

6tisch Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: 24 August 2020

D. Dujovne  
Universidad Diego Portales  
M. Richardson  
Sandelman Software Works  
21 February 2020

IEEE 802.15.4 Information Element encapsulation of 6TiSCH Join and  
Enrollment Information  
draft-ietf-6tisch-enrollment-enhanced-beacon-14

## Abstract

In TSCH mode of IEEE STD 802.15.4, opportunities for broadcasts are limited to specific times and specific channels. Routers in a Time-Slotted Channel Hopping (TSCH) network transmit Enhanced Beacon (EB) frames to announce the presence of the network. This document provides a mechanism by which additional information critical for new nodes (pledges) and long sleeping nodes may be carried within the Enhanced Beacon in order to conserve use of broadcast opportunities.

## 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 24 August 2020.

## Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2020 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 (<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

Internet-Draft

IE for ICMPv6

February 2020

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

<a href="#">1.</a>	Introduction . . . . .	<a href="#">2</a>
<a href="#">1.1.</a>	Use of <a href="#">BCP 14</a> Terminology . . . . .	<a href="#">2</a>
<a href="#">1.2.</a>	Layer-2 Synchronization . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">1.3.</a>	Layer-3 synchronization: IPv6 Router Solicitations and Advertisements . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">1.4.</a>	Layer-2 Selection . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	Protocol Definition . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	Security Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">4.</a>	Privacy Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">5.</a>	IANA Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">6.</a>	Acknowledgements . . . . .	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">7.</a>	References . . . . .	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">7.1.</a>	Normative References . . . . .	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">7.2.</a>	Informative References . . . . .	<a href="#">10</a>
	Authors' Addresses . . . . .	<a href="#">11</a>

## [1.](#) Introduction

[RFC7554] describes the use of the Time-Slotted Channel Hopping (TSCH) mode of [[ieee802154](#)].

In TSCH mode of IEEE STD 802.15.4, opportunities for broadcasts are limited to specific times and specific channels. Routers in a Time-Slotted Channel Hopping (TSCH) network transmit Enhanced Beacon (EB) frames during broadcast slots in order to announce the time and channel schedule.

This document defines a new IETF Information Element (IE) subtype to place into the Enhanced Beacon (EB) to provide join and enrollment information to prospective pledges in a more efficient way.

The following sub-sections explain the problem being solved, which justify carrying the join and enrollment information in the EB.

### [1.1.](#) Use of [BCP 14](#) 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 [BCP 14 \[RFC2119\]](#) [[RFC8174](#)] when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

---

Internet-Draft

IE for ICMPv6

February 2020

Other terminology can be found in [[I-D.ietf-6tisch-architecture](#)] in [section 2.1](#).

## [1.2](#). Layer-2 Synchronization

As explained in [section 6 of \[RFC8180\]](#), the Enhanced Beacon (EB) has a number of purposes: synchronization of the Absolute Slot Number (ASN) and Join Metric, carrying the timeslot template identifier, carrying the channel hopping sequence identifier, and indicating the TSCH SlotFrame.

An EB announces the existence of a TSCH network, and of the nodes already joined to that network. Receiving an EB allows a Joining Node (pledge) to learn about the network and synchronize to it.

The EB may also be used as a means for a node already part of the network to re-synchronize [[RFC7554](#)].

There are a limited number of timeslots designated as broadcast slots by each router in the network. Considering 10ms slots and a slot-frame length of 100, these slots are rare and could result in only 1 slot per second for broadcasts, which needs to be used for the beacon. Additional broadcasts for Router Advertisements (RA), or Neighbor Discovery (ND) could even more scarce.

## [1.3](#). Layer-3 synchronization: IPv6 Router Solicitations and Advertisements

At layer 3, [[RFC4861](#)] defines a mechanism by which nodes learn about routers by receiving multicast Router Advertisements (RA). If no RA is received within a set time, then a Router Solicitation (RS) may be transmitted as a multicast, to which an RA will be received, usually unicast.

Although [[RFC6775](#)] reduces the amount of multicast necessary to do address resolution via Neighbor Solicitation (NS) messages, it still

requires multicast of either RAs or RSeS. This is an expensive operation for two reasons: there are few multicast timeslots for unsolicited RAs; and if a pledge node does not receive an RA, and decides to transmit an RS, a broadcast aloha slot (see [\[RFC7554\]](#) section A.5) is consumed with unencrypted traffic. [\[RFC6775\]](#) already allows for a unicast reply to such an RS.

This is a particularly acute issue for the join process for the following reasons:

1. Use of a multicast slot by even a non-malicious unauthenticated node for a Router Solicitation (RS) may overwhelm that time slot.

