

Core  
Internet Draft  
Interned status: Standards Track  
Expires: July 1, 2017

H. Wang  
C. Pu  
P. Wang  
Y. Yang  
D. Xiong  
Chongqing University of  
Posts and Telecommunications  
December 28, 2016

Requirements Analysis for OPC UA over CoAP  
draft-wang-core-opcua-transmission-requirements-00

Abstract

Industrial Internet of Things is an attractive application area for Constrained Application Protocol (CoAP). OPC Unified Architecture (OPC UA) defines a semantic-based information model for industrial control system that can satisfy the requirements of Industry 4.0 based on semantic information exchange. This document analyses requirements for OPC UA transmission over CoAP.

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), its areas, and its working groups. Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts.

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."

The list of current Internet-Drafts can be accessed at  
<http://www.ietf.org/ietf/lid-abstracts.txt>

The list of Internet-Draft Shadow Directories can be accessed at  
<http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html>

This Internet-Draft will expire on July 1, 2017.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2016 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 and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

Table of Contents

- 1. Introduction.....2
- 2. Architecture of OPC UA over CoAP.....3
- 3. Requirements for OPC UA over CoAP.....4
  - 3.1. Encoding.....4
  - 3.2. Application Sublayer Optimization.....4
  - 3.3. Consistency.....4
  - 3.4. Reliability.....5
- 4. Security Considerations.....5
- 5. IANA Considerations.....5
- 6. References.....6
  - 6.1. Normative References.....6
  - 6.2. Informative References.....6
- Authors' Addresses.....7

1. Introduction

CoAP is a web application protocol designed for resource constrained devices and limited networks that has been widely used in machine-to-machine (M2M) communications [RFC7252]. However, the purpose of applying CoAP to the Industrial Internet of Things (IIoT) is to provide connectivity for the devices. Whereas the communication of Industry 4.0 is not only based on data transmission, but also based on semantic information exchange. Driven by this, using CoAP in the IIoT, there is a need to provide good support for data transmission of the application layer in the automation field. According to the definition of Industry 4.0 for communication, CoAP needs to support the exchange of semantic information, namely the semantic information model. For the current protocols supporting semantic information model in the IIoT, the information model defined by OPC UA [IEC 62541-1] is very promising and its transmission mode is

similar to the transmission mode of CoAP, so it can be applied as a branch of the CoAP message payload.

## 2. Architecture of OPC UA over CoAP

With the vision of IIoT in mind, we believe that the architecture of OPC UA over CoAP can be mainly divided into the following two:

1) Figure 1 presents a logical layered structure of OPC UA Information Model over CoAP. In the transport layer, DTLS runs on top of UDP to secure transmission. Then, the middle layer utilizes the message mode defined in the CoAP protocol. Last, the information model of OPC UA [IEC TR 62541-5] is defined as an application of CoAP at the top. In such a hierarchical structure, the semantic-based data information in OPC UA can be transmitted in restricted scenarios, so that CoAP can meet the requirements of semantic information transmission.




Figure 1: OPC UA Information Model over CoAP

2) In order to take full advantage of the service set defined by OPC UA, this document proposes the other architecture for OPC UA




Figure 2: OPC UA Information Model and Services over CoAP

transmission over CoAP. As shown in Figure 2, the information model of OPC UA is defined as the application of CoAP, moreover, the connection establishment, creation session, publish/subscribe and other functions related to data information interaction are all implemented by the service set defined by OPC UA. CoAP is mainly responsible for the definition of message format and runs over UDP to keep the implementation lightweight.

### 3. Requirements for OPC UA over CoAP

#### 3.1. Encoding

CoAP messages are encoded in a simple binary format that starts with a fixed-size 4-byte header. The header is followed by a variable-length Token value, which can be between 0 and 8 bytes long. Following the Token value comes a sequence of zero or more CoAP Options in Type-Length-Value (TLV) format, optionally followed by a payload that takes up the rest of the datagram. In addition, the OPC UA protocol coding mainly includes two ways that are binary and XML. Therefore, in order to transmit the information model of OPC UA over CoAP, specific frame formats of CoAP need to be designed to support two kinds of coding modes of OPC UA.

#### 3.2. Application Sublayer Optimization

For information exchange, the document [draft-ietf-core-coap-pubsub-00] defines the corresponding application sublayer, OPC UA also defines a number of specific communication patterns. For example, in the publish/subscribe mode defined by OPC UA, when the client needs to obtain a data periodically, it will initiate a subscription request to the server. In addition, the server will send the data to the client periodically as it receives the request from the client successfully. Correspondingly, in the publish/subscribe specification of CoAP, it introduces Broker mechanism in which the client sends the state information to the Broker and the Broker provides storage and forwarding function to implement the publish/subscribe function. Comparing above two protocols, their achieving methods have a difference on communication mode of the publish/subscribe function. Therefore, it is necessary to optimize the application sublayer of CoAP to support some particular communication modes of OPC UA.

