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1. Introduction

RPL [RFC6550] specifies a proactive distance-vector based routing scheme. The protocol creates a DAG-like structure which operates with a given "Mode of Operation" (MOP) determining the minimal and mandatory set of primitives to be supported by all the participating nodes.

This document adds a notion of capabilities using which nodes in the network could inform its peers about its additional capabilities. This document highlights the differences of capabilities from that of Mode of operation and explains the necessity of it.

1.1. Requirements Language and 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 RFC 2119 [RFC2119].

MOP: Mode of Operation. Identifies the MOP of the RPL Instance as administratively provisioned at and distributed by the DODAG root.

MOPex: Extended MOP: As defined in [I-D.ietf-roll-mopex].

Capabilities: Additional features or capabilities that are supported by the node.

Cap: Abbreviated term used for Capability.

Caps: Abbreviated term used for Capabilities.

DAO: DODAG Advertisement Object. An RPL message used to advertise the target information in order to establish routing adjacencies.

DIO: DODAG Information Object. An RPL message initiated by the root and is used to advertise the network configuration information.

Current parent: Parent 6LR node before switching to the new path.

NPDAO: No-Path DAO. A DAO message which has target with lifetime 0.

Upstream path/direction: Path or direction from the node to the Root in a DAG.
Downstream path/direction: Path or direction to the node from the Root in a DAG.

This document uses terminology described in [RFC6550]. For the sake of readability all the known relevant terms are repeated in this section.

1.2. What are Capabilities?

Currently RPL specification does not have a mechanism whereby a node can signal the set of features that are available on its end. Such a mechanism could help the root to advertise its capabilities and in response also determine some advanced information about the capabilities of the joining nodes. This document defines Capabilities which could be supported by the nodes and handshaked as part of RPL signaling. Capabilities are embedded as an RPL Control Message Option as defined in Section 6.7 of [RFC6550].

2. Requirements for this document

Following are the requirements considered for this documents:

REQ1: Backwards compatibility. The new options and new fields in the DIO message should be backward compatible i.e. if there are nodes which support old MOPs they could still operate in their own instances.

REQ2: Optional capabilities handshake. Capabilities are features, possibly optional, which could be handshaked between the nodes and the root within an RPL Instance.

REQ3: Capabilities handshake could be optionally added with existing MOPs. Capabilities being optional in nature could be put to use with existing MOPs. Capabilities and MOP-extension is mutually independent i.e. a DIO can have a capabilities option, MOP-extension option or both in the same message.

REQ4: Capabilities could be explicitly queried.

2.1. How are Capabilities different from existing RPL primitives?

The Mode of Operation (MOP) field in RPL mandates the operational requirement for the nodes joining as routers. MOP and DIO Configuration Option is strictly controlled by the Root node in RPL. Intermediate 6LRs cannot modify these fields. Also, the MOP never changes for the lifetime of the RPL instance. Changes in DIO Configuration Option are possible but are rare. Capabilities, on the other hand, might change more dynamically.
RPL DIO message also carries routing metrics and constraints as specified in [RFC6551]. Metrics and constraints are used as part of objective function which aids in node’s rank calculation. A router may use capabilities carried in DIO message as additional metrics/constraints. However, capabilities have a larger scope and may be carried in other messages other than DIO and can flow in both the directions (upstream and downstream).

3. Capabilities

Handling of Capabilities MUST be supported if the network uses MOPex [I-D.ietf-roll-mopex].

Note that capabilities and MOPex are mutually exclusive and it is possible for an implementation to support either or both of the options.

3.1. Capability Control Message Option

![Figure 1: Capabilities Option]

Multiple capabilities could be sent in the same message. The length field allows the message parser to skip the capability TLV parsing.

![Figure 2: Capabilities TLV]

Every capability is identified by its type and it may have an optional Capability Info. Note that a given capability may or may not be disseminated with additional information depending on the scope of the capability indicated by the I bit.

Len: 8-bit unsigned integer, representing the length in octets of the TLV, not including the CapType, Length and Flags fields.

J = Join only as leaf if capability not understood.
I = Ignore the message if this capability is not understood.

C = Flag indicating that the capability MUST be copied in the downstream message.

3.2. Capabilities Handshake

The root node could advertise the set of capabilities it supports in the DIO message. A node could take advantage of the knowledge that the root supports a particular capability. Similarly a node could advertise its capabilities in the DAO message using the capability control message option defined in this document. Capabilities advertised by non-root nodes are strictly a subset of the capabilities advertised by the root.

In storing MOP, the DAO message from the 6LR could contain multiple target options because of the DAO-Aggregation. The targets of the capabilities option are indicated by one or more Target options that precede the Capabilities Option. This handling is similar to the Transit Information Option as supported in Section 6.7.8. of [RFC6550].

4. Querying Capabilities

Nodes may be interested in knowing the capabilities of another node before taking an action. For e.g., Consider [I-D.ietf-roll-dao-projection], the Root may want to know the capabilities of the nodes along a network segment before it initiates a projected DAO to install the routes along that segment.

Caps can be carried in existing RPL Control messages as Control Options, however Caps can also be queried explicitly. This section provides a way for a node to query capability set of another node. The capability query and subsequent response messages are directly addressed between the two peers.

4.1. Capability Query (CAPQ)

```
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| RPLInstanceID |       Flags   |   reserved    | CAPQSequence  |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|   Option(s)... |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

Figure 3: CAPQ base object
**CAPQSequence**: One byte, Sequence number sent by the CAPQ sender which is reflected back by the responder in the CAPS message.

**Flags**: One byte, set to zero by sender, ignored by receiver.

**reserved**: One byte, set to zero by sender, ignored by receiver.

CAPQ base object may be followed by one or more options. The Capability Type List Control Option Figure 4 is used to carry a set of capability types to query about.

If the sender does not send Figure 4 option, this would indicate that the node intends to query the capability type list Figure 4 supported by the target node.

### 4.1.1. Capability Type List Control Option

```
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
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|   Type = TODO | Option Length | CapType1     | CapType2     |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| CapType3     | .....
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

**Figure 4**: Capability Type List Control Option

### 4.1.2. Secure CAPQ

A Secure CAPQ message follows the format in [RFC6550] Figure 7, where the base message format is the CAPQ message shown in Figure 3.

### 4.1.3. Base rules for CAPQ handling

A CAPQ message may get dropped or lost in the transit. The sender of CAPQ MAY retry the CAPQ message after some delay. The delay SHOULD NOT be less than 1 second.

### 4.2. Capability Set Response (CAPS)

```
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
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| RPLInstanceID | Flags | Reserved | CAPQSequence |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| Option(s)... |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```
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Figure 5: CAPS base object

Flags: One byte, set to zero by sender, ignored by receiver.

reserved: One byte, set to zero by sender, ignored by receiver.

CAPQSequence: One byte, Sequence number copied from CAPQSequence received in the CAPQ message.

CAPS message SHOULD contain the capability set Figure 1 queried by the CAPQ sender. If the target node does not support subset of the queried capabilities then the Figure 4 option with the unsupported cap-types SHOULD be sent back indicating the queried capabilities not-supported by the target node. For an example, check Appendix A.3

If the CAPQ message does not contain any Figure 4 option then the receiver MUST respond with the cap types it supports using Figure 4.

If the capability set cannot be transmitted in a single message (for e.g., because of MTU limitations) then multiple CAPS messages could be used. All the CAPS message MUST use the same CAPQSequence number copied from the corresponding CAPQ message.

4.2.1. Secure CAPS

A Secure CAPS message follows the format in [RFC6550] Figure 7, where the base message format is the CAPS message shown in Figure 5.

5. Guidelines for defining new capabilities

This section provides guidelines/recommendations towards defining new capabilities. Note that the capabilities might be carried as part of the multicast messaging such as DIO and hence the set should be used in restrictive manner as far as possible.

5.1. Handling Capability flags

A node MUST drop or discard the message with an unknown capability with ‘D’ flag set. The message MUST be discarded silently.

The ‘J’ (join) flag can be set in context to a capability either by a 6LR or the root. The ‘J’ flag indicates that if the capability is not supported by a node then it can join the instance only as a 6LN (or do not join as 6LR).

The ‘C’ (copy) flag is set by the node indicating that the capabilities MUST be copied downstream by the node even if the node does not understand the capability.
5.1.1. Rules to handle capabilities flag

On receiving a capability it does not support, the node MUST check the 'J' flag of the capability before joining the Instance. If the 'J' flag is set then it can only join as a 6LN.

If the node is operating as 6LR and subsequently it receives a capability from its preferred parent which it does not understand with 'J' flag set, then the node has to switch itself to 6LN mode. During switching the node needs to inform its downstream peers of its changed status by sending a DIO with infinite rank as mentioned in RFC6550. Alternatively, a node may decide to switch to another parent with compatible and known capabilities.

Capabilities are used to indicate a feature that is supported by the node. Capabilities are not meant for configuration management for e.g., setting a threshold.

6. Node Capabilities

6.1. Capability Indicators

Capability Indicators indicates the capabilities supported by the node in the form of simple flags. Capabilities who do not have additional information to be specified could make use of these flags to indicate their support.

6.1.1. Format of Capability Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CapType=0x01</th>
<th>Len</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Flags</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>..Indicators..</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CapType=0x01</td>
<td>Len</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Flags</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>..Indicators..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6: Capability Indicators TLV

Flags: LRs MUST set it to 0. I bit will always be set to 0.

T flag (Bit 1): Indicates whether the node supports 6LoRH [RFC8138].
6.2. Routing Resource Capability

Storing mode of operation requires each intermediate router in the LLN to maintain routing states’ information in the routing table. LLN routers typically operate with constraints on processing power, memory, and energy (battery power). Memory limits the number of routing states an LR and BR can maintain. When the routing table of an LR or BR is full, it will either reject the new DAO messages received or will use some replacement policy to remove a routing entry and add the new one. Rejection of DAO messages will lead to an increase in DAO message transmission that impacts the energy and network convergence time. Routing state replacement leads to downward path downtime.

One possible way to solve problems due to routing table size constraint is to use this information to add neighbors to the DAO parent set. Routing resource capability can be used by LR and BR to advertise their current routing table usage details in the network. LR or LNs in LLN can use this information in the selection of the DAO parent set. PCE can use this information to select intermediate routers for the projected routes. Routing Resource is an optional capability.

Routing resource capability sent in DIO message has link local scope and it MUST not be forwarded. The ‘C’ bit of this capability MUST be set to 0.

6.2.1. Format of Routing Resource Capability

```
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
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| CapType=0x02  |    Len=3      |J|I|C|  Flags  |  Reserved     |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|        Total Capacity         |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

Figure 7: Routing Resource Capability TLV

Type: 0x02.

Flags: I bit MUST be set to 0. C bit MUST be set to 0.

Len: 8-bit unsigned integer, representing the length in octets of the option, not including the Option Type and Length/flags fields.

Resvd: 8-bit unused field. It MUST be initialized to zero by the sender and MUST be ignored by the receiver.
7. Acknowledgements

Thanks to Georgios Papadopoulos, Li Zhao for early review and feedback.

8. IANA Considerations

IANA is requested to allocate new codes for the CAPQ and CAPS messages from the RPL Control Codes registry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBD1</td>
<td>Capability Query</td>
<td>This document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD2</td>
<td>Capability Response</td>
<td>This document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD3</td>
<td>Secure Capability Query</td>
<td>This document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD4</td>
<td>Secure Capability Response</td>
<td>This document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: New RPL Control Messages

The MSB of the codes allocated to "Secure" messages above should be set.

8.1. New option: Capabilities

New entry is required for supporting new Capabilities option and new Capability Type List Option in the "RPL Control Message Options" space [RFC6550].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TODO</td>
<td>Capability Option</td>
<td>This document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TODO</td>
<td>Capability Type List Option</td>
<td>This document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: New options
8.2. Capability Sub-Type

IANA is requested to create a registry for the Capabilities Type as described in Figure 2 of this document. This registry should be located in TODO. New Capabilities types may be allocated only by an IETF review.

| Value | Meaning                     | Reference     |
|-------|-----------------------------+---------------|
| 0x01  | Capability Indicators       | This document |
| 0x02  | Routing Resource Capability | This document |

Table 3: Type

8.3. New Registry for CAPQ Flags

IANA is requested to create a registry for the Capabilities flags as described in Section 4.1 of this document. This registry should be located in TODO. New Capabilities flags may be allocated only by an IETF review. Currently no flags are defined by this document. Each value is tracked with the following qualities:

* Flag
* Description
* Defining RFC

8.4. New Registry for Capabilities Flags

IANA is requested to create a registry for the Capabilities flags as described in Section 2.1 of this document. This registry should be located in TODO. New Capabilities flags may be allocated only by an IETF review. Currently no flags are defined by this document. Each value is tracked with the following qualities:

* Flag
* Description
* Defining RFC
8.5. New Registry for Capabilities Indicators

IANA is requested to create a registry for the Capabilities Indicators as described in Section 6.1 of this document. This registry should be located in TODO. New Capabilities indicators may be allocated only by an IETF review. Each value is tracked with the following qualities:

* Flag
* Description
* Defining RFC

9. Security Considerations

The options defined in this document are carried in the base message objects as defined in [RFC6550]. The RPL control message options are protected by the same security mechanisms that protect the base messages.

Capabilities flag can reveal that the node has been upgraded or is running a old feature set. This document assumes that the base messages that carry these options are protected by RPL security mechanisms and thus are not visible to a malicious node.

TODO] implications of malicious attack involving setting the capability flags.

10. References

10.1. Normative References

[I-D.ietf-roll-mopex]


Appendix A. Capability Handshake Example

A.1. Query supported Cap Types
CAPQ message with no CapTypeList Option results in the peer responding with a CAPS message with CapTypeList Option indicating all the capability set it supports.

A.2. Query specific Cap Set

This flow indicates the case where the Root probes for specific Capabilities of the peer node and the peer node responds with the value of indicated Capability set.

A.3. CAPS with partial Cap Set
Figure 10: Partial Capability Set handshake

Assume that Root queries for capabilities \{Cap1, Cap2, Cap3, Cap4\} from the peer node. However the peer node does not support or does not understand capability \{cap1, cap4\}. In this case the peer node will respond back with value of Cap2 and Cap3 (which it understands) and set the CapTypeList option with \{Cap1, Cap4\} type.
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Abstract

This document extends RFC 6550, RFC 6553, and RFC 8138 to enable a RPL Root to install and maintain Projected Routes within its DODAG, along a selected set of nodes that may or may not include self, for a chosen duration. This potentially enables routes that are more optimized or resilient than those obtained with the classical distributed operation of RPL, either in terms of the size of a Routing Header or in terms of path length, which impacts both the latency and the packet delivery ratio.
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1. Introduction

RPL, the "Routing Protocol for Low Power and Lossy Networks" [RPL]
(LLNs), is an anisotropic Distance Vector protocol that is well-
suited for application in a variety of low energy Internet of Things
(IoT) networks where stretched P2P paths are acceptable vs. the
signaling and state overhead involved in maintaining shortest paths
across.

RPL forms destination Oriented Directed Acyclic Graphs (DODAGs) in
which the Root often acts as the Border router to connect the RPL
domain to the IP backbone and routes along that graph up, towards the
Root, and down towards the nodes.
With this specification, a Path Computation Element [PCE] in an external controller interacts with the RPL Root to compute centrally shorter Peer to Peer (P2P) paths within a pre-existing RPL Main DODAG. The topological information that is passed to the PCE is derived from the DODAG that is already available at the Root in RPL Non-Storing Mode. This specification introduces protocol extensions that enrich the topological information that is available at the Root and passed to the PCE.

Based on usage, path length, and knowledge of available resources such as battery levels and reservable buffers in the nodes, the PCE with a global visibility on the system can optimize the computed routes for the application needs, including the capability to provide path redundancy. This specification also introduces protocol extensions that enable the Root to translates the computed paths into RPL and install them as Projected Routes (aka P-Routes) inside the DODAG on behalf of a PCE.

