

ROLL
Internet-Draft
Updates: [6550](#), [8505](#) (if approved)
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: November 29, 2019

P. Thubert, Ed.
Cisco
May 28, 2019

Routing for RPL Leaves
draft-ietf-roll-unaware-leaves-00

Abstract

This specification leverages 6LoWPAN ND to provide a unicast and multicast routing service in a RPL domain to 6LNs that do not participate to RPL.

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 November 29, 2019.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2019 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 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	4
2.1.	BCP 14	4
2.2.	References	4
2.3.	Subset of a 6LoWPAN Glossary	5
3.	6LoWPAN Neighbor Discovery	6
4.	Updating RFC 6550	7
5.	Updating RFC 8505	7
6.	Dependencies on the 6LN	8
7.	Protocol Operations for Unicast Addresses	8
7.1.	General Flow	8
7.2.	6LN Operation	11
7.3.	6LR Operation	12
7.4.	RPL Root Operation	13
7.5.	6LBR Operation	14
8.	Protocol Operations for Multicast Addresses	15
9.	Implementation Status	17
10.	Security Considerations	17
11.	IANA Considerations	17
12.	Acknowledgments	17
13.	References	17
13.1.	Normative References	17
13.2.	Informative References	19
	Author's Address	20

[1.](#) Introduction

The design of Low Power and Lossy Networks (LLNs) is generally focused on saving energy, which is the most constrained resource of all. Other design constraints, such as a limited memory capacity, duty cycling of the LLN devices and low-power lossy transmissions, derive from that primary concern.

The IETF produced the "Routing Protocol for Low Power and Lossy Networks" [[RFC6550](#)] (RPL) to provide routing services within such constraints. RPL is a Distance-Vector protocol, which, compared to link-state protocols, limits the amount of topological knowledge that needs to be installed and maintained in each node. In order to operate in constrained networks, RPL allows a Routing Stretch (see [[RFC6687](#)]), whereby routing is only performed along a DODAG as opposed to straight along a shortest path between 2 peers, whatever

that would mean in a given LLN. This trades the quality of peer-to-peer (P2P) paths for a vastly reduced amount of control traffic and routing state that would be required to operate a any-to-any shortest path protocol. Finally, broken routes may be fixed lazily and on-

demand, based on dataplane inconsistency discovery, which avoids wasting energy in the proactive repair of unused paths.

In order to cope with lossy transmissions, RPL forms Direction-Oriented Directed Acyclic Graphs (DODAGs) using DODAG Information Solicitation (DIS) and DODAG Information Object (DIO) messages. For most of the nodes, though not all, a DODAG provides multiple forwarding solutions towards the Root of the topology via so-called parents. RPL is designed to adapt to fuzzy connectivity, whereby the physical topology cannot be expected to reach a stable state, with a lazy control that creates routes proactively but only fixes them when they are used by actual traffic. It results that RPL provides reachability for most of the LLN nodes, most of the time, but does not really converge in the classical sense. RPL provides unicast and multicast routing services back to RPL-Aware nodes (RANs). A RAN will inject routes to self using Destination Advertisement Object (DAO) messages sent to either their parents in Storing Mode or to the Root indicating their parent in Non-Storing mode. This process effectively forms a DODAG back to the device that is a subset of the DODAG to the Root with all links reversed.

When a routing protocol such as RPL is used to maintain reachability within a Non-Broadcast Multi-Access (NBMA) subnet, some nodes may act as routers and participate to the routing operations whereas others may be plain hosts. In RPL terms, a plain host that does not participate to the routing protocol is called a Leaf. It must be noted that a 6LN could participate to RPL and inject DAO routes to self, but refrain from advertising DIO and get children. In that case, the 6LN is still a host but not a Leaf.

