


IoT Protocols

Qian Zhang

Agenda



01

Fog Computing Architecture for IoT

02

Protocols of IoT (ZigBee, IEEE 802.11ah, ...)

03


Long range wide area network for IoT

04

Energy-efficient WiFi for IoT


Fog Computing: A Platform for IoT and Analytics

Cloud Computing




THE INTERNET OF THINGS

AN EXPLOSION OF CONNECTED POSSIBILITY



only cloud is not the optimal solution to handle this massive explosion

Fog Computing



- Fog computing is making use of decentralized servers in between network core and network edge for data processing and to serve the immediate requirements of the end systems.
- Fog computing is non-trivial extension of Cloud computing paradigm to the edge of the network.

Need for fog computing

- Why can't do all in cloud?
 - Cloud computing frees the enterprise and the end user from many details.
 - This bliss becomes a problem for latency-sensitive applications.
- Why can't do all in end systems?
 - Physical constraints: energy, space, etc.,

Illustrative Use Cases to Drive Fog computing

- Use Case 1: A smart Traffic Light System (STLS)
- Use Case 2: Wind Farms

To abstract the major requirements to propose an architecture that addresses a vast majority of the IoT requirements.

Use Case 1: A Smart Traffic Light System(STLS)

System Outline:

- STLS calls for deployment of a STL at each intersection.
- The STL is equipped with sensors that
 1. Measure the distance and speed of approaching vehicles from every direction.
 2. Detect presence of pedestrians/other vehicles crossing the street.
 - Issues “Slow down” warnings to vehicles at risk to crossing in red and even modifies its own cycle to prevent collisions.

STLS: System outline continued..

- STLS has 3 major goals:
 1. Accidents prevention
 2. Maintenance of steady flow of traffic (green waves along the main roads)
 3. Collection of relevant data to evaluate and improve the system

Note:

Goal (1) requires real-time reaction, (2) near-real time, and (3) relates to the collection and analysis of global data over long periods.

Key requirements driven by STLS

1. Local Subsystem latency:- Reaction time needed is in the order of < 10 milliseconds.
2. Middleware orchestration platform:- Middleware to handle a # of critical software components. A. Decision maker(DM), B. message bus.
3. Networking infrastructure:- Fog nodes belongs to a family of modular compute and storage devices.
4. Interplay with the cloud:- Data must be injected into a Data center/ cloud for deep analysis to identify patterns in traffic, city pollutants.

STLS Key requirements, cont'd.

5. Consistency of a highly distributed system:- Need to be Consistent between the different aggregator points.
6. Multi-tenancy:- It must provide strict service guarantees all the time.
7. Multiplicity of providers:- May extend beyond the borders of a single controlling authority. Orchestration of consistent policies involving multiple agencies is a challenge unique to Fog Computing.

Use case 2: Wind Farm

Brings up requirements shared by a number of Internet of Everything (IoE) deployments:

1. Interplay between real time analytics and batch analytics.
2. Tight interaction between sensors and actuators, in closed control loops.
3. Wide geographical deployment of a large system consistent of a number of autonomous yet coordinated modules – which gives rise to the need of an orchestration platform.

System outline:

There are 4 typical regions:

1. Region1: Wind speed is very low(say, 6m/sec), not so economical to run the turbine.
2. Region2: Normal operating condition(winds between 6-12m/sec), so maximum conversion of wind power into electrical power.
3. Region3: Winds exceed 12 m/sec, power is limited to avoid exceeding safe electrical and mechanical loads.
4. Region4: Very high wind speeds above 25 m/sec, here turbine is powered down to avoid excessive operating loads.

Key requirements driven by Wind Farm

1. Network Infrastructure: An efficient communication network between sub-systems, system and the internet (cloud)
2. Global controller: gathering data, building the global state, determining the policy.
3. Middle Orchestration platform: A middleware that mediates between sub-systems and the cloud.
4. Data analytics: (1) requires real-time reaction, (2) near-real time, and (3) relates to the collection and analysis of global data over long periods.

Key attributes of Fog computing


The Use Cases that were discussed brings up a # of attributes that differentiate Fog computing platform from the Cloud.

- Applications that require **very low and predictable latency**. (STLS, SCV)
- Geo-distributed applications (pipeline monitoring, STLS)
- Fast mobile applications (Smart connected vehicle, rail)
- Large-scale distributed control systems (STLS, smart grid)
- IoT also brings Big Data with a twist: rather than high volume, the number of data sources **distributed geographically**


Geo-distribution: A new Dimension of Big Data

- 3 Dimensions: Volume, Velocity and Variety.
- IoT use cases: STLS, Connected Rail, pipeline monitoring are naturally distributed.
- This suggests to add a 4th dimension: **geo-distribution**.
- Since challenge is to manage number of sensors (and actuators) that are naturally distributed as a coherent whole.
- Call for “moving the processing to the data”
- A distributed intelligent platform at the Edge (Fog computing) that manages distributed compute, networking, and storage resources.

