IoT protocols and Simulation Framework - Rahul Jadhav LWIG-WG, IETF106, Singapore

What is this about?

- Experience-sharing
 - Untrustworthy results
 - Protocols not realistic
 - IEEE papers give unrealistic data
 - Experiments done in limited scope
 - Difficult for fellow-researchers to try different settings
 - Comparative analysis is difficult
- My context
 - Multihop mesh routing protocols
 - Bigger networks (1K nodes, 16 hops), AMI scenario

What we want?

- Requirements
 - Benchmarking performance
 - Reproducible data
 - Data under realistic network conditions
 - Data with real-world IoT network stacks
 - Interop tests
 - Shareable scenario config

Realistic models are necessary

- Especially for wireless constrained networks
 - Asymmetric links
 - Impact of channel access
 - Inteference and collision patterns
- Performance data is important to be measured with realistic wireless modelling
 - Best is to use hardware, but it may not be possible!

So, Yet another framework!

- Cooja
 - Very easy to use, good visualization, integrates contiki
 - Supports Hardware Emulation!
 - But not realistic: path loss and propagation models
 - Cannot scale: to hundreds of nodes
- NS3/Omnet++
 - Realistic models
 - But difficult to integrate with real-world stacks
 - What about NS3-TapBridge?

- Hardware Testbeds
 - Indriya, FIT/IOT-Lab
 - Practical data but limited scale
 - Difficult to debug, limited runtimes

Realistic Simulation Frameworks are difficult to use



Ref: Challenging the IPv6 Routing Protocol for Low-Power and Lossy Networks (RPL): A Survey, Hyung-Sin Kim et.al.

Introducing Whitefield

- Started during IETF96
- Design Goals
 - Integrate proven wireless models with real-world stacks
 - Scalable to thousands of nodes
 - Can migrate to hardware using the same setup
 - Cloneable setup
- Stacklines supported
 - Contiki, RIOT
 - OpenThread (support in progress)
- AirLine support
 - NS3
 - IdealAir (in progress)



High Level Design



- Contiki/RIOT/OpenThread have been added with Whitefield platform support (in whitefield org repo)
- Every StackLine node is a Linux process
- Mapping of StackLine node to virtual AirLine node
- Whitefield orchestrates the AirLine and StackLine processes
- AirLine, StackLine, CommLine decoupled
- CommLine currently uses abstract unix domain sockets
- Every node is identified by a unique ID
- Max 60K nodes possible
- Common OAM/Visualization



Case-Study-1

- draft-ietf-roll-rpl-observations
 - For the first time we could test interop between RIOT and Contiki at scale
 - RPL DAO aggregation not handled in Contiki
 - Reported RPL DAO fragmentation issue on RIOT ML (ref)
 - Essentially could not interop at scale
 - Network convergence time for 300 Contiki nodes
 - With Cooja was <20s
 - With Whitefield it was 1-2mins with very high variation depending on app-traffic
 - With hardware we found similar convergence time
 - We actually had 300 node hw setup!
 - Control Overhead was very different

Case-Study-2

- draft-ietf-roll-efficient-npdao
 - Impact of optimized invalidation on overall network performance
 - Numbers drastically vary from Cooja
 - Numbers with Cooja are actually very good, but misleading

More Case-Studies

- draft-ietf-lwig-nbr-mgmt-policy
 - Impact of neighbor cache policy on the stability of the network
- draft-ietf-6lo-minimal-fragment
 - Impact of 802.15.4 single channel operation on fragment forwarding

Detailed setup config, observations and raw data is present on the Whitefield-framework github

Other work in the context

- IoTBench
 - "A community effort to better evaluate and compare low-power wireless network"
 - Provides excellent conceptual framework
 - Enlists tools and testbeds in the context
- Whitefield will use the recommendations
 - Organizing the suites, metrics, configuration
 - Use of profiles for ease of management



Whitefield

https://github.com/whitefieldframework/whitefield



Future Extensions: https://trello.com/b/9bdugZxX/project-whitefield

Questions: rahul.ietf@gmail.com