

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

Non-RSSI based energy efficient transmission power control protocol for low power indoor wireless sensor networks

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the
requirement for the degree of

PhD
in
Engineering

at
Massey University
Palmerston North
New Zealand

Debraj Basu
2016

Acknowledgement

First and foremost I offer my deepest gratitude to my primary supervisor, A/Prof Gourab Sen Gupta and secondary supervisors Dr. Giovanni Moretti and Dr. Xiang Gui, for their relentless support and guidance throughout my thesis. It is because of their untiring effort and belief in me that have helped me to finish my PhD.

I would like to thank the members of the Massey University Smart Environment (MUSE) team for the intellectually stimulating sessions that have immensely shaped my research skills. In particular, I convey my heartfelt gratitude to Prof. Stephen Marsland for the time he offered to help me with tackling some mathematical nuances.

My appreciation also extend to Mr. Ken Mercer, senior tutor with the school of Engineering and Advanced Technology, Massey University, who has been absolutely supportive with my building of electronic circuitry and testing for experimental purposes.

For all kind of administrative support, I am grateful to Mrs. Michele Wagner and Mrs. Linda Lowe from the school of Engineering and Advanced Technology, Massey University.

I would also like to thank my friends in New Zealand and overseas for keeping me company (and sane) during my studies.

I am indebted to my parents for their selfless act to bring me up and take care of me all throughout.

My final words of gratitude and appreciation go to my wife, Tamalika, who has been the primary source of my inspiration to complete my thesis. Without any doubt, I acknowledge that this thesis would never have seen the light of the day without her sacrifice and understanding.

Abstract

In this thesis, we present the state-based adaptive power control (S-APC) protocol that is aimed to reduce energy consumption in low power wireless sensors while maintaining an application specific packet success rate requirement. The state-based approach is unique of its kind that dynamically adapt to the varying path losses caused by the movement of mobile sensors, by obstructions appearing between the stationary sensor and the base-station and movements of objects or humans in between two communicating stations. Since the primary reason for a drop in transmitted packets is the poor signal-to-noise ratio, it is important for the sensor to select a set of RF transmission power levels that will deliver the packets within a specified error rate while using the least amount of energy. In a battery-powered wireless sensor node, the use of ARQ (Automatic Repeat reQuest) protocol will lead to retransmissions when an attempt to send a packet fails. The proposed adaptive protocol does not use received signal strength indication (RSSI) based beacon or probe packets nor does it listen to the channel before transmitting for channel estimation. The use of the proposed S-APC protocol is not limited to only sensor network. It is applicable to any kind of radio communication when the transmitting radio frequency (RF) modules have configurable output power and options for retransmission. This proposed protocol can comfortably work on top of existing MAC protocol that is contention based and listens to channel before transmitting.

The hardware used for evaluating the protocol parameters is the nRF24L01p transceiver module from Nordic Semiconductor Inc. This radio module is cheaper than other modules that provide the RSSI values to the chip and the application of the adaptive power control protocol can further reduce the overall deployment and running cost of a sensor network.

The proposed protocol is designed to respond to an unknown and variable radio channel in an energy-efficient manner. The adaptive protocol uses past transmission experience or memory to decide the power level at which the new packet transmission will start. It also uses a drop-off algorithm to ramp down power level as and when required. Simulation has been used to compare the performance with the existing RSSI and non-RSSI based adaptive power control protocol. Results have shown that when the channel condition is between average and poor (ratio of bit energy (E_b) and noise power spectral density (N_0) is less than 20 dB), the RSSI based adaptive protocol consumes 10-20% more energy. Following the simulations, exhaustive experimental trials were done to compare S-APC with the existing protocols. It was found that there can be an increase of energy efficiency up-to 33% over fixed power transmission. This protocol could be applied in mobile robots that collect data in real time from sensors and transmit to the base station as well as to body wearable sensors used for monitoring the health conditions of patients in a health facility centre. Overall, this adaptive protocol can be used in radio communication

where the channel has dynamic temporal and spatial characteristics to enhance the lifetime of battery powered wireless sensors.

Table of Content

ABSTRACT	IV
TABLE OF CONTENT.....	VI
LIST OF FIGURES.....	X
LIST OF TABLES.....	XX
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION.....	22
1.1 SENSOR NETWORK APPLICATIONS	22
1.1.1 Habitat and environmental monitoring.....	22
1.1.2 Structural health monitoring	23
1.1.3 Human health monitoring and assisted living	23
1.1.4 Workplace applications	24
1.1.5 Ubiquitous sensor network application (USN).....	24
1.1.6 Industrial automation using mobile robot.....	25
1.1.7 Healthcare application.....	27
1.2 LIMITATIONS OF BATTERY POWERED WIRELESS SENSORS.....	28
1.3 ERROR CONTROL MECHANISMS IN WIRELESS COMMUNICATION	30
1.4 WIRELESS TRANSCEIVER MODULE AND ITS OPERATION	31
1.5 ADAPTIVE POWER CONTROL WITH CONFIGURABLE OUTPUT POWER	32
1.6 THESIS ORGANIZATION	33
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE SURVEY AND THE RESEARCH STATEMENT	35
2.1 EXISTING POWER SAVING ALGORITHMS/PROTOCOLS.....	35
2.1.1 Network layer solution.....	37
2.2 BASIC APPROACH OF ADAPTIVE POWER CONTROL PROTOCOLS	37
2.2.1 RSSI/LQI based adaptive power control with or without beacon packets for link quality estimation	38
Discussion on the use of RSSI based adaptive power control protocols.....	41
2.2.2 Non-RSSI based adaptive power control protocols	41
Discussion on the use of non-RSSI based adaptive power control algorithm.....	43
2.2.3 Power, modulation order and code rate control in broadband access network and cellular network	43
2.2.4 Dynamic or adaptive power control in the physical layer.....	44
2.2.5 Power control with error detection and correction mechanism	46
2.2.6 Other methods of power control	51
2.2.6 Finite state Markov modelling of fading channel and its importance in adaptive transmission	52
2.3 APPLICABILITY OF THE EXISTING ADAPTIVE PROTOCOLS IN INDOOR WIRELESS SENSOR NETWORK	54
2.4 RESEARCH STATEMENT	55
CHAPTER 3 PERFORMANCE PARAMETERS, EXPERIMENTAL SETUP FOR VALIDATION, CHOICE OF ARQ AND COLLISION RATE ANALYSIS.....	56
3.1 PERFORMANCE PARAMETERS USED TO EVALUATE TRANSMISSION PROTOCOLS	56
3.2 CHOICE OF THE ERROR CORRECTION PROTOCOL BASED ON THE CHANNEL UTILIZATION VALUES	58
3.3 HARDWARE DESCRIPTION AND VALIDATION OF SETUP	60

