

A contribution to modeling sensor communication networks by using finite-source queueing systems

Tamás Bérczes, Béla Almási, János Sztrik, Attila Kuki

Faculty of Informatics, University of Debrecen

Debrecen, Hungary,

{berczes.tamas, almasi.bela, sztrik.janos, kuki.attila}@inf.unideb.hu

Abstract—In this paper we introduce a finite source retrial queueing model to investigate the performance characteristics of the wireless transmission problem in sensor networks. We divide the sensors into two classes. The first one is the "Emergency" class, which performs the notification of special emergency situations (eg. fire alarms). The second one is the "Normal" class, which measures and transmits environmental data (eg. temperature). For the performance evaluation of the wireless transmission we study and compare two cases: In the first model the RF transmission possibility will be available randomly for the sensor nodes (Non Controlled case) and in the second model the RF transmission requests coming from the emergency class, will access the wireless channel immediately (Controlled case). Our main interest is to give the main steady-state performance measures of the system computed by the help of the MOSEL tool.

I. INTRODUCTION

Wireless sensor networks are widely used to implement low cost unattended monitoring of different environments. Baronti et al. [1] showed that the technology limits are far beyond the current usage. Chiany [2] represented the wireless sensor networks as a system containing three main components see Figure 1. Buchmann showed [3] that the operation mechanisms depending on the vendor implementations can be totally different, but also common features are observable. For example, power saving is a standard requirement to achieve long time operation of the wireless nodes. Similarly, a common feature that the wireless data transmission can appear as a bottleneck in the operation (see. [4]).

The retrial queueing systems are widely used to model wireless communication systems (see. [5], [6], [7]).

In this paper we introduce a retrial queueing model to investigate the performance characteristics of the wireless transmission problem in the sensor networks. We divide the sensors into two classes. The first one is the "Emergency" class, which performs the notification of special emergency situations (eg. fire alarms). The second one is the "Normal" class, which measures and transmits environmental data (eg. temperature).

The emergency class has priority over the normal class in the operation. For the performance evaluation of the wireless transmission we study and compare two cases: In the first model the RF transmission possibility will be available randomly for the sensor nodes (Non Controlled case). In the second model the RF transmission requests coming from the




Fig. 1. Wireless sensor network.




Fig. 2. A retrial queue with components

emergency class will access the wireless channel immediately (Controlled case).

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we present the corresponding queueing model. Numerical results and their discussion are provided in Section 3. Finally, Section 4 concludes the paper.

II. SYSTEM MODEL

Let's see a queueing model with a single server unit (RF unit), where the jobs come from two groups of finite sources. These sources represent the sensors. The first class of sensors corresponds to the emergency case alerts (eg. fire alarms), while the second one refers to the normal case (eg. temperature, humidity measurement). The number of sensors of the first class is denoted by N , and the number of sensors of the second class is denoted by K . The sensors send a new service request (ie. to send the measured value through the radio interface). The distribution of the inter-request times is exponential with parameter λ_1 for the emergency sensors and with parameter

λ_2 for the normal class. Two states are considered for the radio transmission unit (server) in the model:

- *ON state*: If the RF unit is ON (accessible) it is able to start processing the incoming jobs.
- *OFF state*: The RF unit can be in OFF state (it sleeps for power saving purposes).

The RF unit is engaged when it is in ON state and there are more than zero jobs in the servicing environment. The RF unit is inactive when it is in OFF state and there is no jobs in the servicing environment.

The RF unit begins to work with an ON state period. The distribution of this ON state times is exponential with parameter α . If there are no incoming jobs during this time period, the RF unit switches to OFF state. The distribution of this OFF state times is exponential with parameter β .

When the OFF state period is over, the RF unit enters in ON state. If there are emergency requests waiting in the queue the RF unit begins to serve them. In the other situation, when there are not any emergency requests waiting in the queue, a listening session will be started.

