Master Thesis Report

PrithviRaj Narendra

8th August, 2014

Abstract

Hello Abstract.

Contents

List of Abbreviations

AFH Adaptive Frequency Hopping.

ATT Attribute Protocol.

BLE Bluetooth Low Energy.

CRC Cyclic Redundancy Check.

CSMA Carrier Sense Multiple Access.

GAP Generic Access Profile.

GATT Generic Attribute Profile.

GFSK Gaussian Frequency Shift Keying.

IC Integerated Circuit.

IoT Internet of Things.

ISM Industrial, Scientific and Medical.

kbps kilobit per second.

L2CAP Logical Link Control and Adaptation Protocol.

.

MAC Medium Access Control.

MCU microcontroller.

OS Operating System.

PDR Packet Delivery Ratio.

RDC Radio Duty Cycle.

SIG Special Interest Group.

SM Security Manager.

SoC System-on-Chip.

1 | Introduction

1.1 General introduction to the domain of the thesis

What is BLE? Why was it developed and who/where is it being used? [1]

What is Contiki OS? Why was it and who/where is it being used? Explain the amount of R&D done in terms of communication protocols based on 802.15.4 [2].

1.2 Problem definition

Need for BLE in Contiki as a platform for Internet of Things (IoT). To understand the characteristics of BLE and 802.15.4 so that we can identify the applications suitable for these protocols.

1.3 Goal

To choose and integrate a BLE hardware platform with Contiki. To compare BLE and 802 in various performance criteria of data-rate, latency, reliability and energy consumption in environments with and without external interference.

1.4 Outline of the report

1.method??

2 | Background*

2.1 Overview of Bluetooth Low Energy

Rest of overview, from what is missed in 1st chapter.

2.1.1 Design objectives of BLE

BLE was designed by Bluetooth Special Interest Group (SIG) from the ground up, which helped it achieve certain design goals. These design goals for this wireless personal area network were *low cost, worldwide operation, short range, robustness* and *low power*[3].

Low Power   BLE aims to use a tiny batteries such as button cell to keep a device operating for months to years. To achieve this goal, BLE was optimized to communicate small amounts of data, such as the states of devices. Also BLE is optimized to have lower peak power requirements, which allows use of button cells to be used with BLE devices.

Worldwide Operation   For a technology to be adopted, it is important that there is uniform conformity to the regulations around the world. The 2.4 GHz Industrial, Scientific and Medical (ISM) radio band is the only one available license free worldwide. The technology to develop wireless devices in this band is mature making it the suitable radio band for BLE.

Short Range   BLE was designed to be for personal area network like Classic Bluetooth, which means that it is not a network to work with a cellular base station network. This design criterion goes hand in hand with *low power*.

Low Cost   Lower power requirements mean that the batteries in BLE devices need to smaller and have to be replaced less frequently, both resulting in a reduction of cost for both the manufacturer and the customer. The use of the ISM band for communication levels removes the licensing entry barrier for start-ups to develop BLE devices. BLE embraces simplicity in its pursuit to lower the cost. BLE supports only single-hop communication in a star network, which reduces the memory and processor requirement for supporting the protocol. Simplicity was the key factor for the choosing of Gaussian Frequency Shift Keying (GFSK) as the modulation scheme for BLE to result in low cost, small radio implementation of the radio in the Integerated Circuits (ICs) for BLE.

Robustness   The 2.4 GHz space is crowded with devices communicating with various standards as well as spurious noise making the robustness a key criteria in developing BLE standard. BLE uses a multi-channel hopping mechanism called Adaptive Frequency Hopping (AFH) to detect, avoid and recover from interference. In addition to AFH, BLE uses Cyclic Redundancy Check (CRC) to detect and recover from bit-errors due to background noise.

---

*Includes text and images from minor thesis 'Business ideation for BLE'

2.1.2 BLE network architecture

Single and Dual devices, Advertisers and scanners, Master and Slave, Star Network, figure 2.1

Figure 2.1: Typical BLE network

2.2 BLE stack overview

Explain host and controller division. More details about link layer.
Image of the stack

Physical layer

Link layer

Logical Link Control and Adaptation Protocol (L2CAP)

Generic Access Profile (GAP)

Attribute Protocol (ATT)

Generic Attribute Profile (GATT)

Security Manager (SM)

2.3 Overview of Contiki

??????????????? Which aspects of Contiki here?

