6lo Y. Choi, Ed.
Internet-Draft ETRI
Intended status: Standards Track C-M. Kim
Expires: 24 April 2026 KETI
C. Gomez
Universitat Politecnica de Catalunya
21 October 2025

Transmission of IPv6 Packets over Short-Range Optical Wireless Communications
draft-ietf-6lo-owc-05

Abstract

[IEEE802.15.7], "Short-Range Optical Wireless Communications" defines wireless communication using visible light. It defines how data is transmitted, modulated, and organized in order to enable reliable and efficient communication in various environments. The standard is designed to work alongside other wireless communication systems and supports both Line-of-Sight (LOS) and Non-Line-of-Sight (NLOS) communications. However, ambient light interference from natural sunlight or artificial lighting sources can impact signal reliability. To mitigate this, advanced modulation techniques, optical filtering, and adaptive power control can be employed. This document describes how IPv6 is transmitted over short-range optical wireless communications (OWC) using IPv6 over Low-Power Wireless Personal Area Network (6LoWPAN) techniques.

Status of This Memo

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

The rapid growth of the Internet of Things (IoT) has led to a significant increase in the number of wireless communication technologies utilized for real-time data collection and monitoring in various industrial domains, such as manufacturing, agriculture, healthcare, transportation, and so on. This trend highlights the importance of wireless communication in facilitating real-time data exchange and analysis, ultimately contributing to efficiency and decision-making processes across different industrial sectors.

Optical Wireless Communications (OWC) stands as one of the potential candidates for IoT wireless communication technologies, extensively applied across various industrial domains. The [IEEE802.15.7] standard outlines the procedures for establishing bidirectional communications between two OWC devices. Furthermore, IEEE 802.15.7 delineates a comprehensive OWC standard, encompassing features like Visible Light Communication (VLC), Short-Range Communication, Line-of-Sight (LOS) and Non-Line-of-Sight (NLOS) Support, High and Low Data Rates, Energy Efficiency, and Secure Communication. In addition, the standard has evolved through subsequent related developments to address emerging application requirements:

* [IEEE802.15.7a] introduces Optical Camera Communications (OCC), utilizing image sensors for data reception, making OWC applicable to smart city applications and enhanced vehicular communication.

* [IEEE802.15.13-2023] was developed for industrial IoT and includes new PHYs with pulse modulation (OOK/FDE) and adaptive OFDM for factory automation and real-time industrial networking.

* [IEEE802.11bb-2023] extends Wi-Fi technology to optical communication, leveraging the existing 802.11 MAC and PHY layers. This enables seamless integration of OWC into mainstream wireless networks, opening new possibilities for high-speed data transmission in indoor environments.

While IEEE 802.15.7 and its related amendments define the physical and MAC layers for Optical Wireless Communication (OWC), the documents do not specify how IPv6 packets are transmitted over such links. Therefore, this document defines the adaptation of IPv6 over OWC to enable IP-based interoperability across OWC and other low-power wireless technologies.

OWC is immune to Radio Frequency (RF) interference, making it highly suitable for environments such as hospitals, airplanes, and industrial facilities, where RF interference is a concern. Additionally, OWC can leverage existing visible light infrastructure, reducing deployment costs for smart lighting and IoT applications. OWC also provides energy-efficient operation. Nevertheless, OWC performance is affected in Non-Line-of-Sight (NLoS) links, and by interference produced by ambient light sources.

OWC supports various network topologies, including peer-to-peer and star configurations. With IPv6 over OWC, it is possible to extend the network topology to include the mesh topology by using a route-over mechanism. However, IPv6 over OWC needs 6LoWPAN technologies [RFC4944] [RFC6282] [RFC6775] [RFC8505] because of the low bit rates, limited frame size and energy constraints of OWC. Implementing header compression (e.g., 6LoWPAN or SCHC) significantly reduces packet size, lowering transmission power requirements and extending battery life for IoT devices. This makes OWC an alternative for low-power wireless communication in energy-constrained environments.