2. Terminology

2.1. Requirements Language

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] when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

2.2. References

In this document, readers will encounter terms and concepts that are discussed in the "Routing Protocol for Low Power and Lossy Networks" [RPL], the "6TiSCH Architecture" [6TiSCH-ARCHI], the "Deterministic Networking Architecture" [RFC8655], the "Reliable and Available Wireless (RAW) Architecture/Framework" [RAW-ARCHI], and "Terminology in Low power And Lossy Networks" [RFC7102].

2.3. Glossary

This document often uses the following acronyms:

CMO: Control Message Option
DAO: destination Advertisement Object
DAG: Directed Acyclic Graph
DODAG: destination-Oriented Directed Acyclic Graph; A DAG with only one vertex (i.e., node) that has no outgoing edge (i.e., link)
GUA: IPv6 Global Unicast Address
LLN: Low-Power and Lossy Network
MOP: RPL Mode of Operation
P-DAO: Projected DAO
P-Route: Projected Route
PDR: P-DAO Request
RAN: RPL-Aware Node (either a RPL router or a RPL-Aware Leaf)
RAL: RPL-Aware Leaf
RH: Routing Header
RPI: RPL Packet Information
RTO: RPL Target Option
RUL: RPL-Unaware Leaf
SIO: RPL Sibling Information Option
ULA: IPv6 Unique Local Address
NSM-VIO: A Source-Routed Via Information Option, used in Non-Storing Mode P-DAO messages.
SLO: Service Level Objective
TIO: RPL Transit Information Option
SM-VIO: A strict Via Information Option, used in Storing Mode P-DAO messages.
VIO: A Via Information Option; it can be a SM-VIO or an NSM-VIO.

2.4. Domain Terms

Projected Route: A RPL P-Route is a RPL route that is computed remotely by a PCE, and installed and maintained by a RPL Root on behalf of the PCE. It is installed as a state that signals that destinations (aka Targets) are reachable along a sequence of nodes.

Projected DAO: A DAO message used to install a P-Route.

Path: Quoting section 1.1.3 of [INT-ARCHI]: "At a given moment, all the IP datagrams from a particular source host to a particular destination host will typically traverse the same sequence of gateways. We use the term "path" for this sequence. Note that a path is uni-directional; it is not unusual to have different paths in the two directions between a given host pair.". Section 2 of [I-D.irtf-panrg-path-properties] points to a longer, more modern definition of path, which begins as follows: "A sequence of adjacent path elements over which a packet can be transmitted, starting and ending with a node. A path is unidirectional. Paths are time-dependent, i.e., the sequence of path elements over which packets are sent from one node to another may change. A path is defined between two nodes." It follows that the general acceptance of a path is a linear sequence of nodes, as opposed to a multi-dimensional graph. In the context of this document, a path is observed by following one copy of a packet that is injected in a Track and possibly replicated within.

Track: A networking graph that can be followed to transport packets
with equivalent treatment; as opposed to the definition of a path above, a Track Track is not necessarily linear. It may contain multiple paths that may fork and rejoin, and may enable the RAW Packet ARQ, Replication, Elimination, and Overhearing (PAREO) operations.

This specification builds Tracks that are DODAGs oriented towards a Track Ingress, and the forward direction for packets is East-West from the Track Ingress to one of the possibly multiple Track Egress Nodes, which is also down the DODAG.

The Track may be strictly connected, meaning that the vertices are adjacent, or loosely connected, meaning that the vertices are connected using Segments that are associated to the same Track.

**TrackID**: A RPL Local InstanceID that identifies a Track using the namespace owned ny the Track Ingress. The TrackID is associated with the IPv6 Address of the Track Ingress that is used as DODAGID, and together they form a unique identification of the Track (see the definition of DODAGID in section 2 of [RPL]).

**Serial Track**: A Track that has only one path.

**Stand-Alone**: A single P-DAO that fully defines a Track, e.g., a Serial Track installed with a single Storing Mode Via Information option (SM-VIO).

**subTrack**: A Track within a Track. As the Non-Storing Mode Via Information option (NSM-VIO) can only signal a loose sequence of nodes, it takes a number of them to signal a complex Track. Each NSM-VIO for the same TrackId but a different Segment ID signals a different subTracks that the Track Ingress adds to the topology.

**Track Leg**: An end-to-end East-West serial path that can be a Track by itself or a subTrack of a complex Track. With this specification, a Leg is is installed by the Root of the main DODAG using Non-Storing Mode P-DAO messages, and it is expressed as a loose sequence of nodes that are joined by Track Segments.

**Track Segment**: A serial path formed by a strict sequence of nodes, along which a P-Route is installed. With this specification, a Segment is typically installed by the Root of the main DODAG using Storing Mode P-DAO messages. A Segment used as the topological edge of a Track. Since this specification builds only DODAGs, all Segments are oriented from Ingress (East) to Egress (West), as opposed to the general RAW model, which allows North/South Segments that can be bidirectional.

3. Context and Goal
3.1. RPL Applicability

RPL is optimized for situations where the power is scarce, the bandwidth constrained and the transmissions unreliable. This matches the use case of an IoT LLN where RPL is typically used today, but also situations of high relative mobility between the nodes in the network (aka swarming), e.g., within a variable set of vehicles with a similar global motion, or a toon of drones.

To reach this goal, RPL is primarily designed to minimize the control plane activity, that is the relative amount of routing protocol exchanges vs. data traffic, and the amount of state that is maintained in each node. RPL does not need converge, and provides connectivity to most nodes most of the time.

RPL may form multiple topologies called instances. Instances can be created to enforce various optimizations through objective functions, or to reach out through different Root Nodes. The concept of objective function allows to adapt the activity of the routing protocol to the use case, e.g., type, speed, and quality of the LLN links.

RPL instances operate as ships in the night, unbeknownst of one another. The RPL Root is responsible to select the RPL Instance that is used to forward a packet coming from the Backbone into the RPL domain and set the related RPL information in the packets. 6TiSCH leverages RPL for its distributed routing operations.

To reduce the routing exchanges, RPL leverages an anisotropic Distance Vector approach, which does not need a global knowledge of the topology, and only optimizes the routes to and from the RPL Root, allowing P2P paths to be stretched. Although RPL installs its routes proactively, it only maintains them lazily, in reaction to actual traffic, or as a slow background activity.

This is simple and efficient in situations where the traffic is mostly directed from or to a central node, such as the control traffic between routers and a controller of a Software Defined Networking (SDN) infrastructure or an Autonomic Control Plane (ACP).

But stretch in P2P routing is counter-productive to both reliability and latency as it introduces additional delay and chances of loss. As a result, [RPL] is not a good fit for the use cases listed in the RAW use cases document [USE-CASES], which demand high availability and reliability, and as a consequence require both short and diverse paths.
3.2. RPL Routing Modes

RPL first forms a default route in each node towards the a Root, and those routes together coalesce as a Directed Acyclic Graph upwards. RPL then constructs routes to so-called Targets in the reverse direction, down the same DODAG. So do so, a RPL Instance can be operated either in RPL Storing or Non-Storing Mode of Operation (MOP) The default route towards the Root is maintained aggressively and may change while a packet progresses without causing loops, so the packet will still reach the Root.

In Non-Storing Mode, each node advertises itself as a Target directly to the Root, indicating the parents that may be used to reach self. Recursively, the Root builds and maintains an image of the whole DODAG in memory, and leverages that abstraction to compute source route paths for the packets to their destinations down the DODAG. When a node changes its point(s) of attachment to the DODAG, it takes single unicast packet to the Root along the default route to update it, and the connectivity is restored immediately; this mode is preferable for use cases where internet connectivity is dominant, or when, like here, the Root controls the network activity in the nodes.

In Storing Mode, the routing information percolates upwards, and each node maintains the routes to the subDAG of its descendants down the DODAG. The maintenance is lazy, either reactive upon traffic or as a slow background process. Packets flow via the common parent and the routing stretch is reduced vs. Non-Storing, for a better P2P connectivity, while the internet connectivity is restored more slowly, time for the DV operation to operate hop-by-hop.

Either way, the RPL routes are injected by the Target nodes, in a distributed fashion. To complement RPL and eliminate routing stretch, this specification introduces an hybrid mode that combines Storing and Non-Storing operations to build and project routes onto the nodes where they should be installed. This specification uses the term P-Route to refer to those routes.

A P-Route may be installed in either Storing and Non-Storing Mode, potentially resulting in hybrid situations where the Mode of the P-Route is different from that of the RPL Main DODAG. P-Routes can be used as stand-alone segments to reduce the size of the source routing headers with loose source routing operations down the main RPL DODAG. P-Routes can also be combined with other P-Routes to form a more complex forwarding graph called a Track.
3.3. Requirements

3.3.1. Loose Source Routing

A RPL implementation operating in a very constrained LLN typically uses the Non-Storing Mode of Operation as represented in Figure 1. In that mode, a RPL node indicates a parent-child relationship to the Root, using a destination Advertisement Object (DAO) that is unicast from the node directly to the Root, and the Root typically builds a source routed path to a destination down the DODAG by recursively concatenating this information.

```
+-----+ Border router     | DAO | ACK |
|     | (RPL Root)          ^     |        |
| o o o o o       | o o o o o       | v v    |
| o o o o o       | o o o o o       |      |
| o o o o o       | o o o o o       |
| o o o o o       |                 |

Figure 1: RPL Non-Storing Mode of operation
```

Based on the parent-children relationships expressed in the Non-Storing DAO messages, the Root possesses topological information about the whole network, though this information is limited to the structure of the DODAG for which it is the destination. A packet that is generated within the domain will always reach the Root, which can then apply a source routing information to reach the destination if the destination is also in the DODAG. Similarly, a packet coming from the outside of the domain for a destination that is expected to be in a RPL domain reaches the Root.

It results that the Root, or then some associated centralized computation engine such as a PCE, can determine the amount of packets that reach a destination in the RPL domain, and thus the amount of energy and bandwidth that is wasted for transmission, between itself and the destination, as well as the risk of fragmentation, any potential delays because of paths longer than necessary (shorter paths exist that would not traverse the Root).

As a network gets deep, the size of the source routing header that the Root must add to all the downward packets becomes an issue for nodes that are many hops away. In some use cases, a RPL network
forms long lines and a limited amount of well-targeted routing state would allow to make the source routing operation loose as opposed to strict, and save packet size. Limiting the packet size is directly beneficial to the energy budget, but, mostly, it reduces the chances of frame loss and/or packet fragmentation, which is highly detrimental to the LLN operation. Because the capability to store a routing state in every node is limited, the decision of which route is installed where can only be optimized with a global knowledge of the system, a knowledge that the Root or an associated PCE may possess by means that are outside of the scope of this specification.

This requirement is to store a routing state associated with the Main DODAG in selected RPL routers, to limit the excursion of the source route headers in deep networks. The Root may elide the sequence of routers that is installed in the network from its source route header, which becomes loose while it is strict in [RPL].

3.3.2. East-West Routes

RPL is optimized for INternet access, with Point-to-Multipoint (P2MP) and Multipoint-to-Point (MP2P), whereby routes are always installed North-South (aka up/down) along the RPL DODAG respectively from and towards the Border Router that also serves as DODAG Root. Peer to Peer (P2P) East-West routes in a RPL network will generally suffer from some elongated (stretched) path versus a direct (optimized) path, since routing between two nodes always happens via a common parent, as illustrated in Figure 2:

```
+-----+        +-----+
|     | Internet |     | Border router |
|     | (RPL Root) |     |
+-----+        +-----+
    X
    ^     v  o  o
   ^     o  v  o  o  o  o  o
   ^     o  o  v  o  o  o  o  o  o  o
   ^     o  o  o  v  o  o  o  o  o  o  o  o
    S  o  o  o  D  o  o  o
    o  o  o  o  o  o  o  o  o  o  o  o  o  o
    LLN
```

Figure 2: Routing Stretch between S and D via common parent X along North-South Paths

The amount of stretch depends on the Mode of Operation:
* in Non-Storing Mode, all packets routed within the DODAG flow all the way up to the Root of the DODAG. If the destination is in the same DODAG, the Root must encapsulate the packet to place an RH that has the strict source route information down the DODAG to the destination. This will be the case even if the destination is relatively close to the source and the Root is relatively far off.

* In Storing Mode, unless the destination is a child of the source, the packets will follow the default route up the DODAG as well. If the destination is in the same DODAG, they will eventually reach a common parent that has a route to the destination; at worse, the common parent may also be the Root. From that common parent, the packet will follow a path down the DODAG that is optimized for the Objective Function that was used to build the DODAG.

It results that it is often beneficial to enable East-West P2P routes, either if the RPL route presents a stretch from shortest path, or if the new route is engineered with a different objective, and that it is even more critical in Non-Storing Mode than is in Storing Mode, because the routing stretch is wider. For that reason, earlier work at the IETF introduced the "Reactive Discovery of Point-to-Point Routes in Low Power and Lossy Networks" [RFC6997], which specifies a distributed method for establishing optimized P2P routes. This draft proposes an alternate based on a centralized route computation.

```
+-----+
|     | Border router
|     | (RPL Root)
+-----+
```

Figure 3: More direct East-West Route between S and D

The requirement is to install additional routes in the RPL routers, to reduce the stretch of some P2P routes and maintain the characteristics within a given SLO, e.g., in terms of latency and/or reliability.
3.4. On Tracks

A Track is typically a collection of parallel loose source routed sequences of nodes from Ingress to Egress, forming so-called Track Legs, that are joined with strict Segments of other nodes. The Legs are expressed in RPL Non-Storing Modes and require an encapsulation to add a Source Route Header, whereas the Segments are expressed in Storing Mode.

A Serial Track comprises provides only one path between Ingress and Egress. It comprises at most one Leg. A Stand-Alone Segment defines implicitly a Serial Track from its Ingress to Egress.

A complex Track forms a graph that provides a collection of potential paths to provide redundancy for the packets, either as a collection of Legs that may be parallel or cross at certain points, or as a more generic DODAG.

The concept of a Track was introduced in the "6TiSCH Architecture" [6TiSCH-ARCHI], as a collection of potential paths that leverage redundant forwarding solutions along the way. With this specification, a Track forms DODAG that is directed towards a Track Ingress. If there is a single Track Egress, then the Track is reversible to form another DODAG by reversing the direction of each edge. A node at the Ingress of more than one Segment in a Track may use one or more of these Segments to forward a packet inside the Track.

Section 5.1. of [RPL] describes the RPL Instance and its encoding. There can be up to 128 global RPL Instances, for which there can be one or more DODAGs, and there can be 64 local RPL Instances, with a namespace that is indexed by a DODAGID, where the DODAGID is a Unique Local Address (ULA) or a Global Unicast Address (GUA) of the Root of the DODAG.

A Track is normally associated with a Local RPL Instance which RPLInstanceID is used as the TrackID, more in Section 6.2. A Track Leg may also be used as a subTrack that extends the RPL main DODAG. In that case, the TrackID is set to the global RPLInstanceID of the main DODAG, which suffices to identify the routing topology. As opposed to local RPL instances, the Track Ingress that encapsulates the packets over a subtrack is not Root, and that the source address of the encapsulated packet is not used to determine the Track.
3.5. Serial Track Signaling

This specification enables to set up a P-Route along either a Track Leg or a Segment. A P-Route is installed and maintained using an extended RPL DAO message called a Projected DAO (P-DAO), and a Track is composed of the combination of one or more P-Routes.

A P-DAO message for a Track signals the TrackID in the RPLInstanceID field. In the case of a local RPL Instance, the address of the Track Ingress is used as source to encapsulated packets along the Track is signaled in the DODAGID field of the Projected DAO Base Object, see Figure 6.

This specification introduces the Via Information Option (VIO) to signal a sequence of hops in a Leg or a Segment in the P-DAO messages, either in Storing Mode (SM-VIO) or NON-Storing Mode (NSM-VIO). One P-DAO messages contains a single VIO, associated to one or more RPL Target Options that signal the destination IPv6 addresses that can reached along the Track, more in Section 5.3.

Before diving deeper into Track Legs and Segments signaling and operation, this section provides examples of what how route projection works through variations of a simple example. This simple example illustrates the case of host routes, though RPL Targets can be prefixes.

