



From Best-Effort to Deterministic Packet Delivery for Wireless Industrial IoT Networks

Koutsiamanis, Remous-Aris; Papadopoulos, Georgios Z.; Fafoutis, Xenofon; Del Fiore, Julian M. ; Thubert, Pascal; Montavont, Nicolas

Published in:
I E E Transactions on Industrial Informatics

Link to article, DOI:
[10.1109/TII.2018.2856884](https://doi.org/10.1109/TII.2018.2856884)

Publication date:
2018

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)

Citation (APA):
Koutsiamanis, R.-A., Papadopoulos, G. Z., Fafoutis, X., Del Fiore, J. M., Thubert, P., & Montavont, N. (2018). From Best-Effort to Deterministic Packet Delivery for Wireless Industrial IoT Networks. *I E E Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, 14(10), 4468 - 4480. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TII.2018.2856884>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

From Best-Effort to Deterministic Packet Delivery for Wireless Industrial IoT Networks

Remous-Aris Koutsiamanis, Georgios Z. Papadopoulos, *Member, IEEE*,
Xenofon Fafoutis, *Member, IEEE*, Julián M. Del Fiore, Pascal Thubert, and Nicolas Montavont

Abstract—Wireless industrial networks require reliable and deterministic communication. Determinism implies that there must be a guarantee that each data packet will be delivered within a bounded delay. Moreover, it must ensure that the potential congestion or interference will not impact the predictable properties of the network. In 2016, IEEE 802.15.4-Time-Slotted Channel Hopping (TSCH) emerged as an alternative Medium Access Control to the industrial standards such as WirelessHART and ISA100.11a. However, TSCH is based on traditional collision detection and retransmission, and can not guarantee reliable delivery within a given time. This article proposes LeapFrog Collaboration (LFC) to provide deterministic and reliable communication over an RPL-based network. LFC is a novel multi-path routing algorithm that takes advantage of route diversity by duplicating the data flow onto an alternate path. Simulations and analytical results demonstrate that LFC significantly outperforms the single-path retransmission-based approach of RPL+TSCH and the state-of-the-art LinkPeek solution.

Index Terms—Deterministic Networks, Multi-path Routing Algorithm, Route Diversity, Leapfrog Collaboration

I. INTRODUCTION

Industry 4.0 is an emerging domain of application for the Internet of Things (IoT), with goals to reduce the management cost and to contribute to the automation of the Operational Technology (OT) found in production chains in factories [1], [2]. Cost reduction can be achieved, in particular, by replacing the existing cables with a wireless medium, as long as an appropriate level of service for critical applications can still be guaranteed at all times. To that aim, the network must exhibit deterministic performance in terms of network reliability and timely delivery [3], [2], [4]. More precisely, an industrial communication framework must provide several nines of reliability in data delivery. For instance, several consecutive losses in an industrial automation control loop are sufficient to stop a production chain. Moreover, it should guarantee a worst case latency for a data packet across the network. This latency must be known in advance, and remain constant throughout the lifetime of the associated path. In order to replace wires, a wireless network should exhibit a high delivery ratio with an ultra-low jitter, regardless of transient variations in the wireless medium and of the network congestion. However, the currently deployed IoT technologies focus on best-effort traffic, where the data packets may incur delays due to retransmission, queuing and rerouting.

Time-Slotted Channel Hopping (TSCH) is one of the Medium Access Control (MAC) protocols defined in IEEE 802.15.4-2015 standard [5]. TSCH is a scheduled MAC-layer technology that is especially suited for industrial networks since it provides strict

guarantees, i.e., low-power, low-delay and reliable channel access. However, TSCH is prone to retransmissions when a data packet transmission fails, due to low link quality (i.e., multipath fading, distance) or external interferences which may decrease reliability [6].

Scenarios such as factory automation where the product can be for instance cars, require Low-power and Lossy Networks (LLNs) that consist of hundreds of sensors and actuators communicating LLN Border Router (LBR) [7], [8]. In order to extend the network beyond the radio coverage of one node, a mesh technology enables a node to act as a relay for others, but, beyond one hop, it will require a protocol for routing packets throughout the network. The IPv6 Routing Protocol for Low-Power and Lossy Networks (RPL) [9] is one of the most adopted routing protocol for the IoT. RPL builds a Destination Oriented Directed Acyclic Graph (DODAG) using a distance-vector technique whereby each node selects one or more parent(s), acting as a relay toward its root based on a common objective function. The resulting acyclic topology is also used to route back to the node, using source routing in the so-called Non-Storing Mode (NSM), in which case the root is aware of the network topology. Phinney et al. [7] describe traffic patterns and network topologies in the industrial context and how RPL can provide the baseline protocol to address some specific applications. RPL is commonly used with 6TiSCH and is perceived as a solution for out-of-band industrial information transfer. As such, it is positioned for routing information which is not a part of the industrial process itself, but which is necessary auxiliary information for enhancing the industrial process. For example, diagnostics and asynchronous alerts are within the application field. We propose extensions to enhance reliability and determinism in such a context. The work presented in this article is using RPL NSM as the baseline, and extends it with multi-paths redundancy.

This article investigates the forwarding mechanism and proposes to duplicate the data flow on alternate path, where multiple copies of the same data packet traverse on parallel paths through the wireless network. The proposed scheme, named LeapFrog Collaboration (LFC), allows combating potential link failures on a single path and exploiting path diversity in a wireless network to avoid retransmissions as much as possible. Since the first copy that arrives at the root is the one that matters, LFC lowers end-to-end delay performance. Furthermore, LFC comes with a topology-adapted scheduling algorithm that guarantees data delivery from the source to the destination within a slotframe (or not at all) and, thus, bounds jitter. Given the introduced overhead, we target lower bandwidth applications, such as critical monitoring or alerts. For these uses, LFC is implemented over IEEE 802.15.4-TSCH and RPL to reach network reliability above 99% while providing ultra-low < 15ms jitter performance.

This article extends [10], making the following additional contributions:

X. Fafoutis is with DTU Compute, Technical University of Denmark (e-mail: xefa@dtu.dk). This work was conducted when he was with the University of Bristol, UK.




Fig. 1: An example of TSCH scheduling for node D. A→D stands for ‘A transmits to D’, while EB cells are used for broadcast and advertisement frames.

- It comes with over-provisioning strategy, where one additional timeslot is reserved per data transmission, to guarantee the ultra-high Packet Delivery Ratio (PDR).
- It introduces a scheduler that is adapted to the topology, whereby each data packet is delivered to the destination within one slotframe (101 timeslots in our examples).
- It provides analytical expressions for the calculation of performance metrics of LFC, including the delay-jitter trade-off, the PDR, and upper limits on the end-to-end delay and jitter.
- It evaluates the robustness of the proposed scheme under various link qualities, on top of the COOJA simulator. In addition, LFC is compared to single-path retransmission based approach (i.e., RPL+TSCH configuration) as well as the state-of-the-art solution LinkPeek [11].