2. Conventions and Terminology

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "NOT RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in BCP 14 [RFC2119] [RFC8174] when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

This specification requires readers to be familiar with all the terms and concepts that are discussed in "IPv6 Stateless Address Autoconfiguration" [RFC2462], "IPv6 over Low-Power Wireless Personal Area Networks (6LoWPANs): Overview, Assumptions, Problem Statement, and Goals" [RFC4919], "Transmission of IPv6 Packets over IEEE 802.15.4 Networks" [RFC4944], and "Neighbor Discovery Optimization for IPv6 over Low-Power Wireless Personal Area Networks (6LoWPANs) [RFC6775], and "SCHC: Generic Framework for Static Context Header Compression and Fragmentation" [RFC8724].

6LoWPAN Node (6LN):
: A 6LoWPAN node is any host or router participating in a LoWPAN. This term is used when referring to situations in which either a host or router can play the role described.

6LoWPAN Router (6LR):
: An intermediate router in the LoWPAN that is able to send and receive Router Advertisements (RAs) and Router Solicitations (RSs), as well as forward and route IPv6 packets. 6LoWPAN Routers are present only in route-over topologies.

6LoWPAN Border Router (6LBR):
: A border router located at the junction of separate 6LoWPAN networks or between a 6LoWPAN network and another IP network.

There MAY be one or more 6LBRs at the 6LoWPAN network boundary. A 6LBR is the responsible authority for IPv6 prefix propagation for the 6LoWPAN network it is serving. An isolated LoWPAN also contains a 6LBR in the network that provides the prefix(es) for the isolated network.

Duplicate Address Detection (DAD):
A mechanism used in IPv6 networks to ensure that no two devices share the same address, preventing address conflicts.

3. Short-Range Optical Wireless Communications

Optical Wireless Communication (OWC) utilizes intensity modulation of optical sources, such as Light Emitting Diodes (LEDs) and Laser Diodes (LDs), to transmit data at speeds faster than what the human eye can perceive. OWC combines lighting and data communications, finding applications in various domains including area lighting, signboards, streetlights, vehicles, traffic signals, displays, LED panels, and digital signage.

IEEE802.15.7 describes the use of OWC for optical wireless personal area networks (OWPANs) and covers topics such as network topologies, addressing, collision avoidance, acknowledgment, performance quality indication, dimming support, visibility support, colored status indication, and color stabilization.

3.1. Network Topologies

The MAC layer of OWC provides three types of topologies: peer-to-peer, star and broadcast. In the star topology, the communication is established between devices and a single central controller, called the coordinator. In the peer-to-peer topology, one of the two devices in an association takes on the role of the coordinator. More complex topologies, such as the mesh topology, can be supported by using peer-to-peer at the higher layer with IPv6 over OWC.

3.2. Protocol Stack of OWC

IEEE 802.15.7 defines a protocol stack in terms of a number of layers and sublayers, depicted in Figure 1. The Physical Layer (PHY) in OWCs comprises the light transceiver and its associated low-level control mechanisms. It handles the transmission and reception of light signals, encoding and decoding data, and managing the physical characteristics of the communication channel. On top of the PHY, there is a Media Access Control (MAC) sublayer that facilitates access to the physical channel for various types of data transfers. The MAC sublayer controls how devices share the medium, manages access protocols, and ensures fair and efficient utilization of the optical wireless communication channel. The PHY and MAC sublayer form the data link layer in optical wireless communication, enabling the transmission and reception of data over the physical medium.

The upper layers, depicted in Figure 1, include the network layer responsible for network configuration, manipulation, and message routing, as well as the application layer which encompasses the intended functionality of the device. In order to access the MAC sublayer, a logical link control (LLC) layer can utilize the service-specific convergence sublayer (SSCS). The LLC layer provides a bridge between the upper layers and the MAC sublayer, facilitating the transfer of data and control information between the two layers. The upper layers, including the network layer and application layer, work in conjunction with the MAC sublayer and utilize the LLC layer and SSCS to enable efficient communication and functionality within the optical wireless communication system.

```
   +----------------------------------------+ - - - - - - - - - -
   |   Logical Link Control (LLC) Sublayer  |
   +----------------------------------------+
   |  Service-Specific Convergence Sublayer |   OWC Link Layer
   +----------------------------------------+
   |              MAC Sublayer              |
   +----------------------------------------+ - - - - - - - - - -
   |             Physical Layer             | OWC Physical Layer
   +----------------------------------------+ - - - - - - - - - -
```

Figure 1: Protocol Stack of OWC

In order to send an IPv6 packet over OWC, the packet MUST be passed down to the LLC sublayer. For IPv6 addressing or address configuration, the LLC sublayer MUST provide related information, such as link-layer addresses, to its upper layer.