2. It may require many seconds of on-time before a new pledge receives a Router Advertisement (RA) that it can use.
3. A new pledge may have to receive many Enhanced Beacons (EB) before it can pick an appropriate network and/or closest Join Assistant to attach to. If it must remain in the receive state for an RA as well as find the Enhanced Beacon (EB), then the process may take dozens of seconds, even minutes for each enrollment attempt that it needs to make.

#### 1.4. Layer-2 Selection

In a complex Low-power and Lossy Networks (LLN), multiple LLNs may be connected together by backbone routers ( technology such as [\[I-D.ietf-6lo-backbone-router\]](#)), resulting in an area that is serviced by multiple distinct Layer-2 instances. These are called Personal Area Networks (PAN). Each instance will have a separate Layer-2 security profile, and will be distinguished by a different PANID. The PANID is part of the [\[ieee802154\]](#) layer-2 header: it is a 16-bit value which is chosen to be unique, and it contributes context to the layer-2 security mechanisms. The PANID provides a context similar to the ESSID does in 802.11 networking, and can be conceived of in a similar fashion as the 802.3 ethernet VLAN tag in that it provides context for all layer-2 addresses.

A device which is already enrolled in a network may find after a long sleep that it needs to resynchronize to the Layer 2 network. The enrollment keys that it has will be specific to a PANID, but it may have more than one set of keys. Such a device may wish to connect to

a PAN that is experiencing less congestion, or which has a shallower ([RFC6550]) Routing Protocol for LLNs (RPL) tree. It may even observe PANs for which it does not have keys, but which it believes it may have credentials that would allow it to join.

In order to identify which PANs are part of the same backbone network, the network ID is introduced in this extension. PANs that are part of the same backbone will be configured to use the same network ID. For [RFC6550] RPL networks, configuration of the network ID can be done with a configuration option, which is the subject of future work.

In order to provide some input to the choice of which PAN to use, the PAN priority field has been added. This lists the relative priority for the PAN among different PANs. Every Enhanced Beacon from a given PAN will likely have the same PAN priority. Determination of the PAN priority is the subject of future work; but it is expected that it will be calculated by an algorithm in the 6LBR, possibly involving communication between 6LBRs over the backbone network.

The [RFC6550] parent selection process can only operate within a single PAN, because it depends upon receiving RPL DIO messages from all available parents. As part of the PAN selection process, the device may wish to know how deep in the LLN mesh it will be if it joins a particular PAN, and the rank priority field provides an estimation of what the rank of each announcer is. Once the device synchronizes to a particular PAN's TSCH schedule then it may receive DIOs that are richer in their diversity than this value. How this value will be used in practice is the subject of future research, and the interpretation of this value of the structure is considered experimental.

## 2. Protocol Definition

[RFC8137] creates a registry for new IETF IE subtypes. This document allocates a new subtype.

The new IE subtype structure is as follows. As explained in [RFC8137] the length of the Sub-Type Content can be calculated from the container, so no length information is necessary.




Figure 1: IE subtype structure

res: reserved bits MUST be ignored upon receipt, and SHOULD be set to 0 when sending.

R: The Router Advertisement R-flag is set if the sending node will act as a Router for host-only nodes relying on stateless address auto-configuration (SLAAC) to get their global IPv6 address. Those hosts MUST send a unicast Router Solicitation message in order to receive a RA with the Prefix Information Option.

In most cases, every node sending a beacon will set this flag, and in a typical mesh, this will be every single node. When this bit is not set, it might indicate that this node may be under provisioned, or may have no additional slots for additional nodes. This could make this node more interesting to an attacker.

P: If the Proxy Address P-flag is set, then the Join Proxy Interface ID bit field is present. Otherwise, it is not provided.

This bit only indicates if another part of the structure is present, and has little security or privacy impact.

proxy priority (proxy prio): This field indicates the willingness of the sender to act as join proxy. Lower value indicates greater willingness to act as a Join Proxy as described in [[I-D.ietf-6tisch-minimal-security](#)]. Values range from 0x00 (most willing) to 0x7e (least willing). A priority of 0x7f indicates that the announcer should never be considered as a viable enrollment proxy. Only unenrolled pledges look at this value.

