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Wired Communication

● Pros
  ● Very reliable
    ● For Ethernet, medium HAS TO PROVIDE a Bit Error Rate (BER) of $10^{-12}$ (one error every one trillion bits!)
      ▪ Insulated wires; wires placed underground and in walls
      ▪ Error Correction Techniques
  ● Very high transfer rates
    ● Up to 100-Gbit/s or more
  ● Long distance
    ● Up to 40km (~25 miles) in 10-Gbit/s Ethernet (cutting edge)

● Cons
  ● Expensive to set up infrastructure
  ● Infrastructure is fixed once set up
  ● No mobility
Wireless Communication

● Pros
  ● Allows mobility
  ● Much cheaper and easier to deploy, change, and upgrade!

● Cons
  ● Exposed (unshielded) medium
    ● Susceptible to physical phenomena (interference)
    ● Variable BER -- Error correction may not suffice in all cases
  ● Slower data rates for wider distances
  ● OSI layered stack designed for wired medium
    ● Difficult to "hide" underlying behavior
  ● Security: anyone in range hears transmission

Goals for Today’s Lecture

● Characteristics of Wireless Media
● 802.11 Architecture and Media Access Control Protocol
● Collision Detection vs. Collision Avoidance
  ● Hidden Terminal and Exposed Terminal Problem
  ● Request To Send (RTS) / Clear To Send (CTS) mechanism
● Multihop Wireless Networks
  ● Sensor Networks
  ● TCP over Multihop Networks
● Wireless Security
Wireless Communication Standards (Alphabet Soup)

- **Cellular**
  - 2G: GSM (Global System for Mobile communication), CDMA (Code division multiple access)
  - 3G: CDMA2000
- **IEEE 802.11**
  - A: 5.0Ghz band, 54Mbps (25 Mbps operating rate)
  - B: 2.4Ghz band, 11Mbps (4.5 Mbps operating rate)
  - G: 2.4Ghz, 54Mbps (19 Mbps operating rate)
  - Other versions to come.
- **IEEE 802.15** – lower power wireless
  - 802.15.1: 2.4Ghz, 2.1 Mbps (Bluetooth)
  - 802.15.4: 2.4Ghz, 250 Kbps (Sensor Networks)

Wireless Link Characteristics

(Figure Courtesy of Kurose and Ross)  

![Diagram of wireless link characteristics.](image-url)  

*Figure 6.2* - Link characteristics of selected wireless network standards
Other Wireless Link Characteristics

- **Path loss**
  - Signal attenuation as a function of distance
  - Signal-to-noise ratio (SNR—Signal Power/Noise Power) decreases, make signal unrecoverable

- **Multipath Propagation**
  - Signal reflects off surfaces, effectively causing self-interference

- **Interference from other sources**
  - **Internal Interference**
    - Hosts within range of each other collide with one another’s transmission (remember Aloha)
  - **External Interference**
    - Microwave is turned on and blocks your signal

Path Loss

- **Signal power attenuates by about \( \sim r^2 \) factor for omni-directional antennas in free space**
  - Where \( r \) is the distance between the sender and the receiver

- **The exponent in the factor is different depending on placement of antennas**
  - Less than 2 for directional antennas
  - Faster Attenuation
    - Exponent greater than 2 when antennas are placed on the ground
    - Signal bounces off the ground and reduces the power of the signal
**Multipath Effects**

- Signals bounce off surface and interfere with one another
- What signals are out of phase?
  - Orthogonal signals cancel each other and nothing is received!

---

**A Wireless Link?**
(courtesy of Gilman Tolle and Jonathan Hui, ArchRock)
A Wireless Link!
(courtesy of Gilman Tolle and Jonathan Hui, ArchRock)

The Amoeboid “cell”
(courtesy of David Culler, UCB)
Wireless Bit Errors

- The lower the SNR (Signal/Noise) the higher the Bit Error Rate (BER)
- How can we deal with this?
  - Make the signal stronger
- Why is this not always a good idea?
  - Increased signal strength requires more power
  - Increases the interference range of the sender, so you interfere with more nodes around you
- Error Correction schemes can correct some problems

802.11 Architecture

- Designed for limited geographical area
- AP’s (Access Points) are set to specific channel and broadcast beacon messages with SSID and MAC Address periodically
- Hosts scan all the channels to discover the AP’s
  - Host associates with AP (actively or passively)

Figure 6.7 - IEEE 802.11 LAN architecture

[Diagram showing 802.11 frames exchanges and 802.3 (Ethernet) frames exchanged]
5 Minute Break

Questions Before We Proceed?