3.3. Addressing of OWC Devices

OWC devices have a unique 64-bit address. When a device associates with a coordinator node it is allowed to be allocated a short 16-bit address. Either address is allowed to be used for communication within the OWC data link network. Therefore, both of the 16-bit and 64-bit addresses can be used to generate an IPv6 Interface Identifier (IID).

3.4. MTU and data rates of OWC Link Layer

Type	MTU	Data Rates
PHY Type 1 (PHY1)	1,023 bytes	11.67 kbps ~ 266.6 kbps
PHY Type 2 (PHY2)	65,535 bytes	1.25 Mbps ~ 96 Mbps
PHY Type 3 (PHY3)	65,535 bytes	12 Mbps ~ 96 Mbps

Table 1: MTU and Data Rates of IEEE 802.15.7

Table 1 summarizes the maximum packet size is given by the OWC parameter "aMaxPHYFrameSize", and the data rate that can be supported for each OWC PHY type, as specified in the IEEE 802.15.7.

4. Specification of IPv6 over OWC

OWC technology has requirements owing to low power consumption and allowed protocol overhead. 6LoWPAN standards [RFC4944][RFC6775] [RFC6282] provide useful functionality for reducing the overhead of IPv6 over OWC. This functionality consists of link-local IPv6 addresses and stateless IPv6 address autoconfiguration (see Sections 4.2 and 4.3), Neighbor Discovery (see Section 4.4), header compression (see Section 4.5) and and fragmentation (see Section 4.6).

4.1. Protocol Stack

Figure 2 illustrates the IPv6-over-OWC protocol stack. Upper-layer protocols can be transport-layer protocols (e.g., TCP and UDP), application-layer protocols, and other protocols capable of running on top of IPv6.

```
+-----------------------------------------+
|          Upper-Layer Protocols          |
+-----------------------------------------+
|                   IPv6                  |
+-----------------------------------------+
|   Adaptation Layer for IPv6 over OWC    |
+-----------------------------------------+
|           OWC Logical Link Layer        |
+-----------------------------------------+
|            OWC Physical Layer           |
+-----------------------------------------+
```

Figure 2: Protocol Stack for IPv6 over OWC

The Adaptation Layer for IPv6 over OWC supports Neighbor Discovery, stateless address autoconfiguration, header compression, and fragmentation and reassembly, based on 6LoWPAN. Note that 6LoWPAN header compression [RFC6282] does not define header compression for TCP. The latter can still be supported by IPv6 over OWC, albeit without the performance optimization of header compression.

4.2. Stateless Address Autoconfiguration

An OWC device performs stateless address autoconfiguration as per [RFC4862]. A 64-bit IID for an OWC interface is formed by utilizing the 16-bit or 64-bit address (see Section 3.3). In the viewpoint of address configuration, such an IID should guarantee a stable IPv6 address during the course of a single connection because each data link connection is uniquely identified by OWC Data Link Layer.

Following the guidance of [RFC7136], IIDs of all unicast addresses for OWC devices are 64 bits long and constructed by using the generation algorithm of random identifiers (RIDs) that are stable [RFC7217].

The Random Identifier (RID) is derived using the F() algorithm defined in [RFC7217]. One of the input parameters to F() is Net_Iface, which MAY be derived from the 16-bit or 64-bit OWC Link-Layer Address. However, because short (16-bit) addresses are easily predictable and can be subject to address-scanning attacks, implementations SHOULD apply the randomized identifier generation scheme of [RFC7217] to ensure IID stability and privacy. The F() algorithm SHALL use SHA-256 as the hash function. An optional Network_ID parameter MAY be included to increase randomness in IID generation. The secret key MUST be at least 128 bits long and SHOULD be initialized with a cryptographically strong pseudorandom value as recommended in [RFC4086].

