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Abstract—The use of variable data rate can reduce network latency and average power consumption, and automatic rate selection is critical for improving scalability and minimizing network overhead. In the IEEE 802.15.4 standard the SNR can be inferred through the radio reported link quality or received signal strength, and an extension to the standard leads to highly dynamic and accurate rate selection. Using data from an experimental study of 44 IEEE 802.15.4 nodes in an industrial mesh network, SNR is extracted to show sufficient margin exists for higher data rate communication. A variable rate signaling scheme with automatic rate selection is proposed to provide links at the standard 250kb/s as well as 500kb/s, 1000kb/s and 2000kb/s with a minimum of hardware changes. Using the experimental data to generate a model of the real world system, total network energy is compared using legacy and variable rate signaling showing over 40% savings.

Index Terms—Variable rate, Ad-hoc network, Wireless sensor network, IEEE 802.15.4, Energy optimization

I. INTRODUCTION

In wireless networks, variable data rate communication can reduce latency, congestion, and network energy consumption, optimizing throughput across channel conditions. Studies in ad hoc wireless sensor networks have shown that single rate communication reduces network efficiency [1], yet the most common wireless sensor network protocol, IEEE 802.15.4, provides for only a single data rate. The ultra-wideband extension IEEE 802.15.4a as well as other standards including IEEE 802.11 and Bluetooth include many data rate options, and 802.15.4 radios exist that provide non-standard higher data rate options, but none provide a mechanism for choosing the optimal rate [2]–[4]. Signal to noise ratio (SNR) has become a popular basis for estimating the optimal data rate, but the methods for measuring SNR are limited by the information available at the physical layer (PHY) of the radio [5], [6].

In typical 802.15.4 networks, most links have much more SNR than required for the base data rate. We use data collected over 26 days from a 2.4 GHz IEEE 802.15.4 compliant 44 node network in an industrial setting to show typical network conditions for received signal strength (RSS) and link quality indicator (LQI) [7], both measures that can be related to SNR. The network data shows that the success of a packet is a good indicator of the next packet’s success even when the packets are minutes apart.

We propose Dynamic Rate Adaptation and Control for Energy Reduction (DRACER): an addition to the 802.15.4 specification adding 500kb/s, 1000kb/s and 2000kb/s data rates to the existing 250kb/s along with a media access layer (MAC) extension to select the appropriate data rate. A biorthogonal coding scheme preserves the hardware simplicity captured in the original standard while providing robust error performance. Using link level acknowledgments with the MAC extension, the data rate of the next packet is based on the SNR of the most recent packet. When a packet failure occurs, a simple backoff scheme is used to restore communication. This allows for data rate to be highly adaptable and managed on a per-link basis without the input of a centralized manager.

The total network energy consumption is extracted from a model based on the reference network data and compared to the total network energy when the variable rate scheme is applied showing significant savings in average network power. DRACER also reduces contention in the network between competing users by minimizing the occupied channel time, and it could be used to lower latency and increase the network data capacity.

This paper continues in section II with an explanation of the DRACER protocol for variable data rates in wireless networks. Section III discusses the network experiment and the resulting data on channel conditions. A description of the implementation of the proposed protocol with an explanation of the rate selection and control mechanism is presented in Section IV. The performance of the proposed scheme is then compared to the legacy scheme in Section V.

II. WIRELESS DATA CODING

A. IEEE 802.15.4

The legacy 802.15.4 coding scheme uses pseudo-orthogonal codes where \( k = 4 \) bits are encoded together into a \( n = 32 \) chip signal. The raw signaling is carried out using offset quadrature phase shift keying with half sine shaping (OQPSK-HSS) at a rate of 2Mchip/s. The 1/8th rate coding then results in a throughput of 250kb/s. The standard specifies that the receiver sensitivity be measured at a packet error rate (PER)
of 1% for packets that have a 20B PHY payload plus the 6B of PHY header for a total of 52 symbols. Because a single symbol error results in a packet error, the required SER is given by

$$SER = 1 - (1 - PER)^{1/m}$$

where $m$ is the length of the packet in symbols. The required SER is thus $1.9 \times 10^{-4}$. The maximum packet length allowed by the standard is a total of 133B, giving an acceptable PER of 5.0% for maximum length packets.

