

Roll  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: August 03, 2014

D. Popa  
M. Gillmore  
Itron, Inc  
L. Toutain  
Telecom Bretagne  
J. Hui  
Cisco  
R. Ruben  
Landis+Gyr  
K. Monden  
Hitachi, Ltd., Yokohama Research Laboratory  
February 2014

Applicability Statement for the Routing Protocol for Low Power and Lossy  
Networks (RPL) in AMI Networks

[draft-ietf-roll-applicability-ami-08](#)

#### Abstract

This document discusses the applicability of RPL in Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI) networks.

#### 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 <http://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 August 03, 2014.

#### Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2014 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 (<http://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

Internet-Draft                      RPL Applicability for AMI                      February 2014  
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

<a href="#">1.</a>	<a href="#">Introduction . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">2</a>
<a href="#">1.1.</a>	<a href="#">Requirements Language . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">1.2.</a>	<a href="#">Required Reading . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">1.3.</a>	<a href="#">Out of scope requirements . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	<a href="#">Routing Protocol for LLNs (RPL) . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	<a href="#">Description of AMI networks for electric meters . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">3.1.</a>	<a href="#">Deployment Scenarios . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">4.</a>	<a href="#">Smart Grid Traffic Description . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">4.1.</a>	<a href="#">Smart Grid Traffic Characteristics . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">7</a>
<a href="#">4.2.</a>	<a href="#">Smart Grid Traffic QoS Requirements . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">4.3.</a>	<a href="#">RPL applicability per Smart Grid Traffic Characteristics . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">5.</a>	<a href="#">Layer 2 applicability. . . . .</a>	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">5.1.</a>	<a href="#">IEEE Wireless Technology . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">5.2.</a>	<a href="#">IEEE PowerLine Communication (PLC) technology . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">6.</a>	<a href="#">Using RPL to Meet Functional Requirements . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">10</a>
<a href="#">7.</a>	<a href="#">RPL Profile . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">7.1.</a>	<a href="#">RPL Features . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">7.1.1.</a>	<a href="#">RPL Instances . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">7.1.2.</a>	<a href="#">Storing vs. Non-Storing Mode . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">7.1.3.</a>	<a href="#">DAO Policy . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">7.1.4.</a>	<a href="#">Path Metrics . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">7.1.5.</a>	<a href="#">Objective Function . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">7.1.6.</a>	<a href="#">DODAG Repair . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">7.1.7.</a>	<a href="#">Multicast . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">13</a>
<a href="#">7.1.8.</a>	<a href="#">Security . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">13</a>
<a href="#">7.1.9.</a>	<a href="#">Peer-to-Peer communications . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">13</a>
<a href="#">7.2.</a>	<a href="#">Description of Layer-two features . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">13</a>
<a href="#">7.2.1.</a>	<a href="#">IEEE 1901.2 PHY and MAC sub-layer features . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">13</a>
<a href="#">7.2.2.</a>	<a href="#">IEEE 802.15.4 (g + e) PHY and MAC features . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">14</a>
<a href="#">7.2.3.</a>	<a href="#">IEEE MAC sub-layer Security Features . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">14</a>
<a href="#">7.3.</a>	<a href="#">6LowPAN Options . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">16</a>
<a href="#">7.4.</a>	<a href="#">Recommended Configuration Defaults and Ranges . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">16</a>
<a href="#">7.4.1.</a>	<a href="#">Trickle Parameters . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">16</a>
<a href="#">7.4.2.</a>	<a href="#">Other Parameters . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">18</a>
<a href="#">8.</a>	<a href="#">Manageability Considerations . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">18</a>
<a href="#">9.</a>	<a href="#">Security Considerations . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">19</a>
<a href="#">9.1.</a>	<a href="#">Security Considerations during initial deployment . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">19</a>
<a href="#">9.2.</a>	<a href="#">Security Considerations during incremental deployment . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">19</a>
<a href="#">10.</a>	<a href="#">Other Related Protocols . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">20</a>
<a href="#">11.</a>	<a href="#">IANA Considerations . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">20</a>
<a href="#">12.</a>	<a href="#">Acknowledgements . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">20</a>
<a href="#">13.</a>	<a href="#">References . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">20</a>
<a href="#">13.1.</a>	<a href="#">Informative References . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">20</a>
<a href="#">13.2.</a>	<a href="#">Normative references . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">20</a>
	<a href="#">Authors' Addresses . . . . .</a>	<a href="#">21</a>

## **1. Introduction**

**Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI) systems enable the** measurement, configuration, and control of energy, gas and water consumption and distribution, through two-way scheduled, on exception, and on-demand communication.

AMI networks are composed of millions of endpoints, including meters, distribution automation elements, and eventually home area network devices. They are typically inter-connected using some combination of wireless and power-line communications, forming the so-called Neighbor Area Network (NAN) along with a backhaul network providing connectivity to "command-and-control" management software applications at the utility company back office.

