

6lo
Internet-Draft
Updates: 6775 (if approved)
Intended status: Standards Track
Expires: June 18, 2018

P. Thubert, Ed.
cisco
E. Nordmark
S. Chakrabarti
Verizon
C. Perkins
Futurewei
December 15, 2017

An Update to 6LoWPAN ND
draft-ietf-6lo-rfc6775-update-11

Commented [DT1]: Is there a better name? Maybe "Registration Extensions for 6LoWPAN Neighbor Discovery"?

RFC 6775 was named "Neighbor Discovery Optimization for IPv6 over Low-Power Wireless Personal Area Networks (6LoWPANs)"

Abstract

This specification updates RFC 6775 - 6LoWPAN Neighbor Discovery, to clarify the role of the protocol as a registration technique, simplify the registration operation in 6LoWPAN routers, as well as to provide enhancements to the registration capabilities and mobility detection for different network topologies including the backbone routers performing proxy Neighbor Discovery in a low power network.

Status of This Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of BCP 78 and BCP 79.

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <https://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on June 18, 2018.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2017 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to BCP 78 and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<https://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of

publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Applicability of Address Registration Options	3
3. Terminology	4
4. Updating RFC 6775	6
4.1. Extended Address Registration Option (EARO)	7
4.2. Transaction ID	7
4.2.1. Comparing TID values	7
4.3. Owner Unique ID	9
4.4. Extended Duplicate Address Messages	10
4.5. Registering the Target Address	10
4.6. Link-Local Addresses and Registration	11
4.7. Maintaining the Registration States	12
5. Detecting Enhanced ARO Capability Support	14
6. Extended ND Options And Messages	14
6.1. Enhanced Address Registration Option (EARO)	14
6.2. Extended Duplicate Address Message Formats	17
6.3. New 6LoWPAN Capability Bits in the Capability Indication Option	18
7. Backward Compatibility	18
7.1. Discovering the capabilities of an ND peer	18
7.1.1. Using the "E" Flag in the 6CIO	19
7.1.2. Using the "T" Flag in the EARO	19
7.2. Legacy 6LoWPAN Node	20
7.3. Legacy 6LoWPAN Router	20
7.4. Legacy 6LoWPAN Border Router	21
8. Security Considerations	21
9. Privacy Considerations	22
10. IANA Considerations	23
10.1. ARO Flags	23
10.2. ICMP Codes	23
10.3. New ARO Status values	24
10.4. New 6LoWPAN capability Bits	25
11. Acknowledgments	25
12. References	25
12.1. Normative References	25
12.2. Informative References	26
12.3. External Informative References	29
Appendix A. Applicability and Requirements Served	30
Appendix B. Requirements	30

B.1. Requirements Related to Mobility 31
 B.2. Requirements Related to Routing Protocols 31
 B.3. Requirements Related to the Variety of Low-Power Link
 types 32
 B.4. Requirements Related to Proxy Operations 33
 B.5. Requirements Related to Security 33
 B.6. Requirements Related to Scalability 34
 Authors' Addresses 35

1. Introduction

The scope of this draft is **an IPv6 Low Power Networks** including star and mesh topologies. This specification modifies and extends the behavior and protocol elements of "Neighbor Discovery Optimization for IPv6 over Low-Power Wireless Personal Area Networks" (6LoWPAN ND) [RFC6775] to enable additional capabilities and enhancements such as:

- o Support for indicating **mobility vs retry (T-bit)**
- o **Reduce requirement** of registration for link-local addresses
- o **Enhancement** to Address Registration Option (ARO)
- o Permitting registration of a **target address**
- o Clarification of support ~~of~~**for** privacy and temporary addresses

The applicability of 6LoWPAN ND registration is discussed in Section 2, and new extensions and updates to [RFC6775] are presented in Section 4. Considerations on Backward Compatibility, Security and Privacy are also elaborated upon in Section 7, Section 8 and in Section 9, respectively.

2. Applicability of Address Registration Options

The purpose of the Address Registration Option (ARO) in the **legacy** 6LoWPAN ND specification is to facilitate duplicate address detection (DAD) for hosts as well as **to** populate Neighbor Cache Entries (NCEs) [RFC4861] in the routers. This reduces the reliance on multicast operations, which are often as intrusive as broadcast, in IPv6 ND operations.

With this specification, a failed or useless registration can be detected for reasons other than address duplication. Examples include: the router having run out of space; a registration bearing a stale sequence number perhaps denoting a movement of the host after the registration was placed; a host misbehaving and attempting to register an invalid address such as the unspecified address

Commented [DT2]: Grammar: can't parse "an ... Networks"

Commented [DT3]: Can't understand this.

Commented [DT4]: Meaning what? Drop it from a MUST to a SHOULD or a MAY?

Commented [DT5]: Not useful phrasing. The intro sentence says "enhancements such as", and "enhancements such as enhancement" is cumbersome

Commented [DT6]: Any text before the terminology section should not use terms that can only be understood from the terminology section. Also elsewhere in the document "Target Address" is capitalized.

Commented [DT7]: I don't find this useful in an RFC because it's completely redundant with the Table of Contents above, so adds no value. This looks like something leftover from a research publication that had no TOC.

Commented [DT8]: This term often connotes "obsolete", or did you just mean "existing"?

[RFC4291]; or a host using an address ~~which-that~~ is not topologically correct on that link.

In such cases the host will receive an error to help diagnose the issue and may retry, possibly with a different address, and possibly registering to a different router, depending on the returned error. The ability to return errors to address registrations is not intended to be used to restrict the ability of hosts to form and use addresses, as recommended in "Host Address Availability Recommendations" [RFC7934].

In particular, the freedom to form and register addresses is needed for enhanced privacy; each host may register a number of addresses using mechanisms such as "Privacy Extensions for Stateless Address Autoconfiguration (SLAAC) in IPv6" [RFC4941].

In IPv6 ND [RFC4861], a router must have enough storage to hold ~~neighbor cache entries~~ NCEs for ~~all~~ the addresses to which it ~~may can~~ currently forward packets.

A router using the Address Registration mechanism also needs enough storage to hold NCEs for all the addresses that may be registered to it, regardless of whether or not they are actively communicating. The number of registrations supported by a 6LoWPAN Router (6LR) or 6LoWPAN Border Router (6LBR) must be clearly documented.

A network administrator should deploy updated 6LR/6LBRs to support the number and type of devices in his network, based on the number of IPv6 addresses that those devices require and their address renewal rate and behaviour.

3. Terminology

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

Readers are expected to be familiar with all the terms and concepts that are discussed in

- o "Neighbor Discovery for IP version 6" [RFC4861],
- o "IPv6 Stateless Address Autoconfiguration" [RFC4862],
- o "IPv6 over Low-Power Wireless Personal Area Networks (6LoWPANs): Overview, Assumptions, Problem Statement, and Goals" [RFC4919],
- o "Neighbor Discovery Optimization for Low-power and Lossy Networks" [RFC6775] and

Commented [DT9]: Parity of this phrase seems backwards, as RFC 7934 recommends against restricting. Rerword.

Commented [DT10]: This is a key wording change, as "all ... may" to me implies IPv6 ND must have every on-link address at all times, which is certainly not true.

Commented [DT11]: By whom? A vendor? Is this a normative requirement? If not, what is this talking about? Clarify.

Commented [DT12]: SHOULD? MUST?

Commented [DT13]: Inconsistent spelling throughout. Sometimes it's American (behavior), sometimes British (behaviour)

- o "Multi-link Subnet Support in IPv6" [I-D.ietf-ipv6-multilink-subnets],

as well as the following terminology:

Backbone Link: An IPv6 transit link that interconnects two or more Backbone Routers. It is expected to be a higher speed device ~~speed~~ compared to the LLN in order to carry the traffic that is required to federate multiple segments of the potentially large LLN into a single IPv6 subnet.

Backbone Router: A logical network function in an IPv6 router that federates a LLN over a Backbone Link. In order to do so, the Backbone Router (6BBR) proxies the 6LoWPAN ND operations detailed in ~~the~~ document onto the matching operations that run over the backbone, typically IPv6 ND. Note that 6BBR is a logical function, just like 6LR and 6LBR, and that ~~the~~ same physical router may operate all three.