4.3. IPv6 Link-Local Address

The IPv6 Link-Local Address for an OWC device is formed by appending the IID to the prefix fe80::/64, as depicted in Figure 3.

```
 0          0                  0                          1
 0          1                  6                          2
 0          0                  4                          7
+----------+------------------+---------------------------+
|1111111010|       zeros      |    Interface Identifier   |
+----------+------------------+---------------------------+
.                                                         .
. <- - - - - - - - - - - - - 128 bits - - - - - - - - - - - - -> .
.                                                         .
```

Figure 3: IPv6 Link-Local Address in OWC

4.4. Neighbor Discovery

Neighbor Discovery Optimization for 6LoWPANs [RFC6775][RFC8505] describes the Neighbor Discovery approach in several 6LoWPAN topologies, such as mesh topology. IPv6 over OWC supports mesh topologies with route-over.

* When an OWC 6LN is directly connected to a 6LBR, the 6LN registers its address with the 6LBR by sending a Neighbor Solicitation (NS) message including the Extended Address Registration Option (EARO) [RFC8505]. In this single-hop case, Duplicate Address Detection (DAD)[RFC6775] is not required, since the 6LBR manages address registrations for its attached nodes.

* For multi-hop topologies, the 6LBR MUST perform DAD on registered addresses to ensure address uniqueness across the entire OWC network. In such networks, intermediate 6LNs that connect to multiple neighbors MAY act as 6LoWPAN Routers (6LRs) to forward Neighbor Discovery messages as specified in [RFC6775].

* When receiving RSs and RAs, the OWC 6LNs MUST follow Sections 5.3 and 5.4 of [RFC6775].

* When an OWC device is a 6LR or 6LBR, the OWC device MUST follow Sections 6 and 7 of [RFC6775].

4.5. Header Compression

4.5.1. Traditional 6LoWPAN header compression

Header compression as defined in [RFC6282], which specifies the compression format for IPv6 datagrams on top of IEEE 802.15.4, is REQUIRED in this document as the basis for IPv6 header compression on top of OWC. All headers MUST be compressed according to the encoding formats described in [RFC6282].

Therefore, IPv6 header compression in [RFC6282] MUST be implemented. Further, implementations MAY also support Generic Header Compression (GHC) as described in [RFC7400].

If a 16-bit address is required as a short address, it MUST be formed by the 16-bit OWC Link Layer Address as shown in Figure 4.

```
 0                   1
 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
| 16-bit OWC Link Layer Address |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

Figure 4: OWC Short Address Format

4.5.2. SCHC header compression

The 6LoWPAN Capability Indication Option (6CIO) is defined in [RFC6775]. This document introduces a new capability flag, the ‘S’ bit, indicating support for SCHC header compression. In addition, Static Context Header Compression and fragmentation (SCHC)[RFC8724] is optionally used in OWC networks to reduce overhead. A signaling mechanism SHOULD be implemented to indicate whether a node supports SCHC compression. For instance, SCHC MAY be used to compress IPv6 headers, IPv6/UDP headers, IPv6/UDP/CoAP (if CoAP is used), etc. [RFC8724].

In the star topology, in order to signal that a node supports SCHC for header compression, the node uses the 6LoWPAN Capability Indication Option (6CIO), with a new 6LoWPAN Capability Bit called the "S" bit. This ’S’ bit is intended to indicate generic SCHC functionality, so that it is applicableit emulates beyond OWC networks. Future standardization efforts MAY define a generic specification for the ’S’ bit that extends to other link-layer technologies. The "S" bit is the last bit (47th bit) of the "6LoWPAN Capability Bits" registry (see Figure 5).