Lower values in this field indicate that the transmitter may have more capacity to handle unencrypted traffic. A higher value may indicate that the transmitter is low on neighbor cache entries, or other resources. Ongoing work such as [[I-D.ietf-roll-enrollment-priority](#)] documents one way to set this field.

rank priority: The rank "priority" is set by the IPv6 LLN Router (6LR) which sent the beacon and is an indication of how willing this 6LR is to serve as an RPL [[RFC6550](#)] parent within a particular network ID. Lower values indicate more willingness, and higher values indicate less willingness. This value is calculated by each 6LR according to algorithms specific to the routing metrics used by the RPL ([[RFC6550](#)]). The exact process is a subject of significant research work. It will typically be calculated from the RPL rank, and it may include some modifications based upon current number of children, or number of neighbor cache entries available. Pledges MUST ignore this value. It helps enrolled devices only to compare connection points.

An attacker can use this value to determine which nodes are potentially more interesting. Nodes which are less willing to

be parents likely have more traffic, and an attacker could use this information to determine which nodes would be more interesting to attack or disrupt.

pan priority: The pan priority is a value set by the Destination-Oriented Directed Acyclic Graph (DODAG) root (see [[RFC6550](#)], typically, the 6LBR) to indicate the relative priority of this LLN compared to those with different PANIDs that the operator might

control. This value may be used as part of the enrollment priority, but typically is used by devices which have already enrolled, and need to determine which PAN to pick when resuming from a long sleep. Unenrolled pledges MAY consider this value when selecting a PAN to join. Enrolled devices MAY consider this value when looking for an eligible parent device. Lower values indicate a higher willingness to accept new nodes.

An attacker can use this value, along with the observed PANID in the Beacon to determine which PANIDs have more network resources, and may have more interesting traffic.

**Join Proxy Interface ID:** If the P bit is set, then 64 bits (8 bytes) of address are present. This field provides the Interface ID (IID) of the Link-Local address of the Join Proxy. The associated prefix is well-known as fe80::/64. If this field is not present, then IID is derived from the layer-2 address of the sender as per SLAAC ([[RFC4662](#)]).

This field communicates the Interface ID bits that should be used for this node's layer-3 address, if it should not be derived from the layer-2 address. Communication with the Join Proxy occurs in the clear. This field avoids the need for an additional service-discovery process for the case where the L3 address is not derived from the L2 address. An attacker will see both L2 and L3 addresses, so this field provides no new information.

**network ID:** This is a variable length field, up to 16-bytes in size that uniquely identifies this network, potentially among many networks that are operating in the same frequencies in overlapping physical space. The length of this field can be calculated as being whatever is left in the Information Element.

In a 6tisch network, where RPL [[RFC6550](#)] is used as the mesh routing protocol, the network ID can be constructed from a truncated SHA256 hash of the prefix (/64) of the network. This will be done by the RPL DODAG root and communicated by the RPL Configuration Option payloads, so it is not calculated more than once. This is just a suggestion for a default algorithm: it may be set in any convenience way that results in a non-identifying

value. In some LLNs where multiple PANIDs may lead to the same



management device (the Join Registrar/Coordinator - JRC), then a common value that is the same across all the PANs MUST be configured. Pledges that see the same networkID will not waste time attempting to enroll multiple times with the same network that when the network has multiple attachment points.

If the network ID is derived as suggested, then it will be an opaque, seemingly random value, and will not directly reveal any information about the network. An attacker can match this value across many transmissions to map the extent of a network beyond what the PANID might already provide.

### 3. Security Considerations

All of the contents of this Information Element are transmitted in the clear. The content of the Enhanced Beacon is not encrypted. This is a restriction in the cryptographic architecture of the 802.15.4 mechanism. In order to decrypt or do integrity checking of layer-2 frames in TSCH, the TSCH Absolute Slot Number (ASN) is needed. The Enhanced Beacon provides the ASN to new (and long-sleeping) nodes.

The sensitivity of each field is described within the description of each field.

The Enhanced Beacon is authenticated at the layer-2 level using 802.15.4 mechanisms using the network-wide keying material. Nodes which are enrolled will have the network-wide keying material and can validate the beacon.

Pledges which have not yet enrolled are unable to authenticate the beacons, and will be forced to temporarily take the contents on faith. After enrollment, a newly enrolled node will be able to return to the beacon and validate it.

In addition to the enrollment and join information described in this document, the Enhanced Beacon contains a description of the TSCH schedule to be used by the transmitter of this packet. The schedule can provide an attacker with a list of channels and frequencies on which communication will occur. Knowledge of this can help an attacker to more efficiently jam communications, although there is future work being considered to make some of the schedule less visible. Encrypting the schedule does not prevent an attacker from jamming, but rather increases the energy cost of doing that jamming.

