Verification of Common 802.11 MAC Model Assumptions

David Malone, Ian Dangerfield and Doug Leith Hamilton Institute, NUI Maynooth, Ireland.

6 April 2006

Motivation

- Lots of 802.11 modeling work.
- Modeling has been quite successful.
- However, models make simplifying assumptions.
- Theory to justify assumptions has proven hard.
- Can measurement help?

802.11 Summary

- After TX choose rand(0, CW 1).
- Wait until medium idle for $DIFS(50\mu s)$,
- While idle count down in slots $(20\mu s)$.
- TX when counter gets to 0, ACK after SIFS $(10\mu s)$.
- If ACK then $CW = CW_{\min}$ else CW * = 2.



- Time is slotted.
- Stations transmit in a slot independently.
- Transmission/Collision probabilities fixed.

•
$$1 - p = (1 - \tau)^{n-1}$$
.

•
$$S = \frac{E_p n \tau (1-\tau)^{n-1}}{\sigma (1-\tau)^n + T_s n \tau (1-\tau)^{n-1} + (1-(1-\tau)^n - n \tau (1-\tau)^{n-1}) T_c}$$
.

What Can We Test?

- We can measure delay, collisions and throughputs.
- Are cards close to 802.11?
- Is the timing good enough to slot time?
- Is collision probability really fixed?
- Does throughput formula work out?



- 32 Uniform peaks, within jitter.
- Stefano, et al show not all cards so well behaved.
- Card trying to follow standard, timing plausible.
- Now look at collision probabilities.
- Use synthetic Poisson arrivals.
- Fixed number of stations.





- Collision probability not constant.
- First stage dominates mean.
- Later stages closer for more stations.
- What about independence?
- Use transmit/collision/throughput relationship.
- Look at saturated traffic, vary stations.





Conclusion

- n small assumptions don't hold.
- n large assumptions closer.
- For small n maybe cancellation of errors.
- Can we now improve second order stats?
- Can we measure inter-station correlations?
- Can we get a better handle on slottedness?