ROLL   R. Koutsiamanis, Ed.
Internet-Draft   G. Papadopoulos
Intended status: Standards Track   N. Montavont
Expires: January 4, 2019   IMT Atlantique
                                                                 P. Thubert
                                                                      Cisco
                                                               July 3, 2018

       RPL DAG Metric Container Node State and Attribute object type extension
                   draft-koutsiamanis-roll-nsa-extension-02

   Abstract

      Implementing 6TiSCH Packet Replication and Elimination from / to the
      RPL root requires the ability to forward copies of packets over
      different paths via different RPL parents. Selecting the appropriate
      parents to achieve ultra-low latency and jitter requires information
      about a node's parents. This document details what information needs
      to be transmitted and how it is encoded within a packet to enable
      this functionality.

   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 January 4, 2019.

   Copyright Notice

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

   Industrial network applications have stringent requirements on
   reliability and predictability, and typically leverage 1+1
   redundancy, aka Packet Replication and Elimination (PRE)
   [I-D.papadopoulos-6tisch-pre-reqs] to achieve their goal. In order
   for wireless networks to be able to be used in such applications, the
   principles of Deterministic Networking [I-D.ietf-detnet-architecture]
   lead to designs that aim at maximizing packet delivery rate and
   minimizing latency and jitter. Additionally, given that the network
   nodes often do not have an unlimited power supply, energy consumption
   needs to be minimized as well.

   To meet this goal, IEEE Std. 802.15.4 [IEEE802154-2015] provides
   Time-Slotted Channel Hopping (TSCH), a mode of operation which uses a
   fixed communication schedule to allow deterministic medium access as
   well as channel hopping to work around radio interference. However,
   since TSCH uses retransmissions in the event of a failed
   transmission, end-to-end delay and jitter performance can
   deteriorate.

The 6TiSCH working group, focusing on IPv6 over IEEE Std. 802.15.4-TSCH, has worked on the issues previously highlighted and produced the "6TiSCH Architecture" [I-D.ietf-6tisch-architecture] to address that case. Building on this architecture, "Exploiting Packet Replication and Elimination in Complex Tracks in 6TiSCH LLNs" [I-D.papadopoulos-6tisch-pre-reqs] leverages PRE to improve the Packet Delivery Ratio (PDR), provide a hard bound to the end-to-end latency, and limit jitter.

PRE achieves a controlled redundancy by laying multiple forwarding paths through the network and using them in parallel for different copies of a same packet. PRE can follow the Destination-Oriented Directed Acyclic Graph (DODAG) formed by RPL from a node to the root. Building a multi-path DODAG can be achieved based on the RPL capability of having multiple parents for each node in a network, a subset of which is used to forward packets. In order for this subset to be defined, a RPL parent subset selection mechanism, which falls within the remit of the RPL Objective Function (OF), needs to have specific path information. The specification of the transmission of this information is the focus of this document.

More concretely, this specification focuses on the extensions to the DAG Metric Container [RFC6551] required for providing the PRE mechanism a part of the information it needs to operate. This information is the RPL [RFC6550] parent address set of a node and it must be sent to potential children nodes of the node. The RPL DIO Control Message is the canonical way of broadcasting this kind of information and therefore its DAG Metric Container [RFC6551] field is used to append a Node State and Attribute (NSA) object. The node's parent address set is stored as an optional TLV within the NSA object. This specification defines the type value and structure for this TLV.

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 concept of Track is introduced in the "6TiSCH Architecture" [I-D.ietf-6tisch-architecture], defined as a sequence of elements, each consisting of the 3-tuple of a transmitter, a receiver, and a given timeslot expressed as a slotOffset/channelOffset tuple. A simple Track is intended to provide the full resources required to

allow the transmission of a single packet from a source 6TiSCH node
to a destination 6TiSCH node across a 6TiSCH multihop path.

3.2. Complex Tracks

Similarly to, but as a generalization of a simple Track, a Complex
Track is defined in the "6TiSCH Architecture"
[I-D.ietf-6tisch-architecture] as a DODAG starting at a source 6TiSCH
node and leading to a sink 6TiSCH node in order to support multi-path
forwarding. Multiple independent paths may be produced by using
techniques for Packet Replication and Elimination (PRE)
[I-D.papadopoulos-6tisch-pre-reqs] based on DetNet
[I-D.ietf-detnet-architecture] principles. As an example, a complex
Track allows for branching off and rejoining over non-congruent
paths.

In the following Section, we will detail Deterministic Networks PRE
techniques.

4. Packet Replication and Elimination principles

The idea behind Packet Replication and Elimination (PRE) is to
transmit the same data packet through parallel and adjacent paths in
a network with the aim of improving reliability and predictability
through redundancy.