#### 4. Privacy Considerations

The use of a network ID may reveal information about the network. The use of a SHA256 hash of the DODAGID (see [[RFC6550](#)]), rather than using the DODAGID itself directly provides some privacy for the the addresses used within the network, as the DODAGID is usually the IPv6 address of the root of the RPL mesh.

An interloper with a radio sniffer would be able to use the network ID to map out the extent of the mesh network.

#### 5. IANA Considerations

IANA is asked to assign a new number TBD-XXX from Registry "IEEE Std 802.15.4 IETF IE Subtype IDs" as defined by [[RFC8137](#)].

This entry should be called 6tisch-Join-Info, and should refer to this document.

Value	Subtype-ID	Reference
TBD-XXX	6tisch-Join-Inbfo	[this document]

#### 6. Acknowledgements

Thomas Watteyne provided extensive editorial comments on the document. Carles Gomez Montenegro generated a detailed review of the document at WGLC. Tim Evens provided a number of useful editorial suggestions.

#### 7. References

##### 7.1. Normative References

[BCP14] Leiba, B., "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in [RFC 2119](#) Key Words", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 8174](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8174, May 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8174>>.

[I-D.ietf-6tisch-minimal-security]  
Vucinic, M., Simon, J., Pister, K., and M. Richardson, "Constrained Join Protocol (CoJP) for 6TiSCH", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, [draft-ietf-6tisch-minimal-security-15](#), 10 December 2019, <<http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-ietf-6tisch-minimal-security-15.txt>>.

[ieee802154]

IEEE standard for Information Technology, ., "IEEE Std.

---

Internet-Draft

IE for ICMPv6

February 2020

802.15.4, Part. 15.4: Wireless Medium Access Control (MAC) and Physical Layer (PHY) Specifications for Low-Rate Wireless Personal Area Networks", 2015, <<http://standards.ieee.org/findstds/standard/802.15.4-2015.html>>.

- [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>>.
- [RFC4861] Narten, T., Nordmark, E., Simpson, W., and H. Soliman, "Neighbor Discovery for IP version 6 (IPv6)", [RFC 4861](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4861, September 2007, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4861>>.
- [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, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6775>>.
- [RFC8137] Kivinen, T. and P. Kinney, "IEEE 802.15.4 Information Element for the IETF", [RFC 8137](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8137, May 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8137>>.
- [RFC8174] Leiba, B., "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in [RFC 2119](#) Key Words", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 8174](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8174, May 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8174>>.

## [7.2.](#) Informative References

- [I-D.ietf-6lo-backbone-router]  
Thubert, P., Perkins, C., and E. Levy-Abegnoli, "IPv6 Backbone Router", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, [draft-ietf-6lo-backbone-router-17](#), 20 February 2020, <<http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-ietf-6lo-backbone-router-17.txt>>.

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

Thubert, P., "An Architecture for IPv6 over the TSCH mode of IEEE 802.15.4", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, [draft-ietf-6tisch-architecture-28](http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-ietf-6tisch-architecture-28), 29 October 2019, <<http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-ietf-6tisch-architecture-28.txt>>.

[I-D.ietf-roll-enrollment-priority]

Richardson, M., "Enabling secure network enrollment in RPL

Dujovne & Richardson

Expires 24 August 2020

[Page 10]

---

Internet-Draft

IE for ICMPv6

February 2020

networks", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, [draft-ietf-roll-enrollment-priority-00](http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-ietf-roll-enrollment-priority-00), 16 September 2019, <<http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-ietf-roll-enrollment-priority-00.txt>>.

[RFC4662] Roach, A. B., Campbell, B., and J. Rosenberg, "A Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) Event Notification Extension for Resource Lists", [RFC 4662](https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4662), DOI 10.17487/RFC4662, August 2006, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4662>>.

[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](https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6550), DOI 10.17487/RFC6550, March 2012, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6550>>.

[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](https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7554), DOI 10.17487/RFC7554, May 2015, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7554>>.

[RFC8180] Vilajosana, X., Ed., Pister, K., and T. Watteyne, "Minimal IPv6 over the TSCH Mode of IEEE 802.15.4e (6TiSCH) Configuration", [BCP 210](https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8180), [RFC 8180](https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8180), DOI 10.17487/RFC8180, May 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8180>>.

#### Authors' Addresses

Diego Dujovne (editor)  
Universidad Diego Portales

Escuela de Informatica y Telecomunicaciones, Av. Ejercito 441  
Santiago, Region Metropolitana  
Chile

Phone: +56 (2) 676-8121  
Email: diego.dujovne@mail.udp.cl

Michael Richardson  
Sandelman Software Works

Email: mcr+ietf@sandelman.ca