

Bandwidth Allocation for Quality of Service Provision in IEEE 802.16 Systems

Tze Wei Tang

Thesis submitted for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Electrical and Electronic Engineering

at

The University of Adelaide

(Faculty of Engineering, Computer and Mathematical Sciences)

School of Electrical and Electronic Engineering



March 3, 2009

Contents

Signed Statement	xvii
Acknowledgements	xix
Dedication	xxi
Abstract	xxiii
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Background	2
1.1.1 Quality of Service	2
1.1.2 Bandwidth Allocation	3
1.2 Thesis Structure	6
1.3 Major Research Contributions	7
1.4 List of Publications	9
1.5 Summary	9
2 Scheduling in 802.16 Systems	11
2.1 The IEEE 802.16 Standard	11
2.2 802.16 System Description	12
2.2.1 Physical Layer Overview	13
2.2.2 Medium Access Control Layer Structure	16
2.2.3 Class of Service for MAC Layer QoS Provision	17

2.3	Related Work	18
2.3.1	Homogeneous Algorithms	20
2.3.2	Hybrid Algorithms	22
2.3.3	Algorithms with Adaptive Modulation and Coding	23
2.3.4	Algorithms for Connection Admission Control	25
2.3.5	Specific Algorithms	26
2.3.6	Other Technologies	26
2.4	Motivation and Gap Analysis	30
2.5	MAC Layer Scheduling	32
2.5.1	Connection-Oriented Scheduling	32
2.5.2	Bandwidth Request	33
2.5.3	Bandwidth Grant	34
2.5.4	DL-MAP and UL-MAP	35
2.5.5	Adaptive Time Division Duplexing MAC Frame	35
2.5.6	Equivalence of MAC Scheduling and Slot Allocation	36
2.5.7	Base Station and Subscriber Station Schedulers	37
2.6	Summary	37
3	MAC Layer Scheduling: A Network Manager's Decision	39
3.1	Introduction	39
3.2	802.16 Scheduler Design Framework	41
3.2.1	Subscriber Station Differentiation	42
3.2.2	A General Optimisation Problem	43
3.3	Potential Objective Functions	44
3.3.1	Test Example	46
3.3.2	Objective Function A: Maximising Throughput	48
3.3.3	Objective Function B: Max-min Air-time Fairness and Pro- portional Bit Fairness per SS	49
3.3.4	Objective Function C: Max-min Bit Fairness	52

3.3.5	Objective Function D: Maximising Revenue	54
3.3.6	Discussion	55
3.4	Hierarchical Objectives	56
3.5	Are the Customers Satisfied?	57
3.6	Summary	59
4	Approaches to Customer Satisfaction	61
4.1	What is Customer Satisfaction?	61
4.2	Achieving Customer Satisfaction	63
4.3	Dual-Queue Scheduler in Wired Environment	67
4.3.1	Background	67
4.3.2	The Original Dual-Queue Concept	68
4.3.3	Core Dual-Queue Mechanisms	74
4.4	Issues of Dual-Queue in Wireless 802.16 Environment	79
4.4.1	QoS Violation Detection and QoS Recovery Detection for the DL	80
4.4.2	QoS Violation Detection and QoS Recovery Detection for the UL	82
4.4.3	Queue Structure	83
4.4.4	Automatic Repeat Request	84
4.5	Summary	85
5	Dual-Queue for 802.16 Environments	87
5.1	Introduction	87
5.2	Dual-Queue Framework for 802.16	88
5.2.1	Structure of the α -queue and the β -queue	88
5.2.2	Handling Automatic Repeat Request	90
5.2.3	Service Scheme	90
5.2.4	Scheduling Flow Diagram	92
5.3	Core Downlink Dual-Queue Mechanisms	92

5.3.1	Connection Prioritisation	93
5.3.2	QoS Violation Detection	93
5.3.3	Response to QoS Violation Detection	96
5.3.4	QoS Recovery Detection	98
5.3.5	Response to QoS Recovery Detection	99
5.3.6	Explicit Packet Dropping	100
5.4	Simulation Tool and Assumptions	100
5.5	Downlink Experiments	104
5.5.1	Experiment 1: Changing number of slots to serve DQ traffic .	107
5.5.2	Experiment 2: Changing PHY mode	122
5.5.3	Summary	130
5.6	Core Uplink Dual-Queue Mechanisms	131
5.6.1	Connection Prioritisation	131
5.6.2	QoS Violation Detection	131
5.6.3	Response to QoS Violation Detection	136
5.6.4	QoS Recovery Detection	137
5.6.5	Response to QoS Recovery Detection	138
5.6.6	Explicit Packet Dropping	138
5.7	Uplink Experiments	139
5.7.1	Experiment 1: Changing number of slots to serve DQ traffic .	140
5.7.2	Experiment 2: Changing PHY mode	143
5.7.3	Summary	145
5.8	The Dual-Queue	148
5.8.1	Experiment Description	148
5.8.2	Experimental Results	151
5.8.3	Summary	160
5.9	Mixed Traffic Profiles Experiments	161
5.9.1	Experiment Description	161
5.9.2	Experimental Results	166