```
 0                   1                   2                   3
 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|     Type      |  Length = 1   |   Reserved    |X|A|D|L|B|P|E|G|
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                           Reserved                          |S|
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

Figure 5: New 6LoWPAN Capability Bit in the 6CIO

New option fields:

S: 1-bit flag. Set to indicate that the node sending the 6CIO option supports SCHC for header compression.

Typically, the 6CIO (with the "S" bit set) will only be sent in 6LoWPAN-ND Router Solicitation (RS) packets. The resulting 6LoWPAN-ND Router Advertisement (RA) can then already make use of SCHC and thus indicate SCHC capability implicitly.

In a multihop topology, SCHC header compression can only be used as long as the whole 6LoWPAN network is administratively required to support SCHC-compressed packet transmission over a multihop network. In that case, all network nodes MUST support at least one of the route-over modes defined in [I-D.ietf-6lo-schc-15dot4], i.e., Straightforward Route-Over (SRO), Tunneled, RPL-based Route-Over (TRO) or Pointer-based Route-Over (PRO), and all network nodes MUST use the same route-over mode at a given time.

In order to transmit a SCHC-compressed IPv6 packet over OWC, the frame format to be used depends on the network topology (i.e., star vs multihop) and, for multihop topologies, on the route-over mode used. The frame format SHALL be the corresponding one defined in Sections 4.1 to 4.3 of [I-D.ietf-6lo-schc-15dot4], where "IEEE 802.15.4 frame payload" needs to be replaced by "IEEE 802.15.7 frame payload" in the case of IPv6 over OWC.

4.6. Fragmentation and Reassembly Considerations

For PHY1 of OWC, IPv6 over OWC MUST use [RFC4944] Fragmentation and Reassembly (FAR). The MTU of OWC PHY1 is smaller than the MTU of IPv6 Packet (1280 bytes). However, because the MTU of OWC PHY2 and PHY3 are bigger than MTU of IPv6 Packet, IPv6 over OWC MUST NOT use [RFC4944] FAR at the adaptation layer for the payloads as discussed in Section 3.4.

Even though OWC devices have larger MTUs (i.e., PHY2 and PHY3) than 1280 octets, use of a 1280-octet MTU is RECOMMENDED in order to avoid need for Path MTU discovery procedures [RFC7668].

4.7. Unicast and Multicast Address Mapping

The address resolution procedure for mapping IPv6 non-multicast addresses into OWC Link-Layer Addresses follows the general description in Sections 4.6.1 and 7.2 of [RFC4861], unless otherwise specified.

The Source/Target Link-Layer Address option has the following form when the addresses are 16-bit OWC Link Layer Addresses.

```
 0                   1
 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|      Type     |   Length=1    |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
|                               |
+-     Padding (all zeros)     -+
|                               |
++-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-++-+-+-+-+-+
| OWC 16-bit Link Layer Address |
+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+-+
```

Figure 6: Unicast Address Mapping

Option fields:
- Type:
  - 1: This is for the Source Link-Layer Address.
  - 2: This is for the Target Link-Layer Address.
- Length:
  - This is the length of this option (including the Type and Length fields) in units of 8 bits. The value of this field is 1 for 16-bit OWC Link Layer addresse.

IEEE 802.15.7 does not natively support link-layer multicast transmission. Therefore, IPv6 packets over OWC are normally delivered as unicasts between two OWC devices. When a 6LBR is connected to multiple 6LNs, it MAY emulate multicast delivery by performing link-layer broadcast or by replicating packets as multiple unicasts, while considering the resulting energy impact on constrained nodes.

To reduce unnecessary transmissions, the 6LBR SHOULD maintains a record of multicast listeners at the OWC link-layer granularity (rather than the subnet level) and MUST NOT forward multicast packets to 6LNs that have not registered as listeners for the relevant groups.

In the reverse direction, a 6LN MUST send IPv6 multicast packets as unicasts to the 6LBR, which then distributes them according to its multicast listener table.

5. Internet Connectivity Scenarios

The scenarios in this section provide useful context for understanding OWC device network configurations. To further clarify, OWC can operate in two primary configurations.

* Single-hop networks: Suitable for small-scale IoT applications such as small-scale smart home automation, where OWC-enabled devices communicate directly.