When the RF unit is in ON state, the incoming jobs can access the RF unit. The RF unit will switch to OFF state, if there are no incoming jobs during the ON state.

A request of the emergency class goes directly to a FIFO queue waiting to be served (ie. transmitted through the radio interface).

If an emergency request arrives to the RF unit being in OFF state we consider two operation possibilities:

- The request waits for the end of the OFF state period.
- The request wakes up the RF unit, which will start the service after an exponentially distributed initialization time with parameter γ .

If a request from the second class finds the RF unit busy or in OFF state then the requests goes to the orbit. These requests waiting in the orbit retry to find the RF unit idle according to a Poisson flow with retrial rate ν . We assume that emergency requests have non-preemptive priority over normal requests.

The distribution of service times for each request coming from both classes are exponential with parameter μ .

The functionality of this sensor network is presented on Fig. 2.

The notations described below are introduced (Table I contains the overview of parameters of the network):

- $k_1(t)$ is the number of active sensors in the emergency source at time t ,
- $k_2(t)$ is the number of active sensors in the normal source at time t ,
- $q(t)$ denotes the number of emergency requests in the queue at time t ,
- $o(t)$ is the number of jobs in the orbit at time t .
- $y(t) = 0$ if there is no job in the RF unit and the RF unit is available, $y(t) = 1$ if the RF unit is engaged with a job coming from the emergency class, $y(t) = 2$ when the RF unit is servicing a job coming from the normal

sensor class and $y(t) = 3$ if the server is in OFF state at time t

- $c(t) = 1$ when the RF unit is in OFF State at time t and one emergency request has started the initialisation procedure, $c(t) = 0$ in the other cases.

It is ease to see that:

$$k_1(t) + k_2(t) = \begin{cases} K + N - q(t) - o(t), & y(t) = 0 \\ K + N - q(t) - o(t) - 1, & y(t) = 1, 2 \\ K + N - q(t) - o(t) - c(t), & y(t) = 3 \end{cases}$$

TABLE I
LIST OF NETWORK PARAMETERS

Parameter	Maximum	Value at t
Active emergency sensors	N (population size)	$k_1(t)$
Active normal sensors	K (population size)	$k_2(t)$
Emergency generation rate		λ_1
Normal generation rate		λ_2
Total gen. rate	$\lambda_1 N + \lambda_2 K$	$\lambda_1 k_1(t) + \lambda_2 k_2(t)$
Requests in queue	N	$q(t)$
Service rate		μ
Busy servers	1 (number of servers)	$c(t)$
Cust. in service area	$N + 1$	$c(t) + q(t)$
Requests in Orbit	K (orbit size)	$o(t)$
Retrial rate		ν

To maintain theoretical manageability, the distributions of inter-event times (i.e., request generation time, service time, retrial time, ON state time, OFF state time) presented in the network are by assumption exponential and totally independent. The state of the network at a time t corresponds to a Continuous Time Markov Chain (CTMC) with 4 dimensions:

$$X(t) = (y(t); c(t); q(t); o(t))$$

The steady-state distributions are denoted by

$$P(y, c, q, o) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} P(y(t) = y, c(t) = c, q(t) = q, o(t) = o)$$

Note, that the state space of this Continuous Time Markovian Chain is finite, so the steady-state probabilities surely exist. For computing the steady-state probabilities and the system characteristics, we use the MOSEL software tool in this paper. These computations are described in eg. [8], [9].