2.4 Overview of 802.15.4

Mention that in this thesis the Contiki specific implementations of the 802.15.4 layers will be tested.

2.4.1 Physical layer

2.4.2 MAC layer

2.4.2.1 Radio Duty Cycle (RDC) layer

2.4.2.2 Carrier Sense Multiple Access (CSMA)

3 | Methodology

3.1 Research process

Figure 3.1 shows tasks performed in this thesis boxes of the flow-chart and the steps of the research process on the left. The thesis report is also organized in this manner.

Figure 3.1: Thesis' tasks and steps in the research process

3.2 Research Method

In this experimental research large amount of data was generated to compare the two protocols mentioned, hence utilizing quantitative research method. The approach followed was deductive as the experiment started by defining the metric to measure, then designing the test to perform and finally deducting the conclusions based on the collected data from the tests.

The data collected was condensed with descriptive statistics and graphical representation was used to showcase this information. Univariate analysis of the various metrics of the two protocols was compare the two protocols from these graphical representation.

4 | Literature Study

This chapter provides a brief overview of the related work being done in the research community. Research articles involving the process of porting of Contiki OS to a hardware platform are presented in section 4.1. Performance evaluation of BLE, 802.15.4 and their comparison are presented in section 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4 respectively.

4.1   Porting Contiki OS to a new platform

Contiki OS project originating in 2002 has been ported to an increasing number of hardware platforms [4]. Since Contiki is an open-source BSD Clause-3 licensed project, there are many projects in various hardware platforms based on a fork from the Contiki repository.

These hardware platforms' processors range across a spectrum of 8-bit (8051 and AVR), 16-bit (MSP430) to 32-bit (ARM Cortex-M, PIC32). Contiki has support for 802.15.4 based wireless communication with various external transceivers and SoCs with built in radio transceiver. Various common features of many platforms such as Light Emitting Diodes (LEDs), buttons and serial port have modules in Contiki for common Application Programming Interface (API) across platforms.

In [5] the authors describe Contiki's port to a CC2430 based platform manufactured by Sensinode Ltd. CC2430 is an enhanced Intel 8051 processor based SoC having 802.15.4 physical layer compatible radio transceiver. The authors fully debugged the port which had of a code footprint of about 100 kilobyte (kB), varying based on the compiler mode and the features enabled. Many new features were added to the port including support for Analog to Digital Conversion (ADC) unit, all the sensor available on the platform (accelerometer, light sensor, voltage and temperature sensors), watchdog timer and the general purpose buttons. Because of the limited stack availability of 233 bytes, many optimizations such as moving variables to external Random-Access Memory (RAM) memory space and re-writing the radio driver for CC2430 to prevent stack from overflowing.

Contiki was ported to two new platforms, namely MicaZ and TelosB in a Bachelor thesis [6]. TelosB, similar to the TMote-Sky platform, consists of a 8MHz 16-bit MSP430 microcontroller (MCU), a CC2400 transceiver with 802.15.4 Physical Layer (PHY) and a host of sensors to measure light, temperature and humidity. The port to TelosB was done by changing the port to the fully supported TMote-Sky platform. MicaZ platform consisted of a 8-bit Atmel ATMega128L MCU and a CC2400 transceiver. MicaZ platform needed rewriting of the code for processor abstraction so that the high level Contiki APIs could work.

Contiki has been ported into platform based on a ARM Cortex M3 processor to create a device wired with Ethernet to connected to the Internet [7]. Ethernet based networking with the libraries present in Contiki was developed in this project to demonstrate as a proof of concept.

There are many unofficial ports of Contiki to various hardware platforms, including ones based on ARM Cortex M3 based processors. This can be seen in the port to STM32F10x based platform [8] and LPC1768 based platform [9], both having Cortex M3 processor.

