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The Need for Cross-Layer Protocols: A Voice Message Example

- Require low delay, some frame erasures acceptable
- Application layer: Speech compression must match available routes and links and satisfy QoS needs (intelligible speech vs. speaker recognition, etc.)
- Network layer: Routing should emphasize delay, high-quality (low bit error rate) routes not needed
- Link layer: Reserve multiple time slots on each link via the channel access (MAC) protocol. Detected errors may not result in a retransmission.
- Physical layer: Low-rate codes on poor links (avoid retransmissions), high-rate codes on good links (reduce delay), energy conservation secondary
Cross-Layer Protocols: The Previous Millennium

Terminology (early 1980s to late 1990s):

- Interaction between network operation and the communication subsystem
- Interaction between layers in the network model
- Interplay between spread spectrum and network protocols
- Network layer issues merging with link layer issues
- Interactions between the network layer and the link and physical layers in a spread-spectrum radio network
- Integration of physical-layer information into routing protocols; use of receiver side information in routing
- Tightly coupled protocols; interactive protocols; integrated protocols
- No particular name or phrase; layers simply ignored
A Look Inside the Bit Pipe for Wireless Communications
Some Interactions with the Sender’s Physical Layer
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Some Interactions with the Receiver’s Physical Layer
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Some of the Protocol Interactions
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Network and Traffic Characteristics

- Multiple-hop wireless spread-spectrum network
  - Store-and-forward relaying of packets required
  - Network must conserve energy (e.g., number of batteries)
- Frequency-hop or direct-sequence spread spectrum
- Dynamic environment
  - Variable propagation
  - Time-varying interference
- Multimedia traffic of three types
  - Delay-sensitive traffic, perhaps error-tolerant (e.g., voice)
  - Delay-tolerant, error-intolerant traffic (e.g., data)
  - Delay-tolerant, error-tolerant traffic (e.g., imagery)
The Need for Adaptivity

Time-Varying Transmission Requirements

- network mobility
- fluctuating traffic rate
- multiple traffic types (multimedia)
- variable propagation conditions
- dynamic interference environment

source coding
error-control coding
symbol rate
modulation
spreading factor
transmit power

adaptive transmission
adaptive routing
Efficient Handling of Multimedia Traffic

• Adaptive transmission protocol
  ▪ reduce energy and on-air time for delay-tolerant messages (e.g., decrease power, increase code rate)
  ▪ increase reliability for delay-sensitive messages

• Adaptive routing protocol
  ▪ conserve energy for delay-tolerant messages
  ▪ sacrifice energy conservation for delay-sensitive messages

Cross-layer protocols for adaptive transmission and energy-efficient routing of multimedia traffic
Goals of Adaptive Transmission and Routing

- Make each communication link as energy and time efficient as possible
- Minimize detectability and interference for unintended recipients
- Supply routing protocol with energy-efficient paths
- Select routes that exploit differences in QoS requirements to conserve energy
Adaptive Transmission in Tactical Networks

- Half-duplex radios: Feedback opportunities limited to ACK packets, reservation replies, control packets, etc.
- Channel adaptation: Primarily for such phenomena as changes in range, shadowing, and interference (not fast fading)
- QoS adaptation: Primarily for changes in QoS requirements from message to message when handling multimedia traffic
- Adapt to improve reliability when channel conditions deteriorate or when required for QoS
- Adapt to reduce power and on-air time when channel conditions improve and QoS requirements permit (e.g., to save energy, reduce interference, provide LPI)
Protocol Suite for Frequency-Hop Spread Spectrum

- Channel Access Protocol: RTS/CTS/ACK
- Receiver-directed FH patterns
- Adaptive Transmission Protocol:
  - Use error count \((t)\) and erasure count \((e)\) to adapt code rate and transmit power
  - No power measurements needed
- Adaptive Routing Protocol:
  - Least-resistance routing (LRR) -- a distributed distance-vector routing protocol based on link resistance measures
  - Link resistance derived from metrics that account for link quality, energy consumption, and backlog
  - For multimedia traffic, link resistance depends on message type
Adaptive Transmission Protocol for FH

