

RAW  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: June 24, 2020

G. Papadopoulos, Ed.  
R. Koutsiamanis  
N. Montavont  
IMT Atlantique  
P. Thubert  
Cisco  
December 22, 2019

Exploiting Packet Replication and Elimination in Complex Tracks in LLNs  
[draft-papadopoulos-raw-pareo-reqs-01](#)

Abstract

The Packet Replication and Elimination (PRE) mechanism duplicates data packets into several paths in the network to increase reliability and provide low jitter. PRE may be used to complement layer-2 Automatic Repeat reQuest (ARQ) and receiver-end Ordering to form the PAREO functions. Over a wireless medium, this technique can take advantage of communication Overhearing, when parallel transmissions over two adjacent paths are scheduled. This document presents the concept and details the required changes to the current specifications that will be necessary to enable the PAREO functions.

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 June 24, 2020.

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

<a href="#">1.</a>	Introduction . . . . .	<a href="#">2</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	Terminology . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	Tracks . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">3.1.</a>	Tracks Overview . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">3.2.</a>	Complex Tracks . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">4.</a>	Packet Replication and Elimination principles . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">4.1.</a>	Packet Replication . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">4.2.</a>	Packet Elimination . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">4.3.</a>	Promiscuous Overhearing . . . . .	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">5.</a>	Requirements . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">5.1.</a>	Requirements Related to Alternative Parent Selection . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">5.2.</a>	Requirements Related to Propagated Information . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">5.3.</a>	Requirements Related to Promiscuous Overhearing . . . . .	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">5.4.</a>	Requirements Related to Packet Elimination . . . . .	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">6.</a>	Security Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">7.</a>	IANA Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">8.</a>	References . . . . .	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">8.1.</a>	Informative references . . . . .	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">8.2.</a>	Other Informative References . . . . .	<a href="#">9</a>
	Authors' Addresses . . . . .	<a href="#">10</a>

## [1.](#) Introduction

This draft describes industrial use cases which require deterministic flows over wireless multi-hop paths.

The RAW use cases explicitly do not propose any specific solution or design for the RAW architecture or protocols. These are the subjects of other RAW drafts. The RAW use cases are not considered to be concrete requirements by the RAW Working Group.

The industrial use cases covered in this draft are professional audio, wireless for industrial applications and amusement parks.



## **2. Terminology**

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [[RFC2119](#)].

## **3. Tracks**

### **3.1. Tracks Overview**

The 6TiSCH architecture introduces the concept of Tracks in 6TiSCH Architecture [[I-D.ietf-6tisch-architecture](#)]. A simple track is composed of a sequence of cells (a combination of a transmitter, a receiver and a given channel offset) to ensure the transmission of a single packet from a source node to a destination node across a multihop path.

### **3.2. Complex Tracks**

A Complex Track is designed as a directed acyclic graph from a source node towards a destination node to support multi-path forwarding, as introduced in 6TiSCH Architecture [[I-D.ietf-6tisch-architecture](#)]. By employing DetNet [[I-D.ietf-detnet-architecture](#)] Packet Replication and Elimination (PRE) functions, several paths may be computed, and these paths may be more or less independent. For example, a complex Track may branch off and rejoin over non-congruent paths (branches).

Some more details for Deterministic Network PRE techniques are presented in the following Section.

## **4. Packet Replication and Elimination principles**

In a nutshell, PRE establishes several paths in a network to provide redundancy and parallel transmissions to bound the end-to-end delay to traverse the network. Optionally, promiscuous listening between paths is possible, such that the nodes on one path may overhear transmissions along the other path. Considering the scenario shown in Figure 1, many different paths are possible for S to reach R. A simple way to benefit from this topology could be to use the two independent paths via nodes A, C, E and via B, D, F. But more complex paths are possible by interleaving transmissions from the lower level of the path to the upper level.

PRE may also take advantage of the shared properties of the wireless medium to compensate for the potential loss that is incurred with radio transmissions. For instance, when the source sends to A, B may listen also and get a second chance to receive the frame without an additional transmission. Note that B would not have to listen if it



already received that particular frame at an earlier timeslot in a dedicated transmission towards B.




Figure 1: A Typical Ladder Shape with Two Parallel Paths Toward the Destination

The PRE model can be implemented in both centralized and distributed scheduling approaches. In the centralized approach, a Path Computation Element (PCE) scheduler calculates the routes and schedules the communication among the nodes along a circuit such as a Label switched path. In the distributed approach, each node selects its route to the destination, typically using a source routing header.