The process of replication consists of identifying multiple potential
paths, selecting a subset to use, and sending copies of a single
packet through each path. When receiving packets the process of
elimination is required so that multiple copies of the same packet
are not replicated again, to avoid an exponential growth in
unnecessary traffic. Combined together, these processes enable
controlled redundancy which in turn can be used to achieve the
previously stated goals of reliability (i.e., ultra-high packet
delivery rate) and predictability (i.e., ultra-low end-to-end delay
and jitter) in wireless networks. For example, in Figure 1, the
source 6TiSCH node S is sending the data packet to its RPL Default
Parent (DP) (node A) and Alternative Parent (AP) (node B) in two
different timeslots.

```
                    ( R ) root
                    ^^  ^^
                   //    \\
                  //      \\
               ( C )    ( D )
               ^^ ^      ^ ^^
               || \  /   ||
               ||  \/    ||
               ||  /\    ||
               || /  \   ||
               ( A )    ( B )
               ^^        ^
               ||      /
               ||     /
               ||    /
               ||   /             ||  Preferred Parent
               ( S ) source       |   Potential Parent
```

        Figure 1: Packet Replication: S transmits the same data packet twice:
                     to its DP (A) and to its AP (B).

   In "Exploiting Packet Replication and Elimination in Complex Tracks
   in 6TiSCH LLNs" [I-D.papadopoulos-6tisch-pre-reqs], the concept of
   PRE is further expanded along with its requirements.

5.  Alternative Parent Selection Issue

   In the RPL protocol, each node maintains a list of potential parents.
   For PRE, the DP node is defined as the RPL DODAG preferred parent
   node.  Furthermore, to construct an alternative path toward the root,
   in addition to the DP node, each 6TiSCH node in the network registers
   an AP node as well.  There are multiple alternative methods of
   selecting the AP node, functionality which is included in operation
   of the RPL Objective Function (OF).  In "Exploiting Packet
   Replication and Elimination in Complex Tracks in 6TiSCH LLNs"
   [I-D.papadopoulos-6tisch-pre-reqs], a scheme which allows the two
   paths to remain correlated is detailed.  More specifically, in this
   scheme a 6TiSCH node will select an alternative parent node close to
   its default parent node to allow the operation of overhearing between
   parents.  To do so, the node will check if its Default Grand Parent
   (DGP), the DP of its DP, is in the set of parents of a potential AP.
   If multiple potential APs match this condition, the AP with the
   lowest rank will be registered.

```
                       (R) root
                      ^^ ^^ ^^
                     // || \\
                    // || \\
                   // || \\
                  // || \\
                (C)   (D)   (E)
               ^^ ^   ^ ^^   ^
               || \ / || /
               || \/ || /
               || /\ || /
               || / \ || /
               (A)   (B)
              ^^   ^
               || /
               || /
               || /
               || / || Preferred Parent
              (S) source | Potential Parent
```

                  Figure 2: Example Parent Selection mechanism

   For instance, in Figure 2, source 6TiSCH node S must know its
   grandparent sets both through node A and through node B.  In this
   scenario, node A has the parent set {C, D} with C as DP and node B
   has the parent set {C, D, E} with D as DP.  Therefore, node S can
   decide to use node B as its AP node, since the the DGP of S (via node
   A) is node C, and node C is in the parent set of node B ({C, D, E}).

   In order to select their AP node, 6TiSCH nodes need to be aware of
   their grandparent node sets.  Within RPL [RFC6550], the nodes use the
   DODAG Information Object (DIO) Control Message to broadcast
   information about themselves to potential children.  However, RPL
   [RFC6550], does not define how to propagate parent set related
   information, which is what this document addresses.

6.  Node State and Attribute (NSA) object type extension

   For supporting PRE, nodes need to report their parent set to their
   potential children.  DIO messages can carry multiple options, out of
   which the DAG Metric Container option [RFC6551] is the most suitable
   structurally and semantically for the purpose of carrying the parent
   set.  The DAG Metric Container option itself can carry different
   nested objects, out of which the Node State and Attribute (NSA)
   [RFC6551] is appropriate for transferring generic node state data.
   Within the Node State and Attribute it is possible to store optional
   TLVs representing various node characteristics.  As per the Node
   State and Attribute (NSA) [RFC6551] description, no TLV have been

defined for use.  This document defines one TLV for the purpose of
transmitting a node's parent set.

```
 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
+-+
| RPLInstanceID |Version Number | Rank |
+-+
|G|0| MOP | Prf | DTSN | Flags | Reserved |
+-+
| |
+   +
| |
+   DODAGID   +
| |
+   +
| |
+-+
| DAGMC Type (2)| DAGMC Length | |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+ |
| |
//   DAG Metric Container data   //
| |
+-+
```