II. BASELINE PROTOCOLS AND LFC OVERVIEW

A. IEEE 802.15.4-2015 TSCH

At its core, TSCH uses Time Division Multiple Access (TDMA) and Frequency Hopping Spread Spectrum (FHSS) techniques to achieve high network reliability, reduce energy consumption and mitigate multi-path fading and the impact of external interference. In a TSCH network, nodes are constantly synchronized. The time is sliced into timeslots of equal length, sufficient enough to transmit a data packet and to receive an acknowledgement. A set of timeslots constructs a slotframe that repeats perpetually. Furthermore, an Absolute Sequence Number (ASN) is assigned to each timeslot to count the number of timeslots since the establishment of the TSCH network. All nodes in the network are aware of the current ASN. To define a TSCH scheduler, for each radio link a collection of timeslots and channel offsets is assigned, called its cells. A channel offset is a “virtual channel” that is translated into a physical radio channel that is going to be employed for communication. The translation is carried out by a FHSS algorithm:

$$\text{frequency} = F(\text{ASN} + \text{channelOffset}) \% \text{nFreq} \quad (1)$$

where nFreq is the number of available physical channels (e.g., 16 when using IEEE802.15.4-compliant radios at 2.4 GHz with all channels in use) [12]. F is a look-up table function that translates the result from the operation to actual radio channel (i.e., from 11th to 26th in 2.4 GHz band). In Fig. 1, a TSCH schedule is depicted.

B. RPL

RPL [9] is a distance-vector routing protocol specifically designed to manage hundreds of nodes in LLNs. At its core, RPL constructs a DODAG, i.e., a directed graph with no cycles. To this aim, RPL assigns to each device participating in the routing a *rank*, i.e., a metric which denotes the virtual distance from the root. Note that the rank is dynamically computed and constantly updated throughout the network lifetime. Different Objective Function (OF) can be defined to compute a node’s rank based on different types of metrics (hop count, link quality, expected retransmission times, etc.).

RPL initiates the DODAG construction from the root. It periodically broadcasts a DODAG Information Object (DIO), i.e., a control packet that includes certain configuration information as well as root’s rank value. Nodes may discover their neighbors and their respective ranks upon the reception of such messages. Note that the frequency of DIO packets heavily depends on the network stability, i.e., the more stable is the network the less frequently a DIO packet is transmitted. When a node receives a DIO message, it computes a new rank based on a given OF, and compares it with its current rank. Then, if the newly calculated rank is smaller than the current, it will add the transmitter’s address in its set of potential parents. From this set of parents, a node chooses its preferred parent as the node from which its rank will be minimal. If the new rank is bigger than the current rank, it is ignored. Once the network stabilizes, a node ends up with a preferred parent, a list of possible parents, children and siblings. Then, a node may push its packets toward the root through its preferred parent. Note that once a node computed its own rank, based on the rank of its preferred parent and link quality, it periodically transmits its own DIO packets.

C. Motivation: Toward Deterministic Industrial Networks

A deterministic network ensures that data packets traverse the RPL network in a bounded window of time. It also guarantees that a periodic process will be repeated identically throughout the network lifetime. It particularly means that potential congestions or external interferences must not affect the predictable and deterministic behavior of the network.

As previously detailed, IEEE 802.15.4-2015 comes with resource reservation i.e., transmissions are scheduled. However, wireless links are heavily affected by external interference and noise. Therefore, wireless communication comes with retransmission schemes, but at a cost of energy consumption, delay (in best-effort traffic) and bandwidth, since additional timeslots are required. In TSCH, if a data packet transmission fails, the transmitter will retransmit in the following slotframe, e.g., after 101 timeslots in our example, which is more than a second. In the case of a node crash, failures or over-the-air-programming, the link quality between two nodes will drastically decrease (or eliminate the link) for some time, which will essentially increase the losses in the network. In such a scenario, retransmission-based schemes will not allow the packet to pass through this link. To overcome this issue, RPL comes with a failure solution wherein a child node will select another parent. However, the time needed for failure detection and new parent selection is large and during this time, all data packets will be discarded.

To address this limitation, this article presents a novel technique which takes advantage of path diversity and data duplication to combat the potential losses and to minimize the delay and jitter in

wireless networks. It demonstrates that determinism can be ensured by using multiple parallel paths instead of retransmissions over the default DODAG path.

D. System model and assumptions

The context for LFC is an IEEE 802.15.4-2015 TSCH network running the RPL protocol for routing. The focus is on the transport of information from internal network nodes to the root node of the DODAG. The root node may be seen as a gateway to another network, possibly wired, and incoming packets can be sent to external destinations for further processing, but this is out of scope for this work.

The information is in the form of UDP packet payloads. Therefore, at the transport layer the sending node does not expect or receive a delivery confirmation for the packets it sends, and thus no feedback loop exists at this layer. We are agnostic to the actual payload information transferred, which is considered an application layer concern.

The intended use is networks with at least 2 hops, since in 1-hop networks simple retransmission provides the same performance. We consider only upwards traffic (i.e., towards the DODAG root), which is typical of critical monitoring or alert information transmission. Given this use case, we mainly focus on reliability rather than throughput, so given the network overhead introduced for achieving high reliability, very high bandwidth applications are not an appropriate use-case. In our analysis and simulations, we use symmetric wireless network links with a static (e.g., 80%) or variable (uniform 70%–100%) error probability, and in both cases packet-loss follows a uniform distribution with the given probability. We rely on the default IEEE 802.15.4 TSCH retransmission scheme when packet losses occur; each hop acknowledges a data packet, and if the acknowledgement is not received, the sending node performs a retransmission. In our analysis and experiments, we use different maximum numbers of retransmissions. The network nodes themselves are assumed not to malfunction or operate maliciously and their internal clocks are assumed to be synchronized by IEEE 802.15.4-2015 TSCH (i.e., beacon packets and data packets with timing information to help correct drift as well as guard time in each time slot to compensate for uncorrected drift [13], [14], [15]).

III. LEAPFROG COLLABORATION DESIGN

In this Section, the LeapFrog Collaboration (LFC), a cross-layer (MAC and Routing) scheme that minimizes the delay and the jitter metrics is detailed.

In a nutshell, LFC computes two parallel or interleaved paths for one track, with promiscuous listening between them, to allow the nodes on one path to overhear transmissions along the other path. Each node participating in a track selects a preferred or default parent and a so-called alternative parent. For every data packet transmission within this track, the data packet is sent twice, one copy to the default parent and another copy to the alternative parent. For instance, in Fig. 2 a typical ladder-based topology of two parallel paths, $8 \rightarrow 6 \rightarrow 4 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 1$ and $8 \rightarrow 7 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 1$, is depicted. In such a scenario, using packet replication and elimination would allow transferring a copy of the packet along one or both of these paths, in a ship-by-night fashion.




Fig. 2: LFC: Red arrows represent the RPL DODAG tree whereas blue ones the alternative paths. Packet Replication: 8 transmits twice the same packet, to its DP 6 and to its AP 7. Packet Elimination: 5 discards the packet from 7, since it received it earlier from 6.

The LFC algorithm can be designed and implemented in either a centralized or a distributed scheduling fashion. Under the centralized design, a central entity (e.g., the root) computes the routes and schedules the communication among the nodes in the network, similar to a label-switched path. Alternatively, in the distributed approach, each node constructs its path to the root, typically by employing a source routing header. In this article, the later case is investigated.

A. Alternative Parent Selection

As previously mentioned, when running the RPL protocol, each node maintains a list of potential parents. LFC defines the preferred parent through the RPL DODAG as the Default Parent (DP), as shown in Fig. 2. To construct an alternative path toward the root, in addition to the DP, each node in the network registers an Alternative Parent (AP) as well. There are multiple potential AP selection methods, but this article presents a method which allows the two paths to remain correlated: a node will select an alternative parent close to its default parent in order to allow overhearing between parents. Thus, to choose an AP, a node will select another parent from its list of parents that has a common parent with the node DP. So the node will check if its Default Grand Parent (DGP), the DP of its DP, is in the set of parents of a potential AP. If several potential APs follow this condition, the AP with the lowest rank will be selected.