The Edge (Fog) and the core (Cloud) interplay: Many uses of same data



Fog Software Architecture




- Fog nodes are heterogeneous in nature and deployed in variety of environments including core, edge, access networks and endpoints
- Fog architecture should facilitate seamless resource management across diverse set of platforms

Conclusion

- We looked at Fog computing and key aspects of it
- How fog complements and extends cloud computing
- We looked at use cases that motivated the need for fog
- Seen a high-level description of Fog's architecture

Agenda



01

Fog Computing Architecture for IoT

02

Protocols of IoT (ZigBee, IEEE 802.11ah, ...)


03

Long range wide area network for IoT

04

Energy-efficient WiFi for IoT

IoT Ecosystem



Protocols for IoT

Session		MQTT, SMQTT, CoRE, DDS, AMQP , XMPP, CoAP, ...	Security	Management
Network	Encapsulation	6LowPAN, 6TiSCH, 6Lo, Thread, ...	TCG, Oath 2.0, SMACK, SASL, ISASecure, ace, DTLS, Dice, ...	IEEE 1905, IEEE 1451, ...
	Routing	RPL, CORPL, CARP, ...		
Datalink		WiFi, Bluetooth Low Energy, Z-Wave, ZigBee Smart, DECT/ULE, 3G/LTE, NFC, Weightless, HomePlug GP, 802.11ah, 802.15.4e, G.9959, WirelessHART, DASH7, ANT+, LTE-A, LoRaWAN, ...		

1. Bluetooth

- Started with Ericsson's Bluetooth Project in 1994 for radio-communication between cell phones over short distances
- Named after Danish king Herald Blatand (AD 940-981) who was fond of blueberries
- Intel, IBM, Nokia, Toshiba, and Ericsson formed Bluetooth SIG in May 1998
- Version 1.0A of the specification came out in late 1999
- IEEE 802.15.1 approved in early 2002 is based on Bluetooth. Later versions handled by Bluetooth SIG directly
- Key Features:
 - Lower Power: 10 mA in standby, 50 mA while transmitting
 - Cheap: \$5 per device
 - Small: 9 mm² single chips

History

ERICSSON

intel.

NOKIA



$$\begin{matrix} \times & + & \beta \\ "H" & & "B" \end{matrix} = \begin{matrix} \text{Bluetooth} \end{matrix}$$

1994-97



4.0
Bluetooth®

2006



2010



2011-2012




2015

Bluetooth Versions

- **Bluetooth 1.1:** IEEE 802.15.1-2002
- **Bluetooth 1.2:** IEEE 802.15.1-2005. Completed Nov 2003. Extended SCO, Higher variable rate retransmission for SCO + Adaptive frequency hopping (avoid frequencies with interference)
- **Bluetooth 2.0** + Enhanced Data Rate (EDR) (Nov 2004): 3 Mbps using DPSK. For video applications. Reduced power due to reduced duty cycle
- **Bluetooth 2.1** + EDR (July 2007): Secure Simple Pairing to speed up pairing
- **Bluetooth 3.0+** High Speed (HS) (April 2009): 24 Mbps using WiFi PHY + Bluetooth PHY for lower rates
- **Bluetooth 4.0** (June 2010): Low energy. Smaller devices requiring longer battery life (several years). New incompatible PHY. Bluetooth Smart or BLE
- **Bluetooth 4.1:** 4.0 + Core Specification Amendments (CSA) 1, 2, 3, 4
- **Bluetooth 4.2** (Dec 2014): Larger packets, security/privacy, IPv6 profile

Naming for Bluetooth 4.x

- Bluetooth 4.0
- Bluetooth Low Energy
 - BLE, BTLE, LE
- SIG Preferred
 - Bluetooth Smart
 - Bluetooth Smart Ready



Bluetooth Smart

- **Low Energy:** 1% to 50% of Bluetooth classic
- **For short broadcast:** Your body temperature, Heart rate, Wearables, **sensors**, automotive, industrial
Not for voice/video, file transfers, ...
- **Small messages:** 1Mbps data rate but throughput not critical
- **Battery life:** In years from coin cells
- **Simple:** Star topology. No scatter nets, mesh, ...
- **Lower cost** than Bluetooth classic
- New protocol design based on Nokia's **WiBree** technology
Shares the same 2.4GHz radio as Bluetooth
→ Dual mode chips
- All new smart phones (iPhone, Android, ...) have dual-mode chips

BLE Roles

Master

Client

*Can read/write data to
Slave/Server*



Central



Peripheral

Slave

Server

Has read/write data

Can receive broadcast data




Observer




Broadcaster

Has read-only broadcast data

Topology




Piconet v4.0




Scatter net v4.1

BLE Power Status




Bluetooth Smart PHY

- 2.4 GHz. 150 m open field
- Star topology
- 1 Mbps Gaussian Frequency Shift Keying
Better range than Bluetooth classic
- Adaptive Frequency hopping. 40 Channels with 2 MHz spacing
- 3 channels reserved for advertising and 37 channels for data
- Advertising channels specially selected to avoid interference with WiFi channels