In both cases, at each node in the paths, a default parent and alternative parent(s) should be selected to set up complex tracks.

In the following Subsections, all the required operations defined by PRE, namely, Alternative Path Selection, Packet Replication, Packet Elimination and Promiscuous Overhearing, are described.

#### **4.1. Packet Replication**

The objective of PRE is to provide deterministic networking properties: high reliability and bounded latency. To achieve this goal, determinism in every hop of the forwarding paths MUST be guaranteed.

By employing a Packet Replication procedure, each node forwards a copy of each data packet to multiple parents: its Default Parent (DP) and multiple Alternative Parents (APs). To do so, each node (i.e., source and intermediate node) transmits the data packet multiple times in unicast to each parent. For instance, in Figure 2, the source node S is transmitting the packet to both parents, nodes A and B, in two different timeslots within the same TSCH slotframe. An example TSCH schedule is shown in Figure 3. Thus, the packet eventually obtains parallel paths to the destination.






Figure 2: Packet Replication: S transmits twice the same data packet, to its DP (A) and to its AP (B).




Figure 3: Packet Replication: Sample TSCH schedule

#### 4.2. Packet Elimination

The replication operation increases the traffic load in the network, due to packet duplications. Thus, a Packet Elimination operation SHOULD be applied at each RPL DODAG level to reduce the unnecessary traffic. To this aim, once a node receives the first copy of a data packet, it discards the subsequent copies.

Because the first copy that reaches a node is the one that matters, it is the only copy that will be forwarded upward. Then, once a node performs the Packet Elimination operation, it will proceed with the Packet Replication operation to forward the packet toward the RPL DODAG Root.

#### 4.3. Promiscuous Overhearing

Considering that the wireless medium is broadcast by nature, any neighbor of a transmitter may overhear a transmission. By employing the Promiscuous Overhearing operation, a DP and some AP(s) eventually have more chances to receive the data packets. In Figure 4, when node A is transmitting to its DP (node C), the AP (node D) and its sibling (node B) may decode this data packet as well. As a result, by employing correlated paths, a node may have multiple opportunities to receive a given data packet. This feature not only enhances the end-to-end reliability but also it reduces the end-to-end delay and increases energy efficiency.








Figure 4: Unicast to DP with Overhearing: by employing Promiscuous Overhearing, DP, AP and the sibling nodes have more opportunities to receive the same data packet.

## 5. Requirements

### 5.1. Requirements Related to Alternative Parent Selection

To perform the Packet Replication procedure, it is necessary to define the Alternative Parent(s) and, consequently, the path to the destination node, for each node in the wireless network. An AP can be selected in many different ways, and is dependent on the implementation.

The requirements are:

Req1.1: The routing protocol SHOULD be extended to allow for each node to select AP(s) in addition to the DP. This enables packet replication to multiple parents.

Req1.2: Considering that the Packet Replication procedure significantly increases the traffic in a network, when proposing solutions for Alternative Parent Selection, they should be efficient enough to mitigate the potential uncontrolled packet duplications.

Req1.3: The topology SHOULD be defined when proposing solutions for Alternative Parent Selection. For instance, the ladder topology should be defined explicitly e.g., number of parallel paths, density.

### 5.2. Requirements Related to Propagated Information

For Alternative Parent(s) selection, nodes MAY need additional information about the network topology.

This draft does not prescribe the information required for AP selection or how it is to be propagated to the nodes that need to select AP(s). TODO: To be discussed.

The requirement is:



Req2.1: Nodes MUST have a way of receiving the required information for efficient Alternative Parent Selection.

As an example, it is possible to use and extend the RPL [[RFC6550](#)] DODAG Information Object (DIO) Control Message to allow nodes to propagate information about themselves to potential children. For instance, "RPL DAG Metric Container (MC) Node State and Attribute (NSA) object type extension" [[I-D.ietf-roll-nsa-extension](#)] focuses on extending the DAG Metric Container [[RFC6551](#)] by defining a new type-length-value (TLV), entitled Parent Set (PS) which can be carried in the Node State and Attribute (NSA) object.

### **5.3. Requirements Related to Promiscuous Overhearing**

As stated previously, to further increase the network reliability and to achieve deterministic packet deliveries at the destination node, Promiscuous Overhearing can be considered.

As it is described in [BCP 210](#) [[RFC8180](#)], in TSCH mode, the data frames are transmitted in unicast mode and are acknowledged by the receiving neighbor. To perform the promiscuous overhearing procedure, there SHOULD be an option for the transmitted frames, i.e., in unicast, to be overheard by the potential neighborhood node.