When we have calculated the distributions defined above, the most important steady-state system characteristics can be obtained in the following way:

- *Utilization of the RF unit*

$$U_S = \sum_{y=1}^2 \sum_{q=0}^N \sum_{o=0}^K P(y, 0, q, o)$$

- *Availability of the RF unit*

$$A_S = \sum_{y=0}^2 \sum_{q=0}^N \sum_{o=0}^K P(y, 0, q, o)$$

- Average number of jobs in the orbit

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{O} &= E(o(t)) = \\ &= \sum_{y=0}^2 \sum_{q=0}^N \sum_{o=0}^K oP(y, 0, q, o) \\ &+ \sum_{c=0}^1 \sum_{q=0}^N \sum_{o=0}^K oP(3, c, q, o)\end{aligned}$$

- Average number of jobs in FIFO

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{Q} &= E(q(t)) = \\ &= \sum_{y=0}^2 \sum_{q=0}^N \sum_{o=0}^K qP(y, 0, q, o) \\ &+ \sum_{c=0}^1 \sum_{q=0}^N \sum_{o=0}^K qP(3, c, q, o)\end{aligned}$$

- Average number of jobs in the network

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{M} &= \bar{O} + \bar{Q} + \\ &+ \sum_{y=1}^2 \sum_{q=0}^N \sum_{o=0}^K P(y, 0, q, o) + \\ &+ \sum_{q=0}^N \sum_{o=0}^K P(3, 1, q, o)\end{aligned}$$

- Average number of active emergency sensors

$$\bar{\Lambda}_1 = N - \bar{Q} - \sum_{q=0}^{N-1} \sum_{o=0}^K P(1, 0, q, o)$$

- Average number of active normal sensors

$$\bar{\Lambda}_2 = K - \bar{O} - \sum_{q=0}^N \sum_{o=0}^{K-1} P(2, 0, q, o)$$

- Average generation rate of emergency sensors:

$$\bar{\lambda}_1 = \lambda_1 \bar{\Lambda}_1$$

- Average generation rate of normal sensors:

$$\bar{\lambda}_2 = \lambda_2 \bar{\Lambda}_2$$

- Average waiting time in FIFO:

$$ET_q = \frac{\bar{Q}}{\lambda_1}$$

- Average waiting time in orbit:

$$ET_o = \frac{\bar{O}}{\lambda_2}$$

III. NUMERICAL RESULTS

To demonstrate the efficiency of sleeping period in sensor networks in graphs, some computational results are presented in this chapter. The corresponding parameters can be overviewed in Table II. Numerous interactions of parameters were investigated by using the model. The most interesting results are displayed on the following figures. On each figure the blue lines (dotted with circles) and the red lines (dotted with triangles) represent the Non Controlled and the Controlled cases, respectively.

On Figure 3 one can see the effect of increasing density of sensor request for the length of waiting emergency requests. In the lower domain of the parameter the random operation of the RF unit proved less efficient than in Controlled mode.

Figure 4 shows how orbit fills up when the request generator parameter is increasing. These types of results are useful for fine tuning the orbit size in different cases of low priority requests densities.

Figure 5 deals with the essential part of the response time of RF unit, since processing a single request of a sensor can be described with a simple service rate. In Controlled case the average waiting time of emergency requests in queue, consequently the response time of processing an emergency signal is much more efficient than the random operation case. In higher request generation domain this difference fades out.

This figure (Figure 6) displays the effect of different operational modes on the average waiting times of normal requests in the orbit. Since a normal mode requests is not able to wake up the radio unit, no significant difference can be observed.

For the following results the overall request generator parameter (λ) is set at value of 0.5 which can be considered as a low density of request generation. The effect of mean time of the OFF state periods for the system characteristics is investigated.

On Figure 7 the average number of waiting emergency requests is shown. In the random case (Non Controlled) this number significantly increases with the increasing length of the OFF state period. The longer time the RF unit sleeps, the more emergency requests are waiting. Due to the 'wake up' property, in Controlled case this queue length is not depend on the length of sleeping period of RF unit.

Next figure (Figure 8) presents the corresponding results for normal requests. Here the length of RF unit OFF state period has a great influence to the number of waiting requests in orbit. The difference between the two cases is growing with the length of sleeping period, since there are a relatively low number of emergency requests, and serving a high priority request will leave the RF unit in idle state thus request can leave the orbit.