Bluetooth Smart MAC




- Two Device Types: “**Peripherals**” simpler than “**central**”
- Two PDU Types: Advertising, Data
- **Non-Connectable Advertising**: Broadcast data in clear
- **Discoverable Advertising**: Central may request more information. Peripheral can send data without connection
- **General Advertising**: Broadcast presence wanting to connect. Central may request a short connection.
- **Directed Advertising**: Transmit signed data to a previously connected master



Bluetooth Smart Protocol Stack



Generic Attribute Profile - GATT



Services, characteristics, and descriptors are collectively referred to as *attributes*, and identified by [UUIDs](#). 16 bits (e.g. “180A”) or 128 bits (e.g. “6BCF0ED3-68E3-4804-96D5-5AB8765FB9BC ”)

GATT Operations

- Central can
 - discover UUIDs for all primary services
 - Find a service with a given UUID
 - Find secondary services for a given primary service
 - Discover all characteristics for a given service
 - Find characteristics matching a given UUID
 - Read all descriptors for a particular characteristic
 - Can do read, write, long read, long write values etc.
- Peripheral
 - Notify or indicate central of changes

Security

- Encryption (128 bit AES)
- Pairing (Without key, with a shared key, out of band pairing)
- Passive eavesdropping during key exchange (but fixed in Bluetooth 4.2)
- Many products are building their own security on top of BLE
- Check out Mike Ryan (iSec partners) work on security

Bluetooth Smart Applications

- Proximity: In car, In room 303, In the mall
- Locator: Keys, watches, Animals
- Health devices: Heart rate monitor, physical activities monitors, thermometer
- Sensors: Temperature, Battery Status, tire pressure
- Remote control: Open/close locks, turn on lights

Use Cases – Physical Security



Download on the
App Store ANDROID APP ON
Google play




Bluetooth®

INTERIOR TRIM



Use Cases – Home Automation



Use Cases – Geo-fencing/ Positioning



Use Cases - Fun




Development Kits/Boards



Operating System Support

- iOS 8 ☺
- OSX 10.10 ☺
- Android 4.3, 4.4, 5.0 ☻
- Linux 3.4, BlueZ 5.0 ☻
- Windows Phone 8.1 (only central) ☹
- Windows 8.1 (app mode) ☹


2. ZigBee Markets



ZigBee Technology-Performance

- Proven excellent in-building coverage
 - Inherently robust radio link
 - Mesh networking
 - Acknowledge oriented protocol
 - Now proven in major deployments in Australia, Sweden, & USA
- Proven tolerance to interference
 - Trade shows like CES-works when WiFi and Bluetooth fail
 - Montage Hotels and MGM City Center deployments
 - Products which implement multiple radio technologies
- Proven coexistence
 - Many multi-radio products and multi-radio deployments
- Proven scalability
 - City Center at 70,000 plus radios
 - Montage Hotels at 4000 plus radios per property

ZigBee Platform Interoperability




- Ensures Network interoperability but does not imply application layer interoperability
- There are multiple Compliant Platforms to choose from

ZigBee Product Interoperability




ZigBee
Compliant
Product



- Products with the same application profiles interoperate end to end
- ZigBee has published a set of Public Application Profiles ensuring end product interoperability


Basic Network Characteristics

- 65,536 network (client) nodes
- 27 channels over 2 bands
- 250Kbps data rate
- Optimized for timing-critical applications and power management
- Full Mesh Networking Support




Basic Radio Characteristics

ZigBee technology relies upon IEEE 802.15.4, which has excellent performance in low SNR environments




Frequency Band	License Required?	Geographic Region	Data Rate	Channel Number(s)
868.3 MHz	No	Europe	20kbps	0
902-928 MHz	No	Americas	40kbps	1-10
2405-2480 MHz	No	Worldwide	250kbps	11-26


ZigBee Mesh Networking




ZigBee Mesh Networking




ZigBee Mesh Networking




ZigBee Mesh Networking



ZigBee Mesh Networking



ZigBee Stack Architecture



ZigBee Device Types



- ZigBee Coordinator (ZC)
 - One required for each ZB network.
 - Initiates network formation.




- ZigBee Router (ZR)
 - Participates in multihop routing of messages.




- ZigBee End Device (ZED)
 - Does not allow association or routing.
 - Enables very low cost solutions

ZigBee Network Topologies




Star



Cluster Tree

Mesh



- ZigBee Coordinator
- ZigBee Router
- ZigBee End Device


ZigBee Public Profiles

- Home Automation (HA)
- Smart Energy (SE)
- Commercial Building Automation (CBA)
- ZigBee Health Care (ZHC)
- Telecom Applications (TA)



- ZigBee RF4CE Remote Control
- +Future profiles proposed by member companies...