Say we want to build a Serial Track from node A to E in Figure 4, so A can route packets to E’s neighbors F and G along A, B, C, D and E as opposed to via the Root:

```
A ===> B ===> C ===> D ===> E <
\|===> G
```

Figure 4: Reference Track

Conventionally we use ==> to represent a strict hop and --> for a loose hop. We use -to- like in C==>D==>E-to-F to represent coma-separated Targets, e.g., F is a Target for Segment C==>D==>E. In this example, A is Track Ingress, E is Track Egress. C is a stitching point. F and G are "external" Targets for the Track, and become reachable from A via the Track A(ingress) to E (Egress and implicit Target in Non-Storing Mode) leading to F and G (explicit Targets).

In a general manner the desired outcome is as follows:
* Targets are E, F, and G
* P-DAO 1 signals C===>D===>E
* P-DAO 2 signals A===>B===>C
* P-DAO 3 signals F and G via the A--->E Track

P-DAO 3 may be omitted if P-DAO 1 and 2 signal F and G as Targets.

Loose sequences of hops must be expressed in Non-Storing Mode, so P-DAO 3 contains a NSM-VIO. With this specification, the DODAGID to be used by the Ingress as source address is signaled if needed in the DAO base object, the via list starts at the first loose hop and matches the source route header, and the Egress of a Non-Storing Mode P-DAO is an implicit Target that is not listed in the RTO.

3.5.1. Using Storing Mode Segments

A===>B===>C and C===>D===>E are segments of a same Track. Note that the Storing Mode signaling imposes strict continuity in a segment, since the P-DAO is passed hop by hop, as a classical DAO is, along the reverse datapath that it signals. One benefit of strict routing is that loops are avoided along the Track.

3.5.1.1. Stitched Segments

In this formulation:

* P-DAO 1 signals C===>D===>E-to-F,G
* P-DAO 2 signals A===>B===>C-to-F,G

Storing Mode P-DAO 1 is sent to E and when it is successfully acknowledged, Storing Mode P-DAO 2 is sent to C, as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>P-DAO 1 to E</th>
<th>P-DAO 2 to C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>Storing</td>
<td>Storing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track Ingress</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(DODAGID, TrackID)</td>
<td>(A, 129)</td>
<td>(A, 129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SegmentID</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIO</td>
<td>C, D, E</td>
<td>A, B, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targets</td>
<td>F, G</td>
<td>F, G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: P-DAO Messages

As a result the RIBs are set as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node</th>
<th>destination</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Next Hop(s)</th>
<th>TrackID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>F, G</td>
<td>P-DAO 1</td>
<td>Neighbor</td>
<td>(A, 129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P-DAO 1</td>
<td>Neighbor</td>
<td>(A, 129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F, G</td>
<td>P-DAO 1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>(A, 129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>P-DAO 1</td>
<td>Neighbor</td>
<td>(A, 129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F, G</td>
<td>P-DAO 1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>(A, 129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P-DAO 2</td>
<td>Neighbor</td>
<td>(A, 129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F, G</td>
<td>P-DAO 2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>(A, 129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>P-DAO 2</td>
<td>Neighbor</td>
<td>(A, 129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F, G</td>
<td>P-DAO 2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(A, 129)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: RIB setting
Packets originated by A to F or G do not require an encapsulation as the RPI can be placed in the native header chain. For packets that it routes, A must encapsulate to add the RPI that signals the trackID; the outer headers of the packets that are forwarded along the Track have the following settings:

| Header | IPv6 Source Addr. | IPv6 Dest. Addr. | TrackID in RPI |
|--------+-------------------+-------------------+----------------|
| Outer  | A                 | F or G            | (A, 129)       |
| Inner  | X != A            | F or G            | N/A            |

Table 3: Packet Header Settings

As an example, say that A has a packet for F. Using the RIB above:

* From P-DAO 2: A forwards to B and B forwards to C.
* From P-DAO 1: C forwards to D and D forwards to E.
* From Neighbor Cache Entry: C delivers the packet to F.

3.5.1.2. External routes

In this example, we consider F and G as destinations that are external to the Track as a DODAG, as discussed in section 4.1.1. of [RFC9008]. We then apply the directives for encapsulating in that case, more in Section 6.6.

In this formulation, we set up the Track Leg explicitly, which creates less routing state in intermediate hops at the expense of larger packets to accommodate source routing:

* P-DAO 1 signals C==>D==>E-to-E
* P-DAO 2 signals A==>B==>C-to-E
* P-DAO 3 signals F and G via the A--E-to-F,G Track

Storing Mode P-DAO 1 and 2, and Non-Storing Mode P-DAO 3, are sent to E, C and A, respectively, as follows:
### Table 4: P-DAO Messages

Note in the above that E is not an implicit Target in Storing mode, so it must be added in the RTO.

As a result the RIBs are set as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node</th>
<th>destination</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Next Hop(s)</th>
<th>TrackID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>F, G</td>
<td>P-DAO 1</td>
<td>Neighbor</td>
<td>(A, 129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P-DAO 1</td>
<td>Neighbor</td>
<td>(A, 129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>P-DAO 1</td>
<td>Neighbor</td>
<td>(A, 129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P-DAO 1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>(A, 129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P-DAO 2</td>
<td>Neighbor</td>
<td>(A, 129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P-DAO 2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>(A, 129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>P-DAO 2</td>
<td>Neighbor</td>
<td>(A, 129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P-DAO 2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(A, 129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>F, G</td>
<td>P-DAO 3</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>(A, 129)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: RIB setting
Packets from A to E do not require an encapsulation. The outer headers of the packets that are forwarded along the Track have the following settings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Header</th>
<th>IPv6 Source Addr.</th>
<th>IPv6 Dest. Addr.</th>
<th>TrackID in RPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outer</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>(A, 129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>E (X != A), F or G</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Packet Header Settings

As an example, say that A has a packet for F. Using the RIB above:

* From P-DAO 3: A encapsulates the packet the Track signaled by P-DAO 3, with the outer header above. Now the packet destination is E.
* From P-DAO 2: A forwards to B and B forwards to C.
* From P-DAO 1: C forwards to D and D forwards to E; E decapsulates the packet.
* From Neighbor Cache Entry: C delivers packets to F or G.

3.5.1.3. Segment Routing

In this formulation leverages Track Legs to combine Segments and form a Graph. The packets are source routed from a Segment to the next to adapt the path. As such, this can be seen as a form of Segment Routing [RFC8402]:

* P-DAO 1 signals C==>D==>E-to-E
* P-DAO 2 signals A==>B-to-B,C
* P-DAO 3 signals F and G via the A-->C-->E-to-F,G Track

Storing Mode P-DAO 1 and 2, and Non-Storing Mode P-DAO 3, are sent to E, B and A, respectively, as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>P-DAO 1 to E</th>
<th>P-DAO 2 to B</th>
<th>P-DAO 3 to A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Track Ingress</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SegmentID</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIO</td>
<td>C, D, E</td>
<td>A, B</td>
<td>C, E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targets</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F, G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: P-DAO Messages

Note in the above that the Segment can terminate at the loose hop as used in the example of P-DAO 1 or at the previous hop as done with P-DAO 2. Both methods are possible on any Segment joined by a loose Track Leg. P-DAO 1 generates more signaling since E is the Segment Egress when D could be, but has the benefit that it validates that the connectivity between D and E still exists.

As a result the RIBs are set as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node</th>
<th>destination</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Next Hop(s)</th>
<th>TrackID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>F, G</td>
<td>P-DAO 1</td>
<td>Neighbor</td>
<td>(A, 129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P-DAO 1</td>
<td>Neighbor</td>
<td>(A, 129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>P-DAO 1</td>
<td>Neighbor</td>
<td>(A, 129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P-DAO 1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>(A, 129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P-DAO 2</td>
<td>Neighbor</td>
<td>(A, 129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>P-DAO 2</td>
<td>Neighbor</td>
<td>(A, 129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P-DAO 2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(A, 129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>E, F, G</td>
<td>P-DAO 3</td>
<td>C, E</td>
<td>(A, 129)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: RIB setting
Packets originated at A to E do not require an encapsulation, but carry a SRH via C. The outer headers of the packets that are forwarded along the Track have the following settings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Header</th>
<th>IPv6 Source Addr.</th>
<th>IPv6 Dest. Addr.</th>
<th>TrackID in RPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outer</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C till C then E</td>
<td>(A, 129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>E (X != A), F or G</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Packet Header Settings

As an example, say that A has a packet for F. Using the RIB above:

* From P-DAO 3: A encapsulates the packet the Track signaled by P-DAO 3, with the outer header above. Now the destination in the IPv6 Header is C, and a SRH signals the final destination is E.
* From P-DAO 2: A forwards to B and B forwards to C.
* From P-DAO 3: C processes the SRH and sets the destination in the IPv6 Header to E.
* From P-DAO 1: C forwards to D and D forwards to E; E decapsulates the packet.
* From the Neighbor Cache Entry: C delivers packets to F or G.

3.5.2. Using Non-Storing Mode joining Tracks

In this formulation:

* P-DAO 1 signals C==>D==E-to-F,G
* P-DAO 2 signals A==>B==>C-to-C,F,G

A==>B==>C and C==>D==>E are Tracks expressed as Non-Storing P-DAOs.

3.5.2.1. Stitched Tracks

Non-Storing Mode P-DAO 1 and 2 are sent to C and A respectively, as follows:
Table 10: P-DAO Messages

As a result the RIBs are set as follows:

Table 11: RIB setting

Packets originated at A to E, F and G do not require an encapsulation, though it is preferred that A encapsulates and C decapsulates. Either way, they carry a SRH via B and C, and C needs to encapsulate to E, F, or G to add an SRH via D and E. The encapsulating headers of packets that are forwarded along the Track between C and E have the following settings:
As an example, say that A has a packet for F. Using the RIB above:

* From P-DAO 2: A encapsulates the packet with destination of F in the Track signaled by P-DAO 2. The outer header has source A, destination B, an SRH that indicates C as the next loose hop, and a RPI indicating a TrackId of 131 from A’s namespace, which is distinct from TrackId of 131 from C’s.

* From the SRH: Packets forwarded by B have source A, destination C, a consumed SRH, and a RPI indicating a TrackId of 131 from A’s namespace. C decapsulates.

* From P-DAO 1: C encapsulates the packet with destination of F in the Track signaled by P-DAO 1. The outer header has source C, destination D, an SRH that indicates E as the next loose hop, and a RPI indicating a TrackId of 131 from C’s namespace. E decapsulates.

3.5.2.2. External routes

In this formulation:

* P-DAO 1 signals C==D==E-to-E
* P-DAO 2 signals A==B==C-to-C,E
* P-DAO 3 signals F and G via the A==E-to-F,G Track

Non-Storing Mode P-DAO 1 is sent to C and Non-Storing Mode P-DAO 2 and 3 are sent A, as follows:
Table 13: P-DAO Messages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Track Ingress</th>
<th>SegmentID</th>
<th>VIO</th>
<th>Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Storing</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D, E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Storing</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B, C</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Storing</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>F, G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a result the RIBs are set as follows:

Table 14: RIB setting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node</th>
<th>destination</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Next Hop(s)</th>
<th>TrackID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>F, G</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>Neighbor</td>
<td>Any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>Neighbor</td>
<td>Any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>Neighbor</td>
<td>Any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P-DAO 1</td>
<td>D, E</td>
<td>(C, 131)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>Neighbor</td>
<td>Any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>Neighbor</td>
<td>Any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>C, E</td>
<td>P-DAO 2</td>
<td>B, C</td>
<td>(A, 129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>F, G</td>
<td>P-DAO 3</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>(A, 141)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The encapsulating headers of packets that are forwarded along the Track between C and E have the following settings:
Table 15: Packet Header Settings

As an example, say that A has a packet for F. Using the RIB above:

* From P-DAO 3: A encapsulates the packet with destination of F in the Track signaled by P-DAO 3. The outer header has source A, destination E, and a RPI indicating a TrackId of 131 from A’s namespace. This recurses with:

  * From P-DAO 2: A encapsulates the packet with destination of E in the Track signaled by P-DAO 2. The outer header has source A, destination B, an SRH that indicates C as the next loose hop, and a RPI indicating a TrackId of 129 from A’s namespace.

  * From the SRH: Packets forwarded by B have source A, destination C, a consumed SRH, and a RPI indicating a TrackId of 129 from A’s namespace. C decapsulates.

  * From P-DAO 1: C encapsulates the packet with destination of E in the Track signaled by P-DAO 1. The outer header has source C, destination D, an SRH that indicates E as the next loose hop, and a RPI indicating a TrackId of 131 from C’s namespace. E decapsulates.

3.5.2.3. Segment Routing

In this formulation:

* P-DAO 1 signals C==>D==>E-to-E
* P-DAO 2 signals A==>B-to-C
* P-DAO 3 signals F and G via the A-->C-->E-to-F,G Track

Non-Storing Mode P-DAO 1 is sent to C and Non-Storing Mode P-DAO 2 and 3 are sent A, as follows:
### Table 16: P-DAO Messages

As a result the RIBs are set as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node</th>
<th>destination</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Next Hop(s)</th>
<th>TrackID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>F, G</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>Neighbor</td>
<td>Any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>Neighbor</td>
<td>Any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>Neighbor</td>
<td>Any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P-DAO 1</td>
<td>D, E</td>
<td>(C, 131)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>Neighbor</td>
<td>Any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>Neighbor</td>
<td>Any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P-DAO 2</td>
<td>B, C</td>
<td>(A, 129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>E, F, G</td>
<td>P-DAO 3</td>
<td>C, E</td>
<td>(A, 141)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 17: RIB setting

The encapsulating headers of packets that are forwarded along the Track between A and B have the following settings:
The encapsulating headers of packets that are forwarded along the Track between B and C have the following settings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Header</th>
<th>IPv6 Source Addr.</th>
<th>IPv6 Dest. Addr.</th>
<th>TrackID in RPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outer</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B till D then E</td>
<td>(A, 129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>(A, 141)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>E, F or G</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18: Packet Header Settings

The encapsulating headers of packets that are forwarded along the Track between C and E have the following settings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Header</th>
<th>IPv6 Source Addr.</th>
<th>IPv6 Dest. Addr.</th>
<th>TrackID in RPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outer</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D till D then E</td>
<td>(C, 131)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>(A, 141)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>E, F or G</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19: Packet Header Settings

As an example, say that A has a packet for F. Using the RIB above:

* From P-DAO 3: A encapsulates the packet with destination of F in the Track signaled by P-DAO 3. The outer header has source A, destination C, an SRH that indicates E as the next loose hop, and a RPI indicating a TrackId of 141 from A’s namespace. This recurses with:
* From P-DAO 2: A encapsulates the packet with destination of C in
  the Track signaled by P-DAO 2. The outer header has source A,
  destination B, and a RPI indicating a TrackId of 129 from A’s
  namespace. B decapsulates forwards to C based on a sibling
  connected route.

* From the SRH: C consumes the SRH and makes the destination E.

* From P-DAO 1: C encapsulates the packet with destination of E in
  the Track signaled by P-DAO 1. The outer header has source C,
  destination D, an SRH that indicates E as the next loose hop, and
  a RPI indicating a TrackId of 131 from C’s namespace. E
  decapsulates.

3.6. Complex Tracks

To increase the reliability of the P2P transmission, this
specification enables to build a collection of Legs between the same
Ingress and Egress Nodes and combine them with the same TrackID, as
shown in Figure 5. Legs may cross at loose hops edges or remain
parallel.

The Segments that join the loose hops of a Leg are installed with the
same TrackID as the Leg. But each individual Leg and Segment has its
own P-RouteID which allows to manage it separately. When Legs cross
within respective Segment, the next loose hop (the current
destination of the packet) indicates which Leg is being followed and
a Segment that can reach that next loose hop is selected.
Note that while this specification enables to build both Segments inside a Leg (aka East-West), such as Segment 2 above which is within Leg 1, and Inter-Leg Segments (aka North-South), such as Segment 2 above which joins Leg 1 and Leg 2, it does not signal to the Ingress which Inter-Leg Segments are available, so the use of North-South Segments and associated PAREO functions is currently limited. The only possibility available at this time is to define overlapping Legs.
as illustrated in Figure 5, with Leg 3 that is congruent with Leg 1 till node B and congruent with Leg 2 from node H on, abstracting Segment 5 as an East-West Segment.