Extended LLN: The aggregation of multiple LLNs as defined in [RFC4919], interconnected by a Backbone Link via Backbone Routers, and forming a single IPv6 MultiLink Subnet.

Registration: The process during which a 6LN registers its address(es) with the Border Router so the 6BBR can serve as proxy for ND operations over the Backbone.

Binding: The association between an IP address ~~with and~~ a MAC address, a port and/or other information about the node that owns the IP address.

Registered Node: The node for which the registration is performed, and which owns the fields in the ~~EARO~~ option.

Registering Node: The node that performs the registration to the 6BBR, which may proxy for the registered node.

Registered Address: An address owned by the Registered Node ~~node~~ that was or is being registered.

IPv6 ND: The IPv6 Neighbor Discovery protocol as specified in [RFC4861] and [RFC4862].

legacy: ~~a 6LN, a 6LR or a 6LBR~~ that supports [RFC6775] but not this specification.

updated: a 6LN, a 6LR or a 6LBR that supports this specification.

Commented [DT14]: This is only an informational reference, but used here in a way that would require it to be normative.

<https://www.ietf.org/iesg/statement/normative-informative.html> says "Normative references specify documents that **must be read to understand** or implement the technology in the new RFC". The sentence that says that "Readers are **expected to be familiar with** all the terms and concepts that are discussed in" this reference means it's saying that the reference "must be read to understand" this document, which makes it normative.

It is fine to reference drafts, but one must not have any drafts mentioned in this required prerequisite list.

Commented [DT15]: redundant

Commented [DT16]: which document? This one? RFC 6775?

Commented [DT17]: Expand acronym on first use in the doc

Commented [DT18]: redundant

Commented [DT19]: so "legacy" is being defined as a noun, as in "a legacy"? I don't think that's what you meant. Certainly that's not how bottom of page 6 uses it.

Commented [DT20]: So this is being defined as a noun?

4. Updating RFC 6775

This specification introduces the Extended Address Registration Option (EARO) based on the ARO as defined in [RFC6775]; in particular a "T" flag is added that MUST be set in NS messages when this specification is used, and echoed in NA messages to confirm that the protocol is supported.

The extensions to the ARO option are used in the Duplicate Address Request (DAR) and Duplicate Address Confirmation (DAC) messages, so as to convey the additional information all the way to the 6LBR. In turn the 6LBR may proxy the registration using IPv6 ND over a backbone as illustrated in Figure 1. Note that this specification avoids the extended DAR flow for Link Local Addresses in Route-Over mode.

Commented [DT21]: Meaning what? RFC 6775 only uses "route-over" to apply to a "topology" or "configuration", not a "mode".




Figure 1: (Re-)Registration Flow

In order to support various types of link layers, it is RECOMMENDED to allow multiple registrations, including for privacy / temporary addresses, and provides new mechanisms to help clean up stale registration states as soon as possible.

Commented [DT22]: Can't parse grammar. What is the subject that goes with this verb? Reword.

A Registering Node SHOULD prefer registering to a 6LR that is found to support this specification, as discussed in Section 7.1, over a legacy one.

4.1. Extended Address Registration Option (EARO)

The Extended ARO (EARO) **deprecates** the ARO and is backward compatible with it. More details on backward compatibility can be found in Section 7.

Commented [DT23]: In my view, *documents* deprecate things. Do you mean "replaces", or perhaps "obsoletes"?

The semantics of the ARO are modified as follows:

- o The address that is being registered with a Neighbor Solicitation (NS) with an EARO is now the Target Address, as opposed to the Source Address as specified in [RFC6775] (see Section 4.5). This change enables a 6LBR to use one of its addresses as source to the proxy-registration of an address that belongs to a LLN Node to a 6BBR. This also limits the use of an address as source address before it is registered and the associated DAD process is complete.
- o The Unique ID in the EARO Option is not required to be a MAC address (see Section 4.3).
- o The specification introduces a Transaction ID (TID) field in the EARO (see Section 4.2). The TID MUST be provided by a node that supports this specification and a new "T" flag MUST be set to indicate so.
- o Finally, this specification introduces new status codes to help diagnose the cause of a registration failure (see Table 1).

4.2. Transaction ID

The Transaction ID (TID) is a sequence number that is incremented with each re-registration. The TID is used to detect the freshness of the registration request and **useful** to detect one single registration by multiple 6LoWPAN border routers (e.g., 6LBRs and 6BBRs) supporting the same 6LoWPAN. The TID may also be used by the network to track the sequence of movements of a node in order to route to the current (freshest known) location of a moving node.

Commented [DT24]: Bad grammar, reword. Maybe just delete "useful"?

When a Registered Node is registered with multiple **6BBRs** in parallel, the same TID SHOULD be used, to **enable the 6BBRs to determine that the registrations are the same, and distinguish that situation from a movement**.

Commented [DT25]: BBR is not defined, only 6BBR

Commented [DT26]: What does it do differently? Maybe reference where the difference in behavior is specified.

4.2.1. Comparing TID values

The TID is a sequence counter and its operation is the exact match of the path sequence specified in RPL, the IPv6 Routing Protocol for Low-Power and Lossy Networks [RFC6550] specification.

In order to keep this document self-contained and yet compatible, the text below is an exact copy from section 7.2. "Sequence Counter Operation" of [RFC6550].

A TID is deemed to be fresher than another when its value is greater per the operations detailed in this section.

The TID range is subdivided in a 'lollipop' fashion ([Perlman83]), where the values from 128 and greater are used as a linear sequence to indicate a restart and bootstrap the counter, and the values less than or equal to 127 used as a circular sequence number space of size 128 as in [RFC1982]. Consideration is given to the mode of operation when transitioning from the linear region to the circular region. Finally, when operating in the circular region, if sequence numbers are detected to be too far apart then they are not comparable, as detailed below.

A window of comparison, `SEQUENCE_WINDOW = 16`, is configured based on a value of 2^N , where N is defined to be 4 in this specification.

For a given sequence counter,

1. The sequence counter SHOULD be initialized to an implementation defined value which is 128 or greater prior to use. A recommended value is 240 ($256 - \text{SEQUENCE_WINDOW}$).
2. When a sequence counter increment would cause the sequence counter to increment beyond its maximum value, the sequence counter MUST wrap back to zero. When incrementing a sequence counter greater than or equal to 128, the maximum value is 255. When incrementing a sequence counter less than 128, the maximum value is 127.
3. When comparing two sequence counters, the following rules MUST be applied:
 1. When a first sequence counter A is in the interval $[128..255]$ and a second sequence counter B is in $[0..127]$:
 1. If $(256 + B - A)$ is less than or equal to `SEQUENCE_WINDOW`, then B is greater than A , A is less than B , and the two are not equal.
 2. If $(256 + B - A)$ is greater than `SEQUENCE_WINDOW`, then A is greater than B , B is less than A , and the two are not equal.

For example, if A is 240, and B is 5, then $(256 + 5 - 240)$ is 21. 21 is greater than `SEQUENCE_WINDOW` (16), thus 240 is greater than 5. As another example, if A is 250 and B is 5, then $(256 + 5 - 250)$ is 11. 11 is less than `SEQUENCE_WINDOW` (16), thus 250 is less than 5.

2. In the case where both sequence counters to be compared are less than or equal to 127, and in the case where both sequence counters to be compared are greater than or equal to 128:
 1. If the absolute magnitude of difference between the two sequence counters is less than or equal to `SEQUENCE_WINDOW`, then a comparison as described in [RFC1982] is used to determine the relationships greater than, less than, and equal.
 2. If the absolute magnitude of difference of the two sequence counters is greater than `SEQUENCE_WINDOW`, then a desynchronization has occurred and the two sequence numbers are not comparable.
4. If two sequence numbers are determined to be not comparable, i.e. the results of the comparison are not defined, then a node should consider the comparison as if it has evaluated in such a way so as to give precedence to the sequence number that has most recently been observed to increment. Failing this, the node should consider the comparison as if it has evaluated in such a way so as to minimize the resulting changes to its own state.