This specification enables a RPL-Unaware Leaf (RUL) to announce itself as a host and demand that the 6LR that accepts the registration also inject the relevant routing information for the Registered Address in the RPL domain on its behalf. The unicast packet forwarding operation by the 6LR serving a Leaf 6LN is described in "When to use [RFC 6553](#), 6554 and IPv6-in-IPv6"

[[I-D.ietf-roll-useofrplinfo](#)]. This document adds the capability by a 6LR to advertise the Global, Unique-Local and Multicast IPv6 address(es) of the 6LN in the RPL protocol.

Examples of routing-agnostic 6LN may include lightly-powered sensors such as window smash sensor (alarm system), or the kinetically powered light switch. Other application of this specification may include a smart grid network that controls appliances - such as washing machines or the heating system - in the home. Appliances may not participate to the RPL protocol operated in the smart grid network but can still receive control packet from the smart grid.

Thubert

Expires November 29, 2019

[Page 3]

Internet-Draft

Routing for RPL Leaves

May 2019

[2.](#) Terminology

[2.1.](#) [BCP 14](#)

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.

[2.2.](#) References

The Terminology used in this document is consistent with and incorporates that described in Terms Used in Routing for Low-Power and Lossy Networks (LLNs). [[RFC7102](#)].

Other terms in use in LLNs are found in Terminology for Constrained-Node Networks [[RFC7228](#)].

A glossary of classical 6LoWPAN acronyms is given in [Section 2.3](#).

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

"RPL", "RPL Packet Information" (RPI) and "RPL Instance", DIO, DAO and DIS messages are defined in the "RPL: IPv6 Routing Protocol for Low-Power and Lossy Networks" [[RFC6550](#)] specification.

This document introduces the term RPL-Unaware Leaf (RUL) to refer to

a node that uses a RPL router (without necessarily knowing it) as 6LR and depends on that router to obtain reachability for its addresses inside the RPL domain. On the contrary, the term RPL-Aware Leaf (RAL) is used to refer to a host or a router that participates to RPL and advertises its addresses of prefixes by itself.

Other terms in use in LLNs are found in Terminology for Constrained-Node Networks [[RFC7228](#)].

Readers are expected to be familiar with all the terms and concepts that are discussed in

- o "Neighbor Discovery for IP version 6" [[RFC4861](#)],
- o "IPv6 Stateless Address Autoconfiguration" [[RFC4862](#)],
- o "Problem Statement and Requirements for IPv6 over Low-Power Wireless Personal Area Network (6LoWPAN) Routing" [[RFC6606](#)],

Thubert

Expires November 29, 2019

[Page 4]

Internet-Draft

Routing for RPL Leaves

May 2019

- o "IPv6 over Low-Power Wireless Personal Area Networks (6LoWPANs): Overview, Assumptions, Problem Statement, and Goals" [[RFC4919](#)],
- o "Neighbor Discovery Optimization for Low-power and Lossy Networks" [[RFC6775](#)], and
- o "Registration Extensions for IPv6 over Low-Power Wireless Personal Area Network (6LoWPAN) Neighbor Discovery" [[RFC8505](#)].

[2.3.](#) Subset of a 6LoWPAN Glossary

This document often uses the following acronyms:

6BBR: 6LoWPAN Backbone Router (proxy for the registration)

6LBR: 6LoWPAN Border Router (authoritative on DAD)

6LN: 6LoWPAN Node

6LR: 6LoWPAN Router (relay to the registration process)

6CIO: Capability Indication Option

(E)ARO: (Extended) Address Registration Option
(E)DAR: (Extended) Duplicate Address Request
(E)DAC: (Extended) Duplicate Address Confirmation
DAD: Duplicate Address Detection
DODAG: Destination-Oriented Directed Acyclic Graph
LLN: Low-Power and Lossy Network (a typical IoT network)
NA: Neighbor Advertisement
NCE: Neighbor Cache Entry
ND: Neighbor Discovery
NDP: Neighbor Discovery Protocol
NS: Neighbor Solicitation
ROVR: Registration Ownership Verifier (pronounced rover)
RPL: IPv6 Routing Protocol for LLNs (pronounced ripple)