DetNet Forwarding Nodes only understand the simple 1-to-1 forwarding sublayer transport operation along a segment whereas the more sophisticated Relay nodes can also provide service sublayer functions such as Replication and Elimination. One possible mapping between DetNet and this specification is to signal the Relay Nodes as the hops of a Leg and the forwarding Nodes as the hops in a Segment that join the Relay nodes as illustrated in Figure 5.

3.7. Scope and Expectations

This specification expects that the RPL Main DODAG is operated in RPL Non-Storing Mode to sustain the exchanges with the Root. Based on its comprehensive knowledge of the parent-child relationship, the Root can form an abstracted view of the whole DODAG topology. This document adds the capability for nodes to advertise additional sibling information to complement the topological awareness of the Root to be passed on to the PCE, and enable the PCE to build more/better paths that traverse those siblings.

P-Routes require resources such as routing table space in the routers and bandwidth on the links; the amount of state that is installed in each node must be computed to fit within the node’s memory, and the amount of rerouted traffic must fit within the capabilities of the transmission links. The methods used to learn the node capabilities and the resources that are available in the devices and in the network are out of scope for this document. The method to capture and report the LLN link capacity and reliability statistics are also out of scope. They may be fetched from the nodes through network management functions or other forms of telemetry such as OAM.

The "6TiSCH Architecture" [6TiSCH-ARCHI] leverages a centralized model that is similar to that of "Deterministic Networking Architecture" [RFC8655], whereby the device resources and capabilities are exposed to an external controller which installs routing states into the network based on its own objective functions that reside in that external entity. With DetNet and 6TiSCH, the component of the controller that is responsible of computing routes is a PCE. The PCE computes its routes based on its own objective functions such as described in [RFC4655], and typically controls the routes using the PCE Protocol (PCEP) by [RFC5440]. While this specification expects a PCE and while PCEP might effectively be used between the Root and the PCE, the control protocol between the PCE and the Root is out of scope.
This specification expects a single PCE with a full view of the network. Distributing the PCE function for a large network is out of scope. The PCE may be collocated with the Root, or may reside in an external Controller. In that case, the protocol between the Root and the PCE is out of scope and abstracted by / mapped to RPL inside the DODAG; one possibility is for the Root to transmit the RPL DAOs with the SIOs that detail the parent/child and sibling information.

The algorithm to compute the paths and the protocol used by the PCE and the metrics and link statistics involved in the computation are also out of scope. The effectiveness of the route computation by the PCE depends on the quality of the metrics that are reported from the RPL network. Which metrics are used and how they are reported is also out of scope, but the expectation is that they are mostly of long-term, statistical nature, and provide visibility on link throughput, latency, stability and availability over relatively long periods.

The "Reliable and Available Wireless (RAW) Architecture/Framework" [RAW-ARCHI] extends the definition of Track, as being composed of East-West directional segments and North-South bidirectional segments, to enable additional path diversity, using Packet ARQ, Replication, Elimination, and Overhearing (PAREO) functions over the available paths, to provide a dynamic balance between the reliability and availability requirements of the flows and the need to conserve energy and spectrum. This specification prepares for RAW by setting up the Tracks, but only forms DODAGs, which are composed of aggregated end-to-end loose source routed Legs, joined by strict routed Segments, all oriented East-West.

The RAW Architecture defines a dataplane extension of the PCE called the Path Selection Engine (PSE), that adapts the use of the path redundancy within a Track to defeat the diverse causes of packet loss. The PSE controls the forwarding operation of the packets within a Track. This specification can use but does not impose a PSE and does not provide the policies that would select which packets are routed through which path within a Track, IOW, how the PSE may use the path redundancy within the Track. By default, the use of the available redundancy is limited to simple load balancing, and all the segments are East-West unidirectional only.

A Track may be set up to reduce the load around the Root, or to enable urgent traffic to flow more directly. This specification does not provide the policies that would decide which flows are routed through which Track. In a Non-Storing Mode RPL Instance, the Main DODAG provides a default route via the Root, and the Tracks provide more specific routes to the Track Targets.
4. Extending existing RFCs

4.1. Extending RFC 6550

This specification extends RPL [RPL] to enable the Root to install East-West routes inside a Main DODAG that is operated as non-Storing Mode. A Projected DAO (P-DAO) message (see Section 4.1.1) contains a new Via Information Option that installs a strict or a loose sequence of hops to form respectively a Track Segment or a Track Leg. A new P-DAO Request (PDR) message (see Section 5.1) enables a Track Ingress to request the Track from the Root for which it is the Root and it owns the address that serves as TrackID, as well as the associated namespace from which it selects the TrackID. In the context of this specification, the installed route appears as a more specific route to the Track Targets, and the Track Ingress routes the packets towards the Targets via the Track using the longest match as usual.

To ensure that the PDR and P-DAO messages can flow at most times, it is RECOMMENDED that the nodes involved in a Track maintain multiple parents in the Main DODAG, advertise them all to the Root, and use them in turn to retry similar packets. It is also RECOMMENDED that the Root uses diverse source route paths to retry similar messages to the nodes in the Track.

4.1.1. Projected DAO

Section 6 of [RPL] introduces the RPL Control Message Options (CMO), including the RPL Target Option (RTO) and Transit Information Option (TIO), which can be placed in RPL messages such as the destination Advertisement Object (DAO). A DAO message signals routing information to one or more Targets indicated in RTOs, providing one hop information at a time in the TIO. A Projected DAO (P-DAO) is a special DAO message generated by the Root to install a P-Route formed of multiple hops in its DODAG. This provides a RPL-based method to install the Tracks as expected by the 6TiSCH Architecture [6TiSCH-ARCHI] as a collection of multiple P-Routes.

The P-DAO is signaled with a new "Projected DAO" (P) flag, see Figure 6. The 'P' flag is encoded in bit position 2 (to be confirmed by IANA) of the Flags field in the DAO Base Object. The Root MUST set it to 1 in a Projected DAO message. Otherwise it MUST be set to 0. It is set to 0 in Legacy implementations as specified respectively in Sections 20.11 and 6.4 of [RPL]

The P-DAO is control plane signaling and should not be stuck behind high traffic levels. The expectation is that the P-DAO message is sent as high QoS level, above that of data traffic, typically with the Network Control precedence.
Figure 6: Projected DAO Base Object

New fields:

TrackID: The local or global RPLInstanceID of the DODAG that serves as Track, more in Section 6.2

P: 1-bit flag (position to be confirmed by IANA).

The 'P' flag is set to 1 by the Root to signal a Projected DAO, and it is set to 0 otherwise.

In RPL Non-Storing Mode, the TIO and RTO are combined in a DAO message to inform the DODAG Root of all the edges in the DODAG, which are formed by the directed parent-child relationships. Options may be factorized; multiple RTOs may be present to signal a collection of children that can be reached via the parent(s) indicated in the TIO(s) that follows the RTOs. This specification generalizes the case of a parent that can be used to reach a child with that of a whole Track through which children and siblings of the Track Egress are reachable.
4.1.2. Via Information Option

New CMOs called the Via Information Options (VIO) are introduced for use in P-DAO messages as a multihop alternative to the TIO, more in Section 5.3. One VIO is the stateful Storing Mode VIO (SM-VIO); an SM-VIO installs a strict hop-by-hop P-Route called a Track Segment. The other is the Non-Storing Mode VIO (NSM-VIO); the NSM-VIO installs a loose source-routed P-Route called a Track Leg at the Track Ingress, which uses that state to encapsulate a packet IPv6_in_IPv6 with a new Routing Header (RH) to the Track Egress, more in Section 6.6.

A P-DAO contains one or more RTOs to indicate the Target (destinations) that can be reached via the P-Route, followed by exactly one VIO that signals the sequence of nodes to be followed, more in Section 6. There are two modes of operation for the P-Routes, the Storing Mode and the Non-Storing Mode, see Section 6.3.2 and Section 6.3.3 respectively for more.

4.1.3. Sibling Information Option

This specification adds another CMO called the Sibling Information Option (SIO) that is used by a RPL Aware Node (RAN) to advertise a selection of its candidate neighbors as siblings to the Root, more in Section 5.4. The SIO is placed in DAO messages that are sent directly to the Root of the main DODAG.

4.1.4. P-DAO Request

Two new RPL Control Messages are also introduced, to enable a RPL-Aware Node to request the establishment of a Track between self as the Track Ingress Node and a Track Egress. The node makes its request by sending a new P-DAO Request (PDR) Message to the Root. The Root confirms with a new PDR-ACK message back to the requester RAN, see Section 5.1 for more.

4.1.5. Extending the RPI

Sending a Packet within a RPL Local Instance requires the presence of the abstract RPL Packet Information (RPI) described in section 11.2. of [RPL] in the outer IPv6 Header chain (see [RFC9008]). The RPI carries a local RPLInstanceID which, in association with either the source or the destination address in the IPv6 Header, indicates the RPL Instance that the packet follows.

This specification extends [RPL] to create a new flag that signals that a packet is forwarded along a P-Route.
Projected-Route ‘P’: 1-bit flag. It is set to 1 in the RPI that is added in the encapsulation when a packet is sent over a Track. It is set to 0 when a packet is forwarded along the main Track, including when the packet follows a Segment that joins loose hops of the Main DODAG. The flag is not mutable en-route.

The encoding of the ‘P’ flag in native format is shown in Section 4.2 while the compressed format is indicated in Section 4.3.

4.2. Extending RFC 6553

"The RPL Option for Carrying RPL Information in Data-Plane Datagrams" [RFC6553] describes the RPL Option for use among RPL routers to include the abstract RPL Packet Information (RPI) described in section 11.2. of [RPL] in data packets.

The RPL Option is commonly referred to as the RPI though the RPI is really the abstract information that is transported in the RPL Option. [RFC9008] updated the Option Type from 0x63 to 0x23.

This specification modifies the RPL Option to encode the ‘P’ flag as follows:

Figure 7: Extended RPL Option Format

Option Type: 0x23 or 0x63, see [RFC9008]

Opt Data Len: See [RFC6553]

‘O’, ‘R’ and ‘F’ flags: See [RFC6553]. Those flags MUST be set to 0 by the sender and ignored by the receiver if the ‘P’ flag is set.

Projected-Route ‘P’: 1-bit flag as defined in Section 4.1.5.

RPLInstanceID: See [RFC6553]. Indicates the TrackId if the ‘P’ flag is set, as discussed in Section 4.1.1.

SenderRank: See [RFC6553]. This field MUST be set to 0 by the
sender and ignored by the receiver if the ‘P’ flag is set.

4.3. Extending RFC 8138

The 6LoWPAN Routing Header [RFC8138] specification introduces a new IPv6 over Low-Power Wireless Personal Area Network (6LoWPAN) [RFC6282] dispatch type for use in 6LoWPAN route-over topologies, which initially covers the needs of RPL data packet compression.

Section 4 of [RFC8138] presents the generic formats of the 6LoWPAN Routing Header (6LoRH) with two forms, one Elective that can be ignored and skipped when the router does not understand it, and one Critical which causes the packet to be dropped when the router cannot process it. The ‘E’ Flag in the 6LoRH indicates its form. In order to skip the Elective 6LoRHs, their format imposes a fixed expression of the size, whereas the size of a Critical 6LoRH may be signaled in variable forms to enable additional optimizations.

When the [RFC8138] compression is used, the Root of the Main DODAG that sets up the Track also constructs the compressed routing header (SRH-6LoRH) on behalf of the Track Ingress, which saves the complexities of optimizing the SRH-6LoRH encoding in constrained code. The SRH-6LoRH is signaled in the NSM-VIO, in a fashion that it is ready to be placed as is in the packet encapsulation by the Track Ingress.

Section 6.3 of [RFC8138] presents the formats of the 6LoWPAN Routing Header of type 5 (RPI-6LoRH) that compresses the RPI for normal RPL operation. The format of the RPI-6LoRH is not suited for P-Routes since the O,R,F flags are not used and the Rank is unknown and ignored.

This specification introduces a new 6LoRH, the P-RPI-6LoRH that can be used in either Elective or Critical 6LoRH form, see Table 21 and Table 22 respectively. The new 6LoRH MUST be used as a Critical 6LoRH, unless an SRH-6LoRH is present and controls the routing decision, in which case it MAY be used in Elective form.

The P-RPI-6LoRH is designed to compress the RPI along RPL P-Routes. Its format is as follows:

```
0                   1                   2
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3
+-----------------------------------------------+
|1|0|E| Length | 6LoRH Type | RPLInstanceID |
+-----------------------------------------------+
```
Figure 8: P-RPI-6LoRH Format

Type: IANA is requested to define the same value of the type for both Elective and Critical forms. A type of 8 is suggested.

Elective ‘E’: See [RFC8138]. The ‘E’ flag is set to 1 to indicate an Elective 6LoRH, meaning that it can be ignored when forwarding.

RPLInstanceID: In the context of this specification, the RPLInstanceID field signals the TrackID, see Section 3.4 and Section 6.2.

Section 6.7 details how a Track Ingress leverages the P-RPI-6LoRH Header as part of the encapsulation of a packet to place it into a Track.

5. New RPL Control Messages and Options

5.1. New P-DAO Request Control Message

The P-DAO Request (PDR) message is sent by a Node in the Main DODAG to the Root. It is a request to establish or refresh a Track where this node is Track Ingress, and signals whether an acknowledgment called PDR-ACK is requested or not. A positive PDR-ACK indicates that the Track was built and that the Roots commits to maintain the Track for the negotiated lifetime.

The Root may use an asynchronous PDR-ACK with an negative status to indicate that the Track was terminated before its time. A status of "Transient Failure" (see Section 10.9) is an indication that the PDR may be retried after a reasonable time that depends on the deployment. Other negative status values indicate a permanent error; the tentative must be abandoned until a corrective action is taken at the application layer or through network management.

The source IPv6 address of the PDR signals the Track Ingress to-be of the requested Track, and the TrackID is indicated in the message itself. One and only one RPL Target Option MUST be present in the message. The RTO signals the Track Egress, more in Section 6.1.

The RPL Control Code for the PDR is 0x09, to be confirmed by IANA. The format of PDR Base Object is as follows:
Figure 9: New P-DAO Request Format

TrackID:  8-bit field. In the context of this specification, the TrackID field signals the RPLInstanceID of the DODAG formed by the Track, see Section 3.4 and Section 6.2. To allocate a new Track, the Ingress Node must provide a value that is not in use at this time.

K:  The 'K' flag is set to indicate that the recipient is expected to send a PDR-ACK back.

R:  The 'R' flag is set to request a Complex Track for redundancy.

Flags:  Reserved. The Flags field MUST initialized to zero by the sender and MUST be ignored by the receiver.

ReqLifetime:  8-bit unsigned integer. The requested lifetime for the Track expressed in Lifetime Units (obtained from the DODAG Configuration option).

A PDR with a fresher PDRSequence refreshes the lifetime, and a PDRLifetime of 0 indicates that the Track should be destroyed, e.g., when the application that requested the Track terminates.

PDRSequence:  8-bit wrapping sequence number, obeying the operation in section 7.2 of [RPL]. The PDRSequence is used to correlate a PDR-ACK message with the PDR message that triggered it. It is incremented at each PDR message and echoed in the PDR-ACK by the Root.

5.2. New PDR-ACK Control Message

The new PDR-ACK is sent as a response to a PDR message with the 'K' flag set. The RPL Control Code for the PDR-ACK is 0x0A, to be confirmed by IANA. Its format is as follows:
Figure 10: New PDR-ACK Control Message Format

TrackID: Set to the TrackID indicated in the TrackID field of the PDR messages that this replies to.

Flags: Reserved. The Flags field MUST initialized to zero by the sender and MUST be ignored by the receiver

Track Lifetime: Indicates that remaining Lifetime for the Track, expressed in Lifetime Units; the value of zero (0x00) indicates that the Track was destroyed or not created.

PDRSequence: 8-bit wrapping sequence number. It is incremented at each PDR message and echoed in the PDR-ACK.

