

IETF 113 ROLL - Routing over Low-Power And Lossy Networks

Chairs:

Dominique Barthel

Ines Robles

Secretary:

Michael Richardson

23 March 2022

This session is being recorded

IETF 113 Vienna
hosted by



This session is being recorded

IETF 113 Meeting Tips

In-person participants

- Make sure to sign into the session using the Meetecho (usually the “onsite tool” client) from the Datatracker agent
- Use Meetecho to join the mic queue
- *Keep audio and video off if not using the onsite version*



Remote participants

- Make sure your audio and video are off unless you are chairing or presenting during a session
- Use of a headset is strongly recommended

Resources for IETF 113 Vienna

- Agenda
<https://datatracker.ietf.org/meeting/agenda>
- Meetecho and other information:
<https://www.ietf.org/how/meetings/113/preparation>
- If you need technical assistance, see the Reporting Issues page:
<http://www.ietf.org/how/meetings/issues/>

Note Well

This is a reminder of IETF policies in effect on various topics such as patents or code of conduct. It is only meant to point you in the right direction. Exceptions may apply. The IETF's patent policy and the definition of an IETF "contribution" and "participation" are set forth in BCP 79; please read it carefully.

As a reminder:

- By participating in the IETF, you agree to follow IETF processes and policies.
- If you are aware that any IETF contribution is covered by patents or patent applications that are owned or controlled by you or your sponsor, you must disclose that fact, or not participate in the discussion.
- As a participant in or attendee to any IETF activity you acknowledge that written, audio, video, and photographic records of meetings may be made public.
- Personal information that you provide to IETF will be handled in accordance with the IETF Privacy Statement.
- As a participant or attendee, you agree to work respectfully with other participants; please contact the ombudsteam (<https://www.ietf.org/contact/ombudsteam/>) if you have questions or concerns about this.

Definitive information is in the documents listed below and other IETF BCPs. For advice, please talk to WG chairs or ADs:

- [BCP 9](#) (Internet Standards Process)
- [BCP 25](#) (Working Group processes)
- [BCP 25](#) (Anti-Harassment Procedures)
- [BCP 54](#) (Code of Conduct)
- [BCP 78](#) (Copyright)
- [BCP 79](#) (Patents, Participation)
- <https://www.ietf.org/privacy-policy/>(Privacy Policy)

Note Well Cont.

- IETF meetings, virtual meetings, and mailing lists are intended for professional collaboration and networking, as defined in the [IETF Guidelines for Conduct](#) (RFC 7154), the [IETF Anti-Harassment Policy](#), and the [IETF Anti-Harassment Procedures](#) (RFC 7776). If you have any concerns about observed behavior, please talk to the [Ombudsteam](#), who are available if you need to confidentially raise concerns about harassment or other conduct in the IETF.
- The IETF strives to create and maintain an environment in which people of many different backgrounds are treated with dignity, decency, and respect. Those who participate in the IETF are expected to behave according to professional standards and demonstrate appropriate workplace behavior.
- IETF participants must not engage in harassment while at IETF meetings, virtual meetings, social events, or on mailing lists. Harassment is unwelcome hostile or intimidating behavior -- in particular, speech or behavior that is aggressive or intimidates.
- If you believe you have been harassed, notice that someone else is being harassed, or have any other concerns, you are encouraged to raise your concern in confidence with one of the Ombudspersons.

Source: <https://www.ietf.org/about/note-well/>

Resources for ROLL@IETF 113 Vienna

- Remote Participation
 - Meetecho: <https://meetings.conf.meetecho.com/ietf113/?group=roll&short=&item=1>
 - Material: <https://datatracker.ietf.org/meeting/113/session/roll>
 - Jabber: xmpp:[roll@jabber.ietf.org](xmpp:roll@jabber.ietf.org)?join
 - CodiMD: <https://notes.ietf.org/notes-ietf-113-roll>
 - Minute takers: **Please volunteer, thank you :)**

Agenda

Wednesday, March 23th, 2022

12:00-13:00 (UTC) Wednesday Afternoon session I

Time (UTC)	Duration	Draft/Topic	Presenter
12:00 - 12:20	20 min	WG Status	Ines/Dominique
12:20 - 12:35	15 min	draft-ietf-roll-dao-projection	Pascal
12:35 - 12:50	15 min	draft-ietf-roll-enrollment-priority	Michael
12:50 - 12:55	5 min	draft-ietf-6lo-multicast-registration	Pascal
12:55 - 13:00	5 min	Open Floor	Everyone