Thubert

Expires November 29, 2019

[Page 5]

Internet-Draft

Routing for RPL Leaves

May 2019

RA: Router Advertisement
RS: Router Solicitation
TSCH: Timeslotted Channel Hopping
TID: Transaction ID (a sequence counter in the EAR0)

[3.](#) 6LoWPAN Neighbor Discovery

The IPv6 [\[RFC8200\]](#) Neighbor Discovery (IPv6 ND) Protocol (NDP) suite [\[RFC4861\]](#) [\[RFC4862\]](#) defined for fast media such as Ethernet, relies heavily on multicast operations for address discovery and duplicate address detection (DAD).

"Neighbor Discovery Optimizations for 6LoWPAN networks" [[RFC6775](#)] (6LoWPAN ND) adapts IPv6 ND for operations over energy-constrained LLNs. In particular, 6LoWPAN ND introduces a unicast host address registration mechanism that contributes to reduce the use of multicast messages that are present in the classical IPv6 ND protocol. 6LoWPAN ND defines a new Address Registration Option (ARO) that is carried in the unicast Neighbor Solicitation (NS) and Neighbor Advertisement (NA) messages between the 6LoWPAN Node (6LN) and the 6LoWPAN Router (6LR). 6LoWPAN ND also defines the Duplicate Address Request (DAR) and Duplicate Address Confirmation (DAC) messages between the 6LR and the 6LoWPAN Border Router (6LBR). In an LLN, the 6LBR is the central repository of all the Registered Addresses in its domain.

"Registration Extensions for 6LoWPAN Neighbor Discovery" [[RFC8505](#)] updates the behavior of [RFC 6775](#) to enable a generic registration to routing services and defines an Extended ARO (EARO). The format of the EARO is shown in Figure 1:




Figure 1: EARO Option Format

The 'R' flag that is set if the Registering Node expects that the 6LR ensures reachability for the Registered Address, e.g., by means of routing or proxying ND.

The EARO also includes a sequence counter called Transaction ID (TID), which maps to the Path Sequence Field found in Transit Options in RPL DAO messages. It is a prerequisite for this specification.

Finally, the EARO transports an Opaque field and an 'I' field that describes what the Opaque field transports and how to use it. This specification requires that the I field is left to 0 and to use the Opaque field to carry the RPL InstanceID if one is known, else to leave the Opaque field to zero.

4. Updating [RFC 6550](#)

This document specifies a new behavior whereby a 6LR injects DAO messages for unicast addresses registered through the updated 6LoWPAN ND [[RFC8505](#)] on behalf of 6LN nodes that are not RPL-aware.

Upon the renewal of a 6LoWPAN ND registration, this specification changes the behavior of the 6LR as follows. If the 'R' flag is set, the 6LR injects a DAO targeting the Registered Address, and refrains from sending a DAR message. the DAR/DAC exchange that refreshes the state in the 6LBR happens instead between the RPL Root and the 6LBR. In that flow, the RPL Root acts as a proxy on behalf of the 6LR upon the reception of the DAO propagation initiated at the 6LR.

5. Updating [RFC 8505](#)

The behavior defined in this specification whereby the 6LR that processes the registration advertises the Registered Address in DAO messages and bypasses the DAR/DAC process for the renewal of a registration, is only triggered by an NS(EARO) that has the 'R' flag set. If the 'R' flag is not set, then the Registering Node is expected to be a RAN router that handles the reachability of the Registered Address by itself.

This document also specifies a keep-alive EDAR message that the RPL Root may use to maintain an existing state in the 6LBR upon receiving DAO messages. The keep-alive EDAR message may only act as a refresher and can only update the Lifetime and the TID of the state in the 6LBR.

This document similarly specifies a keep-alive NS(EARO) message that the RPL Root may use to maintain an existing state in a 6BBR upon receiving DAO messages. The keep-alive NS(EARO) message may only act

state in the 6BBR.