PDR-ACK Status: 8-bit field indicating the completion. The PDR-ACK Status is substructured as indicated in Figure 11:

```
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| E | R | Value |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

Figure 11: PDR-ACK status Format

E: 1-bit flag. Set to indicate a rejection. When not set, the value of 0 indicates Success/Unqualified Acceptance and other values indicate "not an outright rejection".

R: 1-bit flag. Reserved, MUST be set to 0 by the sender and ignored by the receiver.

Status Value: 6-bit unsigned integer. Values depending on the setting of the ’E’ flag, see Table 27 and Table 28.

Reserved: The Reserved field MUST initialized to zero by the sender and MUST be ignored by the receiver
5.3. Via Information Options

A VIO signals the ordered list of IPv6 Via Addresses that constitutes the hops of either a Leg (using Non-Storing Mode) a Segment (using storing mode) of a Track. A Storing Mode P-DAO contains one Storing Mode VIO (SM-VIO) whereas a Non-Storing Mode P-DAO contains one Non-Storing Mode VIO (NSM-VIO).

The duration of the validity of a VIO is indicated in a Segment Lifetime field. A P-DAO message that contains a VIO with a Segment Lifetime of zero is referred as a No-Path P-DAO.

The VIO contains one or more SRH-6LoRH header(s), each formed of a SRH-6LoRH head and a collection of compressed Via Addresses, except in the case of a Non-Storing Mode No-Path P-DAO where the SRH-6LoRH header is not present.

In the case of a SM-VIO, or if [RFC8138] is not used in the data packets, then the Root MUST use only one SRH-6LoRH per Via Information Option, and the compression is the same for all the addresses, as shown in Figure 12, for simplicity.

In case of an NSM-VIO and if [RFC8138] is in use in the Main DODAG, the Root SHOULD optimize the size of the NSM-VIO if using different SRH-6LoRH Types make the VIO globally shorter; this means that more than one SRH-6LoRH may be present.

The format of the Via Information Options is as follows:
Figure 12: VIO format (uncompressed form)

Option Type: 0x0E for SM-VIO, 0x0F for NSM-VIO (to be confirmed by IANA), see Table 25

Option Length: 8-bit unsigned integer, representing the length in octets of the option, not including the Option Type and Length fields, see section 6.7.1. of [RPL]; the Option Length is variable, depending on the number of Via Addresses and the compression applied.

P-RouteID: 8-bit field that identifies a component of a Track or the Main DODAG as indicated by the TrackID field. The value of 0 is used to signal a Serial Track, i.e., made of a single segment/Leg. In an SM-VIO, the P-RouteID indicates an actual Segment. In an an NSM-VIO, it indicates a Leg, that is a serial subTrack that is added to the overall topology of the Track.

Segment Sequence: 8-bit unsigned integer. The Segment Sequence obeys the operation in section 7.2 of [RPL] and the lollipop starts at 255.
When the Root of the DODAG needs to refresh or update a Segment in a Track, it increments the Segment Sequence individually for that Segment.

The Segment information indicated in the VIO deprecates any state for the Segment indicated by the P-RouteID within the indicated Track and sets up the new information.

A VIO with a Segment Sequence that is not as fresh as the current one is ignored.

A VIO for a given DODAGID with the same (TrackID, P-RouteID, Segment Sequence) indicates a retry; it MUST NOT change the Segment and MUST be propagated or answered as the first copy.

Segment Lifetime: 8-bit unsigned integer. The length of time in Lifetime Units (obtained from the Configuration option) that the Segment is usable.

The period starts when a new Segment Sequence is seen. The value of 255 (0xFF) represents infinity. The value of zero (0x00) indicates a loss of reachability.

SRH-6LoRH head: The first 2 bytes of the (first) SRH-6LoRH as shown in Figure 6 of [RFC8138]. As an example, a 6LoRH Type of 4 means that the VIA Addresses are provided in full with no compression.

Via Address: An IPv6 ULA or GUA of a node along the Segment. The VIO contains one or more IPv6 Via Addresses listed in the datapath order from Ingress to Egress. The list is expressed in a compressed form as signaled by the preceding SRH-6LoRH header.

In a Storing Mode P-DAO that updates or removes a section of an already existing Segment, the list in the SM-VIO may represent only the section of the Segment that is being updated; at the extreme, the SM-VIO updates only one node, in which case it contains only one IPv6 address. In all other cases, the list in the VIO MUST be complete.

In the case of an SM-VIO, the list indicates a sequential (strict) path through direct neighbors, the complete list starts at Ingress and ends at Egress, and the nodes listed in the VIO, including the Egress, MAY be considered as implicit Targets.
In the case of an NSM-VIO, the complete list can be loose and excludes the Ingress node, starting at the first loose hop and ending at a Track Egress; the Track Egress MUST be considered as an implicit Target, so it MUST NOT be signaled in a RPL Target Option.

5.4. Sibling Information Option

The Sibling Information Option (SIO) provides indication on siblings that could be used by the Root to form P-Routes. One or more SIO(s) may be placed in the DAO messages that are sent to the Root in Non-Storing Mode.

To advertise a neighbor node, the router MUST have an active Address Registration from that sibling using [RFC8505], for an address (ULA or GUA) that serves as identifier for the node. If this router also registers an address to that sibling, and the link has similar properties in both directions, only the router with the lowest Interface ID in its registered address needs report the SIO, and the Root will assume symmetry.

The format of the SIO is as follows:

```
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
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|   Type        | Option Length |S| Flags |Comp.|    Opaque     |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|           Step of Rank       |          Reserved             |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                                                               |
|                                                               |
+                                                               +
.                                                               .
|                                                               |
+                                                               +
.                                                               .
|   Sibling DODAGID (if the D flag not set)                     |
.                                                               .
+                                                               +
|                                                               |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                                                               |
|                                                               |
+                                                               +
.                                                               .
|   Sibling Address                                           |
.                                                               .
+                                                               +
|                                                               |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

Figure 13: Sibling Information Option Format
Option Type: 0x10 for SIO (to be confirmed by IANA), see Table 25.

Option Length: 8-bit unsigned integer, representing the length in octets of the option, not including the Option Type and Length fields, see section 6.7.1. of [RPL].

Reserved for Flags: MUST be set to zero by the sender and MUST be ignored by the receiver.

S: 1-bit flag that is set to indicate that sibling belongs to the same DODAG. When not set, the Sibling DODAGID is indicated.

Flags: Reserved. The Flags field MUST initialized to zero by the sender and MUST be ignored by the receiver.

Opaque: MAY be used to carry information that the node and the Root understand, e.g., a particular representation of the Link properties such as a proprietary Link Quality Information for packets received from the sibling. An industrial Alliance that uses RPL for a particular use / environment MAY redefine the use of this field to fit its needs.

Compression Type: 3-bit unsigned integer. This is the SRH-6LoRH Type as defined in figure 7 in section 5.1 of [RFC8138] that corresponds to the compression used for the Sibling Address and its DODAGID if resent. The Compression reference is the Root of the Main DODAG.

Step of Rank: 16-bit unsigned integer. This is the Step of Rank [RPL] as computed by the Objective Function between this node and the sibling.

Reserved: The Reserved field MUST initialized to zero by the sender and MUST be ignored by the receiver.

Sibling DODAGID: 2 to 16 bytes, the DODAGID of the sibling in a [RFC8138] compressed form as indicated by the Compression Type field. This field is present if and only if the D flag is not set.

Sibling Address: 2 to 16 bytes, an IPv6 Address of the sibling, with a scope that MUST be make it reachable from the Root, e.g., it cannot be a Link Local Address. The IPv6 address is encoded in the [RFC8138] compressed form indicated by the Compression Type field.
An SIO MAY be immediately followed by a DAG Metric Container. In that case the DAG Metric Container provides additional metrics for the hop from the Sibling to this node.

6. Root Initiated Routing State

6.1. Requesting a Track

This specification introduces the PDR message, used by an LLN node to request the formation of a new Track for which this node is Ingress. Note that the namespace for the TrackID is owned by the Ingress node, and in the absence of a PDR, there must be some procedure for the Root to assign TrackIDs in that namespace while avoiding collisions, more in Section 6.2.

The PDR signals the desired TrackID and the duration for which the Track should be established. Upon a PDR, the Root MAY install the Track as requested, in which case it answers with a PDR-ACK indicating the granted Track Lifetime. All the Segments MUST be of a same mode, either Storing or Non-Storing. All the Segments MUST be created with the same TrackID and the same DODAGID signaled in the P-DAO.

The Root designs the Track as it sees best, and updates / changes the Segments overtime to serve the Track as needed. There is no notification to the requesting node when those changes happen. The Segment Lifetime in the P-DAO messages does not need to be aligned to the Requested Lifetime in the PDR, or between P-DAO messages for different Segments. The Root may use shorter lifetimes for the Segments and renew them faster than the Track is, or longer lifetimes in which case it will need to tear down the Segments if the Track is not renewed.

When the Track Lifetime that was returned in the PDR-ACK is close to elapse - vs. the trip time from the node to the Root, the requesting node SHOULD resend a PDR using the TrackID in the PDR-ACK to extend the lifetime of the Track, else the Track will time out and the Root will tear down the whole structure.

If the Track fails and cannot be restored, the Root notifies the requesting node asynchronously with a PDR-ACK with a Track Lifetime of 0, indicating that the Track has failed, and a PDR-ACK Status indicating the reason of the fault.
6.2. Identifying a Track

RPL defines the concept of an Instance to signal an individual routing topology, and multiple topologies can coexist in the same network. The RPLInstanceID is tagged in the RPI of every packet to signal which topology the packet actually follows.

This draft leverages the RPL Instance model as follows:

* The Root MAY use P-DAO messages to add better routes in the main (Global) RPL Instance in conformance with the routing objectives in that Instance.

To achieve this, the Root MAY install a Segment along a path down the main Non-Storing Mode DODAG. This enables a loose source routing and reduces the size of the Routing Header, see Section 3.3.1. The Root MAY also install a Track Leg across the Main DODAG to complement the routing topology.

When adding a P-Route to the RPL Main DODAG, the Root MUST set the RPLInstanceID field of the P-DAO Base Object (see section 6.4.1. of [RPL]) to the RPLInstanceID of the Main DODAG, and MUST NOT use the DODAGID field. A P-Route provides a longer match to the Target Address than the default route via the Root, so it is preferred.

* The Root MAY also use P-DAO messages to install a Track as an independent routing topology (say, Traffic Engineered) to achieve particular routing characteristics from an Ingress to an Egress Endpoints. To achieve this, the Root MUST set up a local RPL Instance (see section 5 of [RPL]), and the Local RPLInstanceID serves as TrackID. The TrackID MUST be unique for the IPv6 ULA or GUA of the Track Ingress that serves as DODAGID for the Track.

This way, a Track is uniquely identified by the tuple (DODAGID, TrackID) where the TrackID is always represented with the D flag set to 0 (see also section 5.1. of [RPL]), indicating when used in an RPI that the source address of the IPv6 packet signals the DODAGID.

The P-DAO Base Object MUST indicate the tuple (DODAGID, TrackID) that identifies the Track as shown in Figure 6, and the P-RouteID that identifies the P-Route MUST be signaled in the VIO as shown in Figure 12.

The Track Ingress is the root of the DODAG ID formed by the local RPL Instance. It owns the namespace of its TrackIDs, so it can pick any unused value to request a new Track with a PDR. In a
particular deployment where PDR are not used, the namespace can be
delegated to the main Root, which can assign the TrackIDs for the
Tracks it creates without collision.

With this specification, the Root is aware of all the active
Tracks, so it can also pick any unused value to form Tracks
without a PDR. To avoid a collision of the Root and the Track
Ingress picking the same value at the same time, it is RECOMMENDED
that the Track Ingress starts allocating the ID value of the Local
RPLInstanceID (see section 5.1. of [RPL]) used as TrackIDs with
the value 0 incrementing, while the Root starts with 63
decrementing.

6.3. Installing a Track

A Serial Track can be installed by a single P-Route that signals the
sequence of consecutive nodes, either in Storing Mode as a single-
Segment Track, or in Non-Storing Mode as a single-Leg Track. A
single-Leg Track can be installed as a loose Non-Storing Mode
P-Route, in which case the next loose entry must recursively be
reached over a Serial Track.

A Complex Track can be installed as a collection of P-Routes with the
same DODAGID and Track ID. The Ingress of a Non-Storing Mode P-Route
is the owner and Root of the DODAGID. The Ingress of a Storing Mode
P-Route must be either the owner of the DODAGID, or a hop of a Leg of
the same Track. In the latter case, the Targets of the P-Route must
include the next hop of the Leg if there is one, to ensure forwarding
continuity. In the case of a Complex Track, each Segment is
maintained independently and asynchronously by the Root, with its own
lifetime that may be shorter, the same, or longer than that of the
Track.

A route along a Track for which the TrackID is not the RPLInstanceID
of the Main DODAG MUST be installed with a higher precedence than the
routes along the Main DODAG, meaning that:

* Longest match MUST be the prime comparison for routing.

* In case of equal length match, the route along the Track MUST be
  preferred vs. the one along the Main DODAG.

* There SHOULD NOT be 2 different Tracks leading to the same Target
  from same Ingress node, unless there’s a policy for selecting
  which packets use which Track; such policy is out of scope.
* A packet that was routed along a Track MUST NOT be routed along the main DODAG again; if the destination is not reachable as a neighbor by the node where the packet exits the Track then the packet MUST be dropped.

6.3.1. Signaling a Projected Route

This draft adds a capability whereby the Root of a main RPL DODAG installs a Track as a collection of P-Routes, using a Projected-DAO (P-DAO) message for each individual Track Leg or Segment. The P-DAO signals a collection of Targets in the RPL Target Option(s) (RTO). Those Targets can be reached via a sequence of routers indicated in a VIO.

Like a classical DAO message, a P-DAO causes a change of state only if it is "new" per section 9.2.2. "Generation of DAO Messages" of the RPL specification [RPL]; this is determined using the Segment Sequence information from the VIO as opposed to the Path Sequence from a TIO. Also, a Segment Lifetime of 0 in a VIO indicates that the P-Route associated to the Segment is to be removed. There are two Modes of operation for the P-Routes, the Storing and the Non-Storing Modes.

A P-DAO message MUST be sent from the address of the Root that serves as DODAGID for the Main DODAG. It MUST contain either exactly one sequence of one or more RTOs followed one VIO, or any number of sequences of one or more RTOs followed by one or more TIOs. The former is the normal expression for this specification, where as the latter corresponds to the variation for lesser constrained environments described in Section 7.2.

A P-DAO that creates or updates a Track Leg MUST be sent to a GUA or a ULA of the Ingress of the Leg; it must contain the full list of hops in the Leg unless the Leg is being removed. A P-DAO that creates a new Track Segment MUST be sent to a GUA or a ULA of the Segment Egress and MUST signal the full list of hops in Segment; a P-DAO that updates (including deletes) a section of a Segment MUST be sent to the first node after the modified Segment and signal the full list of hops in the section starting at the node that immediately precedes the modified section.
In Non-Storing Mode, as discussed in Section 6.3.3, the Root sends the P-DAO to the Track Ingress where the source-routing state is applied, whereas in Storing Mode, the P-DAO is sent to the last node on the installed path and forwarded in the reverse direction, installing a Storing Mode state at each hop, as discussed in Section 6.3.2. In both cases the Track Ingress is the owner of the Track, and it generates the P-DAO-ACK when the installation is successful.

If the 'K' Flag is present in the P-DAO, the P-DAO must be acknowledged using a DAO-ACK that is sent back to the address of the Root from which the P-DAO was received. In most cases, the first node of the Leg, Segment, or updated section of the Segment is the node that sends the acknowledgment. The exception to the rule is when an intermediate node in a Segment fails to forward a Storing Mode P-DAO to the previous node in the SM-VIO.

In a No-Path Non-Storing Mode P-DAO, the SRH-6LoRH MUST NOT be present in the NSM-VIO; the state in the Ingress is erased regardless. In all other cases, a VIO MUST contain at least one Via Address, and a Via Address MUST NOT be present more than once, which would create a loop.