3.3.1	<i>Theoretical background and validation of the hardware setup using simulation and experimental data</i>	63
3.4	EVALUATING THE IMPACT OF CHANNEL CONTENTION IN WSN USING MATLAB SIMULATION	67
3.5	DISCUSSION	69
CHAPTER 4	CHOICE OF RETRANSMISSION DELAY IN INDOOR WIRELESS COMMUNICATION FOR ENHANCED ENERGY EFFICIENCY	70
4.1	INDOOR RADIO CHANNEL WITH FADING.....	70
4.2	CALCULATION OF THE DELAY BETWEEN RETRIES	71
4.3	EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN.....	71
4.4	VISUALIZATION OF THE CURRENT CONSUMPTION OF THE NORDIC TRANSCEIVER	74
4.5	EXPERIMENTAL SCENARIO	75
4.6	EXPERIMENTAL SETUP	75
4.7	RESULTS.....	76
4.7.1	<i>Result Set I</i>	76
4.7.2	<i>Result set II</i>	78
4.7.3	<i>Result set III</i>	79
4.7.4	<i>Result set IV</i>	81
4.7.5	<i>Result set V</i>	83
4.8	ANALYTICAL UNDERSTANDING OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AVERAGE COST OF SUCCESSFUL TRANSMISSION AND THE AVERAGE NUMBER OF RETRIES	86
4.8.1	<i>Validation of the mathematical model of energy consumption with the measured data</i>	88
4.9	OTHER LOW POWER WIRELESS TRANSCEIVERS	88
4.10	DISCUSSION	89
CHAPTER 5	S-APC PROTOCOL AND COMPARISON WITH FIXED POWER TRANSMISSION	90
5.1	DESCRIPTION OF THE ADAPTIVE PROTOCOL	90
5.2	COMPARISON OF ENERGY CONSUMPTION: FIXED PROBABILITY AGAINST EXPONENTIAL PROBABILITY THAT TAKES INTO ACCOUNT THE NUMBER OF SUCCESSES (S)	95
5.3	COMPARISON OF ENERGY CONSUMPTION: FIXED COUNT AGAINST EXPONENTIAL PROBABILITY THAT TAKES INTO ACCOUNT THE NUMBER OF SUCCESSES (S)	96
5.4	PERFORMANCE COMPARISON OF ADAPTIVE PROTOCOL WITH THE FIXED POWER TRANSMISSION	98
5.4.1	<i>Experimental setup</i>	98
5.4.2	<i>Factors affecting the average cost in fixed power mode and trend analysis</i>	99
5.4.3	<i>Experimental result and analysis</i>	100
5.4	COMPUTATIONAL TIME OF THE PROPOSED S-APC PROTOCOL.....	106
5.6	DISCUSSION	107
CHAPTER 6	APPLICABILITY OF S-APC PROTOCOL IN MOBILE SENSOR SCENARIOS	109
6.1	THE NEED FOR CONTROL POWER FOR WIRELESS MOBILE SENSOR NODES	109
6.2	SIMULATION DESIGN, PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION AND OBSERVATIONS	110
6.2.1	<i>Existing non-RSSI based adaptive power control protocol</i>	111
6.2.2	<i>Results from random walk 1 simulation</i>	112
6.2.3	<i>Results from random walk 2 simulation</i>	114
6.2.4	<i>Results of random walk 3 simulation</i>	116
6.2.5	<i>Results from random walk 4 simulation</i>	117
6.2.6	<i>Results from random walk 5 simulation</i>	118
6.3	DETERMINING THE SENSITIVITY OF THE DROP-OFF FACTOR R	120

6.4	INITIAL TEST RUN WITH MOBILE SENSORS IN A CLUTTERED RADIO ENVIRONMENT	122
6.4.1	<i>Experimental setup</i>	123
6.4.2	<i>Analysis based on data collected from super market</i>	124
6.5	EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS TO COMPARE PERFORMANCE OF THE ADAPTIVE SYSTEM WITH FIXED POWER SYSTEM WHEN SENSORS ARE MOBILE	125
6.6	DISCUSSION	131
CHAPTER 7	PERFORMANCE COMPARISON OF RSSI BASED AND PROPOSED S-APC	132
7.1	RADIO LINK QUALITY ESTIMATORS	132
7.2	GENERAL APPROACH TO RSSI BASED ADAPTIVE POWER CONTROL	132
7.2.1	<i>Validation of theoretical RSSI value using simulation</i>	133
7.3	DETERMINING THE THRESHOLD RSSI VALUE FOR CONSISTENTLY HIGH (> 95%) PACKET SUCCESS RATE BASED ON ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH THE AVERAGE RECEIVED E_b/N_0	136
7.4	ATPC: ADAPTIVE TRANSMISSION POWER CONTROL FOR WIRELESS SENSOR NETWORKS	139
7.5	SIMULATION RESULTS ANALYSIS OF THE BEACON BASED ADAPTIVE PROTOCOL	140
7.5.1	<i>Simulation design</i>	140
7.5.2	<i>Simulation results for comparison of cost and efficiency between the ATPC and non-RSSI based adaptive power control</i>	140
7.6	COMPARISON OF THE ENERGY COST OF BEACON-BASED (USES RSSI MEASUREMENT) POWER CONTROL ALGORITHM WITH S-APC	144
7.7	TRADE-OFF BETWEEN THE ACCURACY OF PREDICTING THE TRANSMISSION POWER AND COST	147
7.8	SIMULATION RESULTS WITH DIFFERENT BEACON PACKETS SENT PER OUTPUT POWER LEVEL	147
7.8.1	<i>Simulation results with 10 beacon packets sent per output power level</i>	148
7.8.2	<i>Simulation results with 1 beacon packet sent per output power level</i>	150
7.9	DISCUSSIONS	152
CHAPTER 8	USE OF REAL WORLD RSSI DATA TO COMPARE PERFORMANCE OF S-APC WITH ATPC AND FIXED POWER TRANSMISSION	153
8.1	COLLECTION OF THE RSSI VALUES	153
8.1.1	<i>Data collection scenarios</i>	154
8.1.2	<i>Simulation parameters:</i>	154
8.1.3	<i>Working principle of ATPC</i>	155
8.2	COMPARISON OF THE MINIMUM COST VALUES OF ATPC, S-APC AND FIXED POWER TRANSMISSION USING RSSI DATA	156
8.2.1	<i>Long term RSSI data collected over a period of approximately 10 hours inside University building</i>	156
8.2.2	<i>Short term busy hour RSSI data collected from University dining hall between 11:30 am and 1:00 pm</i>	160
8.2.3	<i>Short term RSSI data collected from town shopping centre between 11:30 am and 1:30 pm during weekends</i>	164
8.3	COMPARISON OF THE MINIMUM COST VALUES OF ATPC, S-APC AND FIXED POWER TRANSMISSION WHEN THE MEAN E_b/N_0 VALUE IS REDUCED BY 20 dB	168
8.3.1	<i>University building with average E_b/N_0 reduced by 20 dB</i>	169
8.3.2	<i>University dining hall with average E_b/N_0 reduced by 20 dB</i>	170
8.3.3	<i>Town Shopping centre with average E_b/N_0 reduced by 20 dB</i>	172
8.4	COMPARISON OF THE MINIMUM COST VALUES OF ATPC, S-APC AND FIXED POWER TRANSMISSION WHEN THE MEAN E_b/N_0 VALUE IS REDUCED BY 40 dB	174