ZigBee Home Automation: for Home Control



ZigBee Home Area Network (HAN)



Smart Energy & Home Automation

*Urgent demand for Smart Energy + compatibility with mainstream
Home Automation systems enables customer choice*




3. WirelessHART

- The HART (Highway Addressable Remote Transducer Protocol) communication protocol is designed to **add diagnostic information to process devices** compatible with legacy 2-20mA analog instrumentation
- The overall performance has been designed to **satisfy process automation needs**. It is able to work on distances up to 1500m
- WerelessHART is an extension of HART, its functions include
 - Implements an RF self-healing mesh network
 - Allows for network-wide time synchronization
 - Enhances the publish/subscribe messaging
 - Adds network and transport layers
 - Adds a fast pipe for time critical traffic and ciphering

Overview

- WirelessHART targets sensors and actuators, rotating equipment such as kiln dryers, environmental health and safety applications such as safety showers, condition monitoring, and flexible manufacturing in which a portion of the plant can be reconfigured for specific products.



WirelessHART

- WirelessHART main characteristics
 - Low power consumption and low-cost devices
 - Data rate of 250 kbps per channel in 2.4GHz ISM band with 15 channels
 - Based on IEEE 802.15.4-2006 PHY layer
 - Based on a proprietary data link layer with TDMA and CSMA/CA
 - Supporting *channel hopping* and *channel blacklisting*
 - Network layer implementing self-healing mesh network
 - Application layer fully compatible with HART

WirelessHART

Comparison between HART, wirelessHART and ZigBee

TABLE 31.1 ISO/OSI 7 Layer Model: Comparison among HART, WirelessHART, and ZigBee


Layer \ Standard	HART	WirelessHART	ZigBee
Application	Command oriented, predefined data types and application procedures		Application and security
Presentation	—	—	—
Session	—	—	—
Transport	Auto-segmented transfer of large amount of data, reliable stream transport, and negotiated segment sizes		—
Network	—	Power Optimized redundant path mesh network	Ad-hoc routing, mesh networks
Data link	Token passing master/slave	Time synchronized channel hopping	IEEE 802.15.4-2006
Physical	Simultaneous analog and digital signaling (4–20 mA wire)	IEEE 802.15.4-2006 at 2.4 GHz	IEEE 802.15.4-2006

The Network Architecture

- Each wirelessHART network includes four main elements
 - Field devices. They include wirelessHART process transmitters and wireless adapters
 - Gateway. Gateway bridges the wirelessHART network with wired infrastructures
 - Network manager (*only one*). It is responsible for network configuration, communication among devices, management of routing messages and monitor network conditions
 - Security manager. Security manager deals with security and encryption, setting up session keys and their periodic change
 - Handhold devices for maintaining purposes are optional

The Network Architecture

Example wirelessHART network



4. Z-Wave

- Z-Wave is a low-power MAC protocol designed for home automation and has been used for IoT communication, especially for smart home and small commercial domains
- It covers about 30-meter point-to-point communication and is suitable for small messages in IoT applications, like light control, energy control, wearable healthcare control and others
- It uses **CSMA/CA** for collision detection and ACK messages for reliable transmission
- It follows a **master/slave architecture** in which the master control the slaves, send them commands, and handling scheduling of the whole network

Z-Wave Vs. Zigbee: What do they have in common?

- Both technologies are mesh networks
 - Each node in the system acts as both a wireless data source and a repeater. Information from a single sensor node hops from node to node until the transmission reaches the gateway
- Both technologies use the IEEE 802.15.4 low-rate personal area network (LR-PAN) protocol
 - for the unified physical layer (OSI layer 1), structuring packets, and creating MAC (Medium Access Control) schemes
- Both are widely used in local area sensor data networks
 - like in security systems, urban smart grid controllers, HVAC control systems, home automation, and lighting controls

Z-Wave Vs. Zigbee: How are they different?


- Z-wave has a **tightly controlled product ecosystem** that caters to the smart home and smart building space, whereas Zigbee can be used for a number of applications
 - There's no expectation that two Zigbee devices are interoperable unless the interoperability is preplanned. A Z-Wave application, on the other hand, will almost always integrate with another Z-Wave device
- Zigbee uses the global standard 2.4GHz ISM frequency band, whereas Z-Wave uses the 915 MHz ISM band (in the U.S.) and the 868 MHz RFID band (in Europe).
 - 2.4 GHz band can be subject to intense interference from WiFi and Bluetooth systems, whereas the sub-GHz bands Z-Wave uses do not face the same **interference issues**
- Lots of providers make Zigbee radios, but Z-Wave uses a proprietary radio system from Sigma designs
- Z-Wave uses frequency-shift keyed modulation (FSK), whereas Zigbee **modulation** is carried out through direct sequence spread spectrum (DSSS)

5. IEEE 802.11ah

sub 1GHz WLAN for IoT

- Defines operation of license-exempt (ISM) IEEE 802.11 wireless networks in frequency bands below 1 GHz
 - excluding the TV White Space bands (802.11af)
- IEEE 802.11 WLAN user experience for fixed, outdoor, point to multi point applications