A node that processes a VIO MAY verify whether one of these conditions happen, and when so, it MUST ignore the P-DAO and reject it with a RPL Rejection Status of "Error in VIO" in the DAO-ACK, see Section 10.14.

Other errors than those discussed explicitly that prevent the installing the route are acknowledged with a RPL Rejection Status of "Unqualified Rejection" in the DAO-ACK.

6.3.2. Installing a Track Segment with a Storing Mode P-Route

As illustrated in Figure 14, a Storing Mode P-DAO installs a route along the Segment signaled by the SM-VIO towards the Targets indicated in the Target Options. The Segment is to be included in a DODAG indicated by the P-DAO Base Object, that may be the one formed by the RPL Main DODAG, or a Track associated with a local RPL Instance.
Figure 14: Projecting a route

In order to install the relevant routing state along the Segment, the Root sends a unicast P-DAO message to the Track Egress router of the routing Segment that is being installed. The P-DAO message contains a SM-VIO with the strict sequence of Via Addresses. The SM-VIO follows one or more RTOs indicating the Targets to which the Track leads. The SM-VIO contains a Segment Lifetime for which the state is to be maintained.

The Root sends the P-DAO directly to the Egress node of the Segment. In that P-DAO, the destination IP address matches the last Via Address in the SM-VIO. This is how the Egress recognizes its role. In a similar fashion, the Segment Ingress node recognizes its role as it matches first Via Address in the SM-VIO.

The Egress node of the Segment is the only node in the path that does not install a route in response to the P-DAO; it is expected to be already able to route to the Target(s) based on its existing tables. If one of the Targets is not known, the node MUST answer to the Root with a DAO-ACK listing the unreachable Target(s) in an RTO and a rejection status of "Unreachable Target".

If the Egress node can reach all the Targets, then it forwards the P-DAO with unchanged content to its predecessor in the Segment as indicated in the list of Via Information options, and recursively the message is propagated unchanged along the sequence of routers indicated in the P-DAO, but in the reverse order, from Egress to Ingress.
The address of the predecessor to be used as destination of the propagated DAO message is found in the Via Address the precedes the one that contain the address of the propagating node, which is used as source of the message.

Upon receiving a propagated DAO, all except the Egress router MUST install a route towards the DAO Target(s) via their successor in the SM-VIO. A router that cannot store the routes to all the Targets in a P-DAO MUST reject the P-DAO by sending a DAO-ACK to the Root with a Rejection Status of "Out of Resources" as opposed to forwarding the DAO to its predecessor in the list. The router MAY install additional routes towards the VIA Addresses that are the SM-VIO after self, if any, but in case of a conflict or a lack of resource, the route(s) to the Target(s) are the ones that must be installed in priority.

If a router cannot reach its predecessor in the SM-VIO, the router MUST send the DAO-ACK to the Root with a Rejection Status of "Predecessor Unreachable".

The process continues till the P-DAO is propagated to Ingress router of the Segment, which answers with a DAO-ACK to the Root. The Root always expects a DAO-ACK, either from the Track Ingress with a positive status or from any node along the segment with a negative status. If the DAO-ACK is not received, the Root may retry the DAO with the same TID, or tear down the route.

6.3.3. Installing a Track Leg with a Non-Storing Mode P-Route

As illustrated in Figure 15, a Non-Storing Mode P-DAO installs a source-routed path within the Track indicated by the P-DAO Base Object, towards the Targets indicated in the Target Options. The source-routed path requires a Source-Routing header which implies an IP-in-IP encapsulation to add the SRH to an existing packet. It is sent to the Track Ingress which creates a tunnel associated with the Track, and connected routes over the tunnel to the Targets in the RTO. The tunnel encapsulation MUST incorporate a routing header via the list addresses listed in the VIO in the same order. The content of the NSM-VIO starting at the first SRH-6LoRH header MUST be used verbatim by the Track Ingress when it encapsulates a packet to forward it over the Track.
The next entry in the source-routed path must be either a neighbor of the previous entry, or reachable as a Target via another P-Route, either Storing or Non-Storing, which implies that the nested P-Route has to be installed before the loose sequence is, and that P-Routes must be installed from the last to the first along the datapath. For instance, a Segment of a Track must be installed before the Leg(s) of the same Track that use it, and stitched Segments must be installed in order from the last that reaches to the Targets to the first.

If the next entry in the loose sequence is reachable over a Storing Mode P-Route, it MUST be the Target of a Segment and the Ingress of a next segment, both already setup; the segments are associated with the same Track, which avoids the need of an additional encapsulation. For instance, in Section 3.5.1.3, Segments A==B-to-C and C==D==E-to-F must be installed with Storing Mode P-DAO messages 1 and 2 before the Track A--C--E-to-F that joins them can be installed with Non-Storing Mode P-DAO 3.

Conversely, if it is reachable over a Non-Storing Mode P-Route, the next loose source-routed hop of the inner Track is a Target of a previously installed Track and the Ingress of a next Track, which requires a de- and a re-encapsulation when switching the outer Tracks that join the loose hops. This is exemplified in Section 3.5.2.3 where Non-Storing Mode P-DAO 1 and 2 install strict Tracks that Non-Storing Mode P-DAO 3 joins as a super Track. In such a case, packets are subject to double IP-in-IP encapsulation.
6.4. Tearing Down a P-Route

A P-DAO with a lifetime of 0 is interpreted as a No-Path DAO and results in cleaning up existing state as opposed to refreshing an existing one or installing a new one. To tear down a Track, the Root must tear down all the Track Segments and Legs that compose it one by one.

Since the state about a Leg of a Track is located only the Ingress Node, the Root cleans up the Leg by sending an NSM-VIO to the Ingress indicating the TrackID and the P-RouteID of the Leg being removed, a Segment Lifetime of 0 and a newer Segment Sequence. The SRH-6LoRH with the Via Addresses in the NSM-VIO are not needed and MUST be omitted. Upon that NSM-VIO, the Ingress node removes all state for that Track if any, and replies positively anyway.

The Root cleans up a section of a Segment by sending an SM-VIO to the last node of the Segment, with the TrackID and the P-RouteID of the Segment being updated, a Segment Lifetime of zero (0) and a newer Segment Sequence. The Via Addresses in the SM-VIO indicates the section of the Segment being modified, from the first to the last node that is impacted. This can be the whole Segment if it is totally removed, or a sequence of one or more nodes that have been bypassed by a Segment update.

The No-Path P-DAO is forwarded normally along the reverse list, even if the intermediate node does not find a Segment state to clean up. This results in cleaning up the existing Segment state if any, as opposed to refreshing an existing one or installing a new one.

6.5. Maintaining a Track

Repathing a Track Segment or Leg may cause jitter and packet misordering. For critical flows that require timely and/or in-order delivery, it might be necessary to deploy the PAREO functions [RAW-ARCHI] over a highly redundant Track. This specification allows to use more than one Leg for a Track, and 1+N packet redundancy.

This section provides the steps to ensure that no packet is lost due to the operation itself. This is ensured by installing the new section from its last node to the first, so when an intermediate node installs a route along the new section, all the downstream nodes in the section have already installed their own. The disabled section is removed when the packets in-flight are forwarded along the new section as well.
6.5.1. Maintaining a Track Segment

To modify a section of a Segment between a first node and a second,
downstream node (which can be the Ingress and Egress), while
conserving those nodes in the Segment, the Root sends an SM-VIO to
the second node indicating the sequence of nodes in the new section
of the Segment. The SM-VIO indicates the TrackID and the P-RouteID
of the Segment being updated, and a newer Segment Sequence. The
P-DAO is propagated from the second to the first node and on the way,
it updates the state on the nodes that are common to the old and the
new section of the Segment and creates a state in the new nodes.

When the state is updated in an intermediate node, that node might
still receive packets that were in flight from the Ingress to self
over the old section of the Segment. Since the remainder of the
Segment is already updated, the packets are forwarded along the new
version of the Segment from that node on.

After a reasonable time to enable the deprecated sections to empty,
the root tears down the remaining section(s) of the old segments are
tear ed down as described in Section 6.4.

6.5.2. Maintaining a Track Leg

This specification allows to add Legs to a Track by sending a Non-
Storing Mode P-DAO to the Ingress associated to the same TrackID, and
a new Segment ID. If the Leg is loose, then the Segments that join
the hops must be created first. It makes sense to add a new Leg
before removing one that is misbehaving, and switch to the new Leg
before removing the old.

It is also possible to update a Track Leg by sending a Non-Storing
Mode P-DAO to the Ingress with the same Segment ID, an incremented
Segment Sequence, and the new complete listy of hops in the NSM-VIO.
Updating a live Leg means changing one or more of the intermediate
loose hops, and involves laying out new Segments from and to the new
loose hops before the NSM-VIO for the new Leg is issued.

Packets that are in flight over the old version of the Track Leg
still follow the old source route path over the old Segments. After
a reasonable time to enable the deprecated Segments to empty, the
root tears down those Segments as described in Section 6.4.
6.6. Encapsulating and Forwarding Along a Track

When forwarding a packet to a destination for which a router

determines that routing happens via a Track for which it is Ingress,
the router must encapsulated the packet using IP-in-IP to add the
Source Routing Header with the final destination set to the Track
Egress. Though fragmentation is possible in a 6LoWPAN LLN, e.g.,
using [6LoWPAN], [RFC8930], and/or [RFC8931], it is RECOMMENDED to
allow an MTU that is larger than 1280 in the main DODAG and allows
for the additional headers while exposing only 1280 to the 6LoWPAN
Nodes as indicated by section 4 of [6LoWPAN].

All properties of a Track operations are inherited form the main RPL
Instance that is used to install the Track. For instance, the use of
compression per [RFC8138] is determined by whether it is used in the
RPL Main DODAG, e.g., by setting the "T" flag [TURN-ON_RFC8138] in
the RPL configuration option.

The Track Ingress that places a packet in a Track encapsulates it
with an IP-in-IP header, a Routing Header, and an IPv6 Hop-by-Hop
Option Header that contains the RPL Packet Information (RPI) as
follows:

* In the uncompressed form the source of the packet is the address
that this router uses as DODAGID for the Track, the destination is
the first Via Address in the NSM-VIO, and the RH is a Source
Routing Header (SRH) [RFC6554] that contains the list of the
remaining Via Addresses terminating by the Track Egress.

* The preferred alternate in a network where 6LoWPAN Header
Compression [RFC6282] is used is to leverage "IPv6 over Low-Power
Wireless Personal Area Network (6LoWPAN) Paging Dispatch"
[RFC8025] to compress the RPL artifacts as indicated in [RFC8138].

In that case, the source routed header is the exact copy of the
(chain of) SRH-6LoRH found in the NSM-VIO, also terminating by the
Track Egress. The RPI-6LoRH is appended next, followed by an IP-
in-IP 6LoRH Header that indicates the Ingress router in the
Encapsulator Address field, see as a similar case Figure 20 of
[TURN-ON_RFC8138].

To signal the Track in the packet, this specification leverages the
RPL Forwarding model follows:

* In the data packets, the Track DODAGID and the TrackID MUST be
respectively signaled as the IPv6 Source Address and the
RPLInstanceID field of the RPI that MUST be placed in the outer
chain of IPv6 Headers.
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The RPI carries a local RPLInstanceID called the TrackID, which, in association with the DODAGID, indicates the Track along which the packet is forwarded.

The D flag in the RPLInstanceID MUST be set to 0 to indicate that the source address in the IPv6 header is set to the DODAGID, more in Section 6.2.

* This draft conforms to the principles of [RFC9008] with regards to packet forwarding and encapsulation along a Track, as follows:

- With this draft, the Track is a RPL DODAG. From the perspective of that DODAG, the Track Ingress is the Root, the Track Egress is a RPL-Aware 6LR, and neighbors of the Track Egress that can be reached via the Track, but are external to it, are external destinations and treated as RPL-Unaware Leaves (RULs). The encapsulation rules in [RFC9008] apply.

- If the Track Ingress is the originator of the packet and the Track Egress is the destination of the packet, there is no need for an encapsulation.

- So the Track Ingress must encapsulate the traffic that it did not originate, and add an RPI.

A packet that is being routed over the RPL Instance associated to a first Non-Storing Mode Track MAY be placed (encapsulated) in a second Track to cover one loose hop of the first Track as discussed in more details Section 3.5.2.3. On the other hand, a Storing Mode Track must be strict and a packet that it placed in a Storing Mode Track MUST follow that Track till the Track Egress.

The forwarding of a packet along a track will fail if the Track continuity is broken, e.g.:

* In the case of a strict path along a Segment, if the next strict hop is not reachable, the packet is dropped.

* In the case of a loose source-routed path, when the loose next hop is not a neighbor, there must be a Segment of the same Track to that loose next hop. When that is the case the packet is forwarded to the next hop along that segment, or a common neighbor with the loose next hop, on which case the packet is forwarded to that neighbor, or another Track to the loose next hop for which this node or a neighbor is Ingress; in the last case, another encapsulation takes place and the process possibly recurses; otherwise the packet is dropped.
When a Track Egress extracts a packet from a Track (decapsulates the packet), the destination of the inner packet must be either this node or a direct neighbor, or a Target of another Segment of the same Track for which this node is Ingress, otherwise the packet MUST be dropped.

In case of a failure forwarding a packet along a Segment, e.g., the next hop is unreachable, the node that discovers the fault MUST send an ICMPv6 Error message [RFC4443] to the Root, with a new Code "Error in P-Route" (See Section 10.13). The Root can then repair by updating the broken Segment and/or Tracks, and in the case of a broken Segment, remove the leftover sections of the segment using SM-VIOs with a lifetime of 0 indicating the section of one or more nodes being removed (See Section 6.5).

In case of a permanent forwarding error along a Source Route path, the node that fails to forward SHOULD send an ICMP error with a code "Error in Source Routing Header" back to the source of the packet, as described in section 11.2.2.3. of [RPL]. Upon this message, the encapsulating node SHOULD stop using the source route path for a reasonable period of time which duration depends on the deployment, and it SHOULD send an ICMP message with a Code "Error in P-Route" to the Root. Failure to follow these steps may result in packet loss and wasted resources along the source route path that is broken.

Either way, the ICMP message MUST be throttled in case of consecutive occurrences. It MUST be sourced at the ULA or a GUA that is used in this Track for the source node, so the Root can establish where the error happened.

The portion of the invoking packet that is sent back in the ICMP message SHOULD record at least up to the RH if one is present, and this hop of the RH SHOULD be consumed by this node so that the destination in the IPv6 header is the next hop that this node could not reach. if a 6LoWPAN Routing Header (6LoRH) [RFC8138] is used to carry the IPv6 routing information in the outer header then that whole 6LoRH information SHOULD be present in the ICMP message.

6.7. Compression of the RPL Artifacts

When using [RFC8138] in the Main DODAG operated in Non-Storing Mode in a 6LoWPAN LLN, a typical packet that circulates in the Main DODAG is formatted as shown in Figure 16, representing the case where:
Since there is no page switch between the encapsulated packet and the encapsulation, the first octet of the compressed packet that acts as page selector is actually removed at encapsulation, so the inner packet used in the descriptions below start with the SRH-6LoRH, and is verbatim the packet represented in Figure 16 from the second octet on.

When encapsulating that inner packet to place it in the Track, the first header that the Ingress appends at the head of the inner packet is an IP-in-IP 6LoRH Header; in that header, the encapsulator address, which maps to the IPv6 source address in the uncompressed form, contains a GUA or ULA IPv6 address of the Ingress node that serves as DODAG ID for the Track, expressed in the compressed form and using the DODAGID of the Main DODAG as compression reference. If the address is compressed to 2 bytes, the resulting value for the Length field shown in Figure 17 is 3, meaning that the SRH-6LoRH as a whole is 5-octets long.

```
0                   1                   2
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-
+101| Length | 6LoRH Type 6 | Hop Limit | Track DODAGID |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-
Figure 17: The IP-in-IP 6LoRH Header
```

At the head of the resulting sequence of bytes, the track Ingress then adds the RPI that carries the TrackID as RPLinstanceID as a P-RPI-6LoRH Header, as illustrated in Figure 8, using the TrackID as RPLInstanceID. Combined with the IP-in-IP 6LoRH Header, this allows to identify the Track without ambiguity.