   Figure 3: Example DIO Message with a DAG Metric Container option

The structure of the DIO Control Message when a DAG Metric Container
option is included is shown in Figure 3.  The DAG Metric Container
option type (DAGMC Type in Figure 3) has the value 0x02 as per the
IANA registry for the RPL Control Message Options, and is defined in
[RFC6550].  The DAG Metric Container option length (DAGMC Length in
Figure 3) expresses the the DAG Metric Container length in bytes.
DAG Metric Container data holds the actual data and is shown further
expanded in Figure 4.

```
 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
+-+
|Routing-MC-Type|Res Flags|P|C|O|R| A | Prec | Length (bytes)| |=>MC
+-+
| Res | Flags |A|O| PS type | PS Length | |
+-+ |=>NSA
| PS IPv6 address(es) ... |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

Figure 4: DAG Metric Container (MC) data with Node State and
Attribute (NSA) object body and a TLV

The structure of the DAG Metric Container data in the form of a Node
State and Attribute (NSA) object with a TLV in the NSA Optional TLVs
field is shown in Figure 4.  The first 32 bits comprise the DAG
Metric Container header and all the following bits are part of the
Node State and Attribute object body, as defined in [RFC6551].  This
document defines a new TLV, which CAN be carried in the Node State
and Attribute (NSA) object Optional TLVs field.  The TLV is named
Parent Set and is abbreviated as PS in Figure 4.

PS type:  The type of the Parent Set TLV.  The value is TBD1.

PS Length:  The total length of the TLV value field (PS IPv6
      address(es)) in bytes.

PS IPv6 address(es):  A sequence of zero or more IPv6 addresses
      belonging to a node's parent set.  Each address requires 16
      bytes.  The order of the parents in the parent set is in
      decreasing preference based on the Objective Function [RFC6550]
      used by the node.

6.1.  Usage

The PS SHOULD be used in the process of parent selection, and
especially in alternative parent selection, since it can help the
alternative path from significantly deviating from the preferred
path.  The Parent Set is information local to the node that
broadcasts it.  It does not make sense for this information to be
aggregated due to the scalability issue created by the space required
for many IPv6 addresses.  Therefore, the PS MUST NOT be aggregated.

6.1.1.  DAG Metric Container fields

   Given the intended usage, when using the PS, the NSA object it is
   contained in MUST be used as a constraint in the DAG Metric
   Container.  More specifically, using the PS places the following
   requirements on the DAG Metric Container header fields:

   o  'P' flag: MUST be cleared, since PS is used only with constraints.

   o  'C' flag: MUST be set, since PS is used only with constraints.

   o  'O' flag: Used as per [RFC6550], to indicated optionality.

   o  'R' flag: MUST be cleared, since PS is used only with constraints.

   o  'A' Field: MUST be set to 0 and ignored, since PS is used only
      with constraints.

   o  'Prec' Field: Used as per [RFC6550].

6.1.2.  Node State and Attribute fields

   For reasons of clarity, the usage of the PS places no additional
   restrictions on the NSA flags ('A' and 'O'), which can be used as
   normally defined in [RFC6550].

6.2.  Compression

   The PS IPv6 address(es) field in the Parent Set TLV add overhead due
   to their size.  Therefore, compression is highly desirable in order
   for this extension to be usable.  To meet this goal, a good
   compression method candidate is [RFC8138] 6LoWPAN Routing Header
   (6LoRH).  Furthermore, the PS IPv6 address(es) belong by definition
   to nodes in the same RPL DODAG and are stored in the form of a list
   of addresses.  This makes this field a good candidate for the use of
   the same compression as in Source Routing Header 6LoRH (SRH-6LoRH),
   achieving efficiency and implementation reuse.  Therefore, the PS
   IPv6 address(es) field SHOULD be compressed using the compression
   method for Source Routing Header 6LoRH (SRH-6LoRH) [RFC8138].

7.  Security Considerations

   TODO.

8.  IANA Considerations

    TBA.

9.  References

9.1.  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-14 (work
              in progress), April 2018.

    [I-D.ietf-detnet-architecture]
              Finn, N., Thubert, P., Varga, B., and J. Farkas,
              "Deterministic Networking Architecture", draft-ietf-
              detnet-architecture-06 (work in progress), June 2018.

    [I-D.papadopoulos-6tisch-pre-reqs]
              Papadopoulos, G., Montavont, N., and P. Thubert,
              "Exploiting Packet Replication and Elimination in Complex
              Tracks in 6TiSCH LLNs", draft-papadopoulos-6tisch-pre-
              reqs-01 (work in progress), December 2017.

    [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>.

    [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>.

9.2.  Other Informative References

   [IEEE802154-2015]
              IEEE standard for Information Technology, "IEEE Std
              802.15.4-2015 Standard for Low-Rate Wireless Personal Area
              Networks (WPANs)", December 2015.

Authors' Addresses

   Remous-Aris Koutsiamanis (editor)
   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


   Georgios Papadopoulos
   IMT Atlantique
   Office B00 - 114A
   2 Rue de la Chataigneraie
   Cesson-Sevigne - Rennes  35510
   FRANCE

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


   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