What lies beneath Wi-Fi HaLow





IEEE 802.11ah: scope

- Defines an **OFDM PHY** operating in the license-exempt bands below 1 GHz
 - and enhancements to the IEEE 802.11 MAC to support this PHY, and to provide mechanisms that enable coexistence with other systems in the bands (e.g. IEEE 802.15.4 P802.15.4g)
- The PHY is meant to optimize the ***rate vs. range*** performance of the specific channelization in a given band
 - transmission range up to 1 km
 - data rates > 100 kbit/s
- The MAC is designed to support **thousands of connected devices**

IEEE 802.11ah: use cases

- Use Case 1 : Sensors and meters
 - Smart Grid -meter to pole
 - Environmental monitoring
 - Industrial process sensors
 - Healthcare
 - Home/Building automation
 - Smart city
- Use Case 2 : Backhaul sensor and meter data
 - Backhaul aggregation of sensor networks
 - Long point-to-point wireless links
- Use Case 3 : Extended range Wi-Fi
 - Outdoor extended range hotspot
 - Outdoor Wi-Fi for cellular traffic offloading



Legend:
— Cellular link
— WLAN(.11ah) link
— WLAN(.11a/g/n/ac) link
○ Cellular coverage
○ WLAN(.11ah) coverage

IEEE 802.11ah: PHY (1)


- Advantages of transmitting in sub 1 GHz:
 - Spectrum characteristics
 - good propagation and penetration
 - large coverage area and one-hop reach
 - license-exempt, light licensing
 - Reliability:
 - less congested frequency band
 - high sensitivity and link margin
 - available diversity –(frequency, time, space)
 - Battery operation
 - long battery life
 - short data transmissions

IEEE 802.11ah: PHY (2)

- Channelization:
 - Configurable bandwidth (*channel bonding*) of: **1, 2, 4, 8 and 16MHz**
- Inherited from IEEE 802.11ac (adapted to S1G)
 - OFDM
 - MIMO + MU-MIMO
 - PHY rates ranging from 150kbps to 347Mbps

IEEE 802.11ah: PHY (3)

Expected throughput vs. coverage




IEEE 802.11ah: MAC

- Need to **reduce overhead**: low data rates + short frames (typical in some use cases)
 - Short MAC headers and Beacons
 - Implicit acknowledgement (no ACK needed)
- Need to **support thousands of associated devices** (increases coverage → increases reachable STAs)
 - Thousands of STAs → huge collision probability!
 - Restricted Access Window (RAW): regular RAW
 - Divide STAs into groups (AID)
 - Split channel access into time slots
 - Assign slots to groups (AP indicates RAW allocation and slot assignments in its Beacons)
 - Different *backoff* rules apply during RAW (due to different contention conditions)

Multihop Relay Operation

- Extend (root) AP coverage
- STAs will require lower tx power
- STAs may use faster MCS (less tx time)



IEEE 802.11ah: Summary

LONG RANGE

Lower frequency band

Longer OFDM symbols

Robust modulation and coding schemes

SCALABILITY

Support for >8000 nodes

Grouping

RAW access

EFFICIENCY


Reduced frame formats

Efficient frame exchanges

Enhanced power saving mechanisms

6. LTE-A

- Long-Term Evolution Advanced (LTE-A) is a set of standards designed to fit M2M communication and IoT applications in **cellular networks**




- LTE-A is a **scalable, lower-cost** protocol compared to other cellular protocols
- LTE-A uses OFDMA (Orthogonal Frequency Division Multiple Access) as a MAC layer access technology, which divides the frequency into multiple bands and each one can be used separately
- The architecture of LTE-A consists of a core network (CN), a radio access network (RAN), and the mobile nodes
 - The CN is responsible for controlling mobile devices and to keep track of their IPs
 - RAN is responsible for establishing the control and data planes and handling the wireless connectivity and radio-access control

7. LoRaWAN

- LoRaWAN is a newly arising wireless technology designed for low-power WAN networks with low cost, mobility, security, and bi-directional communication for IoT applications
- It is a low-power consumption optimized protocol designed for scalable wireless networks with millions of devices
- It supports redundant operation, location free, low cost, low power and energy harvesting technologies to support the future needs of IoT while enabling mobility and ease of use features

Agenda



01

Fog Computing Architecture for IoT

02

Protocols of IoT (ZigBee, IEEE 802.11ah, ...)