8.4.1	University building with average E_b/N_0 reduced by 40 dB	175
8.4.2	University dining Hall with average E_b/N_0 reduced by 40 dB	177
8.4.3	Town Shopping centre with average E_b/N_0 reduced by 40 dB	178
8.5	DISCUSSIONS	180
CHAPTER 9	CONCLUSIONS	181
CHAPTER 10	FUTURE WORK	183
REFERENCE	184
RESEARCH PUBLICATIONS	195
APPENDIX	197

List of Figures

Chapter 1

Figure 1. Facility status monitoring [15].	26
Figure 2. Temperature and Humidity Monitoring System at a Warehouse [15].	26
Figure 3. Quality control for manufacturing and inspection processes [15].	26
Figure 4. Error correction using simple Stop-and-Wait protocol.	31
Figure 5. Computation and Communication module of a wireless sensor transceiver.	32

Chapter 2

Figure 6. Simulated PER vs. the E_b/N_0 for full power and half power schemes in AWGN channel shows that at higher E_b/N_0 , the half power scheme can perform better.	45
Figure 7. Simulated PER vs. the E_b/N_0 for full power and half power schemes in fading channel shows that at higher E_b/N_0 , the half power scheme can perform better.	45
Figure 8. Output power levels vs the current consumption values of CC2420 and nRF24L01p shows that their relationship is not linear and half output power does not mean half the current consumption of the full power.	46
Figure 9. Simulated PSR and PSR derived from BER vs. the E_b/N_0 in AWGN channel shows that bit errors are independent and uniformly distributed.	50
Figure 10. Simulated PSR and PSR derived from BER vs. the E_b/N_0 in multi-path fading channel shows that bit errors are not independent and that errors occur in burst.	51

Chapter 3

Figure 11. Channel utilization plots of ARQ protocol at packet error rate of 1%. Stop-and-Wait protocol performs similarly with the sliding window protocols.	59
Figure 12. Channel utilization plots of ARQ protocol at packet error rate of 5%. Stop-and-Wait protocol has comparable channel utilization values with the sliding window protocols.	60
Figure 13. DC load current drawn vs the radiated power curves of nRF24L01 and CC2420	62
Figure 14. Theoretical PSR plot against the average received E_b/N_0 at threshold E_b/N_0 values of 20 dB, 30 dB and 40 dB. A low threshold value indicates that very high PSR can be achieved at lower average received E_b/N_0 . However, the nature of the curves remains the same.	64
Figure 15. Simulated PSR plotted with the efficiency that shows the actual work done in terms of retransmitting to achieve the PSR.	65
Figure 16. Experimental values of PSR plotted when no retries are allowed.	66
Figure 17. Experimental values of PSR and efficiency plotted when retry limit is set at 3.	66
Figure 18. Collision error increases with the number of sensor and also depends on the packet size	68

Chapter 4

Figure 19. Autocorrelation plot of indoor fading channel shows how significantly the channel has changed over a time delay (T_d) for a given maximum Doppler spread (F_d). In order to avoid block fading effect, the autocorrelation value must be low. An autocorrelation value of 50% means that the normalised delay is around 0.3.	71
Figure 20. Transmission operation cycle when the nRF24L01p module is in primary transmission mode [39].	73