4.3. Owner Unique ID

The Owner Unique ID (OUID) enables a duplicate address registration to be distinguished from a double registration or a movement. An ND message from the 6BBR over the Backbone that is proxied on behalf of a Registered Node must carry the most recent EARO option seen for that node. A NS/NA with an EARO and a NS/NA without a EARO thus represent different nodes; if they relate to a same target then an address duplication is likely.

The Owner Unique ID in [RFC6775] is an EUI-64 preconfigured address, under the assumption that duplicate EUI-64 addresses are avoided. With this specification, the Owner Unique ID is allowed to be extended to different types of identifier, as long as the type is clearly indicated. For instance, the type can be a cryptographic string and used to prove the ownership of the registration as discussed in "Address Protected Neighbor Discovery for Low-power and Lossy Networks" [I-D.ietf-6lo-ap-nd].

Commented [DT27]: What does the recipient do differently? Maybe reference where the difference in behavior is specified. (Section 4.7 I think is what should be referenced)

Commented [DT28]: Meaning what?

Commented [DT29]: No, the term "Owner Unique ID" never appears in RFC 6775. Need to explain here that you're referring to the EUI-64 field in RFC 6775 section 4.1.

Commented [DT30]: This sounds like manual configuration, which

The node SHOULD store the unique ID, or a way to generate that ID, in persistent memory. Otherwise, if a reboot causes a loss of memory, re-registering the same address could be impossible until the 6LBR times out the previous registration.

4.4. Extended Duplicate Address Messages

In order to map the new EARO content in the DAR/DAC messages, a new TID field is added to the Extended DAR (EDAR) and the Extended DAC (EDAC) messages as a replacement to a Reserved field, and an odd value of the ICMP Code indicates support for the TID, to transport the "T" flag.

In order to prepare for future extensions, and though no option has been defined for the Duplicate Address messages, implementations SHOULD expect ND options after the main body, and SHOULD ignore them.

As for the EARO, the Extended Duplicate Address messages are backward compatible with the legacy versions, and remarks concerning backwards compatibility for the protocol between the 6LN and the 6LR apply similarly between a 6LR and a 6LBR.

4.5. Registering the Target Address

The Registering Node is the node that performs the registration to the 6BBR. As in [RFC6775], it may be the Registered Node as well, in which case it registers one of its own addresses, and indicates its own MAC Address as Source Link Layer Address (SLLA) in the NS(EARO).

This specification adds the capability to proxy the registration operation on behalf of a Registered Node that is reachable over a LLN mesh. In that case, if the Registered Node is reachable from the 6BBR over a Mesh-Under mesh, the Registering Node indicates the MAC Address of the Registered Node as the SLLA in the NS(EARO). If the Registered Node is reachable over a Route-Over mesh from the Registering Node, the SLLA in the NS(ARO) is that of the Registering Node. This enables the Registering Node to attract the packets from the 6BBR and route them over the LLN to the Registered Node.

In order to enable the latter operation, this specification changes the behavior of the 6LN and the 6LR so that the Registered Address is found in the Target Address field of the NS and NA messages as opposed to the Source Address. With this convention, a TLLA option indicates the link-layer address of the 6LN that owns the address, whereas the SLLA Option in a NS message indicates that of the Registering Node, which can be the owner device, or a proxy.

Commented [DT31]: Such statements are not useful unless they're MUSTs. Otherwise you can never use them because you don't know what implementations might be doing with them.

The Registering Node is reachable from the 6LR, and is also the one expecting packets for the 6LN. Therefore, it MUST place its own Link Layer Address in the SLLA Option that MUST always be placed in a registration NS(EARO) message. This maintains compatibility with legacy 6LoWPAN ND [RFC6775].

4.6. Link-Local Addresses and Registration

Considering that LLN nodes are often not wired and may move, there is no guarantee that a Link-Local address stays unique between a potentially variable and unbounded set of neighboring nodes.

Compared to [RFC6775], this specification only requires that a Link-Local address is unique from the perspective of the two nodes that use it to communicate (e.g., the 6LN and the 6LR in an NS/NA exchange). This simplifies the DAD process in Route-Over Mode for Link-Local addresses, and there is no exchange of Duplicate Address messages between the 6LR and a 6LBR for Link-Local addresses.

In more details:

An exchange between two nodes using Link-Local addresses implies that they are reachable over one hop and that at least one of the 2 nodes acts as a 6LR. A node MUST register a Link-Local address to a 6LR in order to obtain reachability from that 6LR beyond the current exchange, and in particular to use the Link-Local address as source address to register other addresses, e.g., global addresses.

If there is no collision with an address previously registered to this 6LR by another 6LN, then the Link-Local address is unique from the standpoint of this 6LR and the registration is acceptable. Alternatively, two different 6LRs might expose the same Link-Local address but different link-layer addresses. In that case, a 6LN MUST only interact with one of the 6LRs.

The DAD process between the 6LR and a 6LBR, which is based on an exchange of Duplicate Address messages, does not need to take place for Link-Local addresses.

It is preferable for a 6LR to avoid modifying its state associated to the Source Address of an NS(EARO) message. For that reason, when possible, an address that is already registered with a 6LR SHOULD be used by a 6LN.

When registering to a 6LR that conforms to this specification, a node MUST use a Link-Local address as the source address of the registration, whatever the type of IPv6 address that is being

Commented [DT32]: RFC 6775 never uses this term

Commented [DT33]: Fix grammar

registered. That Link-Local Address MUST be either already registered, or the address that is being registered.

When a Registering Node does not have an already-Registered Address, it MUST register a Link-Local address, using it as both the Source and the Target Address of an NS(EARO) message. In that case, it is RECOMMENDED to use a Link-Local address that is (expected to be) globally unique, e.g., derived from a globally unique hardware MAC address. An EARO option in the response NA indicates that the 6LR supports this specification.

Since there is no Duplicate Address exchange for Link-Local addresses, the 6LR may answer immediately to the registration of a Link-Local address, based solely on its existing state and the Source Link-Layer Option that MUST be placed in the NS(EARO) message as required in [RFC6775].

A node needs to register its IPv6 Global Unicast IPv6 Addresses (GUAs) to a 6LR in order to establish global reachability for these addresses via that 6LR. When registering with an updated 6LR, a Registering Node does not use ~~its-a~~ GUA as Source Address, in contrast to a node that complies to [RFC6775]. For non-Link-Local addresses, the Duplicate Address exchange MUST conform to [RFC6775], but the extended formats described in this specification for the DAR and the DAC are used to relay the extended information in the case of an EARO.

Commented [DT34]: Word change to not imply it can only have one GUA

4.7. Maintaining the Registration States

This section discusses protocol actions that involve the Registering Node, the 6LR and the 6LBR. It must be noted that the portion that deals with a 6LBR only applies to those addresses that are registered to it; as discussed in Section 4.6, this is not the case for Link-Local addresses. The registration state includes all data that is stored in the router relative to that registration, in particular, but not limited to, an NCE in a 6LR. 6LBRs and 6BBRs may store additional registration information in more complex data structures and use protocols that are out of scope of this document to keep them synchronized when they are distributed.

Commented [DT35]: typo

When its Neighbor Cache is full, a 6LR cannot accept a new registration. In that situation, the EARO is returned in a NA message with a Status of 2, and the Registering Node may attempt to register to another 6LR.

Commented [DT36]: Question: Is it illegal for a 6LR to support both registration and normal ND? If not, then couldn't it simply evict a normal (not registered) NCE instead of failing the registration?

If the registry in the 6LBR is be saturated, in which case the LBR cannot guarantee that a new address is effectively not a duplicate. In that case, the 6LBR replies to an EDAR message with an EDAC message

Commented [DT37]: Can't parse grammar

that carries a Status code 9 indicating "6LBR Registry saturated", and the address stays in TENTATIVE state. Note: this code is used by 6LBRs instead of Status 2 when responding to a Duplicate Address message exchange and is passed on to the Registering Node by the 6LR. There is no point for the node to retry this registration immediately via another 6LR, since the problem is global to the network. The node may either abandon that address, deregister other addresses first to make room, or keep the address in TENTATIVE state and retry later.