B. LFC Operations

1) *Packet Replication:* To provide determinism in a wireless industrial network, LFC guarantees predictability in every level of the forwarding path. To that aim, under LFC, each node transmits (i.e., replicates) each data packet to its DP and its AP, respectively, in unicast transmission mode. Note that this procedure takes place at each level of the DODAG, between all relay nodes. In Fig. 2, the replication operation is illustrated, where node 6 is transmitting the data packet to both parents, nodes 4 (i.e., DP) and 5 (i.e., AP), in two different timeslots within the same TSCH slotframe. As a result, given the ladder-based topology, each data packet may traverse the

wireless network over parallel paths. However, if multiple parents are not available, and thus no AP as well, LFC falls back to the normal RPL+TSCH operation, i.e., forwarding data to the preferred parent only, at the specific node where only one parent is available. Therefore, performance will be identical to the default RPL+TSCH case for that subset of the DODAG where only one parent is available.

2) *Packet Elimination*: By using the replication operation, it follows that a node may receive several copies of the same data packet, which increases the traffic load and, thus, may impact the network congestion and the impact on battery lifetime [16]. In order to avoid such a scenario, the *Packet Elimination* operation is introduced. Once a node receives the first copy of a data packet, it will discard the following received copies, as shown in Fig. 2. To do so, a sequence number is attached in each data packet to identify the duplicates. Note that the packet elimination operation is applied at each DODAG level.

C. LFC Features

1) *Promiscuous Overhearing*: LFC exploits the shared properties of the wireless medium to compensate for the potential loss that is incurred with radio communication. Considering that the wireless medium is broadcast by nature, then any neighboring node may listen to (i.e., overhear) a transmission if it is in the range of the sender, often called *Promiscuous Overhearing*. Thus, a given relay node may have more opportunities to receive a given data packet by listening to unicast transmissions towards other relaying nodes. This is a frequent occurrence in LFC since packet replication is also used. Furthermore, in the case where only one parent is available for a node, as with Packet Replication, the behaviour will fall back to the normal TSCH+RPL case of performing no overhearing and thus being no worse than the default case. This fall back will be limited to the subset of the DODAG where only single parents are available.

Since parents with a common ancestor are selected, a grandparent will have several opportunities to receive a given data packet by promiscuous overhearing. For instance, as shown in Fig. 3a, when the intermediate node 6 is transmitting to its DP (i.e., node 4), the AP (i.e., node 5) may receive this data packet as well, and vice versa in Fig. 3b. Thus, each parent (the DP and the AP) has twice the chances to receive a data packet for each transmission from each child: the original transmission directed to it and an overhearing from the child's transmission to its other parent. Finally, the probability of successful transmission from one DODAG level to its upper one can be enhanced, by considering the overhearing feature of the sibling nodes, i.e., the nodes which have the same parent as the transmitting node. For example, the transmission from node 6 to its DP 4, can be overheard not only by its AP, but also by its sibling as well, node 7. As a result, promiscuous overhearing not only improves network reliability, but may also decrease delay and jitter as long as the transmission opportunities from one level to another are grouped in the slotframe.

2) *Over-provisioning*: Using the previously described mechanisms (packet replication to an alternative parent and promiscuous overhearing) together results in multiple opportunities for a packet to be transmitted from one layer to the next. For instance, in Fig. 3, node 4 has up to four opportunities to receive the data packet: twice from node 6 (i.e., *i*) through direct unicast transmission: 4 is the DP of 6, *ii*) through overhearing the transmission from 6




Fig. 3: By employing the Overhearing operation, the DP, the AP and the sibling nodes have more opportunities to receive the same data packet.

TABLE I: Reception opportunities

Nodes / Level	Parents / Node	Overhearing	Over-provisioning	Total
2	2	2	2	$2^4 = 16$
1	2	2	2	$2^3 = 8$
2	1	2	2	$2^3 = 8$

to its AP node 5) and, similarly, it will receive twice from node 7. As a result, considering the ladder-based topology in Fig. 3, there are up to eight opportunities for a data packet to be received by the upper level of DODAG, i.e., four opportunities per node.

To further improve reliability, the concept of *Over-provisioning* is introduced, which can be summarized as conditional retransmission. More specifically, each transmitter after sending a data packet will wait for an acknowledgement. In case of unsuccessful transmission, thanks to the over-provisioning algorithm, the transmitter will have another opportunity to transmit its data packet within the same slotframe, as shown in Fig. 4. It is worth mentioning that the over-provisioning timeslots are scheduled right after the original transmissions to bound the delay and, consequently, the jitter performance. For example, in timeslot 0 node 8 transmits unicast to node 7 while node 6 overhears, and in timeslot 1 these events are repeated in case a retransmission is needed. Thus, by introducing over-provisioning timeslots in the schedule, opportunities of successful packet reception is doubled.

3) *Summary*: Taking all the mechanisms used into account and used concurrently, the opportunities for reception belong to two groups: *i*) if both the sending and the receiving levels have two nodes, then there are a total of 16 reception opportunities, otherwise, *ii*) for the levels which have either only one parent or only one sending node, there are a total of 8 reception opportunities. These cases are summarised in Table I.




Fig. 4: An example of the adaptive LFC scheduler for eight nodes according to the topology in Fig. 3. It illustrates the following operations: Replication, Promiscuous Overhearing, Over-provisioning, as well as the Enhanced Beacons, LeapFrog Beacon and DIO control packets.

IV. LFC SCHEDULER

A. Topology-adapted Scheduler

Next, LFC comes with a scheduler adapted to the topology to achieve minimum and constant delay performance. To do so, the transmissions from the nodes far from the DODAG root are configured to be transmitted first. More precisely, the leaf nodes are configured to transmit first, and then relay nodes according to their distance from the root. As a result, all nodes access the wireless medium sequentially one after the other one and, therefore, the data packet may arrive at the root within one single slotframe, according to the requirements of deterministic networks in Industry 4.0 of ultra-low jitter performance. The schedule is statically defined and precalculated offline for the given topology to be able to guarantee that the TSCH schedule will not externally affect the measurement of the metrics of the examined methods. It is also noteworthy that although in our description we use a schedule which contains all the cells which are required for the transmission of the data from the source to the root, nevertheless it is possible to use a smaller schedule if multi-slotframe delays can be tolerated by the application requirements. This is also a solution for networks which are so large so as to preclude the use of only one slotframe.

In Fig. 4, a scheduler with a single channel offset is illustrated, and it is adapted to eight nodes according to the topology in Fig. 3. As it can be observed, the leaf node 8 transmits first its data packet toward its DP, its RPL parent, while an additional timeslot is assigned for retransmission to the same destination in case of failed transmission. Then, another two timeslots are assigned to the leaf node to transmit to its AP (i.e., timeslots 2 and 3). Note that both parents are overhearing the others transmissions (see yellow boxes). Furthermore, it is worth mentioning that timeslots 4 to 11 are assigned to forward the data packet from level 3 to level 2 of DODAG tree, which is equal to 8 transmissions and 16 opportunities for a single data packet to reach the upper level of DODAG.

B. LeapFrog Beacon Control Packet

During the network initialization phase, nodes receive all necessary RPL information through DIO messages. Thus, the nodes know their set of parents and, consequently they decide

their preferred parent. Similarly, LFC uses control packets called LeapFrog Beacons (LFB). These LFB are periodically transmitted over the network in broadcast every 30s. In the beginning, the LFB contains RPL-related information i.e., a list of possible parents and the preferred parent. Based on this information, nodes eventually learn their DGP and, thus, they can define their AP, siblings and other overheard neighborhood nodes. Later, this additional information is included in the LFB and consequently propagated. Hence, in case a node changes its DP, AP or possible parents, the other nodes can learn about this change thanks to the LFBs and, consequently, recalculate their own AP. Finally, if a change was necessary, nodes will end up informing this to their neighbors with the upcoming LFBs. Thus, the update process travels across the network and the alternative paths can be kept dynamically available all the time.