As prescribed by [[RFC8505](#)], a RPL router SHOULD NOT set the 'R' flag.

6. Dependencies on the 6LN

This document provides RPL routing for a 6LN acting as a plain host and not aware of RPL. Still, a minimal RPL-independent functionality is expected from the 6LN in order to operate properly as a RLU; in particular:

- o the 6LN MUST implement [[RFC8505](#)] and set the 'R' flag in the EARO option. The 'R' flag is used to determine whether the Registering Node is a RUL, not aware of the RPL operation in the network, and thus does not participate to it. A 6LN is considered to be a RUL if and only if it sets the 'R' flag in the EARO.
- o RPL data packets are often encapsulated using IP in IP and in non-storing mode, packets going down will carry an SRH as well. RPL data packets also typically carry a Hop-by-Hop Header to transport a RPL Packet Information (RPI) [[RFC6550](#)]. These additional headers are called RPL artifacts.
- o When IP-in-IP is used and the outer headers terminate at the 6LR that generated the DAO, then the 6LR decapsulates the packet to the 6LN. In that case the 6LN gets a packet that is free of RPL artifacts. IP-in-IP to the 6LR MUST be used if the 6LN cannot handle the RPL artifacts or the way they are compressed [[RFC8138](#)]. It SHOULD be used if there is a particular bandwidth or power constraint at the 6LN.
- o In order to save the IP-in-IP encapsulation and to support storing mode of operation, it is preferred that the 6LN can ignore an RPI and consume a routing header in both the native and compressed forms. In order to enable IP-in-IP to a 6LN in non storing mode, it is also of interest that the 6LN supports decapsulating IP-in-IP in both forms. But since the preferred behaviour when using IP-in-IP is that the outer headers terminate at the 6LR, supporting this capability is secondary.

7. Protocol Operations for Unicast Addresses

7.1. General Flow

This specification enables to save the exchange of Extended Duplicate Address messages, EDAR and EDAC, from a 6LN all the way to the 6LBR across a RPL mesh, for the sole purpose of refreshing an existing

state in the 6LBR. Instead, the EDAR/EDAC exchange is proxied by the RPL Root upon a DAO message that refreshes the RPL routing state. To achieve this, the lifetimes and sequence counters in 6LoWPAN ND and RPL are aligned. In other words, the Path Sequence and the Path Lifetime in the DAO message are derived from the Transaction ID and the registration lifetime in the NS(EAR0) message from the 6LN.

From the perspective of the 6LN, the registration flow happens transparently; it is not delayed by the proxy RPL operation, so the device does not need to wait more whether RPL proxy operation happens or not. The flows below are RPL Non-Storing Mode examples. In Storing Mode, the DAO ACK may not be present, and the DAO messages cascade from child to parent all the way to the DODAG Root.

On the first registration, illustrated in Figure 2, from the perspective of the 6LR in non-storing mode, the Extended Duplicate Address message takes place as prescribed by [[RFC8505](#)]. When successful, the flow creates a Neighbor Cache Entry (NCE) in the 6LR, and the 6LR injects the Registered Address in RPL using DAO/DAO-ACK exchanges all the way to the RPL DODAG Root. The protocol does not carry a specific information that the Extended Duplicate Address messages were already exchanged, so the Root proxies them anyway. Note that in Storing Mode the DAO ACK is generated from the parent that does not necessary wait for the grand parent to acknowledge, so the DAO-ACK is no guarantee that the keep-alive EDAR succeeded. On the other hand, the flows can be nested in non storing mode, and it is possible to carry information such as an updated lifetime from the 6LBR all the way to the 6LN.




Figure 2: First Registration Flow

A re-registration is performed by the 6LN to maintain the NCE in the 6LR alive before lifetime expires. Upon a re-registration, as illustrated in Figure 3, the 6LR redistributes the Registered Address NS(EARO) in RPL. This causes the RPL DODAG Root to refresh the state in the 6LBR with a keep-alive EDAC message. The keep-alive EDAC lacks the Registration Ownership Verifier (ROVR) information, since it is not present in RPL DAO messages, but the EDAC message sent in response by the 6LBR contains the actual value of the ROVR field for that registration. This enables the RPL Root to perform the proxy-registration for the Registered Address and attract traffic captured over the backbone by the 6BBR and route it back to the device.