03

Long range wide area network for IoT

04

Energy-efficient WiFi for IoT

Short range vs. long-range IoT

Local Area IoT



Source: Amazon



Source: LG

Wide Area IoT



Source: fiorentini.cn



Source: ofo




Source: Max Pixel



Source: bdk


IoT-connectivity technologies

Multiple standards, different attributes



LPWA requirements

Low Power Wide Area wireless connects low bandwidth, low power devices and provides long-range coverage




10+ Years
Battery Life



Deep
Penetration



Mass
Deployment



Low
Bandwidth



Device
Cost


Includes cellular (NB-IoT, LTE-M/Cat-M1) *and* non-cellular (Sigfox, LoRa etc) technologies

LPWA requirements

The most critical factors in a LPWAN are:

- ◆ Network architecture
- ◆ Communication range
- ◆ Battery lifetime or low power
- ◆ Robustness to interference
- ◆ Network capacity (maximum number of nodes in a network)
- ◆ Network security
- ◆ One-way vs. two-way communication
- ◆ Variety of applications served

IoT -the connectivity pyramid



Low-Power Wide-Area Networks

25 mW transmission power

Low-Power Wide-Area Networks

20 years on simple battery

Low-Power Wide-Area Networks

15-50 km rural outdoor

2-3 km urban indoor

Low-Power Wide-Area Networks

No scheduling

No routing

ALOHA

Device-initiated com

Huge densities

Low throughput

250 kHz or less

Narrow-band

Low-Power Wide-Area Networks

Duty cycling	Collisions	Data-over-NAS	In-band
	Acknowledgements		Guard-bands
	License free	In licensed spectrum	
250 kHz or less			

Narrow-band




Low-Power Wide-Area Networks

Duty cycling	Collisions	Data-over-NAS	In-band
	Acknowledgements		Guard-bands
	License free	In licensed spectrum	No scheduling
250 kHz or less			No routing
25 mW transmission power	15-50 km rural outdoor		ALOHA
Narrow-band			
20 years on simple battery	2-3 km urban indoor	Device-initiated com	Huge densities
			Low throughput

Low-Power Wide-Area Networks

100 bps (50 kbps max)	12 byte payload (50 byte payload)	140 messages uplink	4 messages downlink
---------------------------------	---	-------------------------------	-------------------------------

LPWA market opportunity



Cellular LPWA example applications


Real use cases being deployed now [NB-IoT]

Bike share



Source: ofo.so. mobike.com

Smart agriculture




Source: richardvanhooijdonk.com

Smart meters




Source: fiorentini.cn




Fixed measurements points, 3km distance from TV tower LoRa IoT station

WHERE DOES LPWAN FIT?



WHAT IS LoRaWAN™?

LoRaWAN™ defines the communication protocol and system architecture for the network while the LoRa physical layer enables the long-range communication link.



LoRa

What is it?

- LoRa technology was originally developed by a French company, Cycleo (founded in 2009 as an IP and design solution provider), a patented spread spectrum wireless modulation technology that was acquired by SemTech in 2012 for \$5 million
- In April 2013, SemTech released the SX1272 chip, which was equipped with LoRa technology
 - At that time, FSK modulated European smart meter transceivers were used, with a maximum transmission distance of 1 to 2 kilometers
 - LoRa operated under the same conditions, and the transmission distance could be more

LoRa Technology

Two major components

End device: ED

Base Station: BS





Fig. 1. Typical LPWAN network landscape

LoRa modulation


- The use of signals with high bandwidth-time product ($BT>1$) should make the radio signals resistant against in band and out of band interferences
- The use of sufficiently broadband chirps should help to fight against heavy multipath fading characteristic for indoor propagation and urban environments




LoRaWAN network protocol

- LoRaWAN network protocol is optimized specifically for energy limited EDs
- LPWAN typically has star topology and consists of BSs relaying data messages between the EDs and an application server
- The BSs can be connected to the central server via backbone internet protocol (IP) based link, and the wireless communication based on LoRa or GFSK modulation is used to move the data between EDs and the BSs


Network Architecture



Strong Ecosystem Enables Customized Deployment




Network Options



Network Capacity: Adaptive Data Rate

Benefit of adaptive data rate -


High data rate (shorter range) nodes communicate with micro-cell, but do not have enough range to affect the elevated concentrator , capacity is increased.




Network Capacity: Single Data Rate

No benefit with single data rate -

Elevated antenna is now saturated by all the sensors that should be handled by the micro-cell.



LoRa End Node



- Partner module solution for NA
- TX = 1W, GPS+sensors, battery
- Fully Compliant with FCC




- Partner Module for EU
- ST Micro(STM32) + SX1272



Abeeway – Asset tracking device

Three classes of EDs



LoRaWAN Performance

Data rates settings and frames characteristics

Table I. LoRaWAN data rates settings and frames characteristics

Data rate (DR)	SF	Band width, kHz	Modulation	maximum MACPayload size, bytes	Maximum FRMPayload size ¹ , bytes	Shortest downlink frame ToA, s	Longest downlink frame ToA, s	Shortest uplink frame ToA, s	Longest uplink frame ToA, s
0	12	125	LoRa	59	51	0.991	2.793	1.155	2.793
1	11	125	LoRa	59	51	0.578	1.479	0.578	1.561
2	10	125	LoRa	59	51	0.289	0.698	0.289	0.698
3	9	125	LoRa	123	115	0.144	0.677	0.144	0.677
4	8	125	LoRa	250	242	0.072	0.697	0.082	0.707
5	7	125	LoRa	250	242	0.041	0.394	0.041	0.400
6	7	250	LoRa	250	242	0.021	0.197	0.021	0.200
7	n/a	150	GFSK	250	242	0.0032	0.0421	0.0035	0.0424