* Multi-hop networks: Suitable Where OWC devices relay data across multiple hops to extend the network range (e.g., for industrial IoT deployments). Additionally, interoperability with other 6lo wireless technologies can be considered. In hybrid networks, IPv6 over OWC can coexist with these technologies by utilizing IPv6 routing mechanisms, allowing seamless integration with existing infrastructure.

5.1. OWC Device Network Connected to the Internet

Figure 7 illustrates an example of an OWC device network connected to the Internet. Each OWC device, such as a 6LN, 6LR, or 6LBR, is considered an OWC device, and they communicate with one another as long as they are within each other’s range.

```
                   6LN
                    |
      OWC link →    |
            ↓       |
   6LR ------- 6LBR -- (( Internet )) -- Corresponding Node
    .           .
    .<-Subnet--> .
    .   to the   .
    .  Internet  .
```

Figure 7: Example of OWC Device Network Connected to the Internet

The 6LBR is acting as a router and forwarding packets between 6LNs and the Internet. Also, the 6LBR MUST ensures address collisions do not occur because the 6LNs are connected to the 6LBR like a start topology, so the 6LBR checks whether or not IPv6 addresses are duplicates, since 6LNs need to register their addresses with the 6LBR.

5.2. OWC Device Multi-hop Network

In some scenarios, the OWC device network MAY operate as a simple, isolated ad-hoc network, as illustrated in Figure 8. Two groups of 6LNs are interconnected in a star topology, with each group connected to a 6LR.

```
                    6LN                6LN
                     |                  |
          OWC link → |       OWC link → |
               ↓     |             ↓    |
        6LN -------- 6LR -------------- 6LR ------- 6LN
         .                              |      ↑      .
         .                              | ← OWC link .
         .                              |            .
         .                             6LN           .
         .                                           .
         . < - - - - - - - -  Subnet - - - - - - -  - > .
```

Figure 8: Example of isolated OWC Device Multi-hop Network

In multihop (i.e., more complex) topologies, DAD requires the extensions for multihop networks, such as the ones in [RFC6775].

6. IANA Considerations

IANA is requested to make the following addition to the "6LoWPAN Capability Bits" registry, as follows:

Bit	Description	Reference
47 (suggested)	SCHC Support (S bit)	RFC This

Figure 9: New 6LoWPAN Capability Bit (S bit)

7. Security Considerations

Security mechanisms for IPv6 over OWC MUST address confidentiality, integrity, and replay protection. Future work may consider optical-layer encryption and physical-layer key establishment.

8. References

8.1. Normative References

[I-D.ietf-6lo-schc-15dot4]
Gomez, C. and A. Minaburo, "Transmission of SCHC-compressed packets over IEEE 802.15.4 networks", Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, draft-ietf-6lo-schc-15dot4-11, 14 October 2025, <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/draft-ietf-6lo-schc-15dot4-11>.

[IEEE802.15.7]
IEEE, "IEEE Standard for Local and metropolitan area networks--Part 15.7: Short-Range Optical Wireless Communications", IEEE Std 802.15.7-2018, DOI 10.1109/IEEESTD.2019.8697198, April 2019, <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/8697198>.

[RFC2462] Thomson, S. and T. Narten, "IPv6 Stateless Address Autoconfiguration", RFC 2462, DOI 10.17487/RFC2462, December 1998, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2462>.

[RFC4861] Narten, T., Nordmark, E., Simpson, W., and H. Soliman, "Neighbor Discovery for IP version 6 (IPv6)", RFC 4861, DOI 10.17487/RFC4861, September 2007, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4861>.

[RFC4862] Thomson, S., Narten, T., and T. Jinmei, "IPv6 Stateless Address Autoconfiguration", RFC 4862, DOI 10.17487/RFC4862, September 2007, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4862>.

[RFC4944] Montenegro, G., Kushalnagar, N., Hui, J., and D. Culler, "Transmission of IPv6 Packets over IEEE 802.15.4 Networks", RFC 4944, DOI 10.17487/RFC4944, September 2007, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4944>.