Figure 3: Next Registration Flow

Note that any of the functions 6LR, Root and 6LBR might be collapsed in a single node, in which case the flow above happens internally, and possibly through internal API calls as opposed to messaging.

[7.2.](#) 6LN Operation

This specification does not alter the operation of a 6LoWPAN ND-compliant 6LN, which is expected to operate as follows:

- o The 6LN obtains an IPv6 global address, for instance using autoconfiguration [[RFC4862](#)] based on a Prefix Information Option (PIO) [[RFC4861](#)] found in a Router Advertisement message or by some other means such as DHCPv6 [[RFC3315](#)].
- o Once it has formed an address, the 6LN (re)registers its address periodically, within the Lifetime of the previous registration, as prescribed by [[RFC8505](#)].
- o Upon each consecutive registration, the 6LN MUST increase the TID field.

Thubert

Expires November 29, 2019

[Page 11]

Internet-Draft

Routing for RPL Leaves

May 2019

- o If the 6LN is aware of the RPL Instance the packet should be injected into, then it SHOULD set the Opaque field to the InstanceID, else it MUST leave the Opaque field to zero. In any fashion the 6LN MUST set the 'I' field to zero.
- o A 6LN acting as a RUL MUST set the 'R' flag in the EARO whereas a 6LN acting as a RAN SHOULD NOT set the 'R' flag.
- o The 6LN MAY register to more than one 6LR at the same time. In that case, a same value of TID is used for each registration.
- o The 6LN MAY use any of the 6LRs to which it register to forward its packets.
- o the 6LN is not expected to be aware of RPL so it is not expected to produce RPL artifacts in the data packets.

[7.3.](#) 6LR Operation

Also as prescribed by [[RFC8505](#)], the 6LR generates a DAR message upon reception of a valid NS(EARO) message for the registration of a new IPv6 Address by a 6LN. If the Duplicate Address exchange succeeds, then the 6LR installs a Neighbor Cache Entry (NCE). If the 'R' flag was set in the EARO of the NS message, and this 6LR can manage the reachability of Registered Address, then the 6LR sets the 'R' flag in

the ARO of the response NA message.

From then on, the 6LN periodically sends a new NS(EARO) to refresh the NCE state before the lifetime indicated in the EARO expires, with TID that is incremented each time till it wraps in a lollipop fashion. As long as the 'R' flag is set and this router can still manage the reachability of Registered Address, the 6LR keeps setting the 'R' flag in the EARO of the response NA message, but the exchange of Extended Duplicate Address messages is skipped.

The Opaque field in the EARO hints the 6LR on the RPL Instance that should be used for the DAO advertisements, and for the forwarding of packets sourced at the registered address when there is no RPL Packet Information (RPI) in the packet, in which case the 6LR SHOULD add one to the packet. if the 'I' field is not zero, then the 6LR MUST consider that the Opaque field is left to zero. If the Opaque field is not set to zero, then it should carry a RPL InstanceID for the Instance suggested by the 6LN. If the 6LR does not participate to the associated Instance, then the 6LR MUST consider that the Opaque field is left to zero. If the Opaque field left to zero, the 6LR is free to use the default Instance (zero) for the registered address or to select an Instance of its choice; else, that is if the 6LR

participates to the suggested Instance, then the 6LR SHOULD use that Instance for the registered address.

Upon a successful NS/NA(EARO) exchange: if the 'R' flag was set in the EARO of the NS message, then the 6LR SHOULD inject the Registered Address in RPL by sending a DAO message on behalf of the 6LN; else the 6LR MUST NOT inject the Registered Address into RPL.