Ethernet vs 802.11

- Wireless MAC design
  - Why not just use Ethernet algorithms?
    - Ethernet: one shared “collision” domain
  - It’s technically difficult to detect collisions
    - Collisions are at receiver, not sender
  - … even if we could, it wouldn’t work
    - Different transmitters have different coverage areas
  - In addition, wireless links are much more prone to loss than wired links
  - Carrier Sense (CSMA) is OK; detection (CD) is not
Hidden Terminals

- A and C can both send to B but can’t hear each other
- A is a hidden terminal for C and vice versa
- CSMA/CD will be ineffective – need to sense at receiver

Exposed Terminals

- Exposed node: B sends a packet to A; C hears this and decides not to send a packet to D (despite the fact that this will not cause interference)!
CSMA/CA: CSMA w/ Collision Avoidance

- Since we can’t detect collisions, we try to avoid them.
- When medium busy, choose random interval (contention window)
  - Wait for that many idle timeslots to pass before sending
- When a collision is inferred, retransmit with binary exponential backoff (like Ethernet)
  - Use ACK from receiver to infer “no collision”
  - Use exponential backoff to adapt contention window

Multiple Access with Collision Avoidance (MACA)

- Before every data transmission
  - Sender sends a Request to Send (RTS) frame containing the length of the transmission
  - Receiver responds with a Clear to Send (CTS) frame
  - Sender sends data
  - Receiver sends an ACK; another sender can send data
- When sender doesn’t get a CTS back, it assumes collision
MACA, con’t

- If other nodes hear RTS, but not CTS: send
  - Presumably, destination for first sender is out of node’s range …
  - … Can cause problems when a CTS is lost
  - When you hear a CTS, you keep quiet until scheduled transmission is over (hear ACK)
**RTS / CTS Protocols (MACA)**

MACA = Multiple Access with Collision Avoidance
Overcome exposed/hidden terminal problems with contention-free protocol

1. B stimulates C with Request To Send (RTS)
2. A hears RTS and defers (to allow C to answer)
3. C replies to B with Clear To Send (CTS)
4. D hears CTS and defers to allow the data
5. B sends to C

---

**802.11 Stack View**

- CSMA/CA runs over the 802.11 physical layer
- Link-level acknowledgements for every frame sent
Link-Layer Acknowledgements

Kurose and Ross

- Receiver acks every data packet
- If ACK is lost, source tries again until a maximum retransmission number is reached

Channelization of spectrum

- Typically, available frequency spectrum is split into multiple channels
- Some channels may overlap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Channels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26 MHz</td>
<td>3 channels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>915 MHz</td>
<td>2.45 GHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 MHz</td>
<td>5 channels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.125 GHz</td>
<td>61.25 GHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 MHz</td>
<td>500 MHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.25 GHz</td>
<td>1000 MHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 MHz</td>
<td>122.5 GHz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preventing Collisions Altogether

- Frequency Spectrum partitioned into several channels
  - Nodes within interference range can use separate channels
  - Now A can send B while C sends to D without any interference!
  - Aggregate Network throughput doubles

Using Multiple Channels

- 802.11: AP’s on different channels
  - Usually manually configured by administrator
  - Automatic Configuration may cause problems
- Most cards have only 1 transceiver
  - Not Full Duplex: Cannot send and receive at the same time
- Multichannel MAC Protocols
  - Automatically have nodes negotiate channels
    - Channel coordination amongst nodes is necessary
    - Introduces negotiation and channel-switching latency that reduce throughput
Wireless Multihop Networks

- Vehicular Networks
  - Delay Tolerant (batch) sending over several hops carry data to a base station
- Common in Sensor Network for periodically transmitting data
  - Infrastructure Monitoring
    - E.g., structural health monitoring of the Golden Gate Bridge
- Multihop networking for Internet connection sharing
  - Routing traffic over several hops to base station connected to Internet
  - E.g., Meraki Networks

Large Multihop Network
(courtesy of Sanjit Biswas, MIT)

1 kilometer
Multi-Hop Wireless Ad Hoc Networks
(Courtesy of Tianbo Kuang and Carey Williamson University of Calgary)
Multi-Hop Wireless Ad Hoc Networks

(Assume ideal world...)
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(Reality check…)

Problem 1: node A can’t use both of these links at the same time
- shared wireless channel
- transmit or receive, but not both

Problem 2: can’t use both of these links at same time
- range overlap at A
- “hidden node” problem
- “exposed node” problem
Problem 3: LOTS of contention for the channel
- in steady state, all want to send
- need RTS/CTS to resolve contention

RTS: Request-To-Send
CTS: Clear-To-Send
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Problem 4: TCP uses ACKS to indicate reliable data delivery
- bidirectional traffic (DATA, ACKS)
  - even more contention!!!
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Diagram showing the network topology with nodes S, A, B, C, D, and R, illustrating the multi-hop communication between them.
Summary

- Wireless connectivity provides a very different set of tradeoffs from wired
  - Much greater ease of deployment
  - Mobility
  - But: unprotected physical signaling
  - Complications due to interference, attenuated range
  - Leading to much more frequent loss
- Hidden terminal and Exposed terminal problems motivate need for a different style of Media Access Control: CSMA/CA
- Multihop provides applications to sensornets, citynets
  - But additional complications of routing, contention
- Wireless devices bring new security risks
- Next lecture: Quality of Service