¹- given that $FHDR_{OPTS}=0$

LoRaWAN Performance

Maximum throughput per LoRaWAN channel and ED

Table IV. Maximum throughput per LoRaWAN channel and ED

Data rate (DR)	Bandwidth, kHz	Maximum APP throughput per channel, bit/s	Maximum APP throughput per ED per channel, bit/s		
			10% duty cycle	1% duty cycle	0.1% duty cycle
0	125	146.1	14.61	1.46	0.15
1	125	261.4	26.14	2.61	0.26
2	125	584.2	58.42	5.84	0.58
3	125	1 359.2	135.92	13.59	1.36
4	125	2 738.1	273.81	27.38	2.74
5	125	4 844.7	484.47	48.45	4.84
0-5 cumulative ¹	125	9 933.6	n/a	n/a	n/a
6	250	9 689.3	968.93	96.89	9.69
7	150	45 660.4	1 851.6 ²	456.6	45.66

¹- given that the spreading factors for DR0-DR5 are orthogonal, the transmissions with different SF may coexist in the same channel at the same time

²- due to the need for opening RX windows after each frame, the maximum possible duty cycle is 4.1% (see Table II, acknowledged transmission)


COMPARING LPWAN TECHNOLOGY OPTIONS

Feature	LoRaWAN	Narrow-Band	LTE Cat-1 2016 (Rel12)	LTE Cat-M 2018 (Rel13)	NB-LTE 2019(Rel13+)
Modulation	SS Chirp	UNB / GFSK/BPSK	OFDMA	OFDMA	OFDMA
Rx bandwidth	500 - 125 KHz	100 Hz	20 MHz	20 - 1.4 MHz	200 KHz
Data Rate	290bps - 50Kbps	100 bit/sec 12 / 8 bytes Max	10 Mbit/sec	200kbps – 1Mbps	~20K bit/sec
Max. # Msgs/day	Unlimited	UL: 140 msgs/day	Unlimited	Unlimited	Unlimited
Max Output Power	20 dBm	20 dBm	23 - 46 dBm	23/30 dBm	20 dBm
Link Budget	154 dB	151 dB	130 dB+	146 dB	150 dB
Battery lifetime - 2000mAh	105 months	90 months		18 months	
Power Efficiency	Very High	Very High	Low	Medium	Med high
Interference immunity	Very high	Low	Medium	Medium	Low
Coexistence	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Security	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mobility / localization	Yes	Limited mobility, No loc	Mobility	Mobility	Limited Mobility No Loc

Conclusion

- LoRaWAN technology, like any other, has its own strengths and weaknesses
 - The high coverage and satisfactory scalability under low uplink traffic
 - The most critical drawbacks are low reliability and potentially poor performance in terms of downlink traffic
- LoRa can be effectively utilized for the moderately dense networks of very low traffic devices which do not impose strict latency or reliability requirements

Agenda



01

Fog Computing Architecture for IoT

02

Protocols of IoT (ZigBee, IEEE 802.11ah, ...)

03


Long range wide area network for IoT

04


Energy-efficient WiFi for IoT

Wi-Fi: a New Contender of IoT


- Some low-power protocols do not currently enjoy **ubiquitous access** to the Internet



Wide deployments



Compatibility with Internet



Wi-Fi: a New Contender of IoT



- Need to support all traffic demands
- Symmetrical design is very inefficient



Lower Sample Rate
in Receiver
to Make Energy Efficient



Enable Low-Energy By
Pushing Decoding Burdens
to the AP Side

Energy-Efficient WiFi Support

W. Wang, Y. Chen, L. Wang, and Q. Zhang, “From Rateless to Sampleless: Wi-Fi Connectivity Made Energy Efficient”, IEEE Infocom 2017.

Wi-Fi Has A Power Problem



Need to support all traffic demands



Use the same sampling rates for packet receiving



Heavy traffic



High end




Light traffic



Energy constrained

If Receivers Can Flexibly Select Sampling Rates



A power reduction of 36%(30%) can be achieved by selecting $\frac{1}{2}$ sampling rate [1]



20MHz



10MHz



5MHz



[1] Zhang et al. "E-MiLi: Energy-Minimizing Idle Listening in Wireless Networks." MobiCom 2011.