The DAO message advertising the Registered Address MUST be constructed as follows:

- o The Registered Address is placed in a RPL Target Option in the DAO message as the Target Prefix, and the Prefix Length is set to 128
- o the External 'E' flag in the Transit Information Option (TIO) associated to the Target Option is set to indicate that the 6LR redistributes an external target into the RPL network. This is how the root knows in non-storing mode to use IP-in-IP and

terminate the outters headers at the 6LR that generated the DAO.

- o the Path Lifetime in the TIO is computed from the Lifetime in the EARO Option to adapt it to the Lifetime Units used in the RPL operation. Note that if the lifetime is 0, then the 6LR generates a No-Path DAO message that cleans up the routes down to the Address of the 6LN.
- o the Path Sequence in the TIO is set to the TID value found in the EARO option.
- o Additionally, in Non-Storing Mode the 6LR indicates one of its global IPv6 unicast addresses as the Parent Address in the TIO.

If a 6LR receives a valid NS(EARO) message with the 'R' flag reset and the 6LR was redistributing the Registered Address due to previous NS(EARO) messages with the flag set, then it MUST stop injecting the address. It is up to the Registering Node to maintain the corresponding route from then on, either keeping it active by sending further DAO messages, or destroying it using a No-Path DAO.

[7.4.](#) RPL Root Operation

In RPL Storing Mode of Operation (MOP), the DAO message is propagated from child to parent all the way to the Root along the DODAG, populating routing state as it goes. In Non-Storing Mode, The DAO message is sent directly to the route. Upon reception of a DAO message that creates or updates an existing RPL state:

- o the Root notifies the 6LBR using an internal API if they are collocated, or performs a keep-alive DAR/DAC exchange on behalf of the registering node if they are separated.
- o In an extended topology with a Backbone Link, the Root notifies the 6LBR by proxying a keep-alive NS(EARO) on behalf of the 6LN that owns the address indicated in the Target Option.

The keep-alive EDAR and the NS(EARO) messages MUST be constructed as follows:

- o The Target IPv6 address from in the RPL Target Option is placed in the Registered Address field of the EDAR message and in the Target field of the NS message, respectively
- o the ROVR field in the keep-alive EDAR is set to 64-bits of all ones to indicate that it is not provided and this is a keep-alive EDAR. The actual value of the ROVR for that registration is returned by the 6LBR in an EDAC, and used in the proxy NS(EARO).
- o the Registration Lifetime is adapted from the Path Lifetime in the TIO by converting the Lifetime Units used in RPL into units of 60 seconds used in the 6LoWPAN ND messages.
- o The RPL Root indicates its own MAC Address as Source Link Layer Address (SLLA) in the NS(EARO).
- o the TID value is set to the Path Sequence in the TIO. The 'T' flag and an ICMP code of 1 are used in the NS(EARO) and the DAR message, respectively.

Upon a status in a DAC message that is not "Success", the Root MAY destroy the formed paths using a No-Path DAO downwards as specified in [[I-D.ietf-roll-efficient-npdo](#)].

In Non-Storing Mode, the outer IPv6 header that is used by the Root to transport the source routing information in data packets down the DODAG has the 6LR that serves the 6LN as final destination. This way, when the final 6LR decapsulates the outer header, it also removes all the RPL artifacts from the packet.

[7.5.](#) 6LBR Operation

Upon reception of a DAR message with the Owner Unique ID field is set to all ones, the 6LBR checks whether an entry exists for the and computes whether the TID in the DAR message is fresher than that in the entry as prescribed in [section 4.2.1. of \[RFC8505\]](#).

If the entry does not exist, the 6LBR does not create the entry, and answers with a Status "Removed" in the DAC message.

If the entry exists but is not fresher, the 6LBR does not update the

entry, and answers with a Status "Success" in the DAC message.

If the entry exists and the TID in the DAR message is fresher, the 6LBR updates the TID in the entry, and if the lifetime of the entry is extended by the Registration Lifetime in the DAR message, it also updates the lifetime of the entry. In that case, the 6LBR replies with a Status "Success" in the DAC message.

