LOW LATENCY MAC PROTOCOL FOR INDUSTRIAL WIRELESS SENSOR NETWORK

Submitted by

Samiya Marium

NUST201361609MPNEC45313F

Supervised by

Dr. Bilal Muhammad Khan



THESIS

Submitted to

Department of Electronics and Power Engineering
Pakistan Navy Engineering College, Karachi
National University of Sciences and Technology, Islamabad, Pakistan

In partial fulfillment of requirements for award of the degree of MASTER OF SCIENCE IN ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING

Specialization in Communication

August 2017

ABSTRACT

Electronic devices are adaptable and easy to use. These devices can be used to measure both static and dynamic signals. Sensors are electronic devices used to convert a physical parameter to an electric output. They can be used through wired or wireless devices which can then form a network to monitor an area. Future of digital world now relies on internet and integration of devices with internet to generate and consume information. The target of thesis is industrial environment monitoring, so moving towards this, we need to monitor machine health, entity observation, environment cleaning etc. Devices used depends on certain parameters like battery efficiency, throughput, reliability, security and latency. Latency range varies from application to application. For industrial domain, typical range is around 10 ms, for process control, it is in seconds, and for asset monitoring, in minutes. Wireless Sensor Network (WSN) are attaining greater attention in today's world due to their low cost deploy ability and mobility. IWSN(Industrial Wireless Sensor Network) need to possess certain capabilities such as self- organization, flexibility, energy efficiency ,rapid deployment(to name a few) to combat industrial automation requirements. Because sensor nodes are subject to dynamic topologies, nodes are battery powered, data redundancy exists, packet errors occurs, large scale deployment requirement etc. Certain protocols have been developed till now that provides promising solution to these problems, some of these protocols are wireless HART, ISA100.11A, 802.15.4, 802.15.4e etc. but some constraints do apply when it comes to counter harsh industrial environment.

In this thesis report, a comparative study of available IWSN protocols is presented. Moreover, the details for selection of 802.15.4 protocol and importance of proposed network in achieving low latency is also provided in the thesis. It can be concluded from the thesis that these state of the art protocols produces promising solutions to wireless networking problems, however they introduce complexity and in turn introduces latency issues at the cost of reliability within the network. To resolve this issue, a Low Latency MAC (LLMAC) protocol for IWSN, based on another novel proposed protocol NCAMAC (Network Coded-Aggregated MAC), is proposed for industrial applications to minimize hazards caused by latency, to provide an optimized throughput and better network lifetime.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would first like to express my gratitude to my ALLAH AL-MIGHTY for all of his blessings and then I would like to thanks Dr. Bilal Muhammad Khan, the supervisor of my thesis work, for his supervision, appreciative behavior, knowledge sharing and forbearance throughout my research work. He also made himself available throughout thesis for guidance anytime.

I would also like to thanks my GEC members for their guidance in thesis and also grateful to all faculty members who taught me courses throughout MS program. I would also like to thanks National University of Sciences and Technology (NUST) for providing an opportunity to prove my skills.

Last but not the least, I would like to thanks my parents and family for their support and patience throughout my thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Figures	IV
List of Tables	X
Chapter 1	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Motivation	3
1.3 Problem Statement and Description	3
1.3.1 Aggregation	5
1.3.2 GTS	5
1.3.3 Network Coding	6
1.4 Brief Description of Working	6
1.5 Thesis organization	6
Chapter 2 Literature review	7
2.1 Overview	7
2.1.1 IEEE 802.11	10
2.1.2 IEEE 802.15.1	10
2.1.3 Wireless Interface to Sensors and Actuators	11
2.1.4 IEEE 802.15.4	12
2.1.5 Wireless HART	13
2.1.6 ISA100.11A	14
Chapter 3 Analysis of 802.15.4 along with GTS mechanism	18
3.1 Introduction of 802.15.4	18
3.2 Topologies	18
3.3 General Architecture of 802.15.4	20
3.4 Working of 802.15.4	20
3.5 Literature Review	22
3.6 GTS mechanism	23

3.7 Evaluation using MATLAB	24
3.7.1 Block Diagram	24
3.7.2 Pseudocode for Latency and Throughput using GTS mechanism	25
3.7.3 Results	27
3.8 Conclusion	35
Chapter 4 Network Coded-Aggregated MAC(NCAMAC)protocol for IWSN	36
4.1 Aggregation	36
4.2 Network Coding	40
4.3 Block Diagram	46
4.4 Pseudocode for NCAMAC	47
4.5 Results	49
4.5.1 Latency and Throughput results of 802.15.4 and NCAMAC	51
4.5.2 Network Lifetime of NCAMAC	60
4.6 Conclusion	62
Chapter 5 Low Latency MAC(LLMAC) protocol for Industrial WSN	64
5.1 Background	64
5.2 Block Diagram	65
5.3 Pseudocode of LLMAC	66
5.4 Simulation and results	70
5.4.1 802.15.4 & WirelessHART comparison	70
5.4.2 LLMAC Evaluation	73
5.4.3 LLMAC's Coordinators performance	78
5.5 Conclusion	81
Chapter 6 Conclusion and Future Enhancement	83
Deferences	95