The SRH-6LoRH is then added at the head of the resulting sequence of bytes as a verbatim copy of the content of the SR-VIO that signaled the selected Track Leg.
The format of the resulting encapsulated packet in [RFC8138] compressed form is illustrated in Figure 19:

```
++ ... ++++ ... ++++ ... ++++ ... ++++ ... ++++ ... ++++ ...
| Page 1 | SRH-6LoRH | P-RPI-6LoRH | IP-in-IP 6LoRH | Inner Packet
++ ... ++++ ... ++++ ... ++++ ... ++++ ... ++++ ... ++++ ...
```

Signals : Loose Hops : TrackID : Track DODAGID :

Figure 19: A Packet as Forwarded along a Track

7. Lesser Constrained Variations

7.1. Storing Mode Main DODAG

This specification expects that the Main DODAG is operated in Non-Storing Mode. The reasons for that limitation are mostly related to LLN operations, power and spectrum conservation:

* In Non-Storing Mode The Root already possesses the DODAG topology, so the additional topological information is reduced to the siblings.

* The downwards routes are updated with unicast messages to the Root, which ensures that the Root can reach back to the LLN nodes after a repair faster than in the case of Storing Mode. Also the Root can control the use of the path diversity in the DODAG to reach to the LLN nodes. For both reasons, Non-Storing Mode provides better capabilities for the Root to maintain the P-Routes.

* When the Main DODAG is operated in Non-Storing Mode, P-Routes enable loose Source Routing, which is only an advantage in that mode. Storing Mode does not use Source Routing Headers, and does not derive the same benefits from this capability.

On the other hand, since RPL is a Layer-3 routing protocol, its applicability extends beyond LLNs to a generic IP network. RPL requires fewer resources than alternative IGPs like OSPF, ISIS,
EIGRP, BABEL or RIP at the expense of a route stretch vs. the shortest path routes to a destination that those protocols compute. P-Routes add the capability to install shortest and/or constrained routes to special destinations such as discussed in section A.9.4. of the ANIMA ACP [RFC8994].

In a powered and wired network, when enough memory to store the needed routes is available, the RPL Storing Mode proposes a better trade-off than the Non-Storing, as it reduces the route stretch and lowers the load on the Root. In that case, the control path between the Root and the LLN nodes is highly available compared to LLNs, and the nodes can be reached to maintain the P-Routes at most times.

This section specifies the additions that are needed to support Projected Routes when the Main DODAG is operated in Storing Mode. As long as the RPI can be processed adequately by the dataplane, the changes to this specification are limited to the DAO message. The Track structure, routes and forwarding operations remain the same.

In Storing Mode, the Root misses the Child to Parent relationship that forms the Main DODAG, as well as the sibling information. To provide that knowledge the nodes in the network MUST send additional DAO messages that are unicast to the Root as Non-Storing DAO messages are.

In the DAO message, the originating router advertises a set of neighbor nodes using Sibling Information Options (SIO)s, regardless of the relative position in the DODAG of the advertised node vs. this router.

The DAO message MUST be formed as follows:

* The originating router is identified by the source address of the DAO. That address MUST be the one that this router registers to neighbor routers so the Root can correlate the DAOs from those routers when they advertise this router as their neighbor. The DAO contains one or more sequences of one Transit Information Option and one or more Sibling Information Options. There is no RPL Target Option so the Root is not confused into adding a Storing Mode route to the Target.

* The TIO is formed as in Storing Mode, and the Parent Address is not present. The Path Sequence and Path Lifetime fields are aligned with the values used in the Address Registration of the node(s) advertised in the SIO, as explained in Section 9.1. of [RFC9010]. Having similar values in all nodes allows to factorise the TIO for multiple SIOs as done with [RPL].
* The TIO is followed by one or more SIOs that provide an address (ULA or GUA) of the advertised neighbor node.

But the RPL routing information headers may not be supported on all type of routed network infrastructures, especially not in high-speed routers. When the RPI is not be supported in the dataplane, there cannot be local RPL Instances and RPL can only operate as a single topology (the Main DODAG). The RPL Instance is that of the Main DODAG and the Ingress node that encapsulates is not the Root. The routes along the Tracks are alternate routes to those available along the Main DODAG. They MAY conflict with routes to children and MUST take precedence in the routing table. The Targets MUST be adjacent to the Track Egress to avoid loops that may form if the packet is reinjected in the Main DODAG.

7.2. A Track as a Full DODAG

This specification builds parallel or crossing Track Legs as opposed to a more complex DODAG with interconnections at any place desirable. The reason for that limitation is related to constrained node operations, and capability to store large amount of topological information and compute complex paths:

* With this specification, the node in the LLN has no topological awareness, and does not need to maintain dynamic information about the link quality and availability.

* The Root has a complete topological information and statistical metrics that allow it or its PCE to perform a global optimization of all Tracks in its DODAG. Based on that information, the Root computes the Track Leg and predigest the source route paths.

* The node merely selects one of the proposed paths and applies the associated pre-computed routing header in the encapsulation. This alleviates both the complexity of computing a path and the compressed form of the routing header.

The "Reliable and Available Wireless (RAW) Architecture/Framework" [RAW-ARCHI] actually expects the PSE at the Track Ingress to react to changes in the forwarding conditions along the Track, and reroute packets to maintain the required degree of reliability. To achieve this, the PSE need the full richness of a DODAG to form any path that could make meet the Service Level Objective (SLO).

This section specifies the additions that are needed to turn the Track into a full DODAG and enable the main Root to provide the necessary topological information to the Track Ingress. The expectation is that the metrics that the PSE uses are of an order
other than that of the PCE, because of the difference of time scale between routing and forwarding, more in [RAW-ARCHI]. It follows that the PSE will learn the metrics it needs from an alternate source, e.g., OAM frames.

To pass the topological information to the Ingress, the Root uses a P-DAO messages that contains sequences of Target and Transit Information options that collectively represent the Track, expressed in the same fashion as in classical Non-Storing Mode. The difference as that the Root is the source as opposed to the destination, and can report information on many Targets, possibly the full Track, with one P-DAO.

Note that the Path Sequence and Lifetime in the TIO are selected by the Root, and that the Target/Transit information tuples in the P-DAO are not those received by the Root in the DAO messages about the said Targets. The Track may follow sibling routes and does not need to be congruent with the Main DODAG.

8. Profiles

This document provides a set of tools that may or may not be needed by an implementation depending on the type of application it serves. This section describes profiles that can be implemented separately and can be used to discriminate what an implementation can and cannot do. This section describes profiles that enable to implement only a portion of this specification to meet a particular use case.

Profiles 0 to 2 operate in the Main RPL Instance and do not require the support of local RPL Instances or the indication of the RPL Instance in the data plane. Profile 3 and above leverage Local RPL Instances to build arbitrary Tracks rooted at the Track Ingress and using its namespace for TrackID.

Profiles 0 and 1 are REQUIRED by all implementations that may be used in LLNs; this enables to use Storing Mode to reduce the size of the Source Route Header in the most common LLN deployments. Profile 2 is RECOMMENDED in high speed / wired environment to enable traffic Engineering and network automation. All the other profile / environment combinations are OPTIONAL.

Profile 0 Profile 0 is the Legacy support of [RPL] Non-Storing Mode, with default routing Northwards (up) and strict source routing Southwards (down the main DOAG). It provides the minimal common functionality that must be implemented as a prerequisite to all the Track-supporting profiles. The other Profiles extend Profile 0 with selected capabilities that this specification introduces on top.
Profile 1 (Storing Mode P-Route Segments along the Main DODAG) Profile 1 does not create new paths; compared to Profile 0, it combines Storing and Non-Storing Modes to balance the size of the Routing Header in the packet and the amount of state in the intermediate routers in a Non-Storing Mode RPL DODAG.

Profile 2 (Non-Storing Mode P-Route Segments along the Main DODAG) Profile 2 extends Profile 0 with Strict Source-Routing Non-Storing Mode P-Routes along the Main DODAG, which is the same as Profile 1 but using NSM VIOs as opposed to SM VIOs. Profile 2 provides the same capability to compress the SRH in packets down the Main DODAG as Profile 1, but it requires an encapsulation, in order to insert an additional SRH between the loose source routing hops. In that case, the Tracks MUST be installed as subTracks of the Main DODAG, the main RPL Instance MUST be used as TrackID, and the Ingress node that encapsulates is not the Root as it does not own the DODAGID.

Profile 3 In order to form the best path possible, those Profiles require the support of Sibling Information Option to inform the Root of additional possible hops. Profile 3 extends Profile 1 with additional Storing Mode P-Routes that install segments that do not follow the Main DODAG. If the Segment Ingress (in the SM-VIO) is the same as the IPv6 Address of the Track Ingress (in the projected DAO base Object), the P-DAO creates an implicit Track between the Segment Ingress and the Segment Egress.

Profile 4 Profile 4 extends Profile 2 with Strict Source-Routing Non-Storing Mode P-Routes to form East-West Tracks that are inside the Main DODAG but do not necessarily follow it. A Track is formed as one or more strict source routed paths between the Root that is the Track Ingress, and the Track Egress that is the last node.

Profile 5 Profile 5 Combines Profile 4 with Profile 1 and enables to loose source routing between the Ingress and the Egress of the Track. As in Profile 1, Storing Mode P-Routes connect the dots in the loose source route.

Profile 6 Profile 6 Combines Profile 4 with Profile 2 and also enables to loose source routing between the Ingress and the Egress of the Track.

Profile 7 Profile 7 implements profile 5 in a Main DODAG that is operated in Storing Mode as presented in Section 7.1. As in Profile 1 and 2, the TrackID is the RPLInstanceID of the Main DODAG. Longest match rules decide whether a packet is sent along the Main DODAG or rerouted in a track.
Profile 8  Profile 8 is offered in preparation of the RAW work, and for use cases where an arbitrary node in the network can afford the same code complexity as the RPL Root in a traditional deployment. It offers a full DODAG visibility to the Track Ingress as specified in Section 7.2 in a Non-Storing Mode Main DODAG.

Profile 9  Profile 9 combines profiles 7 and 8, operating the Track as a full DODAG within a Storing Mode Main DODAG, using only the Main DODAG RPLInstanceID as TrackID.

9. Security Considerations

It is worth noting that with [RPL], every node in the LLN is RPL-aware and can inject any RPL-based attack in the network. This draft uses messages that are already present in RPL [RPL] with optional secured versions. The same secured versions may be used with this draft, and whatever security is deployed for a given network also applies to the flows in this draft.

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, (see [RFC7416] section 7). This trust model could be at a minimum based on a Layer-2 Secure joining and the Link-Layer security. This is a generic 6LoWPAN requirement, see Req5.1 in Appendix B.5 of [RFC8505].

In a general manner, the Security Considerations in [RPL], and [RFC7416] apply to this specification as well. The Link-Layer security is needed in particular to prevent Denial-Of-Service attacks whereby a rogue router creates a high churn in the RPL network by constantly injected forged P-DAO messages and using up all the available storage in the attacked routers.

Additionally, the trust model could include a role validation (e.g., using a role-based authorization) to ensure that the node that claims to be a RPL Root is entitled to do so. That trust should propagate from Egress to Ingress in the case of a Storing Mode P-DAO.

This specification suggests some validation of the VIO to prevent basic loops by avoiding that a node appears twice. But that is only a minimal protection. Arguably, an attacker that can inject P-DAOs can reroute any traffic and deplete critical resources such as spectrum and battery in the LLN rapidly.

10. IANA Considerations
10.1. New Elective 6LoWPAN Routing Header Type

This document updates the IANA registry titled "Elective 6LoWPAN Routing Header Type" that was created for [RFC8138] and assigns the following value:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 (Suggested)</td>
<td>P-RPI-6LoRH</td>
<td>This document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21: New Elective 6LoWPAN Routing Header Type

10.2. New Critical 6LoWPAN Routing Header Type

This document updates the IANA registry titled "Critical 6LoWPAN Routing Header Type" that was created for [RFC8138] and assigns the following value:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 (Suggested)</td>
<td>P-RPI-6LoRH</td>
<td>This document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22: New Critical 6LoWPAN Routing Header Type

10.3. New Subregistry For The RPL Option Flags

IANA is required to create a subregistry for the 8-bit RPL Option Flags field, as detailed in Figure 7, under the "Routing Protocol for Low Power and Lossy Networks (RPL)" registry. The bits are indexed from 0 (leftmost) to 7. Each bit is Tracked with the following qualities:

* Bit number (counting from bit 0 as the most significant bit)
* Indication When Set
* Reference

Registration procedure is "Standards Action" [RFC8126]. The initial allocation is as indicated in Table 26.
10.4. New RPL Control Codes

This document extends the IANA Subregistry created by RFC 6550 for RPL Control Codes as indicated in Table 24:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0x09 (Suggested)</td>
<td>Projected DAO Request (PDR)</td>
<td>This document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0x0A (Suggested)</td>
<td>PDR-ACK</td>
<td>This document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24: New RPL Control Codes

10.5. New RPL Control Message Options

This document extends the IANA Subregistry created by RFC 6550 for RPL Control Message Options as indicated in Table 25:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0x0E (Suggested)</td>
<td>Stateful VIO (SM-VIO)</td>
<td>This document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0x0F (Suggested)</td>
<td>Source-Routed VIO (NSM-VIO)</td>
<td>This document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0x10 (Suggested)</td>
<td>Sibling Information option</td>
<td>This document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25: RPL Control Message Options
10.6. SubRegistry for the Projected DAO Request Flags

IANA is required to create a registry for the 8-bit Projected DAO Request (PDR) Flags field. Each bit is tracked with the following qualities:

* Bit number (counting from bit 0 as the most significant bit)
* Capability description
* Reference

Registration procedure is "Standards Action" [RFC8126]. The initial allocation is as indicated in Table 26:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bit number</th>
<th>Capability description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>PDR-ACK request (K)</td>
<td>This document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Requested path should be redundant (R)</td>
<td>This document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26: Initial PDR Flags

10.7. SubRegistry for the PDR-ACK Flags

IANA is required to create a subregistry for the 8-bit PDR-ACK Flags field. Each bit is tracked with the following qualities:

* Bit number (counting from bit 0 as the most significant bit)
* Capability description
* Reference

Registration procedure is "Standards Action" [RFC8126]. No bit is currently defined for the PDR-ACK Flags.

10.8. Subregistry for the PDR-ACK Acceptance Status Values

IANA is requested to create a Subregistry for the PDR-ACK Acceptance Status values.

* Possible values are 6-bit unsigned integers (0..63).
* Registration procedure is "Standards Action" [RFC8126].
* Initial allocation is as indicated in Table 27:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Unqualified Acceptance</td>
<td>This document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27: Acceptance values of the PDR-ACK Status

10.9. Subregistry for the PDR-ACK Rejection Status Values

IANA is requested to create a Subregistry for the PDR-ACK Rejection Status values.

* Possible values are 6-bit unsigned integers (0..63).
* Registration procedure is "Standards Action" [RFC8126].
* Initial allocation is as indicated in Table 28:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Unqualified Rejection</td>
<td>This document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Transient Failure</td>
<td>This document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28: Rejection values of the PDR-ACK Status

10.10. SubRegistry for the Via Information Options Flags

IANA is requested to create a Subregistry for the 5-bit Via Information Options (Via Information Option) Flags field. Each bit is tracked with the following qualities:

* Bit number (counting from bit 0 as the most significant bit)
* Capability description
* Reference

Registration procedure is "Standards Action" [RFC8126]. No bit is currently defined for the Via Information Options (Via Information Option) Flags.
10.11. SubRegistry for the Sibling Information Option Flags

IANA is required to create a registry for the 5-bit Sibling Information Option (SIO) Flags field. Each bit is tracked with the following qualities:

* Bit number (counting from bit 0 as the most significant bit)
* Capability description
* Reference

Registration procedure is "Standards Action" [RFC8126]. The initial allocation is as indicated in Table 29:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bit number</th>
<th>Capability description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 (Suggested)</td>
<td>&quot;S&quot; flag: Sibling in same DODAG as Self</td>
<td>This document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29: Initial SIO Flags

10.12. New destination Advertisement Object Flag

This document modifies the "destination Advertisement Object (DAO) Flags" registry initially created in Section 20.11 of [RPL].