8. Protocol Operations for Multicast Addresses

[Section 12 of \[RFC6550\]](#) details the RPL support for multicast flows. This support is not source-specific and only operates as an extension to the Storing Mode of Operation for unicast packets. Note that it is the RPL model that the multicast packet is passed as a Layer-2 unicast to each of the interested children. This remains true when forwarding between the 6LR and the listener 6LN.

"Multicast Listener Discovery (MLD) for IPv6" [\[RFC2710\]](#) and its updated version "Multicast Listener Discovery Version 2 (MLDv2) for IPv6" [\[RFC3810\]](#) provide an interface for a listener to register to multicast flows. MLDv2 is backwards compatible with MLD, and adds in particular the capability to filter the sources via black lists and white lists. In the MLD model, the router is a "querier" and the host is a multicast listener that registers to the querier to obtain copies of the particular flows it is interested in.

On the first registration, as illustrated in Figure 4, the 6LN, as an MLD listener, sends an unsolicited Report to the 6LR in order to start receiving the flow immediately. Since multicast Layer-2 messages are avoided, it is important that the asynchronous messages for unsolicited Report and Done are sent reliably, for instance using an Layer-2 acknowledgement, or attempted multiple times.

The 6LR acts as a generic MLD querier and generates a DAO for the multicast target. The lifetime of the DAO is set to be in the order of the Query Interval, yet larger to account for variable propagation delays.

The root proxies the MLD exchange as listener with the 6BBR acting as the querier, so as to get packets from a source external to the RPL domain. Upon a DAO with a multicast target, the RPL root checks if it is already registered as a listener for that address, and if not, it performs its own unsolicited Report for the multicast target.




Figure 4: First Multicast Registration Flow

A re-registration is pulled by 6LR acting as querier. Note that the message may sent unicast to all the known individual listeners. Upon a time out of the Query Interval, the 6LR sends a Query to each of its listeners, and gets a Report back that is mapped into a DAO, as illustrated in Figure 5,




Figure 5: Next Registration Flow

Note that any of the functions 6LR, Root and 6LBR might be collapsed in a single node, in which case the flow above happens internally, and possibly through internal API calls as opposed to messaging.

[9.](#) Implementation Status

[10.](#) Security Considerations

The LLN nodes depend on the 6LBR and the RPL participants for their operation. A trust model must be put in place to ensure that the right devices are acting in these roles, so as to avoid threats such as black-holing, or bombing attack whereby an impersonated 6LBR would destroy state in the network by using the "Removed" Status code. This trust model could be at a minimum based on a Layer-2 access control, or could provide role validation as well. This is a generic 6LoWPAN requirement, see Req5.1 in Appendix of [[RFC8505](#)].

The keep-alive EDAR message does not carry a valid Registration Unique ID [[RFC8505](#)] and it cannot be used to create a binding state in the 6LBR. The 6LBR MUST NOT create an entry based on a keep-alive EDAR that does not match an existing entry. All it can do is refresh the lifetime and the TID of an existing entry.

[11.](#) IANA Considerations

This specification has no requirement on IANA.

[12.](#) Acknowledgments

The author wishes to thank Michael Richardson and Georgios Papadopoulos for their early reviews of and contributions to this document

[13.](#) References

[13.1.](#) Normative References

[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>>.

[RFC2710] Deering, S., Fenner, W., and B. Haberman, "Multicast Listener Discovery (MLD) for IPv6", [RFC 2710](#),

DOI 10.17487/RFC2710, October 1999,
<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2710>>.

- [RFC3810] Vida, R., Ed. and L. Costa, Ed., "Multicast Listener Discovery Version 2 (MLDv2) for IPv6", [RFC 3810](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC3810, June 2004,
<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3810>>.