4.2 Evaluating the performance of BLE

In a paper [1] providing an overview and evaluation of BLE, its various parameters such as energy consumption, latency, maximum piconet size and throughput have been evaluated. Theoretical calculations were done to predict the lifetime of a BLE slave device running of a 230 mAh coin cell battery for different values of connection interval and slave latency. The average current consumption of a TI CC2540 BLE platform was plotted for the entire range of connection interval keeping the slave latency as zero. The estimate of the lifetime was also done with respect to various Bit Error Rate (BER). **2.Talk about latency (676us) wrt Gomez2012, is what they are talking about called latency?**

The same experimental setup [1] shows the maximum throughput between two CC2540 devices as 58.48 kbps considering a payload of 20 bytes. This is attributed to the fact that in each connection event with an interval of 7.5 ms four packets are not transmitted as in an ideal case. An analytical model of the throughput [10] has been developed for different BER and connection interval. Simulation results validate this model developed. This model show that the maximum throughput in case the BER is zero is 236.7 kbps, independent of the connection interval. An assumption made in this paper is that the master and slave device do not have any limit on the number of packets communicated in a connection interval.

The energy consumption for an advertiser and scanner is modeled for the activity of the scanner discovering the advertiser [11]. The current consumption for each phase of advertisement and scanning is measured. Using this information the a model of the energy consumption is developed taking into account the advertising and scanning interval. The model developed is compared with experiments and validated.

The current consumption in different phases of operation, namely waking up, pre-processing, the transmission-reception cycles and the post-processing is measured [12] to estimate the lifetime. A recent journal article [13] develops a precise model of the energy consumption of BLE devices. A payload (20 bytes) throughput of 102 kbps is achieved in this paper consistent with the manufacturer's claims [14]. The model developed is unique in the sense that it is the first one which encompasses all the modes of operation, all the relevant parameters and their possible values. The model is based upon the actual measured duration of various parameters and measured current in various phases of operation. This leads to a model which at most has 6% variation from actual measurement. The code base for the model is available so that it can be ported to the system being evaluated.

Based on the model developed and evaluated, a set of guidelines are provided for developers of BLE system to reduce energy consumption [13]. In the unconnected mode, the scanner is recommended to be continuously scanning in case the advertisers is expected to be found soon. In case of where a lot of time is spent scanning idly, the parameters of advertising interval and duty cycle of the scanner can be tweaked to minimize both the energy consumption and latency of discovery. In the connected mode, the recommendation is to completely fill the payload as possible and communicate as much data as possible within a connection event. In both modes, it was noted that although reducing the transmission power appropriate to the the distance transmitted helped in reducing energy consumption, it was not as significant as the other factors.

4.3 Evaluating the performance of 802.15.4

[15] Adam Dunkels. "The ContikiMAC Radio Duty Cycling Protocol". In: (Dec. 2011).

[16] Mathieu Michel and Bruno Quoitin. "Technical Report : ContikiMAC vs X-MAC performance analysis". In: arXiv preprint arXiv:1404.3589 (Apr. 2014). arXiv: 1404.3589.

[17] M.-P. Uwase, M. Bezunartea, T.L. Nguyen, et al. "Experimental evaluation of message latency and power usage in WSNs". In: 2014 IEEE International Black Sea Conference on

4.4   Comparison of BLE and 802.15.4

BLE is relatively new protocol compared to 802.15.4, due to which there are few studies conducted comparing the two low power wireless protocols. The energy consumption of BLE and 802.15.4 was compared in terms of the amount of payload can be communicated per Joule of energy i.e. the energy utility measured with unit kByte/J [18]. It was found that for BLE the energy utility was independent of the throughput and depended on the number of packets communicated per connection event. The energy utility varied from around 325 to 525 kByte/J when the packets per connection event rose from one to four respectively. In case of 802.15.4, the energy utility did depend on the throughput. Until 1 kBps the energy utility increased with respect to the throughput, then plateaued at 300 kByte/J.

In the same paper [18] the energy utility of both BLE and 802.15.4 is measured when transmitting a payload over the link layer and when transmitting payload with IPv6 over Low power Wireless Personal Area Networks (6LoWPAN) with the application payload (up to 150 Bytes) as a factor. Both increase in a step-wise manner because of the maximum payload capacity in both protocols with BLE having larger number of step because of the lesser payload capacity of 27 byte at the link layer. The overheads of the different 6LoWPAN frames can also be seen in both the protocols.