A node renews an existing registration by sending a new NS (EARO) message for the Registered Address. In order to refresh the registration state in the 6LBR, the registration MUST be reported to the 6LBR.

A node that ceases to use an address SHOULD attempt to deregister that address from all the 6LRs to which it has registered the address, which is achieved using an NS (EARO) message with a Registration Lifetime of 0.

A node that moves away from a particular 6LR SHOULD attempt to deregister all of its addresses registered to that 6LR and register to a new 6LR with an incremented TID. When/if the node shows up elsewhere, an asynchronous NA (EARO) or EDAC message with a status of 3 "Moved" SHOULD be used to clean up the state in the previous location. For instance, the "Moved" status can be used by a 6BBR in an NA (EARO) message to indicate that the ownership of the proxy state on the Backbone was transferred to another 6BBR, as the consequence of a movement of the device. The receiver of the message SHOULD propagate the status down the chain towards the Registered node and clean up its state.

Upon receiving an NS (EARO) message with a Registration Lifetime of 0 and determining that this EARO is the freshest for a given NCE (see Section 4.2), a 6LR cleans up its NCE. If the address was registered to the 6LBR, then the 6LR MUST report to the 6LBR, through a Duplicate Address exchange with the 6LBR, or an alternate protocol, indicating the null Registration Lifetime and the latest TID that this 6LR is aware of.

Upon receiving the Extended DAR message, the 6LBR evaluates if this is the most recent TID it has received for that particular registry entry. If so, then the entry is scheduled to be removed, and the EDAR is answered with an EDAC message bearing a Status of 0 ("Success"). Otherwise, a Status 3 ("Moved") is returned instead, and the existing entry is maintained.

Commented [DT38]: What alternatives are legal? Is the only legal alternative to do nothing, or could it propagate the status but not clean up state, or could it clean up state and not propagate the status, or could it do anything it wants? (Halt and Catch Fire? there's also a "nasal demons" joke...)

When an address is scheduled to be removed, the 6LBR SHOULD keep its entry in a DELAY state for a configurable period of time, so as to protect a mobile node that deregistered from one 6LR and did not register yet to a new one, or the new registration did not reach yet the 6LBR due to propagation delays in the network. Once the DELAY time is passed, the 6LBR removes silently its entry.

5. Detecting Enhanced ARO Capability Support

The "Generic Header Compression for IPv6 over 6LoWPANs" [RFC7400] introduces the 6LoWPAN Capability Indication Option (6CIO) to indicate a node's capabilities to its peers.

Section 6.3 defines new flags for the 6CIO to signal support for EARO, as well as the node's capability to act as a 6LR, 6LBR and 6BBR. Section 7.1.1 specifies how the "E" flag can be used to provide backward compatibility.

The 6CIO is typically sent in a Router Solicitation (RS) message. When used to signal capabilities per this specification, the 6CIO is typically present in Router Advertisement (RA) messages but can also be present in RS, Neighbor Solicitation (NS) and Neighbor Advertisement (NA) messages.

6. Extended ND Options And Messages

This specification does not introduce new options, but it modifies existing ones and updates the associated behaviors as specified in the following subsections.

6.1. Enhanced Address Registration Option (EARO)

The Address Registration Option (ARO) is defined in section 4.1- of [RFC6775].

The Enhanced Address Registration Option (EARO) updates the ARO option within Neighbor Discovery NS and NA messages between a 6LN and its 6LR. On the other hand, the Extended Duplicate Address messages, EDAR and EDAC, replace the DAR and DAC messages so as to transport the new information between 6LRs and 6LBRs across LLNs meshes such as 6TiSCH networks.

An NS message with an EARO option is a registration if and only if it also carries an SLLAO option. The EARO option also used in NS and NA messages between Backbone Routers over the Backbone link to sort out the distributed registration state; in that case, it does not carry the SLLAO option and is not confused with a registration.

When using the EARO option, the address being registered is found in the Target Address field of the NS and NA messages.

The EARO extends the ARO and is indicated by the "T" flag set. The format of the EARO option is as follows:




Figure 2: EARO

Option Fields

- Type: 33
- Length: 8-bit unsigned integer. The length of the option in units of 8 bytes. Always 2.
- Status: 8-bit unsigned integer. Indicates the status of a registration in the NA response. MUST be set to 0 in NS messages. See Table 1 below.

Value	Description
0..2	See [RFC6775]. Note: a Status of 1 "Duplicate Address" applies to the Registered Address. If the Source Address conflicts with an existing registration, "Duplicate Source Address" should be used.
3	Moved: The registration fails because it is not the freshest. This Status indicates that the registration is rejected because another more recent registration was done, as indicated by a same OUI and a more recent TID. One possible cause is a stale registration that has progressed slowly in the network and was passed by a more recent one. It could also indicate a OUI collision.
4	Removed: The binding state was removed. This may be

	placed in an asynchronous NS(ARO) message, or as the rejection of a proxy registration to a Backbone Router
5	Validation Requested: The Registering Node is challenged for owning the Registered Address or for being an acceptable proxy for the registration. This Status is expected in asynchronous messages from a registrar (6LR, 6LBR, 6BBR) to indicate that the registration state is removed, for instance due to a movement of the device.
6	Duplicate Source Address: The address used as source of the NS(ARO) conflicts with an existing registration.
7	Invalid Source Address: The address used as source of the NS(ARO) is not a Link-Local address as prescribed by this document.
8	Registered Address topologically incorrect: The address being registered is not usable on this link, e.g., it is not topologically correct
9	6LBR Registry saturated: A new registration cannot be accepted because the 6LBR Registry is saturated. Note: this code is used by 6LBRs instead of Status 2 when responding to a Duplicate Address message exchange and <u>is</u> passed on to the Registering Node by the 6LR.
10	Validation Failed: The proof of ownership of the registered address is not correct.

Table 1: EARO Status

Reserved:	This field is unused. It MUST be initialized to zero by the sender and MUST be ignored by the receiver.
T:	One bit flag. Set if the next octet is a used as a TID.
TID:	1-byte integer; a transaction id that is maintained by the node and incremented with each transaction. The node SHOULD maintain the TID in a persistent storage.
Registration Lifetime:	16-bit integer; expressed in minutes. 0 means that the registration has ended and the associated state should be removed.

Owner Unique Identifier (OUI): 8 bytes; same definition and processing as the OUI in the EARO option as defined in Section 6.1.

6.3. New 6LoWPAN Capability Bits in the Capability Indication Option

This specification defines new capability bits for use in the 6CIO, which was introduced by [RFC7400] for use in IPv6 ND RA messages.

Routers that support this specification SHOULD set the "E" flag and 6LN SHOULD favor 6LR routers that support this specification over those that do not. Routers that are capable of acting as 6LR, 6LBR and 6BBR SHOULD set the "L", "B" and "P" flags, respectively. In particular, the function 6LR is often collocated with that of 6LBR.

Those flags are not mutually exclusive and if a router is capable of performing multiple functions, it SHOULD set all the related flags.




Figure 4: New capability Bits L, B, P, E in the 6CIO

Option Fields

Type: 36

- L: Node is a 6LR, it can take registrations.
- B: Node is a 6LBR.
- P: Node is a 6BBR, proxying for nodes on this link.
- E: This specification is supported and applied.

7. Backward Compatibility

7.1. Discovering the capabilities of an ND peer

7.1.1. Using the "E" Flag in the 6CIO

If the 6CIO is used in an ND message and the sending node supports this specification, then the "E" Flag MUST be set.

A router that supports this specification SHOULD indicate that with a 6CIO.

If the Registering Node (RN) receives a 6CIO in a Router Advertisement message, then the setting of the "E" Flag indicates whether or not this specification is supported.