V. ANALYSIS

The first part of this section presents the delay-jitter performance trade-off of TSCH. The goal is to provide insight to the reader on particular design decisions of LFC. The second part of this section provides analytical expressions for the calculation of several performance metrics of LFC, including the PDR, and upper limits on the end-to-end delay and jitter.

A. The delay-jitter trade-off

In addition to promiscuous listening and exploiting multiple paths, LFC incorporates an extra timeslot for one retransmission in each link. Combining all these mechanisms, a particular packet has at least 8 unique opportunities to progress to the next rank of the network within the same slotframe. Fundamentally, the number of unique opportunities a packets has to progress to the next rank is controlled by a performance trade-off. Indeed, increasing this number is beneficial for the end-to-end jitter, as it increases the probabilities that a packet will reach the destination within a single frame. However, the more the allocated slots for retransmissions, the longer the frame is required to be. As a result, the allocation of additional timeslots for retransmissions within the same slotframe has a negative impact on the delay. This is the delay-jitter performance trade-off.

Let us consider a TSCH neighborhood with one receiver (r) and N senders: n_1, n_2, \dots, n_N . The number of consecutive timeslots

per node per slotframe is denoted as k . For example, $k = 1$ corresponds to a frame size of N timeslots with one timeslot per node ($n_1 \rightarrow r, n_2 \rightarrow r, \dots$). Similarly, $k = 2$ corresponds to a frame size of $2N$ slots with two consecutive timeslots per node ($n_1 \rightarrow r, n_1 \rightarrow r, n_2 \rightarrow r, n_2 \rightarrow r, \dots$). Each transmission is modeled as a independent Bernoulli trial with the same probability of success, p (*i.e.* PRR), for each trial. For simplicity, let us assume infinite retransmissions. The probability that a packet will be successfully delivered after i failed attempts is given by:

$$q_i = (1-p)^i p, \quad (2)$$

Without loss of generality, let us focus on the N -th node and let us assume that the packet is generated at beginning of the frame. This assumption constitutes a worst case scenario for the delay. If the transmission occurs on the i -th attempt, the delay is given by the following equation:

$$d_i = kN \left\lfloor \frac{i}{k} \right\rfloor + i \bmod k + k(N-1). \quad (3)$$

where $k(N-1)$ corresponds to the delay due to timeslots allocated to the other $N-1$ nodes in the first slotframe, $kN \left\lfloor \frac{i}{k} \right\rfloor$ corresponds to the delay of whole slotframes (when $i \geq k$), and $i \bmod k$ corresponds to the delay due to failed attempts in the last slotframe.

The average delay is calculated as the probability-based weighted sum of d_i , and it is given by:

$$D = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} q_i d_i, \quad (4)$$

and the jitter, *i.e.*, the deviation from perfect periodicity in packet delivery, be modeled as the standard deviation of the delay:

$$J = \sqrt{\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} q_i (d_i - D)^2}. \quad (5)$$

Fig. 5 demonstrates the delay-jitter trade-off for $N = 4$ and for various link qualities. It can be observed that as the number of timeslots per node per slotframe increases, the jitter decreases, yet with diminishing improvements. However, the delay increases rapidly in an almost linear fashion.

LFC balances the delay-jitter trade-off by allocating up to $n^2 \times m$ timeslots for transmitting a given packet in the rank above, where $n=2$ corresponds to the number of parents and $m=2$ corresponds to the maximum number of transmission to a single parent.

B. LFC performance in the worst case scenario

This section models the performance of LFC in the worst case scenario, providing analytical expressions for calculating the end-to-end PDR, as well as the maximum end-to-end delay and jitter.

Let us consider that a packet is generated in the source node at the beginning of the frame in a TSCH network of R ranks. The number of parents (including any alternative parents) is denoted by n . The maximum number of transmissions to a single parent within the same slotframe is denoted by m . From end to end, three cases can be identified. The first type corresponds to the source node, i , transmitting to its parents, which are located in rank $R-1$.




Fig. 5: An illustration of the delay-jitter trade-off in a star TSCH neighborhood with 4 nodes. Increasing the allocated timeslots per slotframe decreases the jitter, yet increases the delay.

The probability for the packet to fail to reach a parent, j , in rank $R-1$, denoted by q_{R-1} , is given by:

$$q_{R-1}^{(j)} = p_{ij}^{mn}, \quad (6)$$

whereby p_{ij} is the link-layer packet error probability for node i transmitting to parent j . It can be observed that Eq. 6 captures the fact that a packet has $n \times m$ opportunities to reach the next rank, as dictated by the LFC schedule, due to the feature of alternative parents and retransmissions.

The probability for the packet to fail to progress to an intermediate rank $h \in [1, R-2]$ depends on if it managed to reach the previous rank:

$$q_h^{(j)} = \prod_{i=1}^n \left(q_{h+1}^{(i)} + (1 - q_{h+1}^{(i)}) \cdot p_{ij}^{mn} \right). \quad (7)$$

In the intermediate ranks, a packet has additional opportunities to reach the next rank due to the feature of promiscuous overhearing, captured in Eq. 7 by the product.

Lastly, the third case corresponds to the last hop to the root. The probability for the packet to fail to reach the root, of rank 0, is given by:

$$q_0 = \prod_{i=1}^n \left(q_1^{(i)} + (1 - q_1^{(i)}) \cdot p_{ij}^m \right). \quad (8)$$

In this case, promiscuous overhearing is still possible, yet there are no alternative parents.

Assuming that the packet is not retransmitted in a future frame, the end-to-end PDR is calculated recursively by: $1 - q_0$. Note that the Eq. 7 and Eq. 8 does not take into account the probability of sibling overhearing; thus, the model provides a lower bound of the end-to-end PDR.




Fig. 6: The worst-case scenario performance of LFC in networks of various depths (R) and widths in terms of parents (n). The delay increases linearly with the network depth and quadratically with the number of alternative parents. The jitter is independent to the network depth and increases linearly with the number of parents.

Given the packet is successful at reaching the root within a slotframe, the end-to-end delay in the worst case scenario is provided by the following equation:

$$D_{max} = 2 \cdot n \cdot m + (R-2) \cdot n^2 \cdot m, \quad (9)$$

capturing the $n \times m$ timeslots reserved for the first (source to first intermediate rank) and final (last intermediate rank to destination) hops, as well as the $n \times n \times m$ timeslots reserved for the $R-2$ intermediate hops. Similarly, the end-to-end jitter in the worst case scenario is estimated by:

$$J_{max} = n \cdot m - 1. \quad (10)$$

D_{max} and J_{max} are given in timeslots and they must be multiplied by the duration of the timeslot in order to be converted in time.

Fig. 6 plots D_{max} and J_{max} for networks of various depths (in terms of ranks, R), and widths (in terms of number of parents, n). The figure demonstrates how LFC scales with the network size. In particular, the delay increases linearly with the network depth and quadratically with the network width. The jitter is independent from the network depth and increases linearly with the network width.

C. The Capacity Loss Trade-off

The TSCH schedule constitutes a limiting factor for the maximum traffic that can traverse through the network. For example, if one timeslot per second is allocated to a particular link, the maximum supported traffic is one packet per second. This limiting factor is generally not considered an issue, as long as the overlaying application generates traffic at a low rate; yet, it can be a challenge when scheduling high-rate traffic [17].

More specifically, a TSCH schedule must over-allocate timeslots to account for link-layer retransmissions [17]. For example, to




Fig. 7: The number of timeslots per slotframe required for a packet to traverse a network of R ranks ($n=2, m=2$). LFC sacrifices throughput for high reliability, low delay and low jitter.