Figure 21. The transmit mode curve showing the current consumption during transmission, reception of acknowledgement and retry delay when maximum hardware delay of 4 ms is applied. The average current consumption in between retries is 0.320 mA (standby-II mode current).	74
Figure 22. The transmit mode curve showing the current consumption during transmission, reception of acknowledgement and retry delay when the hardware delay is overwritten by software delay of 15 ms+ 4 ms. The average current consumption in between retries is 0.026 mA (standby-I mode current).	75
Figure 24. Distance = 30 meters. Transmit Power = -12 dBm: Comparison of packet success rate (PSR), average number of retries and energy used per successful transmission with 1 partition in between the transmitter and the hub (receiver). The software delay has reduced the average number of retries significantly by 63%. The corresponding reduction in cost due to software delay is around just around 4.3 %. This small difference in costs is due to marginal difference of the PSR value of both types of delays. The average number of retries values and energy expenditures when software delays of 19 ms and 34 ms are used are almost same.	77
Figure 24. Distance = 30 m. Transmit Power = -6 dBm. Comparison of packet success rate (PSR), average number of retries and energy used per successful transmission with 1 partition in between the transmitter and the hub (receiver). The software delay (19 ms) has reduced the average number of retries by 58% which is significant. The cost difference is however negligible. This is because the PSR of both types of delays are practically the same. The average number of retries values and energy expenditures when software delays of 19 ms and 34 ms are used are approximately equal.	77
Figure 25. Distance = 30 m. Transmit Power = 0 dBm. Comparison of packet success rate (PSR), average number of retries and energy used per successful transmission with 1 partition in between the transmitter and the hub (receiver). Practically there is no difference in the PSR, average retry and cost values.	77
Figure 26. Distance = 16 m. Transmit Power = -12 dBm Comparison of packet success rate (PSR), average number of retries and energy used per successful transmission with 4 partitions in between the transmitter and the hub (receiver). The software delay has reduced the average number of retries significantly by 86%. The reduction in cost is around 10%. There is no large change in the cost from software delays of 19 ms to 34 ms.	78
Figure 27. Distance = 16 m. Transmit Power = -6 dBm Comparison of packet success rate (PSR), average number of retries and energy used per successful transmission with 4 partitions in between the transmitter and the hub (receiver). The software delay has reduced the average number of retries significantly by 98%. The reduction in cost is around 3% with no noticeable difference in the costs due to software delays.	79
Figure 28. Distance = 16 m. Transmit Power = 0 dBm Comparison of packet success rate (PSR), average number of retries and energy used per successful transmission at distance of 16 m between the transmitter and the receiver and 4 partitions in between them at output power of 0 dBm. The software delay has practically removed the need of retries. The reduction in cost is around just around 2.5 %. The average costs due to software delays are the same.	79
Figure 29. Distance = 14 m. Transmit Power = -12dBm. Comparison of packet success rate (PSR), average number of retries and energy used per successful transmission with 4 partitions in between the transmitter and the hub (receiver). The software delay has reduced the average number of retries by 26%. The reduction in cost due to introducing a software delay is approximately 54 %. This huge difference in costs is due to a 50% rise in the PSR when software delay is used. Marginal differences are observed in the average number of retries values and energy expenditures when software delays of 19 ms and 34 ms are used.	80

Figure 30. Distance = 14 m. Transmit Power = -6 dBm. Comparison of packet success rate (PSR), average number of retries and energy used per successful transmission with 4 partitions in between the transmitter and the hub (receiver). The software delay has reduced the average number of retries significantly by 87%. The reduction in cost due to software delay is approximately 10 %. This small difference in costs is due to marginal change in PSR (~99-100%). In terms of average number of retries values and energy expenditures, there is no significant difference between delays of 19 ms and 34 ms.	80
Figure 31. Distance = 14 m. Transmit Power = 0 dBm. Comparison of packet success rate (PSR), average number of retries and energy used per successful transmission with 4 partitions in between the transmitter and the hub (receiver). The software delay has reduced the average number of retries significantly by 79%. The reduction in cost due to software delay is around 3 %. This small difference in costs is due to comparable PSR value of both types of delays. The average number of retries values and energy expenditures when software delays of 19 ms and 34 ms are used are same.	81
Figure 32. Distance = 24 m. Transmit Power = -6 dBm Comparison of packet success rate (PSR), average number of retries and energy used per successful transmission with 5 partitions in between the transmitter and the hub (receiver). There is a huge jump in the PSR from ~30% (hardware) to ~50% (software). The software delay has reduced the average number of retries by ~25%. The reduction in cost is around 47 %. Very small differences are observed in the average number of retries values and energy expenditures when software delays of 19 ms and 34 ms are used.	82
Figure 33. Distance = 24 m. Transmit Power = 0 dBm Comparison of packet success rate (PSR), average number of retries and energy used per successful transmission with 5 partitions in between the transmitter and the hub (receiver). The software delay has reduced the average number of retries by more than 50%. The reduction in cost is around just around 28 %. Marginal differences are observed in the average number of retries values and energy expenditures when software delays of 19 ms and 34 ms are used.	82
Figure 34. Distance = 20 m. Transmit Power = -6 dBm Comparison of packet success rate (PSR), average number of retries and energy used per successful transmission with 4 partitions in between the transmitter and the hub (receiver). The software delay has reduced the average number of retries by 9%. The significant reduction in cost due to software delay is due to the PSR value getting doubled when software delays are used. The average number of retries values and energy expenditures when software delays of 19 ms and 34 ms are used are practically equal.	83
Figure 35. Distance = 20 m. Transmit Power = 0 dBm Comparison of packet success rate (PSR), average number of retries and energy used per successful transmission with 4 partitions in between the transmitter and the hub (receiver). The software delay has reduced the average number of retries by 75%. The reduction in cost due to software delay is 18% due to the small change in the PSR value. The average number of retries values and energy expenditures when software delays of 19 ms and 34 ms are used are practically equal.	83
Figure 36. The energy cost per successful transmission of the calculated and measured data is plotted against the PSR. A high correlation of 0.9998 validates the mathematical model. The measured or the experimental values correspond to the software delay between retry of 19 ms when packets are assumed to be independently affected by fading channel condition.	88

Chapter 5

Figure 37. State transition diagram of the adaptive algorithm.	90
Figure 38. The curves behave differently depending on the value of R. Low R value indicates slow back off while high R indicates fast back off. When the number of successes is 0, the probability of transition	