Section 4.1.1 also defines one new entry in the Registry as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bit Number</th>
<th>Capability Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 (Suggested)</td>
<td>Projected DAO (P)</td>
<td>THIS RFC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30: New destination Advertisement Object (DAO) Flag


In some cases RPL will return an ICMPv6 error message when a message cannot be forwarded along a P-Route.

IANA has defined an ICMPv6 "Code" Fields Registry for ICMPv6 Message Types. ICMPv6 Message Type 1 describes "destination Unreachable" codes. This specification requires that a new code is allocated from
the ICMPv6 Code Fields Registry for ICMPv6 Message Type 1, for "Error in P-Route", with a suggested code value of 8, to be confirmed by IANA.

10.14. New RPL Rejection Status values

This specification updates the Subregistry for the "RPL Rejection Status" values under the RPL registry, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 (Suggested)</td>
<td>Out of Resources</td>
<td>THIS RFC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (Suggested)</td>
<td>Error in VIO</td>
<td>THIS RFC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (Suggested)</td>
<td>Predecessor Unreachable</td>
<td>THIS RFC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (Suggested)</td>
<td>Unreachable Target</td>
<td>THIS RFC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6..63</td>
<td>Unassigned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31: Rejection values of the RPL Status
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1. Introduction

[RFC7554] describes the use of the time-slotted channel hopping (TSCH) mode of [IEEE802154]. [I-D.ietf-6tisch-minimal-security] and [I-D.ietf-6tisch-dtsecurity-secure-join] describe mechanisms by which a new node (the "pledge") can use a friendly router as a Join Proxy. [I-D.ietf-6tisch-enrollment-enhanced-beacon] describes an extension to the 802.15.4 Enhanced Beacon that is used by a Join Proxy to announce its existence such that Pledges can find them.

1.1. Motivation and Overview

It has become clear that not every routing member of the mesh ought to announce itself as a _Join Proxy_. There are a variety of local reasons by which a 6LR might not want to provide the _Join Proxy_ function. They include available battery power, already committed network bandwidth, and also total available memory available for Neighbor Cache Entry slots.

There are other situations where the operator of the network would like to selective enable or disable the enrollment process in a particular DODAG.
As the enrollment process involves permitting unencrypted traffic into the best effort part of a (TSCH) network, it would be better to have the enrollment process off when no new nodes are expected.

A network operator might also be able to recognize when certain parts of the network are overloaded and can not accommodate additional enrollment traffic, and it would like to adjust the enrollment priority (the proxy priority field of [I-D.ietf-6tisch-enrollment-enhanced-beacon]) among all nodes in the subtree of a congested link.

This document describes a RPL DIO option that can be used to announce a minimum enrollment priority. The minimum priority expresses the (lack of) willingness by the RPL DODAG globally to accept new joins. It may derive from multiple constraining factors, e.g., the size of the DODAG, the occupancy of the bandwidth at the Root, the memory capacity at the DODAG Root, or an administrative decision.

Each potential _Join Proxy_ would this value as a base on which to add values relating to local conditions such as its Rank and number of pending joins, which would degrade even further the willingness to take more joins.

When a RPL domain is composed of multiple DODAGs, nodes at the edge of 2 DODAGs may not only join either DODAG but also move from one to the other in order to keep their relative sizes balanced. For this, the approximate knowledge of size of the DODAG is an essential metric. Depending on the network policy, the size of the DODAG may or may not affect the minimum enrollment priority. It would be limiting its value to enforce that one is proportional to the other. This is why the current size of the DODAG is advertised separately in the new option.

As explained in [I-D.ietf-6tisch-enrollment-enhanced-beacon], higher values decrease the likelihood of an unenrolled node sending enrollment traffic via this path.

A network operator can set this value to the maximum value allowed, effectively disable all new enrollment traffic.

2. 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.
The term (1) "Join" has been used in documents like [I-D.ietf-6tisch-minimal-security] to denote the activity of a new node authenticating itself to the network in order to obtain authorization to become a member of the network.

In the context of the [RFC6550] RPL protocol, the term (2) "Join" has an alternate meaning: that of a node (already authenticating to the network, and already authorized to be a member of the network), deciding which part of the RPL DODAG to attach to. This term "Join" has to do with parent selection processes.

In order to avoid the ambiguity of this term, this document refers to the process (1) "Join" as enrollment, leaving the term "Join" to mean (2) "Join". The term "onboarding" (or IoT Onboarding) is sometimes used to describe the enrollment process. However, the term _Join Proxy_ is retained with its meaning from [I-D.ietf-6tisch-minimal-security].

3. Protocol Definition

With this specification, the following option is defined for transmission in the DIO issued by the DODAG root and it MUST be propagated down the DODAG.

A 6LR which would otherwise be willing to act as a _Join Proxy_, will examine the minimum priority field, and to that number, add any additional local consideration (such as upstream congestion).

The Enrollment Priority can only be increased by each 6LR in value, to the maximum value of 0x7f.

The resulting priority, if less than 0x7f should enable the _Join Proxy_ function.

```
+----------------+----------------+----------------+----------------+
|          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 |
+----------------+----------------+----------------+
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Opt Length = 3</th>
<th>exp</th>
<th>DODAG Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>min priority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
++----------+

Type To be assigned by IANA

exp a 4 bit unsigned integer, indicating the power of 2 that defines the unit of the DODAG Size, such that (unit=2^exp).

DODAG Size a 12 bit unsigned integer, expressing the size of the
DODAG in units that depend on the exp field. The size of the DODAG is computed as \((\text{DAG}_\text{Size} \times 2^{\text{exp}})\).

min.priority a 7 bit field which provides a base value for the Enhanced Beacon Join priority. A value of 0x7f (127) disables the _Join Proxy_ function entirely.

R a reserved bit that SHOULD be set to 0 by senders, and MUST be ignored by receivers. This reserved bit SHOULD be copied to options created.

This document uses the extensions mechanism designed into [RFC6550]. It does not need any mechanism to enable it.

The size of the DODAG is measured by the Root based one the DAO activity. It represents a number of routes not a number of nodes, and can only be used to infer a load in an homogeneous network where each node advertises the same number of addresses and generates roughly the same amount of traffic. The size may slightly change between a DIO and the next, so the value transmitted must be considered as an approximation.

Future work like [I-D.ietf-roll-capabilities] will enable collection of capabilities such as this one in reports to the DODAG root.

3.1. Upwards compatibility

A 6LR which did not support this option would not act on it, or copy it into its DIO messages. Children and grandchildren nodes would therefore not receive any telemetry via that path, and need to assume a default value.

6LRs that support this option, but whose parent does not send it SHOULD assume a value of 0x40 as their base value. The nodes then adjust this base value based upon their observed congestion, emitting their adjusted DIO value to their children.

A 6LR downstream of a 6LR where there was an interruption in the telemetry could err in two directions:

* if the value implied by the base value of 0x40 was too low, then a 6LR might continue to attract enrollment traffic when none should have been collected. This is a stressor for the network, but this would also be what would occur without this option at all.
* if the value implied by the base value of 0x40 was too high, then a 6LR might deflect enrollment traffic to other parts of the DODAG tree, possibly refusing any enrollment traffic at all. In order for this to happen, some significant congestion must be seen in the sub-tree where the implied 0x40 was introduced.

The 0x40 is only the half-way point, so if such an amount of congestion was present, then this sub-tree of the DODAG simply winds up being more cautious than it needed to be.

It is possible that the temporal alternation of the above two situations might introduce cycles of accepting and then rejecting enrollment traffic. This is something an operator should consider if when they incrementally deploy this option to an existing LLN. In addition, an operator would be unable to turn off enrollment traffic by sending a maximum value enrollment priority to the sub-tree. This situation is unfortunate, but without this option, the the situation would occur all over the DODAG, rather than just in the sub-tree where the option was omitted.

4. Security Considerations

As per [RFC7416], RPL control frames either run over a secured layer 2, or use the [RFC6550] Secure DIO methods. This option can be placed into either a "clear" (layer-2 secured) DIO, or a layer-3 Secure DIO. As such this option will have both integrity and confidentiality mechanisms applied to it.

A malicious node (that was part of the RPL control plane) could see these options and could, based upon the observed minimal enrollment priority signal a confederate that it was a good time to send malicious join traffic.

Such as a malicious node, being already part of the RPL control plane, could also send DIOs with a different minimal enrollment priority which would cause downstream mesh routers to change their _Join Proxy_ behaviour.

Lower minimal priorities would cause downstream nodes to accept more pledges than the network was expecting, and higher minimal priorities cause the enrollment process to stall.
The use of layer-2 or layer-3 security for RPL control messages prevents the above two attacks, by preventing malicious nodes from becoming part of the control plane. A node that is attacked and has malware placed on it creates vulnerabilities in the same way such an attack on any node involved in Internet routing protocol does. The rekeying provisions of [I-D.ietf-6tisch-minimal-security] exist to permit an operator to remove such nodes from the network easily.

5. Privacy Considerations

There are no new privacy issues caused by this extension.

6. IANA Considerations

Allocate a new number TBD01 from Registry RPL Control Message Options. This entry should be called Minimum Enrollment Priority.
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1. Introduction

RPL [RFC6550] specifies a proactive distance-vector based routing scheme. The protocol creates a DAG-like structure that operates with a given "Mode of Operation" (MOP) determining the minimum and mandatory set of primitives to be supported by all the participating nodes.

MOP as per [RFC6550] is a 3-bit value carried in DIO messages and is specific to the RPL Instance. The recipient of the DIO message can join the specified network as a router only when it can support the primitives as required by the mode of operation value. For example, in the case of MOP=3 (Storing MOP with multicast support), the nodes can join the network as routers only when they can handle the DAO advertisements from the peers and manage routing tables. The 3-bit value is already exhausted and requires replenishment. This document introduces a mechanism to extend the mode of operation values.

Jadhav, et al. Expires 13 May 2022
This document further extends the RPL Control Option syntax to handle generic flags. The primary aim of these flags is to define the behavior of a node not supporting the given control type. If a node does not support a given RPL Control Option, there are following possibilities:

Strip off the option

Copy the option as-is

Ignore the message containing this option

Let the node join in only as a 6LN to this parent

1.1. Requirements Language and 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 RFC 2119 [RFC2119].

MOP: Mode of Operation. Identifies the mode of operation of the RPL Instance as administratively provisioned at and distributed by the DODAG root.

MOPex: Extended MOP: This document extends the MOP values over a bigger range. This extension of MOP is called MOPex.

DAO: DODAG Advertisement Object. An RPL message used to advertise the target information to establish routing adjacencies.

DIO: DODAG Information Object. An RPL message initiated by the root and used to advertise the network configuration information.

Current parent: Parent 6LR node before switching to the new path.

This document uses the terminology described in [RFC6550]. For the sake of readability, all the known relevant terms are repeated in this section.

2. Requirements for this document

Following are the requirements considered for this documents:

REQ1: MOP extension. The 3-bits MOP as defined in [RFC6550] is fast depleting. An MOP extension needs to extend the possibility of adding new MOPs in the future.
REQ2: Backwards compatibility. The new options and new fields in the DIO message should be backward compatible i.e. if there are nodes that support old MOPs they could still operate in their RPL Instances.

3. Extended MOP Control Message Option

This document reserves the existing MOP value 7 to be used as an extender. DIO messages with an MOP value of 7 MUST refer to the Extended MOP (MOPex) option in the DIO message.

```
+-----------------+-----------------+-----------------+
| Type = TODO    |  Opt Length    |     OP-value    |
+-----------------+-----------------+-----------------+
```

Figure 1: Extended MOP Option

The option length value MUST be less than or equal to 2. An option length value of zero is invalid and the implementation MUST silently ignore the DIO on receiving a value of zero.

3.1. Handling MOPex

The MOPex option MUST be used only if the base DIO MOP is 7. If the base DIO MOP is 7 and if the MOPex option is not present then the DIO MUST be silently ignored. If the base DIO MOP is less than 7 then MOPex MUST NOT be used. In case the base MOP is 7 and if the MOPex option is present, then the implementation MUST use the final MOP value from the MOPex.

Note that [RFC6550] allows a node that does not support the received MOP to still join the network as a leaf node. This semantics continues to be true even in the case of MOPex.

3.2. Use of values 0-6 in the MOPex option

The MOPex option could also be allowed to re-use the values 0-6, which have been used for MOP so far. The use of current MOPs in MOPex indicates that the MOP is supported with an extended set of semantics e.g., the capability options [I-D.ietf-roll-capabilities].

4. Extending RPL Control Options

Section 6.7.1 of RFC6550 explains the RPL Control Message Option Generic Format. This document extends this format to following:
New fields in extended RPL Control Message Option Format:

'X' bit in Option Type: Value 1 indicates that this is an extended option. If the 'X' flag is set, a 1-byte Option Flags follows the Option Length field.

Option Length: 8-bit unsigned integer, representing the length in octets of the option, not including the Option Type and Length fields. Option Flags and variable length Option Data fields are included in the length.

'J' (Join) bit in Option Flags: A node MUST join only as a 6LN if the Option Type is not understood.

'C' (Copy) bit in Option Flags: A node that does not understand the Option Type MUST copy the Option while generating the corresponding message. E.g., if a 6LR receives a DIO message with an unknown Option with 'C' bit set and if the 6LR chooses to accept this node as the preferred parent then the node MUST copy this option in the subsequent DIO message it generates. Alternatively, if the 'C' flag is unset the node MUST strip off the option and process the message.

'I' (Ignore) bit in Option Flags: A node that does not understand the Option Type MUST ignore this whole message if the 'I' bit is set. If the 'I' bit is set then the value of 'J' and 'C' bits are irrelevant and the message MUST be ignored.

Note that this format does not deprecate the previous format, it simply extends it and the new format is applicable only when 2nd bit ('X' flag) of the Option Type is set. Option Type 0x80 to 0xFF are thus applicable only as extended options.
If a node receives an unknown Option without 'X' flag set then the node MUST ignore the option and process the message. The option MUST be treated as if J=0, C=0, I=0.

5. Implementation Considerations

In [RFC6550], it was possible to discard an unsupported DIO-MOP just by inspecting the base message. With this document, the MOPex is a different control message option and thus the discarding of the DIO message can only happen after inspecting the message options.

6. Acknowledgements
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7. IANA Considerations

7.1. Mode of operation: MOPex

IANA is requested to assign a new Mode of Operation, named "MOPex" for MOP extension under the RPL registry. The value of 7 is to be assigned from the "Mode of Operation" space [RFC6550]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>MOPex</td>
<td>This document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Mode of Operation
7.2. New options: MOPex and Capabilities

A new entry is required for supporting new option "MOPex" in the "RPL Control Message Options" space [RFC6550].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBD1</td>
<td>MOPex</td>
<td>This document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: New options

7.3. New Registry for Extended-MOP-value

IANA is requested to create a registry for the extended-MOP-value (MOPex). This registry should be located in TODO. New MOPex values may be allocated only by an IETF review. Currently no values are defined by this document. Each value is tracked with the following qualities:

* MOPex value
* Description
* Defining RFC

7.4. Change in RPL Control Option field

Section 4 of this document specifies MSB of the RPL Control Option to be used as a bit to indicate RPL Extended Control Options.

IANA is requested to reduce the unassigned values range from 0x10 to 0x7f for RPL Control Options.

IANA is requested to create a new registry for RPL Extended Control Options indicating values 0x80 to 0xff. New values may be allocated only by an IETF Review. Each value is tracked with the following qualities:

* Value
* Meaning
* Defining RFC

The value could be in the range of 0x80 to 0xff.
8. Security Considerations

The options defined in this document are carried in the base message objects as defined in [RFC6550]. The RPL control message options are protected by the same security mechanisms that protect the base messages.

Capabilities flag can reveal that the node has been upgraded or is running an old feature set. This document assumes that the base messages that carry these options are protected by RPL security mechanisms and thus are not visible to a malicious node.
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