com

Internet-Draft

6LoWPAN Routing Header

January 2016

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

Phone: +49-421-218-63921
Email: cabo@tzi.org

Laurent Toutain
Institut MINES TELECOM; TELECOM Bretagne
2 rue de la Chataigneraie
CS 17607
Cesson-Sevigne Cedex 35576
France

Email: Laurent.Toutain@telecom-bretagne.eu

Robert Cragie
ARM Ltd.
110 Fulbourn Road
Cambridge CB1 9NJ
UK

Email: robert.cragie@gridmerge.com