Fig. 8: The available end-to-end bandwidth for LFC and standard TSCH (top). The bandwidth overhead of TSCH compared to standard TSCH (bottom). LFC sacrifices throughput for high reliability, low delay and low jitter.

support a link with a worst-case PRR = 0.5, the TSCH schedule should over-allocate timeslots by a factor of $ETX = 1/PRR = 2$. In general, for a packet to traverse through a network of R ranks, a total number of $R \times ETX$ timeslots are required. Note that, in practice, over-allocation should be higher than the expected transmission count due to error busts and finite queues.

LFC provides additional redundancy. Indeed, for a packet to traverse through R , the total number of required timeslots is given by the worst-case end-to-end delay, Eq. (9). Fig. 7 illustrates the number of timeslots required by LFC in contrast to standard TSCH. As demonstrated in the figure, LFC requires additional timeslots, imposing a limitation to the maximum achievable throughput. Therefore, LFC is suitable for industrial applications that can afford to trade bandwidth for high reliability, low delay and low jitter.

This bandwidth overhead is better illustrated in Fig. 8. TSCH

supports up to 100 timeslots of 10 ms per second; thus, up to 100 packets can be transmitted over a single TSCH link per second. This corresponds to an available bandwidth of

$$B_l = 100 L, \quad (11)$$

where L is the maximum packet size ($L = 127$ bytes or 1016 bits in TSCH). Assuming for simplicity no downlink traffic, the available end-to-end bandwidth, B , is given by

$$B = \frac{B_l}{S}, \quad (12)$$

where S is the timeslots per slotframe (see y-axis of Fig. 7). The available end-to-end bandwidth of LFC and standard TSCH for various network depths is plotted in Fig. 8 (top), while the overhead of LFC as compared to standard TSCH is shown in Fig. 8 (bottom). The figure shows that, under ideal conditions (no link-layer packet loss, $ETX = 1$), LFC introduces a considerable bandwidth overhead of more than 80%. In more realistic scenarios (*i.e.* $ETX = 2$ and $ETX = 3$), the bandwidth overhead of LFC is under 40% and 20% respectively. Overall, LFC is able to support applications that require 2 kbps end-to-end bandwidth in TSCH networks with depth of 7 ranks or less.

VI. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

A. Simulation Setup

To evaluate the performance of the LFC algorithm, COOJA, the network simulator distributed as part of the Contiki OS¹, was employed.

The wireless network consists of 8 nodes that are distributed in a typical ladder-based topology in an area of $130 m \times 40 m$, as depicted in Fig. 3. In particular, node 8 is the source, node 1 is the root, while nodes 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 are relays. The source node transmits 1 data packet every 15 seconds, using a $50 m$ transmission radius so that given the ladder topology, exactly a node's direct children, parents and its sibling are reachable. The radios are configured to communicate at $250 kbits/s$. While this topology is relatively simple, it strikes a balance between complexity and simplicity which has the advantages that:

- it can be studied analytically as well (see Section V),
- it has enough complexity and structure to highlight the advantages and disadvantages of our solution,
- it is very good predictor of performance in even more random topologies due to the method used for selecting alternative parents in LFC (*i.e.*, a nodes DGP must be in the set of parents of a candidate AP).

At the routing layer, the RPL protocol [9] was used to build the DODAG, while at the MAC layer, IEEE 802.15.4-2015 TSCH was selected with slotframe length of 101 timeslots and one channel. The number of timeslots is generally configurable but we selected 101 since it is the default value and it is big enough for our cases. Any other big enough value would work as well. The duration of each timeslot is $10 ms$, the lowest value 6TiSCH supports. This value provides the lower bound of the attainable delay for one network hop. The payload size is configured at $20 bytes$. Each simulation lasts $41.25 hours$ (not including the $25 minutes$ setup/initialisation

TABLE II: Simulation Setup

Topology	Value
Topology	Multi-hop, see Fig. 3
Number of nodes	8 (including the root)
Number of sources	1 source
Node spacing	40 <i>m</i> (in average)
Simulation	Value
Duration	41.25 <i>hours</i>
Traffic Pattern	1 <i>pkt</i> /15 <i>sec</i>
Payload size	20 <i>bytes</i>
Routing model	RPL [9]
MAC model	TSCH [5]
TSCH	Value
EB period	16 <i>sec</i>
LB period	30 <i>sec</i>
Slotframe length	101
Timeslot length	10 <i>ms</i>

phase) within which approximately 9900 *packets* are sent, with 5 independent iterations per configuration. LFC was compared against that of the retransmission-based RPL+TSCH (*i.e.*, a single copy traverses the network), as well as the state-of-the-art solution LinkPeek [11]. Note that the maximum number of link-layer retransmissions was implemented under various configurations: 0, 2, 4 and 8, namely RT0, RT2, RT4 and RT8 respectively. For example, RT4 means that IEEE 802.15.4-TSCH configuration will re-transmit at most four times if no acknowledgment was received at the link-layer. In Table II the details of the network parameters are presented.

It is noted that in this configuration (10 ms timeslot length, $R = 5$, $n = 2$ and $m = 2$), equations (9) and (10) indicate that the maximum delay is 240 ms and the maximum jitter is 30 ms respectively.


B. Link environment

In real-world deployments, the radio link quality presents dynamic behavior over time [18]. However, in critical industrial environments, the deployed wireless network has to combat such link quality variations to maintain ultra-high network performance. In this study, the performance of LFC was evaluated under various radio link qualities. In particular, the following four different use-cases were studied: static link quality of 90%, 80%, 70%, and link quality uniformly random between 70% to 100%. In the last case all link qualities are reset to a randomly generated value in the interval every $10 minutes$. Additionally, the links between the sink node and its two children are always kept at 100%. The reason for this exception is because we would like to exclude these nodes from the reliability calculations. These nodes cannot support the LFC case due to having only one parent (the root node) instead of two. As a result, a lower link quality than 100% between these nodes and the root would unfairly affect LFC in comparison to the no-overhearing cases. Keeping the link qualities at 100% does affect latency, but in the same way for all the compared methods.


C. Simulation Results

In this section, the performance evaluation of LFC in terms of delay, jitter, reliability and energy consumption is presented when compared against LinkPeek and default single-path RPL+TSCH with varying re-transmissions at the link-layer.


¹<http://www.contiki-os.org/start.html>




(a) Mean and standard deviation of end-to-end delay.



(c) Packet Delivery Ratio performance.



(b) Mean end-to-end jitter.



(d) Radio duty cycle performance for TX, RX, and Idle modes.

Fig. 9: Performance evaluation of LFC in terms of end-to-end delay, jitter, reliability and radio duty cycle, when compared against single path retransmission-based approaches of RPL+TSCH, state-of-the-art LinkPeek solution and the theoretical PDR performance of LFC (LFC-Th.An).

1) *Delay:* In Fig. 9a the mean and the standard deviation of MAC layer end-to-end, i.e., from the leaf node to the destination, delay is depicted. Note that the end-to-end delay includes the propagation time of the data packet, as well as the potential retransmission delay. As it can be observed, LFC achieves end-to-end delay close to $205ms$, which is in line with the proposed scheduler and with the mathematical analysis. Furthermore, considering Fig. 11, LFC demonstrates a very stable delay performance. When compared to the retransmission-based approaches of IEEE802.15.4-TSCH (i.e., RT2, RT4 and RT8) and Link Peek, LFC displays delay reduced by up to 577%, 669%, 664%, and 568% respectively. Note that the non-retransmitting IEEE802.15.4-TSCH RT0 approach does achieve very low delay ($\approx 204ms$) but at a very high cost in PDR. The delay is low because only delivered packets are considered, and if a packet has been delivered with RT0, by necessity, it will not have missed any transmissions along its path to delay it.