The effect of WiFi interference on the reception of packets is also considered for the two protocols [18]. It should be noted that the test build did not support AFH to avoid interference, so the authors tested only the non-connected mode for BLE. In that case, up to 1 m the interference resulted in only 5 to 20% of the packets being received successfully, depending on the overlap of the interfering WiFi channel over the advertising BLE channel. 1.5 m and above the WiFi interference affected the communication little. In case of 802.15.4, the WiFi interference closer than 0.5 m resulted in only 35% of the packets being communicated. At a distance of 1 m and above, the interference had negligible effect on the packets being communicated.

Another journal article [19] compares BLE, 802.15.4 and another wireless protocol SimpliciTI over various criteria of throughput (theoretical and experimental), minimum turnaround time, energy consumption of the transceivers and the memory resources required for the stack of these protocols. Minimum turnaround time here is the time required for requesting data and receiving it. SimpliciTI is an flexible open-source low-power proprietary radio protocol developed by TI for their wireless products, compatible with 802.15.4 transceivers. Similar to [10], a the calculation of the maximum throughput for BLE provided a value greater than 300 kbps, now at the link layer. Since SimpliciTI does not have rigid specification, its parameters can be tweaked for the maximum throughput to be calculated as 350 kbps. 802.15.4's maximum throughput was calculated to be between 150 and 200 kbps. The experimental evaluation of the throughput for SimpliciTI and 802.15.4 peaked at about 160 kbps and 145 kbps respectively accounting to the pre-processing operations and CCA inc case of 802.15.4. In case of BLE, the stack allowed different number of packets per connection event based on the link layer payload size. This resulted in a the throughput increasing irregularly with the payload, peaking at 122.6 kbps.

The minimum turnaround time measured for BLE was estimated to be below 1 ms since the reply was expected after the Inter Frame Space (IFS) in the same connection event. Experiments show that this is actually 7.6 ms. This is consistent with the minimum connection interval of 7.5 ms after which the reply is received in the next connection event. The minimum turnaround time was estimated as 1.92 to 10.08 ms and 0.7 to 5 ms for 802.15.4 and SimpliciTI respectively based on the mode of operation. The measured value was between 1.5 and 3 ms higher than the estimated value for both 802.15.4 and SimpliciTI. The energy consumption for the three protocols were measure per transmission and per byte transmitted. It was

found that BLE transceiver consumed 2 to 7 times lower energy than the other two transceivers depending on the mode of operation.

One more article compare the energy consumption of BLE, ZigBee and ANT wireless protocols for a low duty cycle application sending few bytes of data periodically [20]. Standardized in 2003, ZigBee is a wireless, low cost, low power, mesh networking standard [21] typically used in home automation, industrial control, wireless sensor networks and the like. ZigBee uses 802.15.4 for its physical and MAC layer. ANT is another 2.4 GHz ISM based wireless sensor network protocol supporting many network architectures as point to point, broadcasting and mesh. Its typical applications are in fitness and sports Personal Area Network (PAN). In the article [20] the test case involves devices based on these three protocols initiating connection and transferring 8 bytes of data and then disconnecting periodically at an interval ranging from 5 to 120 seconds. For this test case, it was found that the average current consumed by BLE was the lowest, followed by ZigBee and then ANT. **3.There is a flaw in their paper. They say that BLE connection takes time because of frequency hopping. There is no mention of advertising interval, scanning interval or duty cycle. These are the parameters which matters. Overall, it looks like they just bought a system, connected it to measuring device and ran tests without bothering about the protocol configuration. How did they submit to IEEE IWS symposium???**

5 | Porting a BLE platform to Contiki OS

4. 5to10 pages The initial task of the thesis was to choose hardware platform supporting BLE and port Contiki OS to this platform. This task was a pre-requisite to the next task of testing detailed in chapter 6. The choosing of the hardware platform involved listing out the criteria which would be essential and the ones which would be preferable. Once these judging criteria was decided, an exhaustive search was made of all the available platforms to decide on the suitable one.