B. Proposed Additional Coding Schemes

The proposed Dynamic Rate Adaptation and Control for Energy Reduction (DRACER) uses two additional coding modes with $k/n = \{1/4, 1/2\}$ and a raw mode without coding to add data rates of 500kb/s, 1000kb/s and 2000kb/s to 802.15.4 wireless sensor networks.

Orthogonal codes are attractive for use in the DRACER coding scheme because they require few additions to the legacy baseband detection hardware while adding new data rates. The cross correlation between two codes $c_i, c_j$ is

$$c_i \otimes c_j = \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} c_i(m) \cdot c_j(m),$$

where the elements of $c_i,j$ are from the set {-1, 1} and $n$ is the length of the code. It follows that the autocorrelation of a code $c_i \otimes c_i = n$. An orthogonal code set is one in which the cross correlation between any two different codes $c_i \otimes c_j = 0, i \neq j$.

Biorthogonal codes are formed by taking an orthogonal code set $C$ of $k'$ bits per symbol and inverting all of the code values to yield a new code set $\bar{C}$. The union of $C$ and $\bar{C}$ is a biorthogonal code set with $k = k' + 1$ bits per symbol.

Two codes that are biorthogonal have a cross correlation of $-n$ from equation 2, and a single correlator is required to detect two symbols now instead of just one. Biorthogonal codes exhibit slightly better symbol error performance than orthogonal codes and require half the search space in the detector for the same value of $k$ [8].

There are two options for increasing code rate $k/n$. Increasing the number of bits per symbol $k$ increases the coding gain thereby improving performance, but the search space at the detector grows as $2^k$ quickly making this method intractable. Decreasing the symbol length $n$ decreases the symbol energy to improve throughput yielding somewhat lower performance, but it keeps the search space the same size as the legacy system, maintaining the low hardware complexity intended by the standard. The DRACER coding scheme thus uses biorthogonal codes of length $n = 16$ chips for 500kb/s and $n = 8$ for 1000kb/s data rates.

C. Coding Scheme Performance

The performance of the chosen coding scheme can be evaluated by considering the minimum SNR, the ratio of signal power $P_s$ to noise power $P_n$, for a given error performance. This value is heavily dependent not only on the coding scheme but also on the detection scheme and correlation method used. In our performance evaluation we assume non-coherent FSK chip detection and soft decision symbol selection because these choices are popular in 802.15.4 radios including the radios used in the experimental network [9].

For biorthogonal signaling and non-coherent FSK detection, the symbol error probability $p_{es}$ is exponentially dependent on the square root of SNR [8].

$$p_{es} \leq \frac{2^k - 1}{2} \cdot \exp \left(-\sqrt{\frac{n \times SNR}{2}}\right).$$

The symbol error rates for all four rates are shown in figure 1. The permitted error rate is different between the coded rates and the raw rate because of the difference between symbol errors and bit errors.

III. EXPERIMENTAL WIRELESS NETWORK SETUP AND MEASUREMENTS

A. Setup

Data collected from a Dust Networks test network deployed in an industrial environment is used to analyze the performance of a typical 802.15.4 wireless network [7]. The nodes consisted of a microcontroller, CC2420 radio [9], and +15dBm power amplifier. The network was deployed in a three story building housing the offices and production equipment for a printing factory. A single network manager (data sink node) was placed on the 3rd floor, and the 44 nodes were connected to the manager using a time synchronized, frequency hopping, mesh network [10]. Each node recorded data regarding the conditions on each link to its neighbors at the 16 carrier frequencies specified by the 802.15.4 standard. This information was collected every 15 minutes from each node and included PER, RSS, and LQI. Each packet was 133B long including the preamble, and about 9 million successful packet transmissions and receptions occurred in the network during the 26 day study period. For this discussion a path-channel will refer to a data connection between two nodes at a particular carrier frequency, and a link represents a path-channel with conditions averaged over a particular 15 minute interval.