2) *Jitter:* To provide deterministic communication in a wireless network, it is necessary to obtain minimum jitter performance. Note that jitter is the variation in latency from one packet to another, here calculated as the standard deviation of end-to-end delay.

In Fig. 9b the average end-to-end jitter performance is illustrated. As it can be observed, LFC achieves ultra-low jitter (i.e., $\approx 15ms$): lower than any other LFC or RPL+TSCH configuration and LinkPeek solution. On the other hand, the more retransmissions are configured for the following slotframe, the higher the jitter, i.e., see RPL+TSCH-RT4, RPL+TSCH-RT8. As a result, LFC decreases jitter by up to 7357%, 8799%, 8897% and 7301% when compared to RPL+TSCH-RT2, RPL+TSCH-RT4, RPL+TSCH-RT8 and LinkPeek, respectively. Finally, note that the delay and jitter metrics were computed based only on successful packet receptions and also removing delays more than 3 standard deviations (3σ) away from the mean. This explains the performance of RPL+TSCH-RT0 ($\approx 14ms$) that presents high performance of jitter but extremely




Fig. 10: Average radio power consumption on the Zolertia Z1 mote.




Fig. 11: Detailed representation LFC's delay performance under various link qualities.

low PDR performance.

3) *PDR:* To further assess the performance of LFC, the network reliability was evaluated. To this aim, the PDR was computed, where packet loss is calculated as $1 - PDR$ and, thus, for example packet loss 0% is the equivalent of 100% PDR.

In Fig. 9c, the PDR performance under various link qualities (i.e., link qualities fixed at 90%, 80%, 70% and variable random between 70% - 100%), is illustrated. LFC presents ultra-high PDR performance above 99.1% in all cases and above 99.83%

for cases with links with link quality above 80%. In fact, LFC demonstrates results similar to the theoretical performance, i.e., dark green column. These results can be explained as follows. As it can be observed, the additional features of LFC, overhearing and over-provisioning, fundamentally improve the performance of the LFC scheme, since by employing the over-provisioning option each data packet has an additional timeslot as a back up to retransmit in case of a failure of the original transmission, see Table I. As a result, LFC provides reliability similar to the theoretical and RPL+TSCH-RT8, while it minimizes the jitter performance as well, contrary to the retransmission-based solutions.

4) *Duty Cycle*: Finally, this article evaluates the energy consumption for all studied schemes.

Fig. 9d illustrates the average network-wide radio duty-cycle (C) separately for the three modes (TX, RX, and Idle) that the radio can be in. The upper panel in Fig. 9d shows TX (C_{TX}) and RX (C_{RX}) stacked, while the lower panel shows only the Idle mode (C_{Idle}). For TX and RX the maximum duty cycle is $\approx 0.27\%$, while for the Idle mode the maximum is $\approx 8\%$. The majority of the duty cycle corresponds to the Idle mode, while TX and RX have very low and similar duty cycles.

The evaluation results utilise the fact that the majority of the energy consumption in IoT devices results from the operation of the radio module [19]. This leads providing duty cycle results, which are easily transferable to different hardware platforms, in lieu of power consumption values. As an example of this process, we provide the conversion from relative duty cycle to absolute power consumption for the Zolertia Z1 mote which uses the CC2420 radio transceiver module. Given the values for radio power consumption for the Z1 [20] ($P_{TX} = 52.2mW@3V$, $P_{RX} = 56.4mW@3V$, $P_{Idle} = 1.28mW@3V$) we receive the average radio power consumption per mote as:

$$E(P) = P_{TX}C_{TX} + P_{RX}C_{RX} + P_{Idle}C_{Idle} \quad (13)$$

The results for the Z1 mote using Eq. 13 are shown in Fig. 10 for each transmission method. The results indicate that LFC induces a straightforward impact on duty cycle performance, since LFC allocates additional timeslots per scheduler transmission to guarantee reliability above 99% and bounded delay performance (by using the over-provisioning feature). Moreover, by using the overhearing option, the nodes remain active for more timeslots to listen to neighboring transmissions, as compared to the default RPL+TSCH operation. Therefore, LFC consumes more energy network-wide when compared to LinkPeek and retransmission-based RPL+TSCH. As shown in Fig. 10, for the Z1 mote the overhead that LFC adds is $\approx 195\%$ ($E(P_{LFC}) \approx 0.25mW$, $E(P_{RPL+TSCH}) \approx 0.085mW$). For other hardware platforms, the overhead introduced may differ since the reference energy consumption of the radio modes might be different from the Z1 mote, but our results facilitate calculating the overheads given the corresponding energy consumption values.

These results show that LFC provides determinism by bounding delay at the cost of energy consumption.

It is noted that one of the ongoing works on LFC is to reduce the unnecessary active timeslots by introducing a more intelligent scheduler. For instance, in the over-provisioning feature, it may not be necessary to explicitly allocate one additional timeslot per transmission, instead it could be configured probabilistically based

on link quality, meaning that the more stable the link from A to B, the lower the probability to allocate an additional timeslot.

D. Feasibility for industrial applications

LFC has been implemented on Contiki OS with the constraints of low-power motes taken into consideration. The simulations for network and energy performance were executed using the COOJA target to allow examining a large set of parameters and to allow multiple iterations to increase statistical confidence in the results. However, to verify the feasibility of LFC for real industrial applications, we have used the Zolertia Z1 mote.

The Z1 mote has been selected because it is one of the most resource constrained motes available (16-bit RISC CPU @16MHz, 8KB RAM, 92KB internal flash memory, 2MB external flash memory, CC2420 radio transceiver module) which can still execute in IPv6 mode to support 6TiSCH. It also has the added benefit that it is possible to simulate the Z1 mote using the MSPSim software package [21] within COOJA, thus we have accurately verified that the operation is faithful to the scenarios examined in this work. We are confident that since LFC using Contiki OS is operational on the very constrained Z1 mote, then it will be applicable to almost any other equivalent or more powerful hardware platform (e.g. CC2538, CC2650).

More specifically, we have executed sample simulations to verify that:

- 1) LFC on Contiki OS compiles for the Z1 and fits within its available external flash memory (2MB). More specifically, RPL+TSCH compiles to 495960 bytes, while the LFC implementation to 499600 bytes, so the overhead added is 3640 bytes or 0.73%.
- 2) LFC on Contiki OS compiles for and executes normally on the Z1, fitting within its available RAM (8KB). The exact global RAM overhead is 99 bytes or 1.2% of RAM, augmented slightly by minimal stack use during function execution. Out of the 99 bytes, 40 bytes are arrays of configurable size and can be set to less to reduce memory usage. LFC does not use any dynamically allocated memory.
- 3) LFC on Contiki OS executes normally (no missed scheduled events or other timing issues) through the MSPSim simulator for the Z1. Thus, the computational overheads are acceptable. In practice, our implementation mainly adds functionality above the MAC layer, where timing is not so critical. It does modify the operation of the MAC packet reception handler, however our additions are executed *after* the packet has been received and not during the critical timeslot operation. The only modification inside the time critical timeslot operation handler is to enable and disable MAC address filtering when overhearing is required, which has no measurable impact on performance since it is just a configuration option change.