Draft status

Common Ancestor Objective Function and Parent Set DAG Metric Container Extension draft-ietf-roll-nsa-extension-10	AD evaluation, revised I-D needed
Supporting Asymmetric Links in Low Power Networks: AODV-RPL draft-ietf-roll-aodv-rpl-13	IESG evaluation, AD follow-up Short discussion today
Root initiated routing state in RPL draft-ietf-roll-dao-projection-24	Discussed today To be WGLC'ed
Controlling Secure Network Enrollment in RPL Networks draft-ietf-roll-enrollment-priority-06	Discussed today
Mode of Operation extension draft-ietf-roll-mopex-04	waiting for attention
RPL Capabilities draft-ietf-roll-capabilities-09	waiting for attention
RPL Storing Root-ACK draft-jadhav-roll-storing-rootack-03	WG adoption to be called
RNFD: Fast border router crash detection in RPL draft-ietf-roll-rnfd-00	New Work adopted by the WG

Milestones: proposed changes

Initial submission of a root initiated routing state in RPL to the IESG draft-ietf-roll-dao-projection	2022
Initial submission of Enabling secure network enrollment in RPL networks draft to the IESG draft-ietf-roll-enrollment-priority	2022
Initial submission of Mode of Operation extension and Capabilities for RPL to the IESG draft-ietf-roll-mopex-cap	2022
Initial submission of RNFD: Fast border router crash detection in RPL draft-ietf-roll-rnfd	2023
Initial submission of a proposal to augment DIS flags and options to the IESG draft-ietf-roll-dis-modifications	2023
Initial submission of a YANG model for MPL to the IESG draft-ietf-roll-mpl-yang	?
Initial submission of a proposal for Source-Route Multicast for RPL to the IESG draft-ietf-roll-ccast	?
Recharter WG or close	2023

Open Tickets

draft-ietf-roll-enrollment-priority Public

[Issues](#) 7 [Pull requests](#) 4 [Discussions](#) [Actions](#) [Projects](#) [Wiki](#) [Security](#)

Filters

7 Open 1 Closed

- [add explicit lollipop counter into enrollment priority option](#)
#13 opened on Nov 24, 2021 by mcr
- [should root explicitly reset trickle timer?](#)
#12 opened on Nov 24, 2021 by mcr
- [what EB and priority, if any should a node with no feasible parent emit?](#)
#11 opened on Nov 24, 2021 by mcr
- [should priority have more than 1 bit: join disabled/enabled?](#)
#10 opened on Nov 24, 2021 by mcr
- [-05 Section 3.1, questions](#)
#7 opened on Aug 31, 2021 by dbarthel-ol
- [explain how new option values are related to DODAGVersionNumber](#)
#5 opened on Aug 10, 2021 by mcr
- [enrollment priority option name](#)
#4 opened on Aug 10, 2021 by mcr



Open Tickets

/ [rpl-observations](#) Public

[Issues](#) 3 [Pull requests](#) [Actions](#) [Projects](#) [Wiki](#) [Security](#) [Insights](#) [Settings](#)

Filters

3 Open ✓ 4 Closed

[Parent Address MUST be empty in Transit Information for storing MOP](#)
#10 opened on Mar 16, 2020 by nyraahul

[Implications of using smaller lollipop counter window](#)
#9 opened on Dec 12, 2019 by nyraahul

[Path Control bits handling](#)
#6 opened on Nov 12, 2019 by nyraahul

[mopex](#) Public

[Issues](#) 1 [Pull requests](#) [Actions](#) [Projects](#) [Wiki](#) [Security](#) [Insights](#)

Filters

1 Open ✓ 1 Closed

[do-not-join-instance flag in RPL ext control option](#)
#8 opened on Mar 31, 2021 by nyraahul



AODV-RPL: draft-ietf-roll-aodv-rpl-13

- MOP=4 => The Same MOP as RFC6997 (P2P-RPL, Experimental)
- AODV-RPL intended to replace P2P-RPL, going **Standards Track**
- Ben's DISCUSS still on.
- Recent reviews by Pascal and Konrad. Huge thanks!
- All documented in tickets on Github
- Level of Interest in the WG to work on this topic?
- One known implementation, last update 2016
 - https://github.com/lavanyahm/AODV_P2P_RPL (2016)