### **1.1. Requirements Language**

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 [\[RFC2119\]](#).

### **1.2. Required Reading**

[surveySG] gives an overview of Smart Grid architecture and related applications.

NAN can use wireless communication technology in which case is using, from the IEEE 802.15.4 standard family, the IEEE 802.15.4g PHY Layer amendment and IEEE 802.15.4e MAC sub-layer amendment, specifically adapted to smart grid networks.

NAN can also use PLC (Power Line Communication) technology as an alternative to wireless communications. Several standards for PLC technology have emerged, such as IEEE P1901.2.

NAN can further use a mix of wireless and PLC technologies to increase the network coverage ratio, a critical requirement for AMI networks.

### **1.3. Out of scope requirements**

**The following are outside the scope of this document:**

- o Applicability statement for RPL in AMI networks composed of battery-powered devices (i.e., gas/water meters).
- o Applicability statement for RPL in AMI networks composed of a mix of AC powered devices (i.e., electric meters) and battery-powered meters (i.e., gas/water meters).

- o Applicability statement for RPL storing mode of operation in AMI networks.

## **2. Routing Protocol for LLNs (RPL)**

**RPL provides routing functionality for mesh networks that can scale** up to thousands of resource-constrained devices, interconnected by low power and lossy links, and communicating with the external network infrastructure through a common aggregation point(s) (e.g., a LBR).

RPL builds a Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG) routing structure rooted at a LBR (LLN Border Router), ensures loop-free routing, and provides support for alternate routes, as well as, for a wide range of routing metrics and policies.

RPL was designed to operate in energy-constrained environments and includes energy-saving mechanisms (e.g., Trickle timers) and energy-aware metrics. RPL's ability to support multiple different metrics and constraints at the same time enables it to run efficiently in heterogeneous networks composed of nodes and links with vastly different characteristics [[RFC6551](#)].

This document describes the applicability of RPL non-storing mode (as defined in [[RFC6550](#)]) to AMI deployments. RPL was designed to meet the following application requirements:

- o Routing Requirements for Urban Low-Power and Lossy Networks [[RFC5548](#)].
- o Industrial Routing Requirements in Low-Power and Lossy Networks [[RFC5673](#)].
- o Home Automation Routing Requirements in Low-Power and Lossy Networks [[RFC5826](#)].
- o Building Automation Routing Requirements in Low-Power and Lossy Networks [[RFC5867](#)].

The Routing Requirements for Urban Low-Power and Lossy Networks are applicable to AMI networks as well. The terminology used in this document is defined in [I-D.ietf-roll-terminology-13].

## **3. Description of AMI networks for electric meters**

**In many deployments, in addition to measuring energy consumption, the** electric meter network plays a central role in the Smart Grid since the device enables the utility company to control and query the

electric meters themselves and can serve as a backhaul for all other devices in the Smart Grid, e.g., water and gas meters, distribution automation and home area network devices. Electric meters may also be used as sensors to monitor electric grid quality and to support applications such as Electric Vehicle charging.

Electric meter networks can be composed of millions of smart meters (or nodes), each of which is resource-constrained in terms of processing power, storage capabilities, and communication bandwidth, due to a combination of factors including Federal Communications Commission (FCC) or other continents' regulations on spectrum use, American National Standards Institute (ANSI) standards or other continents' regulation on meter behavior and performance, on heat emissions within the meter, form factor and cost considerations.

These constraints result in a compromise between range and throughput, with effective link throughput of tens to a few hundred kilobits per second per link, a potentially significant portion of which is taken up by protocol and encryption overhead when strong security measures are in place.


Electric meters are often interconnected into multi-hop mesh networks, each of which is connected to a backhaul network leading to the utility company network through a network aggregation point, e.g., an LBR.

### **3.1. Deployment Scenarios**

**AMI networks are composed of millions of endpoints distributed across** both urban and rural environments. Such endpoints can include electric, gas, and water meters, distribution automation elements, and home area network devices.

Devices in the network communicate directly with other devices in close proximity using a variety of low-power and/or lossy link technologies that are both wireless and wired (e.g., IEEE 802.15.4g, IEEE 802.15.4e, IEEE 1901.2, IEEE 802.11). In addition to serving as sources and destinations of packets, many network elements typically also forward packets and thus form a mesh topology.

In a typical AMI deployment, groups of meters within physical proximity form routing domains, each in the order of a 1,000 to 10,000 meters. Thus, each electric meter mesh typically has several thousand wireless endpoints, with densities varying based on the area and the terrain.