7.1.2. Using the "T" Flag in the EARO

One alternate way for a 6LN to discover the router's capabilities to first register a Link Local address, placing the same address in the Source and Target Address fields of the NS message, and setting the "T" Flag. The node may for instance register an address that is based on [an EUI-64](#). For such [an](#) address, DAD is not required and using the SLLAO option in the NS is actually more consistent with existing ND specifications such as the "Optimistic Duplicate Address Detection (DAD) for IPv6" [RFC4429].

Once its first registration is complete, the node knows from the setting of the "T" Flag in the response whether the router supports this specification. If support is verified, the node may register other addresses that it owns, or proxy-register addresses on behalf of some another node, indicating those addresses being registered in the Target Address field of the NS messages, while using one of its own previously registered addresses as source.

A node that supports this specification MUST always use an EARO as a replacement to an ARO in its registration to a router. This is harmless since the "T" flag and TID field are reserved in [RFC6775], and are ignored by a legacy router. A router that supports this specification answers an ARO with an ARO and answers an EARO with an EARO.

This specification changes the behavior of the peers in [a](#) registration flows. To enable backward compatibility, a 6LB that registers to a 6LR that is not known to support this specification MUST behave in a manner that is compatible with [RFC6775]. A 6LN can achieve that by sending a NS(EARO) message with a Link-Local Address used as both Source and Target Address, as described in Section 4.6. Once the 6LR is known to support this specification, the 6LN MUST obey this specification.

Commented [DT40]: Fix grammar ("a ... flows")

7.2. Legacy 6LoWPAN Node

A legacy 6LN will use the Registered Address as source and will not use an EARO option. An updated 6LR MUST accept that registration if it is valid per [RFC6775], and it MUST manage the binding cache accordingly. The updated 6LR MUST then use the legacy Duplicate Address messages as specified in [RFC6775] to indicate to the 6LBR that the TID is not present in the messages.

The main difference ~~with-from~~ [RFC6775] is that ~~the~~ Duplicate Address exchange for DAD is avoided for Link-Local addresses. In any case, the 6LR SHOULD use an EARO in the reply, and ~~may~~ use any of the Status codes defined in this specification.

Commented [DT41]: "can"? (I don't think you mean MAY, which is how I read it due to the use of SHOULD earlier in the sentence.)

7.3. Legacy 6LoWPAN Router

The first registration by an updated 6LN MUST be for a Link-Local address, using that Link-Local address as source. A legacy 6LR will ~~not make a difference~~ and treat that registration as if the 6LN was a legacy node.

Commented [DT42]: This phrase is confusing, but reads it fine without it

An updated 6LN will always use an EARO option in the registration NS message, whereas a legacy 6LR will always reply with an ARO option in the NA message. From that first registration, the updated 6LN can determine whether or not the 6LR supports this specification.

After detecting a legacy 6LR, an updated 6LN may attempt to find an alternate 6LR that is updated.

An updated 6LN SHOULD use an EARO in the request regardless of the type of 6LR, legacy or updated, which implies that the "T" flag is set.

If an updated 6LN moves from an updated 6LR to a legacy 6LR, the legacy 6LR will send a legacy DAR message, which can not be compared with an updated one for freshness.

Allowing legacy DAR messages to replace a state established by the updated protocol in the 6LBR would be an attack vector and that cannot be the default behavior.

But if legacy and updated 6LRs coexist temporarily in a network, then it makes sense for an administrator to install a policy that allows so, and the capability to install such a policy should be configurable in a 6LBR though it is out of scope for this document.

7.4. Legacy 6LoWPAN Border Router

With this specification, the Duplicate Address messages are extended to transport the EARO information. Similarly to the NS/NA exchange, updated 6LBR devices always use the Extended Duplicate Address messages and all the associated behavior so they can ~~always~~ be differentiated from legacy ones.

Commented [DT43]: typo

Note that a legacy 6LBR will accept and process an EDAR message as if it ~~was-were~~ a legacy DAR, so legacy support of DAD is preserved.

8. Security Considerations

This specification extends [RFC6775], and the security section of that draft also applies to this as well. In particular, it is expected that the link layer is sufficiently protected to prevent a rogue access, either by means of physical or IP security on the Backbone Link and link layer cryptography on the LLN.

This specification also expects that the LLN MAC provides secure unicast to/from the Backbone Router and secure ~~Broadcast~~ from the Backbone Router in a way that prevents tempering with or replaying the RA messages.

Commented [DT44]: ... or Multicast?

This specification recommends ~~to using~~ privacy techniques (see Section 9, and protection against address theft such as provided by "Address Protected Neighbor Discovery for Low-power and Lossy Networks" [I-D.ietf-6lo-ap-nd], which guarantees the ownership of the Registered Address using a cryptographic OUID.

Commented [DT45]: Fix grammar

Commented [DT46]: Unmatched paren

The registration mechanism may be used by a rogue node to attack the 6LR or the 6LBR with a Denial-of-Service attack against the registry. It may also happen that the registry of a 6LR or a 6LBR is saturated and cannot take any more registrations, which effectively denies the requesting a node the capability to use a new address. In order to alleviate those concerns, Section 4.7 provides a number of recommendations that ensure that a stale registration is removed as soon as possible from the 6LR and 6LBR. In particular, this specification recommends that:

- o A node that ceases to use an address SHOULD attempt to deregister that address from all the 6LRs to which it is registered. See Section 4.2 for the mechanism to avoid replay attacks and avoiding the use of stale registration information.
- o The Registration lifetimes SHOULD be individually configurable for each address or group of addresses. The nodes SHOULD be configured with a Registration Lifetime that reflects their

expectation of how long they will use the address with the 6LR to which it is registered. In particular, use cases that involve mobility or rapid address changes SHOULD use lifetimes that are larger yet of a same order as the duration of the expectation of presence.

- o The router (6LR or 6LBR) SHOULD be configurable so as to limit the number of addresses that can be registered by a single node, as identified at least by MAC address and preferably by security credentials. When that maximum is reached, the router should use a Least-Recently-Used (LRU) algorithm to clean up the addresses, keeping at least one Link-Local address. The router SHOULD attempt to keep one or more stable addresses if stability can be determined, e.g., from the way the IID is formed or because they are used over a much longer time span than other (privacy, shorter-lived) addresses. Address lifetimes SHOULD be individually configurable.
- o In order to avoid denial of registration for the lack of resources, administrators should take great care to deploy adequate numbers of 6LRs to cover the needs of the nodes in their range, so as to avoid a situation of starving nodes. It is expected that the 6LBR that serves an LLN is a more capable node than the average 6LR, but in a network condition where it may become saturated, a particular deployment should distribute the 6LBR functionality, for instance by leveraging a high speed Backbone and Backbone Routers to aggregate multiple LLNs into a larger subnet.

The LLN nodes depend on the 6LBR and the 6BBR 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, or bombing attack whereby an impersonated 6LBR would destroy state in the network by using the "Removed" Status code.

9. Privacy Considerations

As indicated in ~~section~~ Section 2, this protocol does not aim at limiting the number of IPv6 addresses that a device can form. A host should be able to form and register any address that is topologically correct in the subnet(s) advertised by the 6LR/6LBR.

This specification does not mandate any particular way for forming IPv6 addresses, but it discourages using EUI-64 for forming the Interface ID in the Link-Local address because this method prevents the usage of "SEcure Neighbor Discovery (SEND)" [RFC3971] and "Cryptographically Generated Addresses (CGA)" [RFC3972], and that of address privacy techniques.

Commented [DT47]: This seems to contradict the first sentence of section 9

Commented [DT48]: Better to use SHOULD or RECOMMENDED. Otherwise you're vulnerable to attack if you allow arbitrary nodes (which can use say random MAC addresses to act as many nodes).

Commented [DT49]: I don't think anyone other than the node with the IID can or should infer anything about the way the IID is formed, just by looking at the IID.