Fig. 1. A waterfall plot showing symbol error rates using legacy 250kb/s 802.15.4 coding and 500 and 1000kb/s biorthogonal coding and bit error rate of 2000kb/s raw coding across SNR. The horizontal dashed line indicates the minimum acceptable error rates to meet the 802.15.4 PER specification.
B. Measurements

Every successful packet received by the CC2420 returns two measures of path conditions. The RSS indicator (RSSI) measures the signal power $P_s$ and is given in dBm. The link quality indicator (LQI) is a less specifically defined number, but is often thought of as a measure of chip error rate (CER). For the CC2420, which uses soft decisions, the LQI is more precisely a measure of SNR ($P_s/P_n$). A density plot showing the number of links returning specific RSSI and LQI values is shown in figure 2.

This plot shows that the vast majority of links lie on a single curve, monotonic in LQI with respect to RSSI. The width of this curve shows the variability in noise floor across time and channels and differing noise performance across devices. Off of this main curve, there are additional curves containing a number of links of high RSSI with notably lower LQI. These curves indicate the presence of in-band interferers artificially increasing the noise power $P_n$, lowering the SNR. While the signal power itself remains high, there is greater probability of error in these regions. It is useful to note though that there are far fewer links in these high-noise curves; the deployed system contained only very sporadic interference.

The 802.15.4 standard does not specify how the LQI is calculated, but the CC2420 datasheet provides information to map LQI to SNR. The datasheet specifies that soft decisions are used in the correlator, a low-IF receiver architecture is used, and that the average correlator output for 8 symbols from the preamble are averaged to calculate LQI. It is known that 3 bit quantization for soft decisions is standard design practice, and the maximum LQI output in the CC2420 case is $LQI_{max} = 8 \cdot ((2^3) - 1)/16 = 112$. This value agrees with the datasheet and experimental data. Once the method for the calculation of LQI is known, a simulation can be run using a noncoherent FSK detector and many preambles while varying SNR. The resulting data is a function that maps SNR to LQI, and inverting this function provides the desired map of LQI to SNR shown in figure 3. Due to dynamic range and bandwidth limits in the receiver, higher LQIs represent significantly more SNR. Due to the integer granularity on the LQI, the SNR change from one high LQI value to the next can be quite large.

An important performance metric in wireless sensor networks is packet error rate (PER). Equations 1 and 3 and figure 1 showed how SNR directly related to PER. Thus, it makes sense when considering link performance to examine the LQI as opposed to RSSI. In fact, looking at a slice across the link density plot in figure 2 at a constant RSSI, the link SNR is observed to be bimodal. Figure 4 shows the presence of a high-noise interferer resulting in low SNR despite high signal power. Estimating performance from RSSI for links in the lower hump would then result in higher than expected error rates. Again, there are considerably fewer links exhibiting this interference in the network considered here, however, other networks may be more heavily interference dominated.

C. Network Analysis

An aggregate indication of link quality in the network can be made by looking at the complimentary CDF of the SNR across all links in the network, as shown in figure 5. It is clear that most of the links contain significant excess SNR, which can be exploited to send data at higher bit rates using the DRACER protocol described in Section IV.

The link quality can also be correlated across time. The packet error rate is measured for each link in the network. A CDF of the average PER in the 15 minute time interval following an error free time interval is shown in figure 6.
rate is slow compared to the speed of electronics, changing the code set between symbols is not a concern.

Automatic rate selection reduces network overhead. Acknowledgments (ACKs) must be enabled so that both radios in a link are able to measure channel conditions for each packet sent. Initial communication occurs at the legacy rate, and either the RSSI or LQI is used as an estimate of channel capacity. LQI provides better performance in the presence of interference, but the conversion from LQI to available capacity is not always known. It was shown that over time scales of minutes, the typical channel characteristics remain similar with high probability. Therefore the best predictor of the current channel is simply the conditions seen by the last packet. Regardless of current data rate, the rate for the next packet is selected based on the most recent RSSI/LQI at that frequency and for that point to point link. The thresholds for selecting the appropriate data rate can be derived from the network model, as in section V-C.