A typical AMI network architecture (see figure Figure 1) is composed of a MDMS (Meter Data Management System) connected through IP network to a LBR, which can be located in the power substation or somewhere else in the field. The power substation connects the households and buildings. The physical topology of the electrical grid is a tree structure, either due to the 3 different power phases coming through the sub-station or just to the electrical network topology. Meters (represented by a M in the previous figure) can also participate to a HAN (Home-Area Network). The scope of this document is the communication between the LBR and the meters, i.e., the NAN segment. Node density can vary significantly. For example, apartment buildings in urban centers may have hundreds of meters in close proximity, whereas rural areas may have sparse node distributions and include nodes that only have a small number of network neighbors. Each routing domain is connected to the larger IP infrastructure through one or more LBRs, which provide Wide Area Network (WAN) connectivity through various traditional network technologies, e.g., Ethernet, cellular, private WiMAX-based WAN, optical fiber. Paths in the mesh between a network node and the nearest LBR may be composed of several hops or even several tens of hops. Powered from the main line, electric meters have less energy constraints than battery powered devices, such as gas and water meters, and can afford the additional resources required to route packets.

As a function of the the technology used to exchange information, the logical network topology will not necessarily match the electric grid topology. If meters exchange information through radio technologies such as in IEEE 802.15.4 family, the topology is a meshed network, where nodes belonging to the same DODAG can be connected to the grid through different substations. If narrowband PLC technology is used, it will follow more or less the physical tree structure since diaphony may allow one phase to communicate with the other. This is particularly true near the LBR. Some mixt topology can also be observed, since some LBR may be strategically installed in the field to avoid all the communications going through a single LBR. Nevertheless, the short propagation range forces meters to relay the information.

#### **4. Smart Grid Traffic Description**

##### **4.1. Smart Grid Traffic Characteristics**

**In current AMI deployments, metering applications typically require** all smart meters to communicate with a few head-end servers, deployed in the utility company data center. Head-end servers generate data traffic to configure smart meter data reading or initiate queries, and use unicast and multicast to efficiently communicate with a single device (i.e., Point-to-Point (P2P) communications) or groups of devices respectively (i.e., Point-to-Multipoint (P2MP) communication). The head-end server may send a single small packet at a time to the meters (e.g., a meter read request, a small configuration change, service switch command) or a series of large packets (e.g., a firmware download across one or even thousands of devices). The frequency of large file transfers, e.g., firmware download of all metering devices, is typically much lower than the frequency of sending configuration messages or queries. Each smart meter generates Smart Metering Data (SMD) traffic according to a schedule (e.g., periodic meter reads), in response to on-demand queries (e.g., on-demand meter reads), or in response to some local event (e.g., power outage, leak detection). Such traffic is typically destined to a single head-end server. The SMD traffic is thus highly asymmetric, where the majority of the traffic volume generated by the smart meters typically goes through the LBRs, and is directed from the smart meter devices to the head-end servers, in a MP2P fashion. Current SMD traffic patterns are fairly uniform and well-understood. The traffic generated by the head-end server and destined to metering devices is dominated by periodic meter reads, while traffic generated by the metering devices is typically uniformly spread over some periodic read time-window. Smart metering applications typically do not have hard real-time constraints, but they are often subject to bounded latency and stringent reliability service level agreements.

Distribution Automation (DA) applications typically involve a small number of devices that communicate with each other in a Point-to-Point (P2P) fashion, and may or may not be in close physical proximity. DA applications typically have more stringent latency requirements than SMD applications.

There are also a number of emerging applications such as electric vehicle charging. These applications may require P2P communication and may eventually have more stringent latency requirements than SMD applications.

#### **4.2. Smart Grid Traffic QoS Requirements**

**As described previously, the two main traffic families in a NAN are:**

- A) Meter-initiated traffic (Meter-to-head-end - M2HE)
- B) Head-end-initiated traffic (Head-end-to-meter - HE2M)
  - B1) request is sent in point-to-point to a specific meter
  - B2) request is sent in multicast to a subset of meters
  - B3) request is sent in multicast to all meters

The M2HE are event-based, while the HE2M are mostly command-response. In most cases, M2HE traffic is more critical than HE2M one, but there can be exceptions.

Regarding priority, traffic may also be decomposed into several classes :

- C1) Highly Priority Critical traffic for Power System Outage, Pricing Events and Emergency Messages require a 98%+ packet delivery under 5 s. Payload size < 100 bytes
- C2) Critical Priority traffic Power Quality Events, Meter Service Connection and Disconnection require 98%+ packet delivery under 10s. Payload size < 150 bytes
- C3) Normal Priority traffic for System Events including Faults, Configuration and Security require 98%+ packet delivery under 30s. Payload size < 200 bytes
- C4) Low Priority traffic for Recurrent Meter Reading require 98%+ packet 2 hour delivery window 6 times per day. Payload size < 400 bytes
- C5) Background Priority traffic for firmware/software updates processed to 98%+ of devices with in 7 days. Average firmware update is 1 MB.

#### **4.3. RPL applicability per Smart Grid Traffic Characteristics**



RPL non-storing mode of operation naturally support upstream and downstream forwarding of unicast traffic between the DODAG root and each DODAG node, and between DODAG nodes and DODAG root, respectively.

Group communication model used in smart grid requires RPL non-storing mode of operation to support downstream forwarding of multicast traffic with a scope larger than link-local. The DODAG root is the single device that injects multicast traffic, with a scope larger than link-local, into the DODAG.