Commented [DT50]: typo

Commented [DT51]: redundant

Commented [DT52]: This seems to contradict the SHOULD in section 8 bullet 3

"Privacy Considerations for IPv6 Adaptation-Layer Mechanisms" [RFC8065] explains why privacy is important and how to form such addresses. All implementations and deployment must consider the option of privacy addresses in their own environment. Also future specifications involving 6LoWPAN Neighbor Discovery should consult "Recommendation on Stable IPv6 Interface Identifiers" [RFC8064] for default interface identification.

Commented [DT53]: typo

10. IANA Considerations

IANA is requested to make a number of changes under the "Internet Control Message Protocol version 6 (ICMPv6) Parameters" registry, as follows.

10.1. ARO Flags

IANA is requested to create a new subregistry for "ARO Flags". This specification defines 8 positions, bit 0 to bit 7, and assigns bit 7 for the "T" flag in Section 6.1. The policy is "IETF Review" or "IESG Approval" [RFC8126]. The initial content of the registry is as shown in Table 2.

New subregistry for ARO Flags under the "Internet Control Message Protocol version 6 (ICMPv6) [RFC4443] Parameters"

ARO Status	Description	Document
0..6	Unassigned	
7	"T" Flag	This RFC

Table 2: new ARO Flags

10.2. ICMP Codes

IANA is requested to create a new entry in the ICMPv6 "Code" Fields subregistry of the Internet Control Message Protocol version 6 (ICMPv6) Parameters for the ICMP codes related to the ICMP type 157 and 158 Duplicate Address Request (shown in Table 3) and Confirmation (shown in Table 4), respectively, as follows:

New entries for ICMP types 157 DAR message

Code	Name	Reference
0	Original DAR message	RFC 6775
1	Extended DAR message	This RFC

Table 3: new ICMPv6 Code Fields

New entries for ICMP types 158 DAC message

Code	Name	Reference
0	Original DAC message	RFC 6775
1	Extended DAC message	This RFC

Table 4: new ICMPv6 Code Fields

10.3. New ARO Status values

IANA is requested to make additions to the Address Registration Option Status Values Registry as follows:

Address Registration Option Status Values Registry

ARO Status	Description	Document
3	Moved	This RFC
4	Removed	This RFC
5	Validation Requested	This RFC
6	Duplicate Source Address	This RFC
7	Invalid Source Address	This RFC
8	Registered Address topologically incorrect	This RFC
9	6LBR registry saturated	This RFC
10	Validation Failed	This RFC

Table 5: New ARO Status values

10.4. New 6LoWPAN capability Bits

IANA is requested to make additions to the Subregistry for "6LoWPAN capability Bits" as follows:

Subregistry for "6LoWPAN capability Bits" under the "Internet Control Message Protocol version 6 (ICMPv6) Parameters"

Capability Bit	Description	Document
11	6LR capable (L bit)	This RFC
12	6LBR capable (B bit)	This RFC
13	6BBR capable (P bit)	This RFC
14	EARO support (E bit)	This RFC

Table 6: New 6LoWPAN capability Bits

11. Acknowledgments

Kudos to Eric Levy-Abegnoli who designed the First Hop Security infrastructure upon which the first backbone router was implemented. Many thanks to Sedat Gormus, Rahul Jadhav and Lorenzo Colitti for their various contributions and reviews. Also many thanks to Thomas Watteyne for his early implementation of a 6LN that was instrumental to the early tests of the 6LR, 6LBR and Backbone Router.

12. References

12.1. Normative References

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.
- [RFC4291] Hinden, R. and S. Deering, "IP Version 6 Addressing Architecture", RFC 4291, DOI 10.17487/RFC4291, February 2006, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4291>>.
- [RFC4443] Conta, A., Deering, S., and M. Gupta, Ed., "Internet Control Message Protocol (ICMPv6) for the Internet Protocol Version 6 (IPv6) Specification", STD 89, RFC 4443, DOI 10.17487/RFC4443, March 2006, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4443>>.

- [RFC4861] Narten, T., Nordmark, E., Simpson, W., and H. Soliman, "Neighbor Discovery for IP version 6 (IPv6)", RFC 4861, DOI 10.17487/RFC4861, September 2007, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4861>>.
- [RFC4862] Thomson, S., Narten, T., and T. Jinmei, "IPv6 Stateless Address Autoconfiguration", RFC 4862, DOI 10.17487/RFC4862, September 2007, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4862>>.
- [RFC6282] Hui, J., Ed. and P. Thubert, "Compression Format for IPv6 Datagrams over IEEE 802.15.4-Based Networks", RFC 6282, DOI 10.17487/RFC6282, September 2011, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6282>>.
- [RFC6775] Shelby, Z., Ed., Chakrabarti, S., Nordmark, E., and C. Bormann, "Neighbor Discovery Optimization for IPv6 over Low-Power Wireless Personal Area Networks (6LoWPANs)", RFC 6775, DOI 10.17487/RFC6775, November 2012, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6775>>.
- [RFC7400] Bormann, C., "6LoWPAN-GHC: Generic Header Compression for IPv6 over Low-Power Wireless Personal Area Networks (6LoWPANs)", RFC 7400, DOI 10.17487/RFC7400, November 2014, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7400>>.
- [RFC8126] Cotton, M., Leiba, B., and T. Narten, "Guidelines for Writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs", BCP 26, RFC 8126, DOI 10.17487/RFC8126, June 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8126>>.

12.2. Informative References

- [I-D.chakrabarti-nordmark-6man-efficient-nd]
Chakrabarti, S., Nordmark, E., Thubert, P., and M. Wasserman, "IPv6 Neighbor Discovery Optimizations for Wired and Wireless Networks", draft-chakrabarti-nordmark-6man-efficient-nd-07 (work in progress), February 2015.
- [I-D.delcarpio-6lo-wlanah]
Vega, L., Robles, I., and R. Morabito, "IPv6 over 802.11ah", draft-delcarpio-6lo-wlanah-01 (work in progress), October 2015.

- [I-D.ietf-6lo-ap-nd]
Sarikaya, B., Thubert, P., and M. Sethi, "Address Protected Neighbor Discovery for Low-power and Lossy Networks", draft-ietf-6lo-ap-nd-04 (work in progress), November 2017.
- [I-D.ietf-6lo-backbone-router]
Thubert, P., "IPv6 Backbone Router", draft-ietf-6lo-backbone-router-04 (work in progress), July 2017.
- [I-D.ietf-6lo-nfc]
Choi, Y., Hong, Y., Youn, J., Kim, D., and J. Choi, "Transmission of IPv6 Packets over Near Field Communication", draft-ietf-6lo-nfc-08 (work in progress), October 2017.
- [I-D.ietf-6tisch-architecture]
Thubert, P., "An Architecture for IPv6 over the TSCH mode of IEEE 802.15.4", draft-ietf-6tisch-architecture-13 (work in progress), November 2017.
- [I-D.ietf-bier-architecture]
Wijnands, I., Rosen, E., Dolganow, A., Przygienda, T., and S. Aldrin, "Multicast using Bit Index Explicit Replication", draft-ietf-bier-architecture-08 (work in progress), September 2017.
- [I-D.ietf-ipv6-multilink-subnets]
Thaler, D. and C. Huitema, "Multi-link Subnet Support in IPv6", draft-ietf-ipv6-multilink-subnets-00 (work in progress), July 2002.
- [I-D.popa-6lo-6loplc-ipv6-over-ieee19012-networks]
Popa, D. and J. Hui, "6LoPLC: Transmission of IPv6 Packets over IEEE 1901.2 Narrowband Powerline Communication Networks", draft-popa-6lo-6loplc-ipv6-over-ieee19012-networks-00 (work in progress), March 2014.
- [RFC1982] Elz, R. and R. Bush, "Serial Number Arithmetic", RFC 1982, DOI 10.17487/RFC1982, August 1996, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc1982>>.
- [RFC3610] Whiting, D., Housley, R., and N. Ferguson, "Counter with CBC-MAC (CCM)", RFC 3610, DOI 10.17487/RFC3610, September 2003, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3610>>.