IV. CONCLUSION

A sensor network with two priority request classes was investigated. Two operation modes were considered. The emergency (high priority) cases were able to wake up the RF unit while the normal (low priority) cases not. When the dependence on the request generation rate was under



Fig. 3. Mean queue length vs λ




Fig. 6. Mean time spent in Orbit vs λ




Fig. 4. Mean orbit size vs λ




Fig. 7. Mean queue length vs sleeping period, $\lambda = 0.5$




Fig. 5. Mean time spent in queue vs λ




Fig. 8. Mean orbit size vs sleeping period, $\lambda = 0.5$

TABLE II
NUMERICAL VALUES OF MODEL PARAMETERS

Parameter	Symbol	Value
Overall generation rate	λ	[0.1..4.6]
Emergency generation rate	$\lambda_1 = \frac{\lambda}{10}$	[0.01,0.46]
Normal generation rate	$\lambda_2 = \frac{9}{10}\lambda$	[0.09,4.14]
Number of Emergency sensors	N	50
Number of Normal sensors	K	50
Retrial rate	ν	2
Service rate	μ	20
Initialization rate	μ	10
Mean time of sleeping period	$\frac{1}{\beta}$	[0.5, 2.5]
Mean time of listening period	$\frac{1}{\alpha}$	1.5

consideration, the Controlled RF unit functionality has better system characteristics (eg. response time). The Non Controlled cases show lower performance. Similarly, when we investigate the effect of sleeping period of the RF unit, the main system parameters (response time, waiting times in orbit and queue, and queue length) prove the efficiency of the Controlled mode. Since this Controlled operation corresponds to the power safe working of RF units, these results have some technical and economical advantages, as well. Further task could be to study the cases when the sensors have different request generation rates.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The publication was supported by the TÁMOP-4.2.2.C-11/1/KONV-2012-0001 project. The project has been supported by the European Union, co-financed by the European Social Fund,

The publication was also supported by the TÁMOP 4.2.4.A/2-11-1-2012-0001 project. This project has been supported by the European Union, co-financed by the European Social Fund and by the European Union with the help of the GOP-1.3.2-08-2009-0007 program.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Baronti, "Wireless sensor networks: A survey on the state of the art and the 802.15.4 and zigbee standards," *Computer Communications*, vol. 30, pp. 1655–1695, 2007.
- [2] M. W. Chiang, "Architectures of increased availability wireless sensor network nodes," *ITC International Test Conference*, 2004.
- [3] A. Buchman, "An overview of hardware platforms used in wireless sensor nodes," *Carpathian Journal of Electronic and Computer Engineering*, vol. 4, pp. 19–22, 2011.
- [4] Z. Gál, T. Balla, and G. Terdik, "Statistical analysis of heating system with spatially distributed sensor network," in *Plenary Lecture, Embedded Systems and Wireless Sensors Networks Design and Applications ESWS-NDA 2012*, 2012.
- [5] I. F. Akyildiz and M. C. Vuran, *Wireless Sensor Networks*. John Wiley & Sons, July 2010.
- [6] F. Dressler, *Self-Organization in Sensor and Actor Networks*. John Wiley & Sons, 2007.
- [7] T. Bérczes, J. Sztrik, P. Orosz, P. Moyal, N. Limnios, and S. Georgiadis, "Tool supported modeling of sensor communication networks by using finite-source priority retrial queues," *Carpathian Journal of Electronic and Computer Engineering*, vol. 5, pp. 13–18, 2012.
- [8] G. Bolch, S. Greiner, H. de Meer, and K. Trivedi, *Queueing Networks and Markov Chains*, 2nd ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 2006.
- [9] P. Wchnner, J. Sztrik, and H. de Meer, "Modeling wireless sensor networks using finite-source retrial queues with unreliable orbit," *Springer Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 6821, pp. 275–285, 2011.