5.1 BLE Hardware Platform

What is meant by hardware platform?

5.1.1 Requirements of the hardware platform

The *mandatory* requirements for the platform would be:
- Must have a well supported and documented processor with good specifications.
- For a open source project such as Contiki, a free (and preferably open source) development toolchain must support the platform.
- Availability of well documented datasheet and user manual.
- Availability of an evaluation/development kit.
- Enough memory to accommodate Contiki and BLE stack's requirements.
- Presence of basic peripherals such as timers and serial port required for Contiki.

The non-mandatory, although *nice to have* requirements for the platform would be:
- Presence of flexible power modes with low active and sleep power consumption.
- Availability of a good set of peripherals.
- Availability of BLE stack from the vendor, preferably with source code.

5.1.2 Comparison and selection of the hardware platform

With these requirements, based on the comparison **5.(Appendix A)** of the available (BLE + MCU) solutions available today, a platform based on nRF51822 from Nordic-Semiconductors would be a suitable option. DA14580 and BCM20732 would also require mention here since from a technical point of view they meet the requirements, but since they are released recently they are not supported well in terms of availability of the IC, evaluation kit, tool-chain and BLE stack.

5.1.3 Overview of nrf51822 SoC

5.2 Porting PCA10000 platform of nrf51822 to Contiki

Contiki was initially developed in a Linux based operating system, although Windows is also supported now. The porting of PCA10000 platform to Contiki was done in Ubuntu 13.10. The compiler used is **6. ... explain all the other details of the development setup**

5.2.1 Folder structure of Contiki

When porting a new platform to Contiki, the three folders inside a Contiki distribution where additions need to be made are cpu, examples and platform. The content in these folders are as described below. The path of the Contiki distribution is in the path CONIKI.

CONTIKI/cpu   In this folder, all the files contain implementation which is solely dependent on the SoC is present. This includes the code for the processor abstraction, the drivers of the peripherals of the SoC, makefile with commands for compiling and linking the code, linker file and the documentation of these implementation. The boot-loader or start-up code, if required is also present here. The peripheral drivers for peripherals such as timers and serial port must use the API format of Contiki so that the modules of Contiki using these peripherals can operate correctly. The exact implementations of these drivers is explained in section 5.2.2.

CONTIKI/platform   An SoC over time has increasing number of boards or systems that are based on it and these are referred as platforms in this folder. Every board has its own folder in this platform folder which contains files which contain implementation which is dependant on the particular board. These include the specification of the connections to the LEDs, buttons, sensors and serial ports power system, the clock sources, memories present and any other board specific details. Any peripheral driver implementation specific to the board is present here. The default project specifications such as the serial baud-rate and source and frequency of clock are defined here. The main function where the execution of the program starts and initialization of all the peripherals and modules used by Contiki happens is present here.

CONTIKI/examples   The examples folder contains all the files related to projects that are implemented using Contiki with any of the supported hardware platforms. The makefile where the make command is executed is present here. The compiled object and binary files are also stored here.

5.2.2 Peripherals required for Contiki

5.2.2.1 Contiki Clock

5.2.2.2 R-Timer

5.2.2.3 LED(s)

5.2.2.4 Radio

5.2.2.5 Button(s)

5.2.2.6 Serial Port

5.2.3 Makefile structure of Contiki

Introduction to makefile and include. There are multiple makefiles present across different folders that are included in each other to form the complete makefile. In the most basic form

these are the makefile in the example folder, 'makefile.include' in the Contiki root folder, 'make-file.TARGET' in the specific platform folder and 'makefile.CPU' in the specific cpu folder, where TARGET and CPU are specific to the project. This structure by which this inclusion happens is illustrated better in **figure**.

Makefile where the project is present i.e. in the example folder -Makefile.include in root CONTIKI directory –Makefile indicating the target (if not already specified) –Makefile of applications, if any are required –Makefile of the target, present in the platform directory —Makefile of the SoC, present in the cpu directory

The makefile in the example folder is where the make command is called. The operations that can be performed with this make command depends on the makefile. Usually the operations are cleaning (removing the object and binary files), compiling the source files into object files , linking these object files to create an executable file, creating a binary file from this executable file, uploading the binary to the SoC to start execution and so on.