Destination Advertisement Object (DAO) control message of RPL. AODV-RPL uses the "P2P Route Discovery Mode of Operation" (MOP == 4) with three new Options for the DIO message, dedicated to discover P2P routes. These P2P routes may differ from routes discoverable by native RPL. **Since AODV-RPL uses newly defined Options, there is no conflict with P2P-RPL [RFC6997]**, a previous document using the same MOP. AODV-RPL can be operated whether or not P2P-RPL or native RPL is running otherwise. For many networks AODV-RPL could be a

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	5 Open	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	0 Closed
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Clarification needed to describe the differences with P2P-RPL		#5 opened 29 seconds ago by inesrob
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Review draft-ietf-roll-aodv-rpl-12 by Konrad		#4 opened 3 days ago by inesrob
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	Review of draft-ietf-roll-aodv-rpl-13 by Pascal		#3 opened 3 days ago by inesrob
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	draft-ietf-roll-aodv-rpl-11 review by Ben (DISCUSS ballot)		#2 opened on Nov 10, 2021 by inesrob
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	draft-ietf-roll-aodv-rpl-10 review by John Scudder (DISCUSS)		#1 opened on Nov 1, 2021 by inesrob



Root initiated routing state in RPL


draft-ietf-roll-dao-projection

Pascal Thubert, Rahul Arvind Jadhav, Michael Richardson

IETF 113

Presenter: Pascal Thubert, remote.

The RPL Track: A DODAG rooted at Ingress



Targets {Tx }

Legs

L1 = I->A->E to {Ti}, L2 = I->B->E to {Ti}, L3 = I->A->B->E to {Ti}

Segments

S1 = A=>F=>G to E, S2 = I=>H to B

SubTracks

Any Set \subset {L1, L2, L3} but { }

Some rules

- Track is set up by installing Legs and Segment
 - with the same Track ID
- Non-Storing Mode P-DAO signals a Leg
- Storing Mode P-DAO signals a Segment
- Storing Mode P-DAO enables loose hops
 - in Non-Storing main DODAG (typically TrackId is Global instance ID)
 - in Tracks (typically TrackId is Local instance ID to track Ingress)
- Track Egress is implicit Target in Non-Storing Mode
- Leg hop is either a Segment of this Track or another Track

Status of the draft

- Latest rev is [draft-ietf-roll-dao-projection-24](#)
- 21: Includes IOT-DIR review by Toerless (before IETF 112)
- 22: Michael's review
 - Terminology (stretch, Tracks, ..)
 - Clarification (Building Tracks...)
 - Loose source routing benefits
 - New flag 'D' in DODAG conf option to signal "Projected Routes Support"
 - Mapping to DetNet:
 - **Relay Nodes as the hops of a Leg**
 - **Forwarding Nodes as the hops in a Segment that join the Relay nodes**

Status of the draft (cont.)

- -23: Li's review, first round with questions left opened
 - Clarifications
 - Introducing P-DAO ACK
 - Introducing the bidirectional flag in Sibling Info Option (SIO)
- -24: More of Li's review, treated as GitHub issues
 - Allows more than one target options, will reach 1st + undefined subset.
 - Use of the bidirectional flag in Sibling Info Option (SIO) / what if dup
 - Michael's edits on Amends and Extends. Michael becomes co-author
- Since: Rephrasing terminology on Legs and SubTracks
 - Legs are loose hop sequences from Track Ingress to Egress
 - SubTracks (of a Track) are collections of Legs of the Track

Next

- Remous-Aris' Review
 - Items ...

- WGLC; please consider:
 - Need for new status codes
 - Missing flows, e.g., Error flows

Controlling Secure Network Enrollment in RPL Networks

draft-ietf-roll-enrollment-priority-06

Rahul Arvind Jadhav <rahul.ietf@gmail.com>

Pascal Thubert <pthubert@cisco.com>

Huimin She <hushe@cisco.com>

Michael Richardson mcr+ietf@sandelman.ca

IETF113, March 23 2022

The Story So Far

- Behaviour assumed in RFC9032
- Document Adopted March 2020
- Merged with draft-hushe-roll-dodag-metric after virtual interim meeting January 2021.
- Version -04 posted with merged document
- Reviews and Discussion Summer 2021
- Observation that changes to record interacts poorly with trickle, Summer 2021
- Proposal to not change rank in priority field, allow only DODAG root to set it only.
- But, this fails to satisfy desire to balance where nodes join in the tree.
 - new lollipop counter proposed as solution?

Still open Issues

- Trickle timer means that DIOs are not sent if there is no topology change.
 - So would changes to min priority be considered a change?
 - The DODAG size field could change quite often, particularly during network formation, how should it be dealt with?
- If updated min priority does not reset Trickle Timer, then this option needs to go into some new flooded control.
 - What are the desired properties of this new control, and what other things should go into it?
- New lollipop counter proposed to deal with changes
 - Alternatively, split up extension into two new extensions?