is 0. This drop-off algorithm takes into account of all the previous successes indicating that it uses memory information while dropping-off as well.	93
Figure 39. At an average E_b/N_0 value of 30 dB, comparison shows that energy efficiency-wise, both fixed probability and exponential drop-off approaches are comparable.	95
Figure 40. At an average E_b/N_0 value of 15 dB, comparison shows that dynamic probability approach can be more energy efficient if proper choice of R value is made.	96
Figure 41. At average E_b/N_0 of 10 dB, the channel condition/ link quality is poor. The more energy efficient option is to stay in higher power state which is achieved by a high fixed probability of 75% or at a slow back-off value of R 0.05.	96
Figure 42. At average E_b/N_0 of 30 dB, the channel condition/ link quality is good. The use of exponential probability while transiting to a lower state has outperformed the fixed count for transition by a huge margin.	97
Figure 43. At average E_b/N_0 of 15 dB, the channel condition/ link quality is average. The use of exponential probability while transiting to a lower state has outperformed the fixed count for transition by a huge margin.	98
Figure 44. When channel condition is poor ($E_b/N_0 < 10$ dB), the use of exponential probability while transiting to a lower state has outperformed the fixed count for transition by a huge margin.	98
Figure 45. Distance 14 m. Number of partition type I = 5. Comparison of the PSR, efficiency and average cost of successful transmission. The minimum cost at fixed power is achieved at 0 dBm. The PSR of fixed power at 0 dBm is almost similar to the PSRs of the adaptive protocol. The adaptive protocol consumes 55% less energy than at 0 dBm when value of R is 0.5. The efficiency of the fixed power transmission (0 dBm) is a touch higher than the adaptive protocol at R = 0.5.	101
Figure 46. Distance 18 m. Number of partition type I = 4. Comparison of the PSR, efficiency and average cost of successful transmission. The minimal cost of fixed power transmission is achieved at -6 dBm. The minimum energy consumption is at -6 dBm, primarily because of similar PSR and efficiency as at 0 dBm. In terms of energy efficiency, the adaptive protocol consumes 30% less energy than the fixed power transmission at -6 dBm when R is 1. The efficiency of the adaptive protocol at R = 1 is higher than fixed power transmission at -6 dBm.	102
Figure 47. Distance 20 m. Number of partition type I = 4. Comparison of the efficiency and average cost of successful transmission based on the PSR. The minimal cost of fixed power transmission is achieved at 0 dBm In this case the PSR of fixed power at 0 dBm is same as the PSRs of adaptive protocol. In terms of energy efficiency, the adaptive protocol consumes 55% less energy than the fixed power transmission at 0 dBm when R = 1. The efficiency of the fixed power transmission is a touch higher than that of adaptive protocol at R = 1.	103
Figure 48. Distance 24 m. Busy hour. Number of partition type I = 4. Comparison of the efficiency and average cost of successful transmission based on the PSR. The minimum energy consumption of fixed power is achieved at 0 dBm, primarily because it has much higher PSR and efficiency than at -6 dBm. The adaptive protocol consumes 6% less energy than the fixed power transmission at 0 dBm when R = 0.5. The efficiency of the fixed power transmission at 0 dBm is a touch higher than that of adaptive protocol at R = 0.5.	104
Figure 49. Distance 24 m. Non-busy hour. Number of partition type I = 4. Comparison of the efficiency and average cost of successful transmission based on the PSR. The minimum energy consumption of fixed power is achieved at 0 dBm The adaptive protocol consumes 29% less energy than the fixed power transmission at 0 dBm when R = 1 The efficiencies of the adaptive protocol (at R = 1) and fixed power transmission (0 dBm) are comparable.	105

Figure 50. Distance 15m. Large gathering of people. Number of partition type I = 3, Number of partition type II = 1. Comparison of the efficiency and average cost of successful transmission based on the PSR and data collected during a gathering in a house. The minimum energy consumption of fixed power is achieved at 0 dBm. In terms of energy efficiency, the adaptive protocol consumes 26% less energy than the fixed power transmission at 0 dBm when $R = 0.5$. The protocol efficiencies of both fixed (at 0 dBm) and adaptive $R = 0.5$ are the same.	106
---	-----

Chapter 6

Figure 51. The 5 1-D random walks are plotted with the maximum distance between the sensor the hub set to 40 m.	110
Figure 52. Variation of PSR with the outer feedback window in different random walks.....	112
Figure 53. Random Walk 1. The PSR as the constraint parameter shows that both fixed power (above power level -12 dBm) and adaptive transmission strategy have comparable values (~100%). The cost comparison shows that the adaptive protocol consumes less energy for a successful transmission on average. The power level for optimal energy consumption in fixed power mode is -6 dBm. The protocol efficiency at -6 dBm is a touch less than the adaptive protocol.	113
Figure 54. Random Walk 1: Comparison of the PSR, protocol efficiency based on the minimum average cost of successful transmission.....	114
Figure 55. Random Walk 2. The PSR as the constraint parameter shows that both fixed power (above power level -18 dBm) and adaptive transmission strategy have comparable values (above 95%). The cost comparison shows that the adaptive protocol consumes less energy for a successful transmission on average. The power level for optimal energy consumption in fixed power mode is -12 dBm. The protocol efficiency of the adaptive protocol is 5.5% higher than at -12 dBm.	115
Figure 56. Random Walk 2: Comparison of the PSR, protocol efficiency based on the minimum average cost of successful transmission.....	115
Figure 57. Random Walk 3. The PSR as the constraint parameter shows that both fixed power (above power level -12 dBm) and adaptive transmission strategy have comparable values (above 95%). The cost comparison shows that the adaptive protocol consumes approximately 3% less energy for a successful transmission on average. The power level for optimal energy consumption in fixed power mode is -6 dBm. The protocol efficiency of the adaptive protocol is a touch higher than the minimum fixed power level at -6 dBm.....	116
Figure 58. Random Walk 3: Comparison of the PSR, protocol efficiency based on the minimum average cost of successful transmission.....	117
Figure 59. Random Walk 4. The PSR as the constraint parameter shows that both fixed power (above power level -12 dBm) and adaptive transmission strategy have comparable values (above 95%) . The cost comparison shows that the adaptive protocol consumes less energy for a successful transmission on average. The power level for minimum energy consumption in fixed power mode is -6 dBm. The protocol efficiency of the adaptive protocol is comparable with the power level at -6 dBm.	117
Figure 60. Random Walk 4: Comparison of the PSR, protocol efficiency based on the minimum average cost of successful transmission.....	118
Figure 61. Random Walk 5. The PSR as the constraint parameter shows that both fixed power (above power level -18 dBm) and adaptive transmission strategy have comparable values (above 95%). The cost comparison shows that the adaptive protocol consumes less energy for a successful transmission on average. The power level for optimal energy consumption in fixed power mode is -12 dBm. The protocol efficiency of the adaptive protocol is 15% more than that at optimal fixed power level of -12 dBm.	119