Although not currently used in metering applications, support of peer-to-peer communications between DODAG nodes is identified as a key feature to be supported in smart grid networks.

## **5. Layer 2 applicability.**

### **5.1. IEEE Wireless Technology**

**IEEE Std. 802.15.4g-2012 and IEEE 802.15.4e-2012 amendments to 802.15.2-2011** standard have been specifically developed for smart grid networks. They are the most common PHY and MAC layers used for wireless AMI network. 802.15.4g specifies multiple mode of operation (FSK, OQPSK and OFDM modulations) with speeds from 50kbps to 600kbps, and allows for transport of a full IPv6 packet (i.e., 1280 octets) without the need for upper layer segmentation and re-assembly.

IEEE Std. 802.15.4e-2012 is an amendment to IEEE Std 802.15.4-2011 that specifies additional media access control (MAC) behaviors and frame formats that allow IEEE 802.15.4 devices to support a wide range of industrial and commercial applications that were not adequately supported prior to the release of this amendment. It is important to notice that 802.15.4e does not change the link-layer security scheme defined in 802.15.4-2011 (and 802.15.4-2006).

### **5.2. IEEE PowerLine Communication (PLC) technology**

**The IEEE Std 1901.2-2013 standard specifies communications for low frequency (less than 500 kHz) narrowband power line devices via alternating current and direct current electric power lines.** IEEE Std 1901.2-2013 standard supports indoor and outdoor communications

over low voltage line (line between transformer and meter, less than 1000 V), through transformer low- voltage to medium-voltage (1000 V up to 72 kV) and through transformer medium-voltage to low-voltage power lines in both urban and in long distance (multi- kilometer) rural communications. IEEE Std 1901.2 defines the PHY layer and the MAC sub-layer of the data link layer. The MAC sub-layer endorses a sub-set of 802.15.4-2006 and 802.15.4e-2012 MAC sub-layer features. 1901.2 PHY Layer bit rates defined in 1901.2 are scalable to 500 kbps depending on the application requirements and type of encoding used. 1901.2 MAC layer allows for transport of a full IPv6 packets (i.e., 1280 octets) without the need for upper layer segmentation and re-assembly. 1901.2 standard specifies link-layer security features that fully endorse 802.15.4-2006 MAC sub-layer security scheme.

## **6. Using RPL to Meet Functional Requirements**

**The functional requirements for most AMI deployments are similar to those listed in [\[RFC5548\]](#):**

- o The routing protocol **MUST** be capable of supporting the organization of a large number of nodes into regions containing on the order of  $10^2$  to  $10^4$  nodes each.
- o The routing protocol **MUST** provide mechanisms to support configuration of the routing protocol itself.
- o The routing protocol **SHOULD** support and utilize the large number of highly directed flows to a few head-end servers to handle scalability.
- o The routing protocol **MUST** dynamically compute and select effective routes composed of low-power and lossy links. Local network dynamics **SHOULD NOT** impact the entire network. The routing protocol **MUST** compute multiple paths when possible.
- o The routing protocol **MUST** support multicast and unicast addressing. The routing protocol **SHOULD** support formation and identification of groups of field devices in the network.

RPL supports the following features:

- o Scalability: Large-scale networks characterized by highly directed traffic flows between each smart meter and the head-end servers in the utility network. To this end, RPL builds a Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG) rooted at each LBR.
- o Zero-touch configuration: This is done through in-band methods for configuring RPL variables using DIO messages, and DIO message options.

- o The use of links with time-varying quality characteristics: This is accomplished by allowing the use of metrics that effectively capture the quality of a path (e.g., Expected Transmission Count (ETX)) and by limiting the impact of changing local conditions by discovering and maintaining multiple DAG parents, and by using local repair mechanisms when DAG links break.

## **7. RPL Profile**

### **7.1. RPL Features**

#### **7.1.1. RPL Instances**

**RPL operation is defined for a single RPL instance. However,** multiple RPL instances can be supported in multi-service networks where different applications may require the use of different routing metrics and constraints, e.g., a network carrying both SDM and DA traffic.

#### **7.1.2. Storing vs. Non-Storing Mode**

In most scenarios, electric meters are powered by the grid they are monitoring and are not energy-constrained. Instead, electric meters have hardware and communication capacity constraints that are primarily determined by cost, and secondarily by power consumption. As a result, different AMI deployments can vary significantly in terms of memory size, computation power and communication capabilities. For this reason, the use of RPL storing or non-storing mode **SHOULD** be deployment specific. When meters are memory constrained and cannot adequately store the route tables necessary to support hop-by-hop routing, RPL non-storing mode **SHOULD** be preferred. On the other hand, when nodes are capable of storing such routing tables, the use of storing mode may lead to reduced overhead and route repair latency. However, in high-density environments, storing routes can be challenging because some nodes may have to maintain routing information for a large number of descendents. In this document we only focus on non-storing mode of operation.