Discussion!


draft-ietf-roll-enrollment-priority-04




Auxiliary Slides Follow

Enhanced Beacon Samples




 Enhanced Beacons

Example enrollment priority



base diagram from PThubert

With impaired node (24)



IPv6 Neighbor Discovery Multicast Address Listener Registration

draft-ietf-6lo-multicast-registration

Pascal Thubert

IETF 113

Remote

6LoWPAN ND (IPv6 Stateful Address Autoconfiguration)

- [RFC 6775](#) (original 6LoWPAN ND)
 - Defines ARO for registration and DAD operations for stateful AAC
- [RFC 8505](#) (extended 6LoWPAN ND)
 - Extends ARO, updates the registration procedure
 - Allows registering to network services inc. proxy
- [RFC 8928](#) (Address Protection for ND)
 - Secures ownership and enables SAVI
- [RFC 8929](#) (Backbone Router – proxy ND)
 - Defines a proxy ND operation. Updates EDAR to transport ND options such as SLLAO.
- [draft-thubert-6lo-unicast-lookup](#) (Unicast Address lookup on backbone)
 - Allows the 6LBR to respond to lookups and saves broadcasts
- [draft-ietf-6lo-multicast-registration](#) (Anycast and Multicast Address Registration)
 - Registers anycast and multicast addresses (in addition to unicast per RFC 8505)

draft-ietf-6lo-multicast-registration

- Generated as a response to a request from Wi-Sun alliance
 - Remove the need for MLD, and its reactive broadcast REPORT polling
- Extends RFC 8505
 - New flags in the EARO to signal anycast and multicast
 - 6LN operation virtually unmodified, just setting the flags
 - New 6LR behavior that accepts multiple registration with different ROVR
- Extends RFC 9010 (RPL Unaware Leaves)
 - To inject the anycast and multicast addresses in RPL, with new flags
- Extends RFC 6550
 - New MOP for Non-Storing Multicast (MOP 5?), new DAO / RTO flags
 - New anycast support also in Storing Mode Multicast (MOP 3)

Changes in [draft-ietf-6lo-multicast-registration](#)

- Since IETF 112
 - Bumped from 02 to 04
 - Implicit registration of FF02::1 (-04)
 - How RFC 8928 is leveraged to secure addresses (-03)
 - Aligned draft-thubert-bess-secure-evpn-mac-signaling
- During IETF 112
 - Legacy anycast support and backward compatibility (-02)
 - Repurposing EDAR “status” field to carry A and M flags (-02)

New Non-Storing Multicast Mode of Operation

- MOP (?5) => manage collision with AODV-RPL
- 6LRs with listeners register the multicast and anycast address to the Root
 - New flags in DAO messages echo those in EARO
- Packets reach up to the Root as if unicast within the DODAG
- The Root performs Ingress Replication for multicast
 - to all the 6LRs that registered
 - Same encapsulation as external routes (RUL), SRH to the 6LR
 - 6LR decapsulates and distributes to all 6LNs that subscribed (new term)
- The Root performs Destination Selection for Anycast
 - Passes the anycast packet to only one 6LR

New RPL Anycast Operation

- For MOP 3 and the new MOP (?5), also MOP 1 for backward compatibility
- Indistinguishable from anycast, applies to both addresses and prefixes
- TID is irrelevant since multiple nodes can originate an advertisement
 - Multihomed mobile target should be advertised as unicast
- RPL advertises multiple paths as for multicast
 - A tree in Storing Mode, multiple paths at the Root in NS-mode
- But a packet follows only one of those paths
- No instruction for flow stickiness and load balancing given
- In case of collision (flag set / not set) consider all DAOs as anycast

Backward compatibility and deployment considerations

- Discusses interaction with other multicast protocols
 - e.g., Root performing MPL flooding instead of RPL Ingress Replication
- Allows single DODAG with MOP 1 for brown field
 - Support of multicast / anycast must be signaled otherwise (config, mgt)
 - 6LRs that support this spec signal so with 6CIO
- Incremental operation in DODAG with MOP 3
 - MOP 3 (Storing Mode with Multicast) extended to accepted anycast
 - Recognize legacy DAO multicast from address FF:: - Anycast / unicast collision is processed as anycast for all

Next steps

- Missing items?
- Getting a rough green light from this group
- Passing the token to ROLL for validation there as well

AOB?

Thank you very much for your attention