Failure to receive an ACK for the packet results in its retransmission, and there are a variety of options for retransmitting a packet sent at a higher data rate. The transmitter could continue to send at the higher data rate until it is successful, with no reduction in rate (backoff scheme A in table II below). Alternately, upon a packet failure the transmitter can drop down one data rate and transmit at that rate until receiving an ACK (backoff scheme B). The transmitter could also drop to the legacy 802.15.4 coding upon a single packet failure (backoff scheme C). Finally, the transmitter could reduce the transmit rate one step for each packet failure until it hits the legacy 802.15.4 rate (backoff scheme D). Different network conditions may require different strategies: in networks primarily dominated by interference, but the conversion from LQI to available capacity provides better performance in the presence of interference. LQI provides better performance in the presence of interference, but the conversion from LQI to available capacity is not always known. It was shown that over time scales of minutes, the typical channel characteristics remain similar with high probability. Therefore the best predictor of the current channel is simply the conditions seen by the last packet. Regardless of current data rate, the rate for the next packet is selected based on the most recent RSSI/LQI at that frequency and for that point to point link. The thresholds for selecting the appropriate data rate can be derived from the network model, as in section V-C.

Failure to receive an ACK for the packet results in its retransmission, and there are a variety of options for retransmitting a packet sent at a higher data rate. The transmitter could continue to send at the higher data rate until it is successful, with no reduction in rate (backoff scheme A in table II below). Alternately, upon a packet failure the transmitter can drop down one data rate and transmit at that rate until receiving an ACK (backoff scheme B). The transmitter could also drop to the legacy 802.15.4 coding upon a single packet failure (backoff scheme C). Finally, the transmitter could reduce the transmit rate one step for each packet failure until it hits the legacy 802.15.4 rate (backoff scheme D). Different network conditions may require different strategies: in networks primarily dominated by multipath fading and noise, a gradual backoff will provide the best performance, while in networks primarily dominated by interference from other RF devices, maintaining higher data rates (and therefore shorter packets) can reduce the number of collisions and improve performance. In the following performance evaluation, different back off schemes are shown to provide similar performance.

V. PERFORMANCE

In the network examined here, packets are generated at a low enough rate that network congestion is not an issue. As such, impacts on latency and throughput cannot be investigated. However, the overall power consumption of the network can be extracted from simulation and will be used to demonstrate the effectiveness of the variable data rate scheme.

To calculate the network energy, some network parameters must be defined. The packet transmissions are globally scheduled in the network protocol used here, and as such, the receiver will be listening every time the transmitter attempts to send a packet. If the receiver successfully receives the packet, it will respond with an ACK. The transmitter listens for an ACK after every TX attempt, and it is assumed it will hear one if it is generated. Since the packet success rate was found to be correlated over much longer time scales, it is highly unlikely that an ACK will not be heard. There are a fixed number of
packets that need to be sent over each link, and each will be retransmitted until they have all gone through. Finally, the microprocessor will be running during any TX or RX, with an additional 10% overhead for required synchronization and logic. The time each component needs to be on for all network events is shown in table I which can then be applied to derive energies.

### A. Legacy performance

The data returned from the network gives us the number of TX attempts and the number of ACKs received. Using the assumptions listed above, the amount of time spent in TX and RX for each node can be calculated, and the total energy of all nodes other than the base station can be extracted. This value is 15.0 kJ which is an average power of 135µW per node.

### B. Model setup

To evaluate the variable data rate schemes proposed in section IV, the network needs to be simulated. As mentioned above, a fixed number of packets must be sent over each link, and will be retransmitted upon failure. This number is taken as the number of successful ACKs received over each link from the network data. The total packet error rate of each link \( p_{e_{\text{tot}}} \) is also taken from the network data. This error rate can be divided into two components, errors due to interference and errors due to insufficient SNR. That is, \( \Pr\{\text{Packet success}\} = \Pr\{\text{No interference}\} \times \Pr\{\text{Sufficient SNR}\} \), or

\[
1 - p_{e_{\text{tot}}} = (1 - p_{e_{i}})(1 - p_{e_{S\text{NR}}}). \tag{4}
\]

The PER due to SNR \( p_{e_{S\text{NR}}} \) can be calculated from equations 1 and 3 using the LQI taken from the network data, and thus the interference based PER \( p_{e_{i}} \) can be inferred. This can be combined with the SNR-based PER calculated for the alternate coding schemes to yield the total PER at each of the four bit rates. This value can then be applied to packet transmission as a Bernoulli process, and the expected number of TX failures can be estimated. This model for the network using only 802.15.4 coding necessarily yields the same packet behavior as the true network.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Component on time in ms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>250kb/s</td>
<td>500kb/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packet TX</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful Packet RX</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failed Packet RX</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACK TX</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful ACK RX</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failed ACK RX</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. Performance of proposed scheme