#### **7.1.3. DAO Policy**

**Two-way communication is a requirement in AMI systems. As a result,** nodes **SHOULD** send DAO messages to establish downward paths from the root to themselves.

#### **7.1.4. Path Metrics**

**Smart metering deployments utilize link technologies that may exhibit** significant packet loss and thus require routing metrics that take packet loss into account. To characterize a path over such link

Internet-Draft                      RPL Applicability for AMI                      February 2014  
technologies, AMI deployments can use the Expected Transmission Count (ETX) metric as defined in [\[RFC6551\]](#).  
Additional metrics may be defined in companion RFCs.

#### **7.1.5. Objective Function**

**RPL relies on an Objective Function for selecting parents and** computing path costs and rank. This objective function is decoupled from the core RPL mechanisms and also from the metrics in use in the network. Two objective functions for RPL have been defined at the time of this writing, OF0 [\[RFC6552\]](#) and MRHOF [\[RFC6719\]](#), both of which define the selection of a preferred parent and backup parents, and are suitable for AMI deployments. Additional objective functions may be defined in companion RFCs.

#### **7.1.6. DODAG Repair**

**To effectively handle time-varying link characteristics and** availability, AMI deployments SHOULD utilize the local repair mechanisms in RPL. Local repair is triggered by broken link detection. The first local repair mechanism consists of a node detaching from a DODAG and then re-attaching to the same or to a different DODAG at a later time. While detached, a node advertises an infinite rank value so that its children can select a different parent. This process is known as poisoning and is described in [Section 8.2.2.5 of \[RFC6550\]](#). While RPL provides an option to form a local DODAG, doing so in AMI for electric meters is of little benefit since AMI applications typically communicate through a LBR. After the detached node has made sufficient effort to send notification to its children that it is detached, the node can rejoin the same DODAG with a higher rank value. The configured duration of the poisoning mechanism needs to take into account the disconnection time applications running over the network can tolerate. Note that when joining a different DODAG, the node need not perform poisoning. The second local repair mechanism controls how much a node can increase its rank within a given DODAG Version (e.g., after detaching from the DODAG as a result of broken link or loop detection). Setting the DAGMaxRankIncrease to a non-zero value enables this mechanism, and setting it to a value of less than infinity limits the cost of count-to-infinity scenarios when they occur, thus controlling the duration

of disconnection applications may experience.

#### **7.1.7. Multicast**

**Multicast support for RPL in non-storing mode are being developed in companion RFCs (see [[draft-ietf-roll-trickle-mcast-06](#)]).**

#### **7.1.8. Security**

**AMI deployments operate in areas that do not provide any physical security.** For this reason, the link layer, transport layer and application layer technologies utilized within AMI networks typically provide security mechanisms to ensure authentication, confidentiality, integrity, and freshness. As a result, AMI deployments may not need to implement RPL's security mechanisms and could rely on link layer and higher layer security features.

#### **7.1.9. Peer-to-Peer communications**

**Basic peer-to-peer capabilities are already defined in the RPL [[RFC6550](#)].** Additional mechanisms for peer-to-peer communications are proposed in companion RFCs (see [[RFC6997](#)]).

### **7.2. Description of Layer-two features**

#### **7.2.1. IEEE 1901.2 PHY and MAC sub-layer features**

**IEEE 1901.2 physical is based on OFDM modulation and defines a time frequency interleaver over the entire PHY frame coupled with a Reed Solomon and Viterbi Forward Error Correction for maximum robustness.** Since the noise level in each OFDM sub-carrier can vary significantly IEEE 1901.2 specifies two complementary mechanisms allowing to fine-tune the robustness/performance tradeoff implicit in such systems.

More specifically, the first (coarse-grained) mechanism, defines the modulation from several possible choices (robust (super-ROBO, ROBO), BPSK, QPSK,...). The second (fine-grained) maps the sub-carriers which are too noisy and deactivates them.

The existence of multiple modulations and dynamic frequency exclusion renders the problem of selecting a path between two nodes non-trivial, as the possible number of combinations increases significantly, e.g. use a direct link with slow robust modulation, or use a relay meter with fast modulation and 12 disabled sub-carriers. In addition, IEEE 1901.2 technology offers a mechanism (adaptive tone map) for periodic exchanges on the link quality between nodes to constantly react to channel fluctuations. Every meter keeps a state of the quality of the link to each of its neighbors by either piggybacking the tone mapping on the data traffic, or by sending explicit tone map requests.

IEEE 1901.2 MAC frame format shares most in common with the IEEE 802.15.4-2006 MAC frame format [IEEE802.15.4], with a few exceptions described bellow.