Figure 62. Random Walk 5: Comparison of the PSR, protocol efficiency based on the minimum average cost of successful transmission	119
Figure 63. Traversal path of the sensor is shown in dotted red line. The distance between the sensor and the hub is not constant	120
Figure 64. State traversal with the number of transmission when exponential drop-off rate is 0.01. The system toggles between different states less frequently even when link quality decreases (by increasing the distance between the sensor and the hub).....	121
Figure 65. State traversal with the number of transmission when exponential drop-off rate is 0.05. The state drops are faster as compared to $R=0.01$	121
Figure 66. State traversal with the number of transmission when exponential drop-off rate is 0.1. The state drops are now very frequent and system stays in the lower state (1 and 2) more often as compared to $R=0.01$ and $R=0.05$	121
Figure 67. State traversal with the number of transmission when exponential drop-off rate is 0.5. Even less time spent in higher states.....	122
Figure 68. State traversal with the number of transmission when exponential drop-off rate is 1. The system has spent most of the time in lower states.	122
Figure 69. Performance comparison of fixed and adaptive protocol. As expected, the PSR at fixed power of 0 dBm is the maximum but adaptive protocol at R value of 0.5 has comparable PSR. The efficiencies of adaptive and fixed power are comparable. The adaptive protocol saves almost 20% energy at $R=0.5$	124
Figure 70. Performance comparison of fixed and adaptive protocol. As expected, the PSR at fixed power of 0 dBm is the maximum but adaptive protocol at R value of 1 approaches that of 0 dBm. The efficiencies of adaptive and fixed power are comparable. The adaptive protocol at $R=1$ consumes approximately 35% less energy than fixed power transmission (0 dBm).....	125
Figure 71. PSR, Efficiency and cost per successful transmission plots based on random walk in University campus. For a PSR > 97%, the % efficiency is comparable at 88% while using 42% less power.	126
Figure 72. PSR, Efficiency and cost per successful transmission plots based on random walk in University campus. For a PSR > 95%, the % efficiency values are same at 78% while the cost per successful transmission is reduced by 20% when adaptive power control at $R=0.1$ is used over fixed transmission at -6 dBm.	127
Figure 73. PSR, Efficiency and cost per successful transmission plots based on random walk in University campus. For a PSR > 85%, the % efficiency values are same at 60% while there is a reduction of approximately 25% in the cost.	127
Figure 74. PSR, Efficiency and cost per successful transmission plots based on random walk in University campus. For a PSR > 99%, the % efficiency values are same at 96% while using 22% less power when adaptive protocol is used at $R=0.5$	128
Figure 75. PSR, Efficiency and cost per successful transmission plots based on random walk in University campus. For a PSR > 96%, the % efficiency values are more than 80%, while there is a reduction of more than 45% in cost when adaptive protocol with $R=1$	128

Chapter 7

Figure 76. A linear relationship is observed between RSSI and received E_b/N_0 , both in log scale at distance of 10 m between the transmitter and the receiver with data rate of 250 kbps.	135
Figure 77. A linear relationship is observed between RSSI and received E_b/N_0 , both in log scale at distance of 20 m between the transmitter and the receiver with data rate of 250 kbps.	135
Figure 78. A linear relationship is observed between RSSI and received E_b/N_0 , both in log scale at distance of 30 m between the transmitter and the receiver with data rate of 250 kbps.	135

Figure 79. A comparatively patchy or incomplete relationship between RSSI and E_b/N_0 is achieved when one sample of RSSI per output power level are plotted.	136
Figure 80. Plot of PSR vs the average received E_b/N_0 with FSK modulation and channel data rate 250 kbps shows that in order to achieve a high PSR (>98%), the average received E_b/N_0 should be around 30 dB.	137
Figure 81. Plot of PSR vs the average received E_b/N_0 with FSK modulation and channel data rate 100 kbps shows that in order to achieve a high PSR (>98%), the average received E_b/N_0 should be around 30 dB.	138
Figure 82. A linear relationship is observed between RSSI and received E_b/N_0 , both in log scale at distance of 10 m between the transmitter and the receiver when data rate of 100 kbps is set.	138
Figure 83. Plot of PSR vs the average received E_b/N_0 with FSK modulation and channel data rate 500 kbps shows that in order to achieve a high PSR (>98%), the average received E_b/N_0 should be around 30 dB.	138
Figure 84. A linear relationship is observed between RSSI and received E_b/N_0 , (using log scales) at distance of 10 m between the transmitter and the receiver when data rate of 500 kbps is set.	139
Figure 85. Comparison of cost of successful transmission at different frequencies of scanning at distance of 5 m between the transmitter and receiver and 4 type-1 walls resulting in average E_b/N_0 of 30 dB at lowest transmission power level of -18 dBm.	142
Figure 86. Comparison of cost of successful transmission at different frequencies of scanning at distance of 10 m between the transmitter and receiver and 4 type-1 walls resulting in average E_b/N_0 of 21 dB at lowest transmission power level of -18 dBm.	142
Figure 87. Comparison of cost of successful transmission at different frequencies of scanning at distance of 15 m between the transmitter and receiver and 4 type-1 walls resulting in average E_b/N_0 of 16 dB at lowest transmission power level of -18 dBm.	143
Figure 88. Comparison of cost of successful transmission at different frequencies of scanning at distance of 20 m between the transmitter and receiver and 4 type-1 walls resulting in average E_b/N_0 of 12 dB at lowest transmission power level of -18 dBm.	143
Figure 89. Comparison of cost of successful transmission at different frequencies of scanning at distance of 25 m between the transmitter and receiver and 4 type-1 walls resulting in average E_b/N_0 of 10 dB at lowest transmission power level of -18 dBm.	143
Figure 90. Distance 5 m. Average E_b/N_0 = 30 dB at Transmission power = -18 dBm. Comparison of average cost per successful transmission shows that beacon based power control scheme (using RSSI information) with single scanning only saves 0.5% energy as compared to S-APC at $R = 1$	144
Figure 91. Distance 10 m. Average E_b/N_0 = 21 dB at Transmission power = -18 dBm. Comparison of average cost per successful transmission shows that beacon based power control scheme (using RSSI information) with single scanning saves 5% energy as compared to S-APC at $R = 1$	144
Figure 92. Distance 15 m. Average E_b/N_0 = 16 dB at Transmission power = -18 dBm. Comparison of average cost per successful transmission shows that beacon based power control scheme (using RSSI information) with single scanning consumes 20% more energy than S-APC at $R = 0.01$	145
Figure 93. Distance 20 m. Average E_b/N_0 = 12 dB at Transmission power = -18 dBm. Comparison of average cost per successful transmission shows that beacon based power control scheme (using RSSI information) with single scanning consumes 15% more energy than S-APC at $R = 0.05$	146
Figure 94. Distance 25 m. Average E_b/N_0 = 10 dB at Transmission power = -18 dBm. Comparison of average cost per successful transmission shows that beacon based power control scheme (using RSSI information) with single scanning consumes 10% more energy than S-APC at $R = 0.05$	146