[RFC6282] Hui, J., Ed. and P. Thubert, "Compression Format for IPv6 Datagrams over IEEE 802.15.4-Based Networks", RFC 6282, DOI 10.17487/RFC6282, September 2011, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6282>.

[RFC6775] Shelby, Z., Ed., Chakrabarti, S., Nordmark, E., and C. Bormann, "Neighbor Discovery Optimization for IPv6 over Low-Power Wireless Personal Area Networks (6LoWPANs)", RFC 6775, DOI 10.17487/RFC6775, November 2012, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6775>.

[RFC7136] Carpenter, B. and S. Jiang, "Significance of IPv6 Interface Identifiers", RFC 7136, DOI 10.17487/RFC7136, February 2014, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7136>.

[RFC7217] Gont, F., "A Method for Generating Semantically Opaque Interface Identifiers with IPv6 Stateless Address Autoconfiguration (SLAAC)", RFC 7217, DOI 10.17487/RFC7217, April 2014, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7217>.

[RFC7400] Bormann, C., "6LoWPAN-GHC: Generic Header Compression for IPv6 over Low-Power Wireless Personal Area Networks (6LoWPANs)", RFC 7400, DOI 10.17487/RFC7400, November 2014, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7400>.

[RFC7668] Nieminen, J., Savolainen, T., Isomaki, M., Patil, B., Shelby, Z., and C. Gomez, "IPv6 over BLUETOOTH(R) Low Energy", RFC 7668, DOI 10.17487/RFC7668, October 2015, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7668>.

[RFC8505] Thubert, P., Ed., Nordmark, E., Chakrabarti, S., and C. Perkins, "Registration Extensions for IPv6 over Low-Power Wireless Personal Area Network (6LoWPAN) Neighbor Discovery", RFC 8505, DOI 10.17487/RFC8505, November 2018, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8505>.

[RFC8724] Minaburo, A., Toutain, L., Gomez, C., Barthel, D., and JC. Zuniga, "SCHC: Generic Framework for Static Context Header Compression and Fragmentation", RFC 8724, DOI 10.17487/RFC8724, April 2020, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8724>.

8.2. Informative References

[IEEE802.11bb-2023]
IEEE, "IEEE Standard for Information Technology--Telecommunications and Information Exchange between Systems Local and Metropolitan Area Networks--Specific Requirements Part 11: Wireless LAN Medium Access Control (MAC) and Physical Layer (PHY) Specifications Amendment 6: Light Communications", IEEE Std 802.11bb-2023, June 2023, <https://standards.ieee.org/ieee/802.11bb/10823>.

[IEEE802.15.13-2023]
IEEE, "IEEE Standard for Multi-Gigabit per Second Optical Wireless Communications (OWC), with Ranges up to 200 m, for Both Stationary and Mobile Devices", IEEE Std 802.15.13-2023, February 2023, <https://standards.ieee.org/ieee/802.15.13/10269>.

[IEEE802.15.7a]
IEEE, "IEEE Standard for Local and Metropolitan Area Networks - Part 15.7: Short-Range Optical Wireless Communications Amendment 1: Higher Rate, Longer Range Optical Camera Communication (OCC)", IEEE Std 802.15.7a-2024, December 2024, <https://standards.ieee.org/ieee/802.15.7a/10367>.

[RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>.

[RFC4086] Eastlake 3rd, D., Schiller, J., and S. Crocker, "Randomness Requirements for Security", BCP 106, RFC 4086, DOI 10.17487/RFC4086, June 2005, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4086>.

[RFC4919] Kushalnagar, N., Montenegro, G., and C. Schumacher, "IPv6 over Low-Power Wireless Personal Area Networks (6LoWPANs): Overview, Assumptions, Problem Statement, and Goals", RFC 4919, DOI 10.17487/RFC4919, August 2007, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4919>.

[RFC8174] Leiba, B., "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in RFC 2119 Key Words", BCP 14, RFC 8174, DOI 10.17487/RFC8174, May 2017, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8174>.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to the members of the IETF 6lo Working Group. Carles Gomez has been funded in part by the Spanish Government through project PID2019-106808RA-I00 and PID2023-146378NB-I00, and by Secretaria d’Universitats i Recerca del Departament d’Empresa i Coneixement de la Generalitat de Catalunya 2017 through grant SGR 376 and 2021 throught grant SGR 00330.