- o IEEE 1901.2 MAC frame is obtained by prepending a Segment Control Field to the IEEE 802.15.4-2006 MAC header. One function of the Segment Control Field is to signal the use of the MAC sub-layer segmentation and reassembly.
- o IEEE 1901.2 MAC frames uses only the 802.15.4 MAC addresses with a length of 16 and 64 bits.
- o IEEE 1901.2 MAC sub-layer endorses the concept of Information Elements, as defined in IEEE 802.15.4e-2012 [IEEE802.15.4e]. The format and use of Information Elements are not relevant to RPL applicability statement.

The IEEE 1901.2 PHY frame payload size varies as a function of the modulation used to transmit the frame and the strength of the Forward Error Correction scheme.

The maximum IEEE 1901.2 PHY frame payload is 512 bytes. The maximum IEEE 1901.2 MAC frame payload is 1280 bytes, which supports the IPv6 minimum MTU requirement.

When there is a mismatch between the PHY frame payload size and the size of a MAC frame carrying an IPv6 packet, IEEE 1901.2 specifies a MAC sub-layer segmentation and re-assembly mechanism that provides a reliable one-hop transfer of that MAC frame segments.

#### **7.2.2. IEEE 802.15.4 (g + e) PHY and MAC features**

**This section is intentionally left blank.**

#### **7.2.3. IEEE MAC sub-layer Security Features**

Since IEEE 1901.2 standard is based on the 802.15.4-2006 MAC sub-layer and fully endorses the security scheme defined in 802.15.4-2006, we only focus on description of IEEE 802.15.4 security scheme.

The IEEE 802.15.4 specification was designed to support a variety of applications, many of which are security sensitive. The IEEE 802.15.4 provides four basic security services: message authentication, message integrity, message confidentiality, and freshness checks to avoid replay attacks.

The 802.15.4 security layer is handled at the media access control layer, below 6LoWPAN layer. The application specifies its security requirements by setting the appropriate control parameters into the radio/PLC stack. The 802.15.4 defines four packet types: beacon frames, data frames, acknowledgments frame, and command frames for the media access control layer. The 802.15.4 specification does not support security for acknowledgement frames; data frames, beacon frames and command frames can support integrity protection and confidentiality protection for the frames's data field. An application has a choice of security suites that control the type of security protection that is provided for the transmitted MAC frame. The 802.15.4 specification defines eight different security suites, outlined bellow. We can broadly classify the suites by the properties that they offer: no security, encryption only (AES-CTR), authentication only (AES-CBC-MAC), and encryption and authentication (AES-CCM). Each category that supports authentication comes in three variants depending on the size of the MAC (Message Authentication Control) that it offers. The MAC can be either 4, 8, or 16 bytes long. Additionally, for each suite that offers encryption, the recipient can optionally enable replay protection.

- o Null = No security.
- o AES-CTR = Encryption only, CTR mode.
- o AES-CBC-MAC-128 = No encryption, 128-bit MAC.
- o AES-CBC-MAC-64 = No encryption, 64-bit MAC.
- o AES-CCM-128 = Encryption and 128-bit MAC.
- o AES-CCM-64 = Encryption and 64-bit MAC.
- o AES-CCM-32 = Encryption and 32-bit MAC.

To achieve authentication, any device can maintain an Access Control List (ACL) which is a list of trusted nodes from which the device wishes to receive data. Data encryption is done by encryption of Message Authentication Control (MAC) frame payload using the key shared between two devices, or among a group of peers. If the key is to be shared between two peers, it is stored with each entry in the ACL list; otherwise, the key is stored as the default key. Thus, the device can make sure that its data can not be read by devices that do not possess the corresponding key. However, device addresses are always transmitted unencrypted, which makes attacks that rely on device identity somewhat easier to launch. Integrity service is applied by appending a Message Integrity Code (MIC) generated from blocks of encrypted message text. This ensures that a frame can not be modified by a receiver device that does not share a key with the sender. Finally, sequential freshness uses a frame counter and key sequence counter to ensure the freshness of the incoming frame and guard against replay attacks.

A cryptographic MAC is used to authenticate messages. While longer MACs lead to improved resiliency of the code, they also make packet size larger and thus take up bandwidth in the network. In constrained environments such as metering infrastructures, an optimum balance between security requirements and network throughput must be found.

### **7.3. 6LowPAN Options**

**AMI implementations based on 1901.2 and 802.15.4(g+e) can utilize all of the IPv6 Header Compression schemes specified in [\[RFC6282\] Section 3](#) and all of the IPv6 Next Header compression schemes specified in [\[RFC6282\] Section 4](#), if reducing over the air/wire overhead is a requirement. However, since the link-layer MTU in both wireless and PLC links supports the transmission of a full IPv6 packet, the use of 6LowPAN fragmentation is NOT RECOMMENDED.**