- [RFC3810] Vida, R., Ed. and L. Costa, Ed., "Multicast Listener Discovery Version 2 (MLDv2) for IPv6", RFC 3810, DOI 10.17487/RFC3810, June 2004, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3810>>.
- [RFC3971] Arkko, J., Ed., Kempf, J., Zill, B., and P. Nikander, "SEcure Neighbor Discovery (SEND)", RFC 3971, DOI 10.17487/RFC3971, March 2005, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3971>>.
- [RFC3972] Aura, T., "Cryptographically Generated Addresses (CGA)", RFC 3972, DOI 10.17487/RFC3972, March 2005, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3972>>.
- [RFC4429] Moore, N., "Optimistic Duplicate Address Detection (DAD) for IPv6", RFC 4429, DOI 10.17487/RFC4429, April 2006, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4429>>.
- [RFC4919] Kushalnagar, N., Montenegro, G., and C. Schumacher, "IPv6 over Low-Power Wireless Personal Area Networks (6LoWPANs): Overview, Assumptions, Problem Statement, and Goals", RFC 4919, DOI 10.17487/RFC4919, August 2007, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4919>>.
- [RFC4941] Narten, T., Draves, R., and S. Krishnan, "Privacy Extensions for Stateless Address Autoconfiguration in IPv6", RFC 4941, DOI 10.17487/RFC4941, September 2007, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4941>>.
- [RFC6550] Winter, T., Ed., Thubert, P., Ed., Brandt, A., Hui, J., Kelsey, R., Levis, P., Pister, K., Struik, R., Vasseur, JP., and R. Alexander, "RPL: IPv6 Routing Protocol for Low-Power and Lossy Networks", RFC 6550, DOI 10.17487/RFC6550, March 2012, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6550>>.
- [RFC7217] Gont, F., "A Method for Generating Semantically Opaque Interface Identifiers with IPv6 Stateless Address Autoconfiguration (SLAAC)", RFC 7217, DOI 10.17487/RFC7217, April 2014, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7217>>.
- [RFC7428] Brandt, A. and J. Buron, "Transmission of IPv6 Packets over ITU-T G.9959 Networks", RFC 7428, DOI 10.17487/RFC7428, February 2015, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7428>>.

- [RFC7668] Nieminen, J., Savolainen, T., Isomaki, M., Patil, B., Shelby, Z., and C. Gomez, "IPv6 over BLUETOOTH(R) Low Energy", RFC 7668, DOI 10.17487/RFC7668, October 2015, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7668>>.
- [RFC7934] Colitti, L., Cerf, V., Cheshire, S., and D. Schinazi, "Host Address Availability Recommendations", BCP 204, RFC 7934, DOI 10.17487/RFC7934, July 2016, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7934>>.
- [RFC8064] Gont, F., Cooper, A., Thaler, D., and W. Liu, "Recommendation on Stable IPv6 Interface Identifiers", RFC 8064, DOI 10.17487/RFC8064, February 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8064>>.
- [RFC8065] Thaler, D., "Privacy Considerations for IPv6 Adaptation-Layer Mechanisms", RFC 8065, DOI 10.17487/RFC8065, February 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8065>>.
- [RFC8105] Mariager, P., Petersen, J., Ed., Shelby, Z., Van de Logt, M., and D. Barthel, "Transmission of IPv6 Packets over Digital Enhanced Cordless Telecommunications (DECT) Ultra Low Energy (ULE)", RFC 8105, DOI 10.17487/RFC8105, May 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8105>>.
- [RFC8163] Lynn, K., Ed., Martocci, J., Neilson, C., and S. Donaldson, "Transmission of IPv6 over Master-Slave/Token-Passing (MS/TP) Networks", RFC 8163, DOI 10.17487/RFC8163, May 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8163>>.

12.3. External Informative References

- [IEEEstd802154]
IEEE, "IEEE Standard for Low-Rate Wireless Networks", IEEE Standard 802.15.4, DOI 10.1109/IEEE P802.15.4-REVd/D01, June 2017, <<http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/7460875/>>.
- [Perlman83]
Perlman, R., "Fault-Tolerant Broadcast of Routing Information", North-Holland Computer Networks 7: 395-405, 1983, <<http://www.cs.illinois.edu/~pbq/courses/cs598fa09/readings/p83.pdf>>.

Appendix A. Applicability and Requirements Served

This specification extends 6LoWPAN ND to sequence the registration and serves the requirements expressed in Appendix B.1 by enabling the mobility of devices from one LLN to the next based on the complementary work in the "IPv6 Backbone Router" [I-D.ietf-6lo-backbone-router] specification.

In the context of the ~~the~~ TimeSlotted Channel Hopping (TSCH) mode of IEEE Std. 802.15.4 [IEEEstd802154], the "6TiSCH architecture" [I-D.ietf-6tisch-architecture] introduces how a 6LoWPAN ND host could connect to the Internet via a RPL mesh Network, but this requires additions to the 6LoWPAN ND protocol to support mobility and reachability in a secured and manageable environment. This specification details the new operations that are required to implement the 6TiSCH architecture and serves the requirements listed in Appendix B.2.

The term LLN is used loosely in this specification to cover multiple types of WLANs and WPANs, including Low-Power Wi-Fi, BLUETOOTH(R) Low Energy, IEEE Std.802.11AH and IEEE Std.802.15.4 wireless meshes, so as to address the requirements discussed in Appendix B.3.

This specification can be used by any wireless node to associate at Layer-3 with a 6BBR and register its IPv6 addresses to obtain routing services including proxy-ND operations over the Backbone, effectively providing a solution to the requirements expressed in Appendix B.4.

"Efficiency aware IPv6 Neighbor Discovery Optimizations" [I-D.chakrabarti-nordmark-6man-efficient-nd] suggests that 6LoWPAN ND [RFC6775] can be extended to other types of links beyond IEEE Std. 802.15.4 for which it was defined. The registration technique is beneficial when the Link-Layer technique used to carry IPv6 multicast packets is not sufficiently efficient in terms of delivery ratio or energy consumption in the end devices, in particular to enable energy-constrained sleeping nodes. The value of such an extension is especially apparent in the case of mobile wireless nodes, to reduce the multicast operations that are related to IPv6 ND ([RFC4861], [RFC4862]) and plague the wireless medium. This serves scalability requirements listed in Appendix B.6.

Appendix B. Requirements

This section lists requirements that were discussed ~~at-by the~~ 6lo WG for an update to 6LoWPAN ND. This specification meets most of them, but those listed in Appendix B.5 ~~which~~ are deferred to a different specification such as [I-D.ietf-6lo-ap-nd], and those related to multicast.

Commented [DT54]: redundant

Commented [DT55]: Can't parse grammar of this sentence

B.1. Requirements Related to Mobility

Due to the unstable nature of LLN links, even in a LLN of immobile nodes a 6LN may change its point of attachment to a 6LR, say 6LR-a, and may not be able to notify 6LR-a. Consequently, 6LR-a may still attract traffic that it cannot deliver any more. When links to a 6LR change state, there is thus a need to identify stale states in a 6LR and restore reachability in a timely fashion.

Req1.1: Upon a change of point of attachment, connectivity via a new 6LR MUST be **restored timely** without the need to de-register from the previous 6LR.

Req1.2: For that purpose, the protocol MUST enable ~~to~~-differentiating between multiple registrations from one 6LoWPAN Node and registrations from different 6LoWPAN Nodes claiming the same address.

Req1.3: Stale states MUST be cleaned up in 6LRs.

Req1.4: A 6LoWPAN Node SHOULD also be ~~cap~~able to register its Address to multiple 6LRs, **and this**, concurrently.

Commented [DT56]: Can't parse grammar. "restored in a timely fashion"? And is there any requirement about how timely is "timely"? E.g., is 60 seconds timely or not?

Commented [DT57]: Can't parse what "this" means

B.2. Requirements Related to Routing Protocols

The point of attachment of a 6LN may be a 6LR in an LLN mesh. IPv6 routing in a LLN can be based on RPL, which is the routing protocol that was defined at the IETF for this particular purpose. Other routing protocols ~~than RPL~~ are also considered by **Standards DefiningDevelopment** Organizations (SDOs) on the basis of the expected network characteristics. It is required that a 6LoWPAN Node attached via ND to a 6LR would need to participate in the selected routing protocol to obtain reachability via the 6LR.