Figure 95. Distance 5 m. Average $E_b/N_0 = 30$ dB at Transmission power = -18 dBm Comparison of average cost per successful transmission shows that beacon based power control scheme (using RSSI information) with single scanning consumes 12.5% more energy than S-APC.	148
Figure 96. Distance 10 m. Average $E_b/N_0 = 21$ dB at Transmission power = -18 dBm Comparison of average cost per successful transmission shows that beacon based power control scheme (using RSSI information) with single scanning consumes 5% more energy than S-APC.	148
Figure 97. Distance 15 m. Average $E_b/N_0 = 16$ dB at Transmission power = -18 dBm Comparison of average cost per successful transmission shows that beacon based power control scheme (using RSSI information) with single scanning consumes 4.5% more energy than S-APC.	149
Figure 98. Distance 20 m. Average $E_b/N_0 = 12$ dB at Transmission power = -18 dBm Comparison of average cost per successful transmission shows that beacon based power control scheme (using RSSI information) with single scanning consumes 17% more energy than S-APC.	149
Figure 99. Distance 25 m. Average $E_b/N_0 = 10$ dB at Transmission power = -18 dBm Comparison of average cost per successful transmission shows that beacon based power control scheme (using RSSI information) with single scanning consumes 12% more energy than S-APC.	149
Figure 100. Distance 5 m. Average $E_b/N_0 = 30$ dB at Transmission power = -18 dBm. Comparison of average cost per successful transmission shows that beacon based power control scheme (using RSSI information) with single scanning consumes 11% more energy than S-APC.	150
Figure 101. Distance 10 m. Average $E_b/N_0 = 21$ dB at Transmission power = -18 dBm. Comparison of average cost per successful transmission shows that beacon based power control scheme (using RSSI information) with single scanning consumes 5% more energy than S-APC.	150
Figure 102. Distance 15 m. Average $E_b/N_0 = 16$ dB at Transmission power = -18 dBm. Comparison of average cost per successful transmission shows that beacon based power control scheme (using RSSI information) with single scanning consumes 21% more energy than S-APC.	151
Figure 103. Distance 20 m. Average $E_b/N_0 = 12$ dB at Transmission power = -18 dBm. Comparison of average cost per successful transmission shows that beacon based power control scheme (using RSSI information) with single scanning consumes 17% more energy than S-APC.	151
Figure 104. Distance 25 m. Average $E_b/N_0 = 10$ dB at Transmission power = -18 dBm. Comparison of average cost per successful transmission shows that beacon based power control scheme (using RSSI information) with single scanning consumes 12% more energy than S-APC.	151

Chapter 8

Figure 105. University building- long term variation. Variation of the average E_b/N_0 over time. Along x-axis, the numbers of transmissions are noted. The average E_b/N_0 is quite high (>60 dB) and occasionally dropped to 20 dB. Since the distance between the access point and the laptop is constant, the drop in the value is attributed to human movements in between and multipath effects.	157
Figure 106. University building long- term variation. The distribution plot of the received E_b/N_0 from data set 1 shows the wide variation over a range of 40 dB. The proportion of E_b/N_0 values at around 20 dB is appreciable. This has significantly contributed to high standard deviation.	157
Figure 107. University building. Plot of average cost of successful transmission at different link sampling rates when ATPC is used. There are no significant differences in the cost due to different sampling rates.	158
Figure 108. University building. Plot of average cost of successful transmission at different drop-off rates (R) when S-APC is used. The change from $R = 0.01$ to $R = 1$ is approximately 3%.	158
Figure 109. University building. Plot of average cost of successful transmission at different output power levels when fixed power transmissions are used. As expected, the cost values increases with the output power level as the channel condition is generally very good ($E_b/N_0 > 60$).	158