We can now use this model to evaluate the schemes described in section IV. The intended data rate for each link is computed from either the LQI or RSSI in the previous link, thresholded to predefined limits for each of 250, 500, 1000, and 2000 kb/s. Considering the packet success behavior as a Bernoulli trial with success probability calculated from the LQI and interference based packet success rate of the current link, the number of packet success and failures at each of the data rates can be computed for the different back off schemes. The thresholds were set to the minimum energy configuration in each case. The overall network energy savings of the data rate schemes with various thresholding and backoff options are presented in table II.

In particular, scheme D with LQI thresholding was able to achieve a total 41% energy savings against the legacy system across the network:

- If the previous time period’s LQI was 99 or less, only attempt to send packets at the legacy 802.15.4 rate.
- If the previous time period’s LQI was between 100 and 103, attempt to send one packet at 500kb/s. If it fails, send the remaining packets at the legacy 802.15.4 rate.
- If the previous time period’s LQI was 104 or above, attempt to send one packet at 1000kb/s. If it fails, try once more at 500kb/s. If both fail, then send the remaining packets at the legacy 802.15.4 rate.

The 2000 kb/s raw rate was never used in this simulation due to its high SNR requirement.

The results of the same simulation can be used to determine the energy savings per node, and this result is plotted against that node’s packet throughput in figure 7. It is clear to see that

### Table I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component powers and time requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microprocessor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio RX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250kb/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500kb/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000kb/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000kb/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250kb/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500kb/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000kb/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000kb/s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent energy savings comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Backoff scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Energy savings comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional SNR Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250kb/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500kb/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000kb/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000kb/s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in general, nodes that handle more traffic save more energy and therefore contribute greater savings to the overall network. Thus, we would expect that as a wireless network scaled up in size and data traffic, DRACER would contribute greater energy savings, allowing for networks robust to continued growth.

An alternate way of exploiting the excess SNR to reduce power consumption could be to lower the output power of the power amplifier (PA) of the radio transmitter. However, the efficiency of a PA decreases quickly with decreasing output power; for example, an 8x reduction in transmitted power results only in a 40% savings in consumed power. A look at table III indicates that when power savings for a single packet are calculated based on PA efficiencies, varying the data rate has much greater energy saving potential.

VI. RELATED WORK

The prior work in rate adaptation is helpful in understanding the problems faced by variable rate systems, choosing a coding scheme, and in optimizing network performance. The selection of data rate in IEEE 802.11, Bluetooth and other networks has seen a significant amount of attention, and the focus has been on reduced latency or increased throughput [5], [11]–[13]. Reducing the network energy consumption is the most important metric for wireless sensor networks even though latency and throughput can be important in some cases [14]. Many of the studies that do exist are not based on measured data. Those that do use measured data employ data sets that are much smaller than considered here. Energy has been considered in point to point links, but data from physical networks is not considered and energy is not the dominant metric [15], [16]. Variable rate wireless sensor networks have been considered for improving routing algorithms with throughput and congestion as the motivation [1], [17].

VII. CONCLUSIONS

Wireless sensor network physical layers should use variable rate signaling that adapts to the environment or significant power is wasted transmitting and receiving packets. In this paper we propose using variable rate signaling in wireless sensor networks as a way to reduce the average network power consumption, and we further propose the DRACER protocol to provide 3 additional rates to the existing 802.15.4 coding scheme. This protocol provides for 250kb/s, 500kb/s, 1000kb/s and 2000kb/s data with automatic rate selection based on the observed performance of the previous packet. Through a measurement based study of a 44 node network, we show an estimated 40% average power savings using our variable rate system, and we show that savings are best when the LQI, a measure of SNR, is used to determine data rate. This work focuses on reducing the average network power through the use of an adaptive rate coding scheme for 802.15.4, but the reduced channel occupancy also reduces congestion in the shared spectrum improving performance for other users.
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