- Code selection (RS codes) based on erasure count, $e$
  
  $(32,24)$  \hline  $(32,12)$  
  $r = \frac{3}{4}$  \hline  $r = \frac{3}{8}$  
  \hspace{1cm} $\tau_c$ \hspace{1cm} # dwell interval erasures

- Power selection based on $e$, $t$, and $r$

  $-\Delta \text{ dB}$ \hline \hline \hline no change \hline \hline $+\Delta \text{ dB}$

  $\tau_1$ \hline \hline $\tau_2$ \hline \hline $p = \hat{p}(e,t,r)$

No power measurements needed!
Physical-Layer Statistics for Adaptive Transmission in Direct-Sequence Spread Spectrum

BPF → AGC → Matched Filter → \( nT \) → Soft-Decision Decoder → Hard Decision → Symbol Comparator

AGC Device

PDSQ Device

Adaptive Transmission

AGC Statistic → PDSQ Statistic

Symbol Error Count
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Performance Measures

• **Correct packet**: packet that is correct at intended receiver’s decoder output

• **Unit of energy**: amount of energy required to transmit a packet at the lowest code rate and highest power (max energy/packet)

• **Throughput Efficiency (link)**: Average number of correct packets at decoder output per unit of energy
Channel State Information for FH

Channel State \((\rho, \lambda)\)
\[\rho = \text{fraction of the band with interference}\]
\[\lambda = \text{propagation loss}\]

Side Information - information about the channel state that is derived within the communication receiver

Channel State Information (CSI) - information about the channel state that is supplied from external sources (e.g., special measurement system)

Perfect CSI - exact values of \(\rho\) and \(\lambda\) for the previous transmission provided to the communication system
Channel with Intermittent Interference and Time-Varying Path Loss

Channel Model

3 power levels, $\Delta = 1.5$ dB
Routing with Adaptive Transmission
Example: A Dynamic Four-Node Network

Source S

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Channel State: } (\rho, \lambda) \\
\text{Path loss, } \lambda (\text{dB}): \\
\lambda=0 \quad 1-p \\
\lambda=10 \quad 1-q \\
\text{Partial-band interference at terminal B:} \\
1-\alpha \quad 0 \quad \rho \quad 1-\beta \\
\alpha \quad \beta \\
\rho = \text{fraction of band for interference at terminal B}
\end{align*}
\]

Full power adequate for 10 dB excess loss
Without adaptation, each link uses full power

0 dB excess path loss
10 dB excess path loss
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Route Selection, Two Transmission Protocols

Fixed Transmissions

Adaptive Transmissions

All packets routed from S to D

With fixed or adaptive transmissions:

- min-hop routing has no preference for upper vs. lower route
- error probability, throughput, delay same for both routes
- QoS routing has no preference for upper vs. lower route
Adaptive Transmission: enables upper route to use only 1/10 the energy required by lower route; creates opportunity for routing protocol to save energy

Least-Resistance Routing with appropriate resistance metric takes advantage of opportunity created by adaptive transmission

Physical-layer information required for routing metrics and adaptive transmission
Resistance Metrics for Generic Traffic

- **Quality metric (reception quality)**
  - \( I(A,B) = (2t + e)/20 \) [max redundancy is 20 for code set]
  - # of errors \((t)\) and erasures \((e)\) in previous transmission

- **Energy metric (energy consumption)**
  - \( U(A,B) = P(A,B) \frac{r_{\text{min}}}{P_{\text{max}}} r(A,B) \)
  - \( r_{\text{min}} \) = min code rate; \( P_{\text{max}} \) = max transmitter power
  - \( r(A,B) \) = code rate for next transmission A→B
  - \( P(A,B) \) = power for next transmission A→B

\[
LR(A,B) = \alpha_1 I(A,B) + \alpha_2 U(A,B) + c
\]
Four Resistance Measures

\[ LR(A,B) = \alpha_1 I(A,B) + \alpha_2 U(A,B) + c \]

Resistance coefficients:

- **quality**: \( \alpha_1 = 4, \alpha_2 = 0, c = 1 \)
  \[ LR(A,B) = 4 I(A,B) + 1 \]

- **energy**: \( \alpha_1 = 0, \alpha_2 = 10, c = 0 \)
  \[ LR(A,B) = 10 U(A,B) \]

- **hybrid**: \( \alpha_1 = 2, \alpha_2 = 2.5, c = 1 \)
  \[ LR(A,B) = 2 I(A,B) + 2.5 U(A,B) + 1 \]

- **min-hop**: \( \alpha_1 = 0, \alpha_2 = 0, c = 1; \ LR(A,B) = 1 \)
Voice traffic (previous example) and data traffic from S to D:

- Backlog at A causes delay for route S-A-D, but S-A-D suitable for data traffic; energy conserved if data packets use S-A-D
- Interference causes frame erasures in voice traffic sent over S-B-D, but meets QoS requirements for voice; S-B-D requires more energy
- Approach: Conserve energy for data packets, sacrifice energy conservation for voice packets to meet delay constraint
- Requires interaction among Application/Transport, Network, Link, and Physical Layers
Resistance Measures for Multimedia Traffic

• Each type of traffic routed independently
• Resistance measure tailored to service requirements
  ▪ Emphasize energy consumption for delay-tolerant traffic
  ▪ Emphasize backlog at nodes for delay-sensitive traffic
• MM resistance measures (link A→B):
  \[ LR_d(A,B) = 2 I(A,B) + 8 U(A,B) + c_d \]
  \[ LR_v(A,B) = 4 I(A,B) + W(B) + 2.5 U(A,B) + c_v \]
• Backlog metric for terminal B:
  \[ W(B) = N_v + \omega N_d \]
  \[ N_i = \# \text{ packets of type } i \text{ (voice or data) in B’s buffer} \]
Performance Measures

**Correct packet:** packet that is correct at destination receiver’s decoder output

**Unit of energy:** amount of energy required to transmit a packet at the lowest code rate and highest power (max energy/packet)

- **Throughput Efficiency (network):** Average number of correct packets at decoder output of destination terminal per unit of energy transmitted by all terminals in network
Generic vs. Multimedia Traffic

• Simply minimizing energy gives poor performance
• Routing based on link quality and min-hop routing give poor throughput efficiency
• Hybrid quality-energy routing is best compromise for generic traffic

• Emphasize conserving energy for delay-tolerant messages
• Can sacrifice energy conservation for delay-sensitive messages
• Multimedia energy-efficient (MMEE) routing
38-Node Network

- Node $S_i$ generates voice packets for destination $D_i$
- Unlabeled nodes generate data packets with random destinations
- Interference occupies 20% of band, affects 15 nodes
- Network uses adaptive transmission (2 code rates, 8 power levels)
Performance of MMEE Routing for 38-Node Network with Multimedia Traffic

**Throughput Efficiency (Data)**

- MMEE (8)
- MMEE (5)
- hybrid
- quality
- min-hop

**End-to-End Delay (Voice)**

- energy
- MMEE (8), MMEE (5), hybrid, min-hop
- quality

Voice traffic generated at fixed rate of 0.01 packets/packet interval
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Performance of MMEE Routing for 38-Node Network with Multimedia Traffic

Throughput Efficiency (Voice)

Voice traffic generated at fixed rate of 0.01 packets/packet interval

End-to-End Delay (Data)
Performance of MMEE Routing for 65-Node Network with Multimedia Traffic

- 45 nodes generate data traffic with uniformly random destinations; 10 voice connection pairs
- packet generation rates are in packets per packet interval; voice generation rate is twice $\lambda_d$
General Conclusions

- Hybrid quality-energy measure is the best compromise for generic traffic

- MM resistance measures lead to high throughput efficiency for delay-tolerant traffic and low delay for delay-sensitive traffic

- Best resistance measures for multimedia traffic are the MM resistance measures

- Interaction among layers is essential for energy-efficient routing of generic or multimedia traffic