LIST OF FIGURES

1.	Figure 1-1 : Effects of industrialization.	2
2.	Figure 1-2: LLMAC architecture	4
3.	Figure 1-3: Proposed techniques for LLMAC	5
4.	Figure 2-1: Example of wireless networking)
5.	Figure 2-2: Example of Industrial Wireless Sensor Network(IWSN)	9
6.	Figure 2-3: Bluetooth scatter net	.11
7.	Figure 2-4(a):802.15.4 topology	13
8.	Figure 2-4(b): 802.15.4 topology	.13
9.	Figure 2-5: WirelessHART network architecture	.14
10.	. Figure 2-6: ISA100.11a network architecture	.15
11.	. Figure 3-1a : Star topology	.19
12.	. Figure 3-1b : Peer-to-peer topology	19
13.	. Figure 3-1c:Cluster tree network	19
14.	. Figure 3-2 :LR WPAN device architecture	20
15.	. Figure 3-3a :Structure of superframe	21
16.	. Figure 3-3b :Structure of the active periods with GTSs	21
17.	. Figure 3-4 :Block diagram of GTS evaluation	24

18. Figure 3-5:Slot allocation for GTS	27
19. Figure 3-6 :Slot allocation for Contention Access Period	28
20. Figure 3-7:Number of GTS nodes high in active period	29
21. Figure 3-8 : Number of Non-GTS nodes in CAP	29
22. Figure 3-9 : Latency of GTS	30
23. Figure 3-10: Throughput of GTS nodes	31
24. Figure 3-11:Latency between each two consecutive nodes	32
25. Figure 3-12:Latency calculation with non-GTS nodes	33
26. Figure 3-13 :Throughput of non-GTS nodes	34
27. Figure 4-1:Block diagram of data aggregation	37
28. Figure 4-2:Communication without network coding	40
29. Figure 4-3:Communication using network coding	40
30. Figure 4-4: Intra-session network coding	41
31. Figure 4-5:Block diagram of NCAMAC	46
32. Figure 4-6: 802.15.4 and WHART individual latency comparison	51
33. Figure 4-7: 802.15.4 and WHART throughput comparison	52
34. Figure 4-8: 802.15.4 and WHART average latency comparison	53
35. Figure 4-9 :Impact of reduction of iterations on NCAMAC latency	54
36 Figure 4-10: Impact of reduction of iterations on NCAMAC throughout	55

37. Figure 4-11:Impact of reduction of iterations on NCAMAC average latency56
38. Figure 4-12: Individual latency comparison of WirelessHART and NCAMAO
Coordinators57
39. Figure 4-13 :Average latency comparison of WirelessHART and NCAMAO
coordinators58
40. Figure 4-14 :Throughput comparison of WirelessHART and NCAMAO
coordinators59
41. Figure 4-15 :NCAMAC network lifetime
42. Figure 5-1:Block diagram of LLMAC65
43. Figure 5-2:Individual latency comparison of WirelessHART and 802.15.4 with no NC
and DA70
44. Figure 5-3: Average latency comparison of WirelessHART and 802.15.4 with no NC and
DA71
45. Figure 5-4: Throughput comparison of WirelessHART and 802.15.4 with no NC and
DA72
46. Figure 5-5 :Network lifetime of 802.15.4 with no NC and DA73
47. Figure 5-6:Impact of reduction of iterations on LLMAC latency74
48. Figure 5-7 :Impact of reduction of iterations on LLMAC average latency75
49. Figure 5-8:Impact of reduction of iterations on LLMAC throughput70

50. Figure 5-9 :Network lifetime of sensor nodes	77
51. Figure 5-10 :Impact of reduction of iterations on LLMAC coordinators latency	78
52. Figure 5-11:Impact of reduction of iterations on LLMAC coordinators average	
latency	79
53. Figure 5-12 :Impact of reduction of iterations on LLMAC coordinators throughput	80

LIST OF TABLES

1.	Table 2-1: Comparison of protocols	.16
2.	Table 3-1: Summary of GTS evaluation	.34
3.	Table 4-1: NCAMAC parameters	.50
4.	Table 4-2: WirelessHART parameters	50
5.	Table 4-3: Network lifetime's simulation parameters	.60