The makefile in the project specific example folder, the different project source files are specified and the 'makefile.include' present in the root CONTIKI folder is added. 'make-file.inlcude' glues together all the required components of Contiki and provides the default implementation of compiling and linking. The target makefile in the specific platform directory is included here. In 'makefile.TARGET' the source files present in this directory are added, any Contiki modules required are added and the SoC makefile in the specific directory is added. The SoC

6 | Test Cases

6.1 Performance Metrics Definition

Data Rate

Latency

Reliability

Energy Consumption

6.2 Data Dump Test Design


Figure 6.1: Setup to measure data rate with BLE

- Send packets of maximum size for one minute in the fastest way possible
    - Do one test without CCA for 802.15.4
- Repeat with WiFi
    - Choose a channel interfered by WiFi for 802.15.4 and one channel without WiFi interference.
    - For BLE do this with channel map with all channels and channel map with WiFi free channels.

16

- Do this test 10 times

In this test, to measure the various performance criteria in an environment with interference, WiFi interference will be introduced using the tool 'iperf'. The interference pattern generated will simulate streaming of large data over WiFi. **7.Explain the exact configuration of UDP packets sent**

Metrics evaluated
- Data Rate
- Reliability
- Energy Consumption

6.3   Request Response Test Design

- Explain what is meant by request response
- Different cases in BLE and 802.15.4
Metrics evaluated
- Latency
- Energy Consumption

The objectives of the tests are to compare the link layer of BLE and 802.15.4 in the aspects mentioned in the following sections.

The link layer of 802.15.4 consists of MAC layer on top of a RDC layer. For the RDC layer the Null-RDC and ContikiMAC driver will be tested in each of the test with CSMA as the MAC layer. In case of Contiki-MAC the receiving node switches on periodically to sense if there are any packets that need to be received. The default time of this period is 125 ms. In case of null-RDC the radio receiver is never switched off, as the name suggests.

For BLE, communication will be done at the Generic Attribute (GATT) layer because the binary from Nordic Semiconductor used in this project does not provide APIs to access the lower layers in both peripheral and central devices. In all the tests the packet structure in 802.15.4 will be same as in BLE above the link layer. In this test, to measure the various performance criteria in an environment with interference, WiFi interference will be introduced using the tool 'iperf'. The interference pattern generated will simulate streaming of large data over WiFi. **8.Explain the exact configuration of UDP packets sent** In BLE, the devices can assume different roles in the different layers of the protocol. In the link layer a device can be a 'Master' or a 'Slave'. In the ATT layer, a device can be a 'Client' and/or 'Server'. A server contains data and the client can request data from the server.

In some of the tests, to measure the various performance criteria in an environment with interference, WiFi interference will be introduced using the tool 'iperf'. The interference pattern generated will simulate streaming of large data over WiFi.

6.4   Data Rate Test

This experiment aims to measure the maximum data rate of BLE and 802.15.4 at the LL with and without WiFi interference. For the BLE test the devices are configured as shown in the diagram below.


Figure 6.2: Setup to measure data rate with BLE

In this test the data rate is measured by sending data from the server to the client which is not acknowledged in the ATT layer. The data rate is measured at the receiver i.e the Master device. The packet structure will be used such that the complete packet size of BLE is used.

Each run of the test will last of one minute to collect enough data to measure the average data rate.

In case of 802.15.4 one node is configured as transmitter and the other as receiver. The data-rate will be measured at the receiver. In these tests two channels will be used, one which interferes with WiFi and one which does not. This means that each channel will be tested with and without interference. The complete packet size of 802.15.4 will be used when conducting this test.

For data rate measurement tests in both the standards with and without WiFi, the data rate will be measured by sending data for one minute. The data rate will be expressed in both packets per second and kilobit per second (kbps).