Commented [DT58]: Correct expansion of SDO

Next to the 6LBR unicast address registered by ND, other addresses including multicast addresses are needed as well. For example a routing protocol often uses a multicast address to register changes to established paths. ND needs to register such a multicast address to enable routing concurrently with discovery.

Multicast is needed for groups. Groups may be formed by device type (e.g., routers, street lamps), location (Geography, RPL sub-tree), or both.

The Bit Index Explicit Replication (BIER) Architecture [I-D.ietf-bier-architecture] proposes an optimized technique to enable multicast in a LLN with a very limited requirement for routing state in the nodes.

Related requirements are:

Req2.1: The ND registration method SHOULD be extended so that the 6LR is able to advertise the Address of a 6LoWPAN Node over the selected routing protocol and obtain reachability to that Address using the selected routing protocol.

Req2.2: Considering RPL, the Address Registration Option that is used in the ND registration SHOULD be extended to carry enough information to generate a DAO message as specified in [RFC6550] section 6.4, in particular the capability to compute a Path Sequence and, as an option, a RPLInstanceID.

Req2.3: Multicast operations SHOULD be supported and optimized, for instance using BIER or MPL. Whether ND is appropriate for the registration to the 6BBR is to be defined, considering the additional burden of supporting the Multicast Listener Discovery Version 2 [RFC3810] (MLDv2) for IPv6.

B.3. Requirements Related to the Variety of Low-Power Link types

6LoWPAN ND [RFC6775] was defined with a focus on IEEE Std.802.15.4 and in particular the capability to derive a unique Identifier from a globally unique MAC-64 address. At this point, the 6lo Working Group is extending the 6LoWPAN Header Compression (HC) [RFC6282] technique to other link types ITU-T G.9959 [RFC7428], Master-Slave/Token-Passing [RFC8163], DECT Ultra Low Energy [RFC8105], Near Field Communication [I-D.ietf-6lo-nfc], IEEE Std. 802.11ah [I-D.delcarpio-6lo-wlanah], as well as IEEE1901.2 Narrowband Powerline Communication Networks [I-D.popa-6lo-6loplc-ipv6-over-ieee19012-networks] and BLUETOOTH(R) Low Energy [RFC7668].

Related requirements are:

Req3.1: The support of the registration mechanism SHOULD be extended to more LLN links than IEEE Std.802.15.4, matching at least the LLN links for which an "IPv6 over foo" specification exists, as well as Low-Power Wi-Fi.

Req3.2: As part of this extension, a mechanism to compute a unique Identifier should be provided, with the capability to form a Link-Local Address that SHOULD be unique at least within the LLN connected to a 6LBR discovered by ND in each node within the LLN.

Req3.3: The Address Registration Option used in the ND registration SHOULD be extended to carry the relevant forms of unique Identifier.

Commented [DT59]: I've never seen this term before. EUI-64, and MAC certainly, but never MAC-64.

Req3.4: The Neighbour Discovery should specify the formation of a site-local address that follows the security recommendations from [RFC7217].

Commented [DT60]: Use consistent spelling throughout

B.4. Requirements Related to Proxy Operations

Duty-cycled devices may not be able to answer themselves to a lookup from a node that uses IPv6 ND on a Backbone and may need a proxy. Additionally, the duty-cycled device may need to rely on the 6LBR to perform registration to the 6BBR.

The ND registration method SHOULD defend the addresses of duty-cycled devices that are sleeping most of the time and not capable to defend their own Addresses.

Related requirements are:

Req4.1: The registration mechanism SHOULD enable a third party to proxy register an Address on behalf of a 6LoWPAN node that may be sleeping or located deeper in an LLN mesh.

Req4.2: The registration mechanism SHOULD be applicable to a duty-cycled device regardless of the link type, and enable a 6BBR to operate as a proxy to defend the Registered Addresses on its behalf.

Req4.3: The registration mechanism SHOULD enable long sleep durations, in the order of multiple days to a month.

B.5. Requirements Related to Security

In order to guarantee the operations of the 6LoWPAN ND flows, the spoofing of the 6LR, 6LBR and 6BBRs roles should be avoided. Once a node successfully registers an address, 6LoWPAN ND should provide energy-efficient means for the 6LBR to protect that ownership even when the node that registered the address is sleeping.

In particular, the 6LR and the 6LBR then should be able to verify whether a subsequent registration for a given address comes from the original node.

In an LLN it makes sense to base security on layer-2 security. During bootstrap of the LLN, nodes join the network after authorization by a Joining Assistant (JA) or a Commissioning Tool (CT). After joining nodes communicate with each other via secured links. The keys for the layer-2 security are distributed by the JA/CT. The JA/CT can be part of the LLN or be outside the LLN. In both cases it is needed that packets are routed between JA/CT and the joining node.

Related requirements are:

Req5.1: 6LoWPAN ND security mechanisms SHOULD provide a mechanism for the 6LR, 6LBR and 6BBR to authenticate and authorize one another for their respective roles, as well as with the 6LoWPAN Node for the role of 6LR.

Req5.2: 6LoWPAN ND security mechanisms SHOULD provide a mechanism for the 6LR and the 6LBR to validate new registration of authorized nodes. Joining of unauthorized nodes **MUST be impossible**.

Req5.3: 6LoWPAN ND security mechanisms SHOULD lead to small packet sizes. In particular, the NS, NA, DAR and DAC messages for a re-registration flow SHOULD NOT exceed 80 octets so as to fit in a secured IEEE Std.802.15.4 [IEEEstd802154] frame.

Req5.4: Recurrent 6LoWPAN ND security operations MUST NOT be computationally intensive on the LoWPAN Node CPU. When a Key hash calculation is employed, a mechanism lighter than SHA-1 SHOULD be preferred.

Req5.5: The number of Keys that the 6LoWPAN Node needs to manipulate SHOULD be minimized.

Req5.6: The 6LoWPAN ND security mechanisms SHOULD enable the variation of CCM [RFC3610] called CCM* for use at both Layer 2 and Layer 3, and SHOULD enable the reuse of security code that has to be present on the device for upper layer security such as TLS.

Req5.7: Public key and signature sizes SHOULD be minimized while maintaining adequate confidentiality and data origin authentication for multiple types of applications with various degrees of criticality.

Req5.8: Routing of packets should continue when links pass from the unsecured to the secured state.

Req5.9: 6LoWPAN ND security mechanisms SHOULD provide a mechanism for the 6LR and the 6LBR to validate whether a new registration for a given address corresponds to the same 6LoWPAN Node that registered it initially, and, if not, determine the rightful owner, and deny or clean-up the registration that is duplicate.

B.6. Requirements Related to Scalability

Use cases from Automatic Meter Reading (AMR, collection tree operations) and Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI, bi-directional communication to the meters) indicate the needs for a large number of

Commented [DT61]: Probably inappropriate wording, perhaps "infeasible"? If you have unlimited resources to crack crypto algorithms, how can it be "impossible"?

LLN nodes pertaining to a single RPL DODAG (e.g., 5000) and connected to the 6LBR over a large number of LLN hops (e.g., 15).

Related requirements are:

Req6.1: The registration mechanism SHOULD enable a single 6LBR to register multiple thousands of devices.

Req6.2: The timing of the registration operation should allow for a large latency such as found in LLNs with ten and more hops.

Authors' Addresses

Pascal Thubert (editor)
Cisco Systems, Inc
Building D (Regus) 45 Allee des Ormes
MOUGINS - Sophia Antipolis
FRANCE

Phone: +33 4 97 23 26 34
Email: pthubert@cisco.com

Erik Nordmark
Santa Clara, CA
USA

Email: nordmark@sonic.net

Samita Chakrabarti
Verizon
San Jose, CA
USA

Email: samitac.ietf@gmail.com

Charles E. Perkins
Futurewei
2330 Central Expressway
Santa Clara 95050
Unites States

Email: charliep@computer.org