5.10	Summary	170
6	Priority-Based Dual-Queue Scheduler	173
6.1	Motivation	173
6.2	The PBDQ structure	174
6.3	The PBDQ mechanism	175
6.4	Experiment for the PBDQ scheduler	178
6.4.1	Experimental Regions	179
6.4.2	Experimental Results	180
6.4.3	Discussion	192
6.5	Other Applications of the PBDQ scheduler	193
6.6	Summary	194
7	Joint DL and UL Dual-Queue Scheduling	195
7.1	Introduction	195
7.2	Handling One-Directional Connections	196
7.2.1	No Coordination (Benchmark for Comparison)	197
7.2.2	Basic Coordination	198
7.3	Experiment with One-Directional Connections	199
7.3.1	Experimental Regions	200
7.3.2	Experimental Results	200
7.3.3	Summary	209
7.4	Handling Bi-Directional Connections	210
7.4.1	Partial Coordination	210
7.4.2	Full Coordination	211
7.5	Experiment with Bi-Directional Connections	212
7.5.1	Experimental Results	213
7.5.2	Summary	221
7.6	Summary	223

8 Conclusion and Future Work	225
8.1 Summary	225
8.2 Potential Research Extensions	230
8.2.1 Bandwidth Request Polling Interval	230
8.2.2 Connection Prioritisation Schemes	231
A PHY Mode Calculations	233
Acronyms and Abbreviations	235
Bibliography	240

List of Tables

2.3.1	Summary of the different scheduling algorithms used in the hybrid schemes.	23
2.4.1	Comparison of the related work in 802.16 literature.	32
3.3.1	The number of slots and data rate required by each connection in our test example.	47
3.3.2	Slot allocation to maximise throughput.	49
3.3.3	Slot allocation to maintain max-min air-time fairness and proportional bit fairness per SS.	51
3.3.4	Slot allocation to maintain max-min bit fairness.	53
3.3.5	Slot allocation to maximise revenue.	54
3.3.6	Summary of total throughput and revenue under different objectives.	55
3.5.1	Summary of the number of satisfied customers achieved in different objectives.	58
5.4.1	The parameters of each PHY mode considered in our 802.16 systems.	104
5.5.1	System parameters used in our experiments.	105
5.5.2	The objectives defined for the system and the connection prioritisation mechanism.	106
5.5.3	Average number of slots required per MAC frame by a 1 <i>Mbps</i> connection under different PHY modes.	123
5.9.1	A summary of mixed traffic profiles.	165

6.4.1	The objectives defined for the system and the connection prioritisation mechanism for the PBDQ experiment.	179
7.3.1	Summary of the joint DL and UL scheme in terms of maximising the number of one-directional connections in the network that experience good service.	209
7.5.1	Summary of the joint DL and UL schemes in terms of maximising the number of bi-directional sessions that experience good service. .	221

List of Figures

1.1.1	The 7 layers of the OSI reference model.	3
1.1.2	IEEE 802.16 protocol layers obtained from [1]	4
2.5.1	Structure of a MAC frame in ATDD mode.	36
3.2.1	Scheduling process of a base station scheduler.	43
3.3.1	A simple 802.16 network with 4 SSs connected to a BS.	46
3.4.1	A hierarchy of objectives considered in our framework.	57
4.2.1	Network performance perceived by the customers and network provider.	64
4.3.1	The original Dual-Queue scheduling discipline.	69
4.3.2	Flow diagram of the original DQ scheduling discipline.	75
4.3.3	Long-term bandwidth supply and demand graph to explain QoS Violation Detection.	76
5.2.1	Multiple FIFO queues for the α -queue and the β -queue.	89
5.2.2	Flow diagram of a DQ scheduler in 802.16 systems.	92
5.3.1	Delay calculation for packet p that arrives at $F_{a,p}$ and leaves at F_c	95
5.3.2	Required waiting time before moving another connection to the β - queue.	97
5.5.1	End-to-end delay of a VoIP packet.	105
5.5.2	Experiment 1 (DLDQ): (a) DQ bandwidth, (b) packet delay, and (c) MAC throughput.	110