6.4.1 Latency

This experiment aims to measure the latency for a read request in case of BLE and 802.15.4, i.e. the time difference between sending the read request packet and receiving the packet with the value requested. In case of both the protocols there are intervals at which the radio is active, where communication can take place. To make sure that the read request packets are sent randomly at any point in this interval, timers with random values would be used to initiate sending these packets. The table below shows the connection parameters used for the various tests to measure the latency with BLE. The latency is measured at the device sending the packet '1' in the 'Packet' column and is defined as the time from sending the packet '1' to receiving the packet '2'.

9.Redo the correct table

Connection Interval	Connection Configuration	Devices' Configuration		
		LL	GATT	Packet
7.5 ms	Slave latency = 0	Master	Client	1. Read request
	Supervision timeout = 1 s	Slave	Server	2. Read response
	Slave latency = 120	Master	Client	1. Read request
	Supervision timeout = 1 s	Slave	Server	2. Read response
	Slave latency = 120	Slave	Server	1. Indication
	Supervision timeout = 1 s	Master	Client	2. Indication ACK
125 ms	Slave latency = 0	Master	Client	1. Read request
	Supervision timeout = 1 s	Slave	Server	2. Read response
	Slave latency = 15	Master	Client	1. Read request
	Supervision timeout = 3 s	Slave	Server	2. Read response
	Slave latency = 15	Slave	Server	1. Indication
	Supervision timeout = 3 s	Master	Client	2. Indication ACK

Table 6.1: BLE latency measurement test cases

Where,

Connection Interval: After a BLE connection is established, the master device must always send a packet to the slave periodically after the time specified in connection interval. These connection events provide an opportunity for the slave to communicate with the master.

Slave Latency: The maximum number of connection events that a slave can choose not to respond to the master. This is intended to save power on the slave while also providing an opportunity to communicate with the master if necessary.

Supervision Timeout: A BLE connection is said to be lost if there is no bi-directional communication between the master and the slave for the duration specified by supervision timeout. After a tiemout the master will not send a packet to the slave in every connection event.

GATT Read: A packet containing an (attribute) value sent from a GATT server to a GATT client in response to a request from the client.

GATT Indication: A packet containing an (attribute) value sent from a GATT server to a GATT client, which the client should acknowledge (ACK). This packet is sent without the client requesting this data.

In the case of 802.15.4, one node is configured to send unicast messages and another is configured to receive these and send a response. The latency using both ContikiMAC and NullRDC will be measured. The latency is measured as the time difference between sending a unicast message and receiving its response.

The BLE test cases are designed such that the 7.5 ms tests can compare with Null-RDC test of 802.15.4 while the 125 ms tests can compare with the ContikiMAC test of 802.15.4. There are tests with Slave Latency as zero and non-zero, which will help in identifying its effect on latency and the energy consumption of both the master and slave device.

To get an overall sense of the latency over a period of time, the average and standard deviation of the delay for 1000 transactions will be calculated for each test. In all the tests the payload will be of 20 bytes.

6.4.2 Energy Consumption

Energy consumption will be indirectly measured by logging the radio activity in all the tests described above in both the devices communicating. This will provide the duty cycle of when the radio is on. The possibility of logging the sleep cycle of the processor using the binary for BLE software needs to be verified. If the state of the processor is available, it will also be logged.

6.4.3 Reliability

Similar to measuring the energy consumption, reliability will be evaluated by correlating the logs of when the radio is switched on versus when the packets are logged. This will provide an idea of how many times a packet has been dropped and hence find out the Packet Delivery Ratio (PDR).

7 | Results and Analysis

7.1   Data Dump Test

Add graph

7.2   Request Response Test

Add graph

7.3   What we learnt

8 | Other Contributions

8.1   Firmware for demo application

8.2   Radio driver for BLE advertisement packet logger

References

[1] Carles Gomez, Joaquim Oller, and Josep Paradells. "Overview and evaluation of bluetooth low energy: an emerging low-power wireless technology." In: *Sensors (Basel, Switzerland)* 12.9 (Jan. 2012), pp. 11734–53.

[2] *Contiki: The Open Source Operating System for the Internet of Things*. URL: http://contiki-os.org/.

[3] Robin Heydon. *Bluetooth Low Energy: The Developer's Handbook*. 1st ed. Prentice Hall, 2012, p. 368.

[4] *Contiki Hardware*. URL: http://contiki-os.org/hardware.html.