Annex A. Example Use of Combined 6LoWPAN HC and SCHC

This annex presents an optional strategy and considerations for combining 6LoWPAN and SCHC header compression techniques within IPv6 over OWC networks. The goal is to provide flexibility across different deployment scenarios and traffic patterns. This strategy is not a required part of the specification.

A.1 Motivation

OWC-based IPv6 networks can involve both low-latency, local communication (e.g., between nearby sensor devices), and longer-range or upstream communication (e.g., to cloud services). Each of these communication patterns may benefit from different header compression techniques.

6LoWPAN is lightweight and quasi-stateless, making it attractive for devices with strict memory or processing constraints. 6LoWPAN is not fully stateless because it also supports context-based compression for specific prefixes or addresses, particularly in global communication scenarios [RFC6282].

SCHC, on the other hand, may require more memory and processing due to its stateful nature, but offers significantly higher compression efficiency when header field values are predictable. In low bit-rate technologies, SCHC’ s higher compression ratio may lead to reduced overall transmission time, offsetting the additional processing overhead. Supporting both compression schemes can help address the needs of heterogeneous devices and deployments.

A.2 Compression Selection Strategy

An OWC node is able to select an appropriate header compression method based on the following contextual factors:

* Header Field Predictability: The key determinant is whether the values of header fields can be predicted at the time of compression. This impacts SCHC’s effectiveness more than whether traffic is periodic or event-driven.

* Traffic Characteristics: Although traffic may be periodic or event-driven, what matters more is the structure and stability of the header field values across packets. Structured, repeated traffic patterns favor SCHC.

* Service Requirements: Delay-sensitive applications do not automatically favor 6LoWPAN. While SCHC may involve higher processing latency, its ability to reduce packet size can improve transmission times—especially over low-data-rate links.

* Implementation Constraints: Devices with minimal memory and processing capacity may prefer 6LoWPAN HC due to its simpler encoding and lower overhead. More capable devices can benefit from SCHC’s higher efficiency.

* Interoperability Needs: In mixed deployments, legacy 6LoWPAN-only nodes and SCHC-capable nodes may coexist. Supporting both schemes ensures compatibility and facilitates gradual network upgrades.

Signaling mechanisms, such as the 'S' bit in the 6LoWPAN Capability Option, can help indicate SCHC support and coordinate behavior across devices.

Note: SCHC is not limited to LPWAN scenarios. It can be effective in short-range, high-density deployments when header predictability and compression efficiency are beneficial.

A.3 Example Scenarios

The following are example cases where combining 6LoWPAN and SCHC might be beneficial:

* Mixed Generation Deployment: Older devices running legacy 6LoWPAN stacks operate alongside newer SCHC-capable nodes, enabling gradual network transition.

* Resource-Constrained Devices: Minimal hardware nodes use 6LoWPAN HC, while gateways with more resources apply SCHC for upstream traffic.

* Multi-Protocol Compression: SCHC is used to compress headers beyond IPv6/UDP, including CoAP, ICMPv6, and even QUIC (as per evolving specifications).

This hybrid approach allows for fine-grained optimization based on deployment constraints, device diversity, and application-level priorities.

Authors' Addresses

Younghwan Choi (editor)
Electronics and Telecommunications Research Institute
218 Gajeongno, Yuseung-gu
Daejeon
34129
South Korea
Phone: +82 42 860 1429
Email: yhc@etri.re.kr

Cheol-min Kim
Korea Electronics Technology Institute
25, Saenari-ro, Bundang-Gu, Seongnam-Si

Gyeonggi-do
13509
South Korea
Phone: +82 31 789 7595
Email: cmkim@keti.re.kr

Carles Gomez
Universitat Politecnica de Catalunya
C/Esteve Terradas, 7
08860 Castelldefels
Spain
Email: carlesgo@entel.upc.edu