VII. RELATED WORK

Phinney et al. [7] investigates the applicability of RPL for industrial applications and shows that RPL provides the baseline requirements, but QoS still needs to be addressed. Thus, it highlights the need for higher reliability and predictability. Attempting to provide wire-like reliability in IIoT by utilizing the Automatic

Repeat reQuest (ARQ) method, commonly employed in general-purpose wireless networks, leads to simple and easily implemented solutions. However, while the value of simplicity and ease of implementation is considerable, the drawbacks of approaches of this nature are especially problematic for IIoT which have strict constraints, i.e., increased delays and jitter metrics. Additionally, they decrease spectrum utilization by reserving part of it for the retransmissions.

In attempting to reduce the energy costs of reliability-enhancing methods, overhearing has been used to implicitly acknowledge the packet reception. In [22] Lee *et al.* use this approach when the receiver in turn forwards the packet to provide an acknowledgement of reception to the original sender. An enhanced version of this work by Maalel *et al.* [23] adds spatial diversity by maintaining an ordered list of neighboring nodes susceptible of retransmitting the packet.

Additionally, standardized methods of Packet Replication and Elimination (PRE) targeting mission-critical and time-sensitive applications have been created by the Time-Sensitive Networking (TSN) Task Group (TG) at the IEEE the Deterministic Networking (DetNet) Working Group (WG) at the IETF. Both are working on redundancy-based methods wherein packet copies can follow non-congruent paths through the network while ensuring single delivery to the receiving end, even when one of the paths is interrupted [24].

In [11] the authors propose an algorithm to increase reliability in IEEE 802.15.4 networks, by conditionally retransmitting packets to fallback RPL parents when link failure is detected. Their solution, however, does not aim at lowering end-to-end delay and by only retransmitting when failure is detected misses an opportunity for path diversification in cases where a node is completely disconnected from the network.

In [25] the authors propose using data plane packet replication (up to the network graph degree) at the originating nodes only and routing the additional packet copies via disjoint paths, in order to improve reliability and latency, at the cost of increased energy consumption. They use a centralized scheduler to generate the TSCH schedule and a custom simulation for the performance evaluation, showing that packet replication significantly helps in achieving wire-like reliability.

In [26], the authors propose the adaption of the IEEE 802.15.4 in order to facilitate its cooperation with the RPL protocol to achieve multipath routing. The adaptation is required due to a limitation in the IEEE 802.15.4, which allows only one associated parent at any time. Their work results in slightly improved end-to-end delay and reliability. However, their work does not take advantage of the multiple paths to replicate traffic in order to increase reliability.

In [27], the authors propose a distributed scheduling algorithm for IEEE 802.15.4e-TSCH networks, which uses RPL ranks to group nodes into layers which can be scheduled in overlapping cells. Their aim is to use this to increase network capacity by taking spatial separation into account and to create schedules which feature an end-to-end upper bound to delay, specifically delivery within the same slotframe.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

Industrial networks require deterministic protocols to guarantee that the transmitted data packet will traverse the wireless network in a predefined and constant delay. This article proposes the LeapFrog

Collaboration mechanism to exploit spatial diversity and packet redundancy to compensate for the inherently lossy wireless medium. At its core, LFC computes two parallel paths for a single data flow, thus, the nodes on one path may listen-in on the data transmissions along the other parallel path. As a result, each data packet gets multiple opportunities to be received at the upper DODAG level. The performance evaluation results demonstrate that LFC achieves network reliability above 99%, while bounding the delay performance, i.e., providing an ultra-low jitter performance of 15ms. The ongoing work consists of further investigating a more sophisticated scheduler to reduce the unnecessarily active timeslots and, thus, to decrease the energy consumption. Furthermore, it is planned to investigate the performance of LFC in large-scale wireless networks. Finally, it is planned to investigate the behavior of LFC under realistic conditions by performing a set of experimental studies.

REFERENCES

- [1] E. Grossman, C. Gunther, P. Thubert, P. Wetterwald, J. Raymond, J. Korhonen, Y. Kaneko, S. Das, Y. Zha, B. Varga, J. Farkas, F.-J. Goetz, J. Schmitt, X. Vilajosana, T. Mahmoodi, S. Spirou, P. Vizarrata, D. Huang, X. Geng, D. Dujovne, and M. Seewald, "Deterministic networking use cases," Working Draft, IETF Secretariat, Internet-Draft draft-ietf-detnet-use-cases-13, September 2017, <https://tools.ietf.org/id/draft-ietf-detnet-use-cases-11.txt>. [Online]. Available: <https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-detnet-use-cases-13>
- [2] L. D. Xu, W. He, and S. Li, "Internet of things in industries: A survey," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 2233–2243, Nov 2014.
- [3] S. Yamamoto, T. Emori, and K. Takai, "Field wireless solution based on isa100.11a to innovate instrumentation," Yokogawa Technical Report English Edition, Tech. Rep., 2010.
- [4] P. Thubert, "Converging over deterministic networks for an industrial internet," Ph.D. dissertation, 2017, thèse de doctorat dirigée par Toutain, Laurent Informatique Ecole nationale supérieure Mines-Télécom Atlantique Bretagne Pays de la Loire 2017. [Online]. Available: <http://www.theses.fr/2017IMTA0011>
- [5] "IEEE Standard for Low-Rate Wireless Personal Area Networks (LR-WPANs)," *IEEE Std 802.15.4-2015 (Revision of IEEE Std 802.15.4-2011)*, April 2016.
- [6] G. Z. Papadopoulos, A. Gallais, G. Schreiner, and T. Noel, "Importance of Repeatable Setups for Reproducible Experimental Results in IoT," in *Proc. of the ACM PE-WASUN*, 2016.
- [7] T. Phinney, P. Thubert, and RA. Assimiti, "RPL applicability in industrial networks," Working Draft, IETF Secretariat, Internet-Draft draft-ietf-roll-rpl-industrial-applicability-02, October 2013.
- [8] K. Pister, P. Thubert, S. Dwars, and T. Phinney, "Industrial Routing Requirements in Low-Power and Lossy Networks," IETF, RFC 5673, 2009.
- [9] T. Winter, P. Thubert, A. Brandt, J. Hui, R. Kelsey, P. Levis, K. Pister, R. Struik, J. Vasseur, and A. R., "RPL: IPv6 Routing Protocol for Low-Power and Lossy Networks," IETF, RFC 6550, 2012.
- [10] G. Z. Papadopoulos, T. Matsui, P. Thubert, G. Texier, T. Watteyne, and N. Montavont, "Leapfrog Collaboration: Toward Determinism and Predictability in Industrial-IoT applications," in *Proc. IEEE ICC*, 2017.
- [11] Y. S. Lohith, T. S. Narasimman, S. V. R. Anand, and M. Hedge, "Link peek: A link outage resilient ip packet forwarding mechanism for glowan/rpl based low-power and lossy networks (llns)," in *2015 IEEE International Conference on Mobile Services*, June 2015, pp. 65–72.
- [12] T. Watteyne, M. Palattella, and L. Grieco, "Using IEEE 802.15.4e Time-Slotted Channel Hopping (TSCH) in the Internet of Things (IoT): Problem Statement," RFC 7554, 2015.
- [13] D. Stanislawski, X. Vilajosana, Q. Wang, T. Watteyne, and K. S. J. Pister, "Adaptive synchronization in ieee802.15.4e networks," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 795–802, Feb 2014.
- [14] T. Chang, T. Watteyne, K. Pister, and Q. Wang, "Adaptive synchronization in multi-hop tsch networks," *Computer Networks*, vol. 76, pp. 165 – 176, 2015. [Online]. Available: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1389128614003922>
- [15] G. Z. Papadopoulos, A. Mavromatis, X. Fafoutis, N. Montavont, R. Piechocki, T. Tryfonas, and G. Oikonomou, "Guard Time Optimisation and Adaptation for Energy Efficient Multi-hop TSCH Networks," in *Proceedings of the IEEE 3rd World Forum on Internet of Things (WF-IoT)*, 2016, pp. 301–306.
- [16] G. Z. Papadopoulos, J. Beaudaux, A. Gallais, P. Chatzimisios, and T. Noel, "Toward a Packet Duplication Control for Opportunistic Routing in WSNs," in *Proc. of the IEEE GLOBECOM*, 2014, pp. 94–99.