[5] George Oikonomou and Iain Phillips. "Experiences from porting the Contiki operating system to a popular hardware platform". English. In: *2011 International Conference on Distributed Computing in Sensor Systems and Workshops (DCOSS)*. IEEE, June 2011, pp. 1–6.

[6] Alexandru Stan. "Porting the Core of the Contiki operating system to the TelosB and MicaZ platforms". Bachelor Thesis. International University Bremen, 2007.

[7] Adriana Wilde, Richard Oliver, and Ed Zaluska. "Developing a low-cost general-purpose device for the Internet of Things". English. In: *2013 Seventh International Conference on Sensing Technology (ICST)*. IEEE, Dec. 2013, pp. 490–494.

[8] Zoltan Padrah, Ales Verbic, Marko Mihelin, et al. "Connecting Contiki enabled Versatile Sensor Nodes via CC1101 radio". In: *NEWCOM++* (2011).

[9] Voravit Tanyingyong, Robert Olsson, Markus Hidell, et al. "Design and Implementation of an IoT-controlled DC-DC Converter". eng. In: *2013 Sustainable Internet and ICT for Sustainability, SustainIT 2013* (2013), p. 6685199.

[10] Carles Gomez, Ilker Demirkol, and Josep Paradells. "Modeling the Maximum Throughput of Bluetooth Low Energy in an Error-Prone Link". In: *IEEE Communications Letters* 15.11 (Nov. 2011), pp. 1187–1189.

[11] Jia Liu and Canfeng Chen. "Energy analysis of neighbor discovery in Bluetooth Low Energy networks". In: *Nokia.(nd)* (2012).

[12] Elke Mackensen, Matthias Lai, and Thomas M. Wendt. "Performance analysis of an Bluetooth Low Energy sensor system". In: *2012 IEEE 1st International Symposium on Wireless Systems (IDAACS-SWS)*. September. IEEE, Sept. 2012, pp. 62–66.

[13] Philipp Kindt, Daniel Yunge, Robert Diemer, et al. "Precise Energy Modeling for the Bluetooth Low Energy Protocol". In: *CoRR* abs/1403.2 (Mar. 2014). arXiv: 1403.2919.

[14] Mikko Savolainen. *Throughput with Bluetooth Smart technology : Bluegiga Technologies*. 2013. URL: https://bluegiga.zendesk.com/entries/24646818-Throughput-with-Bluetooth-Smart-technology.

[15] Adam Dunkels. "The ContikiMAC Radio Duty Cycling Protocol". In: (Dec. 2011).

[16] Mathieu Michel and Bruno Quoitin. "Technical Report : ContikiMAC vs X-MAC performance analysis". In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1404.3589* (Apr. 2014). arXiv: 1404.3589.

[17] M.-P. Uwase, M. Bezunartea, T.L. Nguyen, et al. "Experimental evaluation of message latency and power usage in WSNs". In: *2014 IEEE International Black Sea Conference on Communications and Networking (BlackSeaCom)*. IEEE, May 2014, pp. 69–72.

[18] Matti Siekkinen, Markus Hiienkari, Jukka K Nurminen, et al. "How low energy is bluetooth low energy? Comparative measurements with ZigBee/802.15.4". In: *2012 IEEE Wireless Communications and Networking Conference Workshops (WCNCW)*. IEEE, Apr. 2012, pp. 232–237.

[19] Konstantin Mikhaylov, Nikolaos Plevritakis, and Jouni Tervonen. "Performance Analysis and Comparison of Bluetooth Low Energy with IEEE 802.15.4 and SimpliciTI". In: *Journal of Sensor and Actuator Networks* 2.3 (Aug. 2013), pp. 589–613.

[20] Artem Dementyev, Steve Hodges, Stuart Taylor, et al. "Power consumption analysis of Bluetooth Low Energy, ZigBee and ANT sensor nodes in a cyclic sleep scenario". English. In: *2013 IEEE International Wireless Symposium (IWS)*. IEEE, Apr. 2013, pp. 1–4.

[21] ZigBee Alliance. *ZigBee Specification*. URL: `http://www.zigbee.org/Specifications.aspx`.