Figure 110. University building data. Comparison of the cost due to different transmission strategy shows that there is hardly any difference in the cost per successful transmission.	160
Figure 111. University dining hall. It shows the variation of the average E_b/N_0 from University dining hall during busy hour between 11:30 am and 1:00 pm. The average E_b/N_0 is quite high (>55 dB) and occasionally dropped to 20 dB. The busy hour period shows that the average E_b/N_0 can widely fluctuate between high E_b/N_0 (> 55 dB) and low E_b/N_0 (~20 dB).	161
Figure 112. University dining hall. The distribution plot of the received E_b/N_0 from University dining hall during busy hour between 11:30 am and 1:00 pm shows the wide variation over a range of 40 dB. The E_b/N_0 values are fairly uniformly distributed between 55 dB and 63 dB with the majority of values around 65 dB. However 6% occupancy in 20 dB indicates rapid fluctuation in the signal level caused by movements of people in between and receiver.	161
Figure 113. University dining hall. Plot of average cost of successful transmission at different link sampling rates when ATPC is used.	162
Figure 114. University dining hall. Plot of average cost of successful transmission at different drop-off rates (R) when adaptive power control protocol is used. There is only a change of 4% savings from R 0.01 to R 1.	162
Figure 115. University dining hall. Plot of average cost of successful transmission at different output power levels when fixed power transmissions are used. As expected, the cost values increases with the output power level as the channel condition is generally very good ($E_b/N_0 > 55$).	163
Figure 116. University dining hall. Comparison of the minimum costs of the different transmission strategies shows that there is negligible difference in the cost per successful transmission.	163
Figure 117. Shopping centre Weekend 1. It shows the variation of the average E_b/N_0 from town shopping centre during busy hour between 11:30 am and 1:30 pm.	165
Figure 118. Shopping centre during Weekend. The distribution plot of the received E_b/N_0 from town shopping centre during busy hour between 11:30 am and 1:30 pm shows the wide variation of link quality. The percentage E_b/N_0 at 20 dB is significantly high (~20%) which indicates that link quality has fluctuated frequently.	165
Figure 119. Shopping centre Weekend: Plot of average cost of successful transmission at different link sampling rates when ATPC is used. There are less than 2% savings in cost when number of samples between sampling link changes from 1 to 100.	166
Figure 120. Shopping centre Weekend: Plot of average cost of successful transmission at different drop-off rates (R) S-APC is used. There is 5% savings from R 0.01 to R 1.	166
Figure 121. Shopping centre Weekend: Plot of average cost of successful transmission at different output power levels when fixed power transmissions are used. As expected, the cost values increases with the output power level.	166
Figure 122. Shopping centre during weekend. Comparison of the cost due to different transmission strategy shows that there is negligible difference in the cost per successful transmission.	168
Figure 123. University building. The frequency distribution plot of the received E_b/N_0 of one of the data sets from University building is presented when it is reduced by 20 dB. The link quality is still good, with maximum time in E_b/N_0 above 40 dB.	169
Figure 124. University building- long term variation. Comparison of the minimum cost and the corresponding PSR and protocol efficiencies due to different transmission strategy shows that the adaptive protocol can save 7% and 12% energy as compared to ATPC and fixed power transmission and outperforming the others in terms of PSR and efficiency.	170

Figure 125. University dining hall. Comparison of the minimum cost and their corresponding PSR and protocol efficiencies due to different transmission strategy shows that S-APC consumes 10% less energy than ATPC protocol and fixed power transmission, with comparable PSR and efficiency. ...	171
Figure 126 University dining hall. The frequency distribution plot of the received E_b/N_0 from the University dining hall data is presented when it is reduced by 20 dB. The link quality is still good, with the maximum time in E_b/N_0 around 40 dB.	172
Figure 127. Shopping centre Weekend. Comparison of the minimum cost and their corresponding PSR and protocol efficiencies due to different transmission strategy shows that the adaptive protocol at $R=0.5$ consumes 17% less energy than the ATPC protocol, outperforming the others in terms of PSR and efficiency.	173
Figure 128. University building- The normalised frequency distribution of the E_b/N_0 values suggests that channel is in bad condition for ~20% of time.	174
Figure 129. University dining hall - The frequency distribution of the E_b/N_0 values in during busy hour shows that the channel quality has oscillated between good and bad.	174
Figure 130. Town shopping center- The frequency distribution of the E_b/N_0 values during busy hour shows that the channel quality has oscillated between good and bad	175
Figure 131. University building data. Comparison of the cost due to different transmission strategy shows that S-APC consumes more energy than ATPC protocol. However, the minimum power consumption occurs if the output power level is fixed at the lowest power level (-18 dBm).	177
Figure 132. University dining hall. Comparison of the cost due to different transmission strategy in University dining hall during busy hours shows that the proposed S-APC protocol is less energy efficient than ATPC and fixed power transmission.	178
Figure 133. Shopping centre Weekend. Comparison of the cost due to different transmission strategy shows that ATPC and fixed power transmissions are significantly more energy efficient than the proposed S-APC protocol.	179

List of Tables

Table 1. Sensor radio power levels.....	33
Table 2. Comparison of the average packet drop rate and overhead of coded and un-coded system	47
Table 3. Simulation parameters in MATLAB	50
Table 4. Channel Utilization without any packet error.....	59
Table 5. Features of nRF24L01p receiver [88]	61
Table 6. Features of nRF24L01p transmitter [39].....	61
Table 7. Operational modes and current consumption of nRF24L01p	61
Table 8. Simulation parameters with MATLAB	65
Table 9 Tabulated PSR, cost and average retries at different distances and partitions in between	84
Table 10. Comparison of Transmission Cost and Delay Cost At Different Power Levels.....	87
Table 11. Operational Modes and Current Consumptions of CC2420	89
Table 12. States, power levels and retry limits.....	91
Table 13. State transition matrix when state levels go up	92
Table 14. State transition matrix when state levels go down	92
Table 15. Execution time of code under different scenarios.....	107
Table 16. States, power levels and number of retries allowed	123
Table 17. Experimental design to test the performance when sensors are mobile.....	126
Table 18 Tabulated PSR, cost and protocol efficiency of fixed and adaptive protocol when used in mobile sensors	129
Table 19. Simulation parameters to find relationship between RSSI and average E_b/N_0	134
Table 20. Transmission regions, PSR and features [37] [108]	137
Table 21. Sample neighbourhood table	141
Table 22. E_b/N_0 values derived from the distance and number of separations using Cost231 model.....	141
Table 23. Simulation parameters for comparison of ATPC with non-RSSI based adaptive protocol in MATLAB.....	154
Table 24. Decision matrix table of ATPC on run time	155
Table 25. Average cost, PSR and protocol efficiency of data sets inside University building.....	159
Table 26. Average cost, PSR and protocol efficiency inside University dining hall.....	163
Table 27. Average cost, PSR and protocol efficiency inside shopping centre	167
Table 28. Average cost, PSR and protocol efficiency inside University building when E_b/N_0 is reduced by 20 dB	169
Table 29. Average cost, PSR and protocol efficiency inside University dining hall during busy hour	171
Table 30. Average cost, PSR and protocol efficiency inside shopping centre during busy hour	172
Table 31. Average cost, PSR and protocol efficiency inside University building when E_b/N_0 is reduced by 40 dB	175
Table 32. Average cost, PSR and protocol efficiency inside University dining hall when E_b/N_0 is reduced by 40 dB	177
Table 33. Average cost, PSR and protocol efficiency at shopping center when E_b/N_0 is reduced by 40 dB.....	178