Thubert

Expires November 29, 2019

[Page 17]

Internet-Draft

Routing for RPL Leaves

May 2019

- [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>>.
- [RFC4862] Thomson, S., Narten, T., and T. Jinmei, "IPv6 Stateless Address Autoconfiguration", [RFC 4862](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4862, September 2007,
<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4862>>.
- [RFC4919] Kushalnagar, N., Montenegro, G., and C. Schumacher, "IPv6 over Low-Power Wireless Personal Area Networks (6LoWPANs): Overview, Assumptions, Problem Statement, and Goals", [RFC 4919](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4919, August 2007,
<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4919>>.
- [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>>.
- [RFC6606] Kim, E., Kaspar, D., Gomez, C., and C. Bormann, "Problem Statement and Requirements for IPv6 over Low-Power Wireless Personal Area Network (6LoWPAN) Routing", [RFC 6606](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6606, May 2012,
<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6606>>.
- [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>>.

- [RFC8138] Thubert, P., Ed., Bormann, C., Toutain, L., and R. Cragie, "IPv6 over Low-Power Wireless Personal Area Network (6LoWPAN) Routing Header", [RFC 8138](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8138, April 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8138>>.
- [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>>.
- [RFC8200] Deering, S. and R. Hinden, "Internet Protocol, Version 6 (IPv6) Specification", STD 86, [RFC 8200](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8200, July 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8200>>.

Thubert

Expires November 29, 2019

[Page 18]

Internet-Draft

Routing for RPL Leaves

May 2019

- [RFC8505] Thubert, P., Ed., Nordmark, E., Chakrabarti, S., and C. Perkins, "Registration Extensions for IPv6 over Low-Power Wireless Personal Area Network (6LoWPAN) Neighbor Discovery", [RFC 8505](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8505, November 2018, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8505>>.

13.2. Informative References

- [I-D.ietf-6lo-ap-nd]
Thubert, P., Sarikaya, B., Sethi, M., and R. Struik, "Address Protected Neighbor Discovery for Low-power and Lossy Networks", [draft-ietf-6lo-ap-nd-12](#) (work in progress), April 2019.
- [I-D.ietf-roll-efficient-npdao]
Jadhav, R., Thubert, P., Sahoo, R., and Z. Cao, "Efficient Route Invalidation", [draft-ietf-roll-efficient-npdao-11](#) (work in progress), May 2019.
- [I-D.ietf-roll-useofrplinfo]
Robles, I., Richardson, M., and P. Thubert, "Using RPL Option Type, Routing Header for Source Routes and IPv6-in-IPv6 encapsulation in the RPL Data Plane", [draft-ietf-roll-useofrplinfo-29](#) (work in progress), May 2019.
- [IEEEstd802154]

IEEE standard for Information Technology, "IEEE Standard for Local and metropolitan area networks-- Part 15.4: Low-Rate Wireless Personal Area Networks (LR-WPANs)".

- [RFC3315] Droms, R., Ed., Bound, J., Volz, B., Lemon, T., Perkins, C., and M. Carney, "Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol for IPv6 (DHCPv6)", [RFC 3315](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC3315, July 2003, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3315>>.
- [RFC6687] Tripathi, J., Ed., de Oliveira, J., Ed., and JP. Vasseur, Ed., "Performance Evaluation of the Routing Protocol for Low-Power and Lossy Networks (RPL)", [RFC 6687](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6687, October 2012, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6687>>.
- [RFC7102] Vasseur, JP., "Terms Used in Routing for Low-Power and Lossy Networks", [RFC 7102](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7102, January 2014, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7102>>.

Thubert

Expires November 29, 2019

[Page 19]

Internet-Draft

Routing for RPL Leaves

May 2019

- [RFC7228] Bormann, C., Ersue, M., and A. Keranen, "Terminology for Constrained-Node Networks", [RFC 7228](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7228, May 2014, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7228>>.

Author's Address

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

Phone: +33 497 23 26 34
Email: pthubert@cisco.com

Thubert

Expires November 29, 2019

[Page 20]