### **7.4. Recommended Configuration Defaults and Ranges**

#### **7.4.1. Trickle Parameters**



Trickle was designed to be density-aware and perform well in networks characterized by a wide range of node densities. The combination of DIO packet suppression and adaptive timers for sending updates allows Trickle to perform well in both sparse and dense environments. Node densities in AMI deployments can vary greatly, from nodes having only one or a handful of neighbors to nodes having several hundred neighbors. In high density environments, relatively low values for *Imin* may cause a short period of congestion when an inconsistency is detected and DIO updates are sent by a large number of neighboring nodes nearly simultaneously. While the Trickle timer will exponentially backoff, some time may elapse before the congestion subsides. While some link layers employ contention mechanisms that attempt to avoid congestion, relying solely on the link layer to avoid congestion caused by a large number of DIO updates can result in increased communication latency for other control and data traffic in the network. To mitigate this kind of short-term congestion, this document recommends a more conservative set of values for the Trickle parameters than those specified in [\[RFC6206\]](#). In particular, *DIOIntervalMin* is set to a larger value to avoid periods of congestion in dense environments, and *DIORedundancyConstant* is parameterized accordingly as described below. These values are appropriate for the timely distribution of DIO updates in both sparse and dense scenarios while avoiding the short-term congestion that might arise in dense scenarios. Because the actual link capacity depends on the particular link technology used within an AMI deployment, the Trickle parameters are specified in terms of the link's maximum capacity for transmitting link-local multicast messages. If the link can transmit *m* link-local multicast packets per second on average, the expected time it takes to transmit a link-local multicast packet is  $1/m$  seconds.

*DIOIntervalMin*: AMI deployments SHOULD set *DIOIntervalMin* such that the Trickle *Imin* is at least 50 times as long as it takes to transmit a link-local multicast packet. This value is larger than that recommended in [\[RFC6206\]](#) to avoid congestion in dense urban deployments as described above. In energy-constrained deployments (e.g., in water and gas battery-based routing infrastructure), *DIOIntervalMin* MAY be set to a value resulting in a Trickle *Imin* of several (e.g. 2) hours.

*DIOIntervalDoublings*: AMI deployments SHOULD set *DIOIntervalDoublings* such that the Trickle *Imax* is at least 2 hours or more. For very energy constrained deployments (e.g., water and gas battery-based routing infrastructure), *DIOIntervalDoublings* MAY be set to a value resulting in a Trickle *Imax* of several (e.g., 2) days.

DIORedundancyConstant: AMI deployments SHOULD set

DIORedundancyConstant to a value of at least 10. This is due to the larger chosen value for DIOIntervalMin and the proportional relationship between Imin and k suggested in [RFC6206]. This increase is intended to compensate for the increased communication latency of DIO updates caused by the increase in the DIOIntervalMin value, though the proportional relationship between Imin and k suggested in [RFC6206] is not preserved. Instead, DIORedundancyConstant is set to a lower value in order to reduce the number of packet transmissions in dense environments.

#### **7.4.2. Other Parameters**

- o **AMI deployments SHOULD set MinHopRankIncrease to 256, resulting in 8 bits of resolution (e.g., for the ETX metric).**
- o To enable local repair, AMI deployments SHOULD set MaxRankIncrease to a value that allows a device to move a small number of hops away from the root. With a MinHopRankIncrease of 256, a MaxRankIncrease of 1024 would allow a device to move up to 4 hops away.

### **8. Manageability Considerations**

Network manageability is a critical aspect of smart grid network deployment and operation. With millions of devices participating in the smart grid network, many requiring real-time reachability, automatic configuration, and lightweight network health monitoring and management are crucial for achieving network availability and efficient operation. RPL enables automatic and consistent configuration of RPL routers through parameters specified by the DODAG root and disseminated through DIO packets. The use of Trickle for scheduling DIO transmissions ensures lightweight yet timely propagation of important network and parameter updates and allows network operators to choose the trade-off point they are comfortable with respect to overhead vs. reliability and timeliness of network updates. The metrics in use in the network along with the Trickle Timer parameters used to control the frequency and redundancy of network updates can be dynamically varied by the root during the lifetime of the network. To that end, all DIO messages SHOULD contain a Metric Container option for disseminating the metrics and metric values used for DODAG setup. In addition, DIO messages SHOULD contain a DODAG Configuration option for disseminating the Trickle Timer parameters throughout the network. The possibility of dynamically updating the metrics in use in the network as well as the frequency of network updates allows deployment characteristics (e.g., network density) to be discovered during network bring-up and to be used to tailor network parameters once the network is operational rather than having to rely on precise pre-configuration. This also allows the network parameters and the overall routing protocol behavior to evolve during the lifetime of the network. RPL specifies a number of variables and events that can be tracked for purposes of network fault and performance monitoring of RPL routers. Depending on the memory and processing capabilities of each smart grid device, various subsets of these can be employed in the field.

## **9. Security Considerations**

**Smart grid networks are subject to stringent security requirements as they are considered a critical infrastructure component.** At the same time, since they are composed of large numbers of resource-constrained devices inter-connected with limited-throughput links, many available security mechanisms are not practical for use in such networks. As a result, the choice of security mechanisms is highly dependent on the device and network capabilities characterizing a particular deployment. In contrast to other types of LLNs, in smart grid networks centralized administrative control and access to a permanent secure infrastructure is available. As a result link-layer, transport-layer and/or application-layer security mechanisms are typically in place and using RPL's secure mode is not necessary.

