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Emergency Scenario

- Emergency event (CBRE).
- Indoor environment (e.g. building or highly frequented public space).
- Dangerous for first responders to explore the area.
- Need for fast environmental information gathering.
- Timely information provision (e.g. first responders location, threat epicentre, rescued people, etc.) to external agencies.
MP2P WSN Paradigm
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The Bandwidth Problem
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Objective

Explore the problem of resource constraints in MP2P WSNs, experimentally evaluating the effects of taking into account *local network conditions*, together with nodes’ *computational capabilities*, during load distribution.
MP2P Load Distribution

- Selection and adaptation of two load sharing algorithms to take into account both computational (CPU) and communication (bandwidth) requirements:
  - **Auction Algorithm** (sender-initiated/reactive).
  - **Lookup List Algorithm** (receiver-initiated/proactive)*.
- Definition of an *Utility Function* for the best candidate node selection.
- Evaluation on real Tmote Sky large-scale sensor testbed.
- Performance metric: average job execution time.

Utility Function

Parameters:
- \( i \) = Neighbour of a IntP \((i=1, ..., N)\)
- \( N \) = Number of a IntP neighbours
- \( C(i) \) = CPU availability of neighbour \( i \)
- \( B(i) \) = Bandwidth availability of neighbour \( i \)
- \( S(i) \) = Score of neighbour \( i \)
- \( w_C \) = Weight CPU
- \( w_B \) = Weight Bandwidth

\[ S(i) = w_C \times C(i) + w_B \times B(i) \]

\( C(i) \) = number of active processes.

\( B(i) \) = historical information of the last \( N \) temporal time slots in which the radio channel was clear or busy (reading Clear Channel Assessment from CC2420).

Best Candidate

\[ S_{\text{max}} = \max\{S(i)\} \]

\( i=1, ..., N \)
HEN Sensor Testbed

Heterogeneous Experimental Network (HEN)

http://www.cs.ucl.ac.uk/research/hen/

- 40 Tmote Sky Sensors
- Random Deployment
- Remotely Accessible
- Remotely Programmable
- Fast Kernel Flashing
- Contiki OS and TinyOS
Experiment A

- 3 IntPs and 21 RcvPs.
- 1 Streaming node.
- Streaming radio power level 0x03 (~250cm packet range).
- Job formed by 32 tasks.
- 50 Offload/upload packets.
- UDP/TCP message exchange.
- Contiki OS.
Experiment A - Auction

- Auction Alg. With Congestion Without Bandwidth Control
- Auction Alg. With Congestion With Bandwidth Control
- Auction Alg. Without Congestion

Job Execution Time (Seconds)

Number of Tasks

~55%
Experiment A - Lookup List

Graph showing job execution time (seconds) vs. number of tasks for different scenarios:
- Lookup List Alg. With Congestion Without Bandwidth Control
- Lookup List Alg. With Congestion With Bandwidth Control
- Lookup List Alg. Without Congestion

The graph indicates a noticeable difference, approximately 50%, between the scenarios with and without congestion.
Experiment B

- 3 IntPs and 21 RcvPs.
- 1 Streaming node.
- Streaming radio power level 0x03 (~250cm packet range).
- Job formed by 32 tasks.
- 50 Offload/upload packets.
- UDP/TCP message exchange.
Experiment B - Auction

- Auction Alg. With Congestion Without Bandwidth Control
- Auction Alg. With Congestion With Bandwidth Control
- Auction Alg. Without Congestion
- Auction Random Alg.

Job Execution Time (Seconds)

Number of Tasks
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Experiment B - Lookup List

- Lookup List Alg. With Congestion Without Bandwidth control
- Lookup List Alg. With Congestion With Bandwidth control
- Lookup List Alg. Without Congestion
- Lookup List Random Alg.

Approximately 25%
Information about the underlying radio conditions is available to the task distribution process:

- by adopting a **cross-layered approach** using an API to allow the application overlay to access low level details;
- by inferring approximate information about the physical state of the network through tests performed **without layer violation**.

The greatest challenge for MP2P WSN systems is to utilise **only** information available at the application overlay to infer congestion levels.
MP2P Systems Implications (II)

Two effects act on the latency of a path:

- **Length/number of hops** of a path underlying a logical links (lower frequency).
- Variability in the **path quality** resulting from congestion (higher frequency).

From latency measurements, a Hamming FIR-H filter can separate the short timescale congestive effect from the longer timescale effects of changing path length.

More effective estimate of bandwidth availability respecting both can be created.
Conclusions

In MP2P WSNs:

• Physical network conditions have a major impact on the performance of job collaborations between peer nodes.

• Simple load sharing algorithms can be adapted to take into account both computational capabilities and network conditions improving system performance.

• Cross-layered or heuristic approaches applied at the application overlay need to gather network parameter and use them within the load sharing algorithms.

In future:

• We plan to study techniques providing effective bandwidth estimation at the application overlay of MP2P WSNs without layer violation.
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