The Challenge

Flexible Bandwidth



Need to modify
AP's PHY



Flexible Rates

(if AP adjusts bandwidth according to rx's sampling rate)

- Modifying existing infrastructure is costly
- Not compatible with legacy devices

The Challenge

Fixed Bandwidth



- Rx's rate < Nyquist rate
- Sparse recovery not work:
Not sparsity in today's PHY



Cannot decode

Flexible Rates


(if AP uses legacy ADC rate and rx flexibly selects the sampling rate)

Idea: From Rateless to Sampleless

Rateless codes

AP uses **highest modulation** schemes that Rx may not be able to decode under current SNR

Gradually add redundancy in **extra transmissions** until the packets can be decoded



Sampleless Wi-Fi

AP uses **legacy bandwidth** for transmission, while Rx uses **down-scaled sampling rates** for reception

Gradually add redundancy in **extra transmissions** until the packets can be decoded


Legacy Transmission



20MHz



20MHz




Down-Sampled Receiver



20MHz



10MHz (rx is downsampled by 2)




Freq. Aliasing




Cannot decode

Sampleless Wi-Fi



Design Challenge: Adding Constellation Diversity


Rateless codes add redundancy at Tx



Not compatible to legacy AP:
Need PHY modifications

Solution: Exploiting Time-Shift Effect

010101...



Add redundancy at Rx:
Compatible to legacy AP

ansmissions

Solution: Exploiting Time-Shift Effect

Time-Domain


$$\begin{array}{c} x(t) \\ \downarrow \\ x(t - \tau) \end{array}$$

Freq-Domain

$$\begin{array}{c} X(f) \\ \curvearrowleft \quad \downarrow \\ X(f)e^{-j\theta} \end{array}$$


Solution: Exploiting Time-Shift Effect

one example constellation map generated (QPSK with $\frac{1}{2}$ sampling rate)




With more transmissions, the distance in constellation diagram increases and it becomes easier to separate neighboring points

Sampleless Wi-Fi: Reception Pipeline



Implementation & Evaluation


- Implemented reception pipeline in USRP N210
 - In a 10m x 10m office



- Trace-driven evaluation for energy saving
 - Collected iPhone 5s traces



BER under Various SNRs




Down-sampling's negative effect on decoding is completely eliminated by Sampleless Wi-Fi


- **Enfold** [2]: state-of-the-art downclocking technique
- 802.11 Power Saving Mode (**PSM**)

[2] F. Lu et al., “Enfold: downclocking ofdm in wifi,” in Proc. ACM MobiCom, 2014.

BER under Various SNRs




Energy Saving for Various Apps



Sampleless Wi-Fi consumes 77.8%-88.7% energy at $\frac{1}{2}$ Nyquist rate.

Energy Saving for Various Apps




Sampleless Wi-Fi consumes 66.8%-94% energy at $\frac{1}{4}$ Nyquist rate.

Quick Summary

- Sampleless Wi-Fi provides reliable communications between **legacy APs** and low-power devices with **various sampling rates**
- It leverages the wisdom of **rateless codes** for under-sampled packets decoding
- It creates **constellation diversity** at Rx using the time-shift effect

Lower Sample Rate
in Receiver
to Make Energy Efficient




Energy-Efficient WiFi Support



Enable Low-Energy By
Pushing Decoding Burdens
to the AP Side

W. Wang, S. He, L. Yang, Q. Zhang, and T. Jiang, "Wi-Fi Teeter-Totter: Overclocking OFDM for Internet of Things", IEEE Infocom 2018.

The Spectrum Efficiency for Massive IoT Connectivity



Wi-Fi for IoT devices need a mature and spectrum efficient multiplexing access technology -- OFDM


Recent Research

- E-MiLi (ACM MobiCom, 2011)
 - Downclocking receiver's clock rate during idle listening
- Enfold (ACM MobiCom, 2014); Sampleless Wi-Fi(IEEE INFOCOM, 2016)
 - Downclocking for OFDM-based Wi-Fi by leveraging the gap between modulation and SNR

AP → IoT: downclocked OFDM transmission

IoT → AP: standard Wi-Fi OFDM transmission

Symmetrical Design



Idea: Transceiver Asymmetry




Transmit at the
lowest power


Receive the signal with
overclocking

Overclocking Opportunities


1x: 64 samples




2x: 128 samples



Overclocking Opportunities




Phase Rotation of Shifted Signal




Time-shifted samples result in different phase rotations at different subcarriers

Phase Rotation in Real World



- The phase shifts across all subcarriers in a real Wi-Fi packet when received at eight-fold clock

Joint Decoding



Implementation

- Implemented on **GNURadio/USRP** platform
- Operates on a **2 MHz or 1 MHz** channel with **52 subcarriers** are carried data values
- Evaluated BPSK, QPSK, 16QAM, and 64QAM modulations




Transmitter




Receiver

Evaluation – Sync Error




The average synchronization error at 8 \times clock rate is merely 13% at the standard clock rate at low SNR.

Evaluation – Modulation Scheme




For all modulations scheme, T-Fi outperforms the standard 802.11 receiver

Evaluation – Wireless Environment



(a) Different sample rates



(b) Different modulations

T-Fi achieves stable performance gain over a wide range of wireless environment

Quick Summary

- We introduce an **asymmetric transceiver paradigm** for IoT that pushes power burden to the AP side
- We propose a reception pipeline to decode legacy packets **at lower SNRs** than the conventional transceivers
- We implement the T-Fi system, and the evaluation confirms the benefits of T-Fi in real environments



End of This Chapter