#### 3.3. Consistency

The interactive model of CoAP is the client/server model. However, in M2M scenarios, CoAP entities often act as both servers and clients. Comparing to OPC UA, though the interactive model is also

the client/server model, there is a set of supported services in the OPC UA server. Consequently, for the great difference of the server definition of these two protocols, we need to tackle with the consistency and integration issues between the CoAP server and the OPC UA server.

### 3.4. Reliability

One of the main design goals of CoAP is to satisfy some special requirements such as communication in the constrained scenarios that address power consumption. Hence, in order to reduce network overhead and avoid network congestion, CoAP is designed to run over UDP, which is a good choice to achieve inter-network data transmissions in use of the IP architecture. However, UDP is a connectionless transport layer protocol that provides unreliable information transmission services. In the field of IIoT, we need to ensure the reliability of data transmission to avoid losing some important data information. Moreover, CoAP addresses transmission reliability by defining a message as requiring acknowledgment, obviously this is not enough to meet the high reliability requirements in the field of IIoT, so the reliability of COAP remains to be optimized.

### 4. Security Considerations

The security of CoAP includes four modes in which three modes implemented based on the Datagram Transport Layer Security (DTLS) except the non-security mode. However, the security architecture of OPC UA is built on the application layer and the communication layer above the transport layer. Specifically, the application layer adopts the authentication and authorization and the communication layer achieves the security of OPC UA [IEC TR 62541-2] through secure channel encryption. Though OPC UA has four modes, the security model of OPC UA is realized based on Transport Layer Security (TLS). Actually, DTLS is an addition to TLS to solve the unreliable transmission feature of UDP. Currently, some documents show that CoAP needs to support TLS. Therefore, the security of the two protocols can be implemented jointly.

### 5. IANA Considerations

This memo includes no request to IANA.

## 6. References

### 6.1. Normative References

[RFC7252] Shelby, Z., Hartke, K., and C. Bormann, "The Constrained Application Protocol", RFC 7252, June 2014, <<https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc7252>>.

### 6.2. Informative References

[IEC TR 62541-1]  
IEC, "OPC unified architecture-Part1: Overview and concepts-IEC 62541", 2016,  
<[https://webstore.iec.ch/preview/info\\_iec62541-1%7Bed2.0%7Den.pdf](https://webstore.iec.ch/preview/info_iec62541-1%7Bed2.0%7Den.pdf)>.

[IEC 62541-5]  
IEC, "OPC unified architecture-Part5: Information Model-IEC 62541", 2015,  
<[https://webstore.iec.ch/preview/info\\_iec62541-5%7Bed2.0%7Db.pdf](https://webstore.iec.ch/preview/info_iec62541-5%7Bed2.0%7Db.pdf)>.

[I-D.koster-core-coap-pubsub]  
Koster, M., Keranen, A., and J. Jimenez, "Publish-Subscribe Broker for the Constrained Application Protocol (CoAP)", draft-ietf-core-coap-pubsub-00 (work in progress), October 2016.

[IEC TR 62541-2]  
IEC, "OPC unified architecture-Part2: Security Model-IEC 62541", 2016,  
<[https://webstore.iec.ch/preview/info\\_iec62541-2%7Bed2.0%7Db.pdf](https://webstore.iec.ch/preview/info_iec62541-2%7Bed2.0%7Db.pdf)>.

Authors' Addresses

Heng Wang  
Chongqing University of Posts and Telecommunications  
2 Chongwen Road  
Chongqing, 400065  
China

Phone: (86)-23-6248-7845  
Email: wangheng@cqupt.edu.cn

Chenggen Pu  
Chongqing University of Posts and Telecommunications  
2 Chongwen Road  
Chongqing, 400065  
China

Phone: (86)-23-6246-1061  
Email: mentospcg@163.com

Ping Wang  
Chongqing University of Posts and Telecommunications  
2 Chongwen Road  
Chongqing, 400065  
China

Phone: (86)-23-6246-1061  
Email: wangping@cqupt.edu.cn

Yi Yang  
Chongqing University of Posts and Telecommunications  
2 Chongwen Road  
Chongqing, 400065  
China

Phone: (86)-23-6246-1061  
Email: 15023705316@163.com

Daijing Xiong  
Chongqing University of Posts and Telecommunications  
2 Chongwen Road  
Chongqing, 400065  
China

Phone: (86)-23-6246-1061  
Email: 15111825021@163.com