### **9.1. Security Considerations during initial deployment**

**This section is intentionally left blank.**

### **9.2. Security Considerations during incremental deployment**

This section is intentionally left blank.

#### **10. Other Related Protocols**

This section is intentionally left blank.

#### **11. IANA Considerations**

This memo includes no request to IANA.

#### **12. Acknowledgements**

The authors would like to acknowledge the review, feedback, and comments of Jari Arkko, Dominique Barthel, Cedric Chauvenet, Yuichi Igarashi, Philip Levis, Jeorjeta Jetcheva, Nicolas Dejean, and JP Vasseur.

#### **13. References**

##### **13.1. Informative References**

[surveySG]

Gungor, V., Sahin, D., Kocak, T., Ergut, S., Buccella, C., Cecati, C. and G.P. Hancke, "A Survey on Smart Grid Potential Applications and Communication Requirements", Feb 2013.

[IEEE802.15.4]

IEEE SA, "IEEE Standard for Information technology-- Local and metropolitan area networks-- Specific requirements-- Part 15.4: Wireless Medium Access Control (MAC) and Physical Layer (PHY) Specifications for Low Rate Wireless Personal Area Networks (WPANs)", September 2006.

[IEEE802.15.4e]

IEEE SA , "IEEE Standard for Local and metropolitan area networks--Part 15.4: Low-Rate Wireless Personal Area Networks (LR-WPANs) Amendment 1: MAC sublayer", April 2012.

[IEEE1901.2]

IEEE SA , "IEEE Standard for Low-Frequency (less than 500 kHz) Narrowband Power Line Communications for Smart Grid Applications", December 2013.

##### **13.2. Normative references**

[RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.

[RFC5548] Dohler, M., Watteyne, T., Winter, T. and D. Barthel, "Routing Requirements for Urban Low-Power and Lossy Networks", [RFC 5548](#), May 2009.

- [[RFC6206](#)] Levis, P., Clausen, T., Hui, J., Gnawali, O. and J. Ko, "The Trickle Algorithm", [RFC 6206](#), March 2011.
- [[RFC6550](#)] Winter, T., Thubert, P., 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](#), March 2012.
- [[RFC6551](#)] Vasseur, JP., Kim, M., Pister, K., Dejean, N. and D. Barthel, "Routing Metrics Used for Path Calculation in Low-Power and Lossy Networks", [RFC 6551](#), March 2012.
- [[RFC5867](#)] Martocci, J., De Mil, P., Riou, N. and W. Vermeylen, "Building Automation Routing Requirements in Low-Power and Lossy Networks", [RFC 5867](#), June 2010.
- [[RFC5826](#)] Brandt, A., Buron, J. and G. Porcu, "Home Automation Routing Requirements in Low-Power and Lossy Networks", [RFC 5826](#), April 2010.
- [[RFC5673](#)] Pister, K., Thubert, P., Dwars, S. and T. Phinney, "Industrial Routing Requirements in Low-Power and Lossy Networks", [RFC 5673](#), October 2009.
- [[RFC6997](#)] Goyal, M., Baccelli, E., Philipp, M., Brandt, A. and J. Martocci, "Reactive Discovery of Point-to-Point Routes in Low-Power and Lossy Networks", [RFC 6997](#), August 2013.
- [[RFC6552](#)] Thubert, P., "Objective Function Zero for the Routing Protocol for Low-Power and Lossy Networks (RPL)", [RFC 6552](#), March 2012.
- [[RFC6719](#)] Gnawali, O. and P. Levis, "The Minimum Rank with Hysteresis Objective Function", [RFC 6719](#), September 2012.

Authors' Addresses

Daniel Popa  
Itron, Inc  
52, rue Camille Desmoulins  
Issy les Moulineaux, 92130  
FR

Email: daniel.popa@itron.com  
Matthew Gillmore  
Itron, Inc  
2111 N Molter Rd.  
Liberty Lake, WA, 99019  
USA

Email: matthew.gillmore@itron.com

Laurent Toutain  
Telecom Bretagne  
2 rue de la Chataigneraie  
Cesson Sevigne, 35510  
FR

Email: laurent.toutain@telecom-bretagne.eu  
Jonathan Hui  
Cisco  
170 West Tasman Drive  
San Jose, CA, 95134  
USA

Email: johui@cisco.com  
Ruben Salazar  
Landys+Gyr  
30000 Mill Creek Ave # 100  
Alpharetta, GA, 30022  
USA

Email: ruben.salazar@landisgyr.com  
Kazuya Monden  
Hitachi, Ltd., Yokohama Research Laboratory  
292, Yoshida-cho, Totsuka-ku, Yokohama-shi  
Kanagawa-ken , 244-0817  
Japan

Email: kazuya.monden.vw@hitachi.com