Destination address filtering is performed at the Medium Access Control (MAC) layer. For example, according to IEEE std. 802.15.4 [[IEEE802154-2015](#)], a node receiving a packet with a destination address different than its own and different to 0xFF discards the packet. A change is needed to be able to receive packets whose destination address is neither multicast nor the overhearing node's MAC address.

The requirements are:

Req3.1:

Req3.1: The MAC implementation MUST be able to disable MAC address filtering to

Req3.1: accept the overheard frame.

Req3.2: The 6top Protocol [[RFC8480](#)] specification MUST be extended to indicate disabling MAC filtering in a receiving cell. This can be achieved by reserving a bit in the 6P CellOptions Bitmap ([Section 6.2.6](#) [[RFC8480](#)]) for this purpose.

Req3.3: The overhearing node can be configured with the timeslot set to shared reception, thus, there will be no acknowledgement



from it. However, there is the security issue that needs to be considered. Since the overhearing case implies that it is not possible to have per-pair keying, there MUST be a key that the overhearing node will be aware of. Hence, the Minimal Security Framework for 6TiSCH [[I-D.ietf-6tisch-architecture](#)] specification should consider such a scenario.

#### **5.4. Requirements Related to Packet Elimination**

By employing Packet Replication, the wireless network is expected to also perform Packet Elimination

to restrict the number of the duplicated packets, i.e., the unnecessary traffic. As per the 6TiSCH Architecture [[I-D.ietf-6tisch-architecture](#)], 6TiSCH has no position about how the sequence numbers would be tagged in the packet.

The requirement is:

Req4.1: To perform Packet Elimination the packet copies MUST contain a sequence number which allows identifying the copies.

Req4.1:

Req4.1:

Req4.1:

Req4.1:

#### **6. Security Considerations**

TODO.

#### **7. IANA Considerations**

This document has no IANA considerations.

#### **8. References**

##### **8.1. Informative references**

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

Thubert, P., "An Architecture for IPv6 over the TSCH mode of IEEE 802.15.4", [draft-ietf-6tisch-architecture-28](#) (work in progress), October 2019.



[I-D.ietf-detnet-architecture]

Finn, N., Thubert, P., Varga, B., and J. Farkas,  
"Deterministic Networking Architecture", [draft-ietf-detnet-architecture-13](#) (work in progress), May 2019.

[I-D.ietf-roll-nsa-extension]

Koutsiamanis, R., Papadopoulos, G., Montavont, N., and P. Thubert, "Common Ancestor Objective Functions and Parent Set DAG Metric Container Extension", [draft-ietf-roll-nsa-extension-05](#) (work in progress), November 2019.

[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>>.

[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>>.

[RFC6551] Vasseur, JP., Ed., Kim, M., Ed., Pister, K., Dejean, N., and D. Barthel, "Routing Metrics Used for Path Calculation in Low-Power and Lossy Networks", [RFC 6551](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6551, March 2012, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6551>>.

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

[RFC8480] Wang, Q., Ed., Vilajosana, X., and T. Watteyne, "6TiSCH Operation Sublayer (6top) Protocol (6P)", [RFC 8480](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8480, November 2018, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8480>>.

## 8.2. Other Informative References

[IEEE802154-2015]

IEEE standard for Information Technology, "IEEE standard for Information Technology, "IEEE Std 802.15.4-2015 Standard for Low-Rate Wireless Personal Area Networks (WPANs)", December 2015".





## Authors' Addresses

Georgios Papadopoulos (editor)  
IMT Atlantique  
Office B00 - 102A  
2 Rue de la Chataigneraie  
Cesson-Sevigne - Rennes 35510  
FRANCE

Phone: +33 299 12 70 04  
Email: georgios.papadopoulos@imt-atlantique.fr

Remous-Aris Koutsiamanis  
IMT Atlantique  
Office B00 - 126A  
2 Rue de la Chataigneraie  
Cesson-Sevigne - Rennes 35510  
FRANCE

Phone: +33 299 12 70 49  
Email: aris@ariskou.com

Nicolas Montavont  
IMT Atlantique  
Office B00 - 106A  
2 Rue de la Chataigneraie  
Cesson-Sevigne - Rennes 35510  
FRANCE

Phone: +33 299 12 70 23  
Email: nicolas.montavont@imt-atlantique.fr

Pascal Thubert  
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