5.5.3	Experiment 1 (DLDQ): (a) DQ bandwidth, (b) connections at each queue; α -queue (green), β -queue (red), and (c) QoS received; good service (green), degraded service (amber) and no service (red). . . .	112
5.5.4	The DQ bandwidth from $t = 15$ to $t = 16$ in experiment 1 with the DLDQ scheduler.	116
5.5.5	Diagram showing the uneven intervals between the BR events. . . .	117
5.5.6	Delay experienced by the UGS traffic on the UL.	118
5.5.7	DQ bandwidth measured over intervals of two MAC frames in length.	119
5.5.8	MAC throughput experienced by each DQ connection measured over intervals of two MAC frames in length.	120
5.5.9	Experiment 2 (DLDQ): (a) PHY rate, (b) packet delay, and (c) MAC throughput.	125
5.5.10	Experiment 2 (DLDQ): (a) PHY rate, (b) connections at each queue; α -queue (green), β -queue (red), and (c) QoS received; good service (green), degraded service (amber) and no service (red). . . .	127
5.6.1	The timing diagram of events across multiple MAC frames.	132
5.6.2	Snapshot of the queue at the end of MAC frame $n-1$	134
5.6.3	A snapshot of a queue when the EPD mechanism drops packets. . .	139
5.7.1	Experiment 1 (ULDQ): (a) DQ bandwidth, (b) packet delay, and (c) MAC throughput.	141
5.7.2	The MAC frame arrangement for different experiments.	142
5.7.3	Experiment 1 (ULDQ): (a) DQ bandwidth, (b) connections at each queue; α -queue (green), β -queue (red), and (c) QoS received; good service (green), degraded service (amber) and no service (red). . . .	144
5.7.4	The MAC frame arrangement for experiment 2.	145
5.7.5	Experiment 2 (ULDQ): (a) PHY mode, (b) packet delay, and (c) MAC throughput.	146

5.7.6	Experiment 2 (ULDQ): (a) PHY rate, (b) connections at each queue; α -queue (green), β -queue (red), and (c) QoS received; good service (green), degraded service (amber) and no service (red).	147
5.8.1	(a) UGS rate and PHY rate, (b) QoS received under DQ, (c) QoS received under EPD enhanced WFQ, and (d) QoS received under WFQ.	152
5.8.2	Overall proportion of good service of all connections under the different schemes.	154
5.8.3	(a) Cumulative number of bits transferred, and (b) cumulative number of good service bits transferred under the different scheduling schemes.	156
5.8.4	Cumulative number of unused slots under the different scheduling schemes.	157
5.8.5	Cumulative number of packets dropped under the different scheduling schemes.	158
5.9.1	(a) Video (TES) MAC throughput, (b) Video (traces) MAC throughput, (c) VoIP MAC throughput.	167
5.9.2	(a) Video (TES) delay, (b) Video (traces) delay, (c) VoIP delay. . .	168
5.9.3	QoS experienced by each connection for one of the 20 experiments; good service (green), degraded service (amber) and no service (red).	169
5.9.4	95% confidence interval of the mean proportion of good service for each connection, with $BER = 0$	171
5.9.5	95% confidence interval of the mean proportion of good service for each connection under different BER values.	171
6.2.1	The structure of a Priority-Based DQ Scheduler.	175
6.4.1	Scheme 1 (Benchmark): (a) PHY rate, (b) packet delay, and (c) MAC throughput.	181

6.4.2	Scheme 1 (Benchmark): (a) PHY rate, (b) connections at each queue; α -queue (green), β -queue (red), and (c) QoS received; good service (green), degraded service (amber) and no service (red). . . .	182
6.4.3	Scheme 2 (PBDQ): (a) PHY rate, (b) packet delay, and (c) MAC throughput.	183
6.4.4	Scheme 2 (PBDQ): (a) PHY rate, (b) connections at each queue; α -queue (green), β -queue (red), and (c) QoS received; good service (green), degraded service (amber) and no service (red).	184
6.4.5	(a) PHY rate, (b) total MAC throughput, and (c) cumulative number of bits transferred.	186
6.4.6	The total MAC throughput for both schemes during the time interval between $t = 12$ and $t = 18$	188
6.4.7	The improved cumulative number of bits transferred under scheme 2 during the time interval between $t = 12$ and $t = 18$	191
7.3.1	No coordination: (a) PHY rate, (b) packet delay, and (c) MAC throughput.	202
7.3.2	No coordination: (a) PHY rate, (b) connections at each queue; α -queue (green), β -queue (red), and (c) QoS received; good service (green), degraded service (amber) and no service (red).	203
7.3.3	Basic coordination: (a) PHY rate, (b) packet delay, and (c) MAC throughput.	205
7.3.4	Basic coordination: (a) PHY rate, (b) connections at each queue; α -queue (green), β -queue (red), and (c) QoS received: good service (green), degraded service (amber) and no service (red).	206
7.5.1	Partial coordination: (a) PHY rate, (b) packet delay, and (c) MAC throughput.	214

7.5.2	Partial coordination: (a) PHY rate, (b) connections at each queue; α -queue (green), β -queue (red), and (c) QoS received: good service (green), degraded service (amber) and no service (red).	216
7.5.3	Full coordination: (a) PHY rate, (b) packet delay, and (c) MAC throughput.	217
7.5.4	Full coordination: (a) PHY rate, (b) connections at each queue; α -queue (green), β -queue (red), and (c) QoS received: good service (green), degraded service (amber) and no service (red).	218

Signed Statement

This work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text.

I consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being available for loan and photocopying.

SIGNED: DATE:

Acknowledgements

This PhD work would never been possible without support from people around me. I would like to express my most sincere gratitude to my supervisors at the University of Adelaide, David Green, Nigel Bean, Michael Rumsewicz and Lang White. Without their consistent guidance and support, I could not have overcome the difficult times over the last few years. I am very thankful for their motivation and inspiration.

I would like to thank Mark Reed at NICTA in Canberra for introducing the WiMAX technology to me and I have enjoyed the few weeks collaboration work carried out in Canberra. I would like to acknowledge the Australian Research Council, and industry partner Tenix Australia, for funding me through Linkage Project LP0453508. Special thanks are also due to the staff of TRC Mathematical Modelling and Electrical and Electronic department.

I am also indebted to Jeremy McMahon for reading through my thesis and for giving me constructive comments. I am also grateful to my fellow students in the TRC, Shafiqul Karim and Ashley Flavel. Their friendship and helpfulness in providing ideas are very much appreciated. I greatly appreciate the PhD moral support offered by Wai Kuan Foong, who gave me so much advice in the last few years. In addition, I thank all my friends for the lunches, dinners and coffees.

Finally, I thank my family who loves and supports me always.

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to my mum and dad.

Abstract

This thesis investigates various aspects of bandwidth allocation and scheduling in the Medium Access Control (MAC) layer of IEEE 802.16 systems. We highlight the important aspects of designing a scheduler and describe the scheduler design problem from a general perspective. That is, we provide a scheduler design framework driven by a set of objectives defined for the systems. In addition, we include Subscriber Station differentiation into our scheduler design. This approach is comprehensive, as it covers the requirements of both the network provider and the end users.

In developing the framework, we discuss the importance of achieving customer satisfaction. This leads to an interesting objective that maximises the number of satisfied customers, rather than network centric objectives, such as fairness. We contend that providing fairness to customers does not necessarily achieve the best outcome for customer satisfaction and artificially limits the choices available to service providers.

In order to maximise the number of satisfied customers, we analyse in detail the Dual-Queue (DQ) scheduling discipline proposed by Hayes *et al.* [2]. The DQ algorithms of Hayes' work are focused on wireline networks, and are not directly deployable in an 802.16 environment, as we discuss in this thesis. We propose a modified DQ implementation for 802.16 systems to handle real-time services. In 802.16 systems, there are two scheduling processes that we need to consider: Downlink (DL) scheduling for data transmission from the Base Station to the Subscriber Stations and Uplink (UL) scheduling for data transmission from the Subscriber Stations to the Base Stations. We investigate the DL and UL implementations separately

because the UL scheduling process is more complicated due to the fundamentally distributed nature of the problem.

We demonstrate that our proposed approach is able to operate effectively in an 802.16 system. We then compare the performance of our proposed DL and UL Dual-Queue schedulers to a Weighted Fair Queue scheduler in noisy environments, where re-transmissions are required. In addition, we also compare our proposed schedulers to an enhanced Weighted Fair Queue scheduler with an Explicit Packet Dropping mechanism. Furthermore, we show that our Dual-Queue system can handle mixed traffic profiles, such as video and voice.

Having proposed a DQ implementation that maximises the number of satisfied customers, we investigate alternative objectives that the DQ scheduler may try to achieve. We find that our proposed DQ implementation may fail to achieve these alternative objectives, and hence, we remedy this shortfall by proposing the Priority-Based Dual-Queue scheduler, which is made up of multiple DQs differentiated by the priority classes of connections. That is, each priority class is handled in a separate DQ. The Priority-Based Dual-Queue scheduler ensures connections that belong to the highest priority class are served ahead of connections that belong to lower priority classes at all times, even when there are changes in the priority class of connections in the system.

Lastly, we investigate the benefits of carrying out the DQ scheduling for both the DL and UL of an 802.16 network jointly. We first investigate a scenario where the network consists of only one-directional connections. We propose a joint scheme that is able to maximise the number of satisfied one-directional connections in the network. We then extend our investigation to another scenario where the network consists of bi-directional sessions, such as Voice over IP and video conferencing. In this case, we propose two joint schemes, which are able to maximise the number of satisfied bi-directional sessions.