- [17] A. Elsts, X. Fafoutis, J. Pope, G. Oikonomou, R. Piechocki, and I. Craddock, "Scheduling High-Rate Unpredictable Traffic in IEEE 802.15.4 TSCH Networks," in *13th Int. Conf. on Distributed Comput. in Sensor Syst. (DCOSS)*, 2017.
- [18] G. Z. Papadopoulos, A. Gallais, G. Schreiner, E. Jou, and T. Noel, "Thorough IoT testbed Characterization: from Proof-of-concept to Repeatable Experimentations," *Elsevier Computer Networks*, vol. 119, pp. 86–101, 2017.
- [19] J. Eriksson, F. Österlind, N. Finne, A. Dunkels, N. Tsiftes, and T. Voigt, "Accurate network-scale power profiling for sensor network simulators," in *Proceedings of the 6th European Conference on Wireless Sensor Networks (EWSN)*, 2009, pp. 312–326.
- [20] Zolertia, *Z1 Datasheet*, March 2010.
- [21] J. Eriksson, A. Dunkels, N. Finne, F. Österlind, and T. Voigt, "MSPSim—an extensible simulator for msp430-equipped sensor boards," in *Proceedings of the European Conference on Wireless Sensor Networks (EWSN), Poster/Demo session*, vol. 118, 2007.
- [22] G.-W. Lee and E.-N. Huh, "Reliable data transfer using overhearing for implicit ack," in *ICCAS-SICE, 2009*. IEEE, 2009, pp. 1976–1979.
- [23] N. Maalel, P. Roux, M. Kellil, and A. Bouabdallah, "Adaptive Reliable Routing Protocol for Wireless Sensor Networks," in *Proc. of the ICWMC*, 2013, pp. 52–55.
- [24] G. Z. Papadopoulos, N. Montavont, and P. Thubert, "Exploiting packet replication and elimination in complex tracks in 6tisch lns," Working Draft, IETF Secretariat, Internet-Draft draft-papadopoulos-6tisch-pre-reqs-00, July 2017.
- [25] J. de Armas, P. Tuset, T. Chang, F. Adelantado, T. Watteyne, and X. Vilajosana, "Determinism Through Path Diversity: Why Packet Replication Makes Sense," in *Proc. of the INCoS*, 2016.
- [26] B. Pavković, F. Theoleyre, and A. Duda, "Multipath opportunistic rpl routing over ieee 802.15.4," in *Proc. ACM MSWiM*, 2011, pp. 179–186.
- [27] I. Hosni and F. Théoleyre, "Self-healing distributed scheduling for end-to-end delay optimization in multihop wireless networks with 6tisch," *Computer Communications*, vol. 110, pp. 103 – 119, 2017.



Remous-Aris Koutsiamanis is a Postdoctoral Researcher at IMT Atlantique in Rennes, France and a Visiting Fellow at Bournemouth University, United Kingdom. Previously he was a Postdoctoral Research Assistant at Bournemouth University, United Kingdom. He received his PhD from the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering of the Democritus University of Thrace, Greece in 2016 with honours, his M.Sc. in Artificial Intelligence from the University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom with a full scholarship in 2006, and his B.Sc. in Informatics from the University of Piraeus,

Greece in 2005 with distinction. Dr. Koutsiamanis has participated in numerous international and national research projects. He has been involved in the organization of an international event (AdHoc-Now'18) and has served as reviewer in multiple conferences and journals. His research interests include the Industrial IoT, 6TiSCH and network resource allocation within the wider networking field.



Georgios Z. Papadopoulos (S'10-M'15) serves as an Associate Professor at the IMT Atlantique in Rennes, France. Previously, he was a Postdoctoral Researcher at the University of Bristol. He received his Ph.D. from University of Strasbourg, in 2015 with honours, his M.Sc. in Telematics Engineering from University Carlos III of Madrid in 2012 and his B.Sc. in Informatics from Alexander T.E.I. of Thessaloniki in 2011. Dr. Papadopoulos has participated in various international and national (FP7 RERUM, FIT Equipex) research projects. He has received the prestigious French national

ANR JCJC grant for young researchers. He has been involved in the organization of many international events (AdHoc-Now'18, IEEE CSCN'18, IEEE ISCC'17). Moreover, he has been serving as Editor for Wireless Networks journal and Internet Technology Letters. His research interests include Industrial IoT, 6TiSCH, LPWAN, Battery Management System and Smart Grid. He has received the Best Ph.D. Thesis Award granted by the University of Strasbourg and he was a recipient of two Best Paper Awards (IFIP Med-Hoc-Net'14 and IEEE SENSORS'14).



Xenofon Fafoutis (S'09-M'14) received a PhD degree in Embedded Systems Engineering from the Technical University of Denmark in 2014; an MSc degree in Computer Science from the University of Crete (Greece) in 2010; and a BSc in Informatics and Telecommunications from the University of Athens (Greece) in 2007. From 2014 to 2018, he held various researcher positions at the University of Bristol (UK), and he was a core member of SPHERE: UK's flagship Interdisciplinary Research Collaboration on Healthcare Technologies. Since 2018 he is an Assistant Professor with the Embedded Systems

Engineering (ESE) section of the Department of Applied Mathematics and Computer Science of the Technical University of Denmark (DTU Compute). His research interests primarily lie in Networked Embedded Systems as an enabling technology for Digital Health, Smart Cities, Industry 4.0, and the Internet of Things (IoT).



Julián M. Del Fiore is a first-year Ph.D. student in the Icube Laboratory at the University of Strasbourg, France. His research focuses on proposing solutions to cope with routing insecurity on the Internet. Previously, Julián obtained his Electronics Engineering diploma with honors at the University of Buenos Aires. He also did an internship in the area of Industrial IoT centered on 6TiSCH networks at IMT Atlantique. His research interests are the Internet and Machine Learning.



Pascal Thubert has been actively involved in research, development and standards efforts on Internet mobility and wireless technologies since joining Cisco in 2000. He currently works at Cisco's Chief Technology and Architecture office, where he focuses on products and standards in the general context of IPv6, wireless, and the Internet of Things. He co-chairs 6TiSCH, the IETF Working Group focusing on IPv6 over the 802.15.4 TSCH deterministic MAC, and LPWAN, that applies IETF protocols over low power wide area networking technologies. Earlier, he specialized in IPv6 as applied

to mobility and wireless devices and developed routers and switches microcode in Cisco's core IPv6 product development group. In parallel with his R&D missions, he has authored multiple IETF RFCs and draft standards dealing with IPv6, mobility and the Internet of Things, including NEMO, 6LoWPAN and RPL. Pascal holds an Engineering Degree from Ecole Centrale de Lyon and a PhD from IMT Atlantique.



Nicolas Montavont is a full professor at IMT Atlantique, in the SRCD department, and responsible of the IRISA OCIF team since 2015. He received the M.Sc. degree and PhD degree in Computer science from the University of Strasbourg, France, in 2001 and 2004 respectively. He also did a post-doc at National Institute of Standard and Technologies (NIST) in Gaithersburg, USA. He received his HDR in 2015 from Université Rennes 1. His research topics are mobility and multihoming management in IPv6 networks, wireless communications and Internet of Things.