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Energy Evaluations

- Most future WSN applications need small and cheap sensor nodes
  - Implicates heavily constrained energy, memory and processing resources
  - Requires special care for resource efficiency, e.g. energy-efficiency

- Common practices to proof energy-efficiency
  - Protocols are evaluated in isolation
    - Possible influence of cross-layer effects neglected
  - Use “simple” simulator tools, e.g., TOSSIM, OMNeT++
    - Need application code modification or separate implementation
    - Not designed for getting energy data
  - Estimate energy consumption by
    - Counting packages
    - Sum up data volume

- What is appropriate or “sufficient”? → We check with reality!
Experiment setup

- Send a single data packet from node A to node B
  - Use TinyOS, Low Power Listening enabled
  - Measure an interval of 10 seconds, that includes exactly one transmission
  - Trigger transmission at random time, repeat 100 times

- Use local WSN testbed (SANDbed)
  - Provides distributed energy measurement of approx. 20 MICAz nodes
  - High resolution of measurements (up to 250 kHz)
  - Proven measurement error below 1% [1]

Experiment Example
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Experiment Example – Detailed View
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Experiment Parameters

- **Important parameter**
  - $t_{LPL}$ – LPL sleep interval
  - $t_{CCA}$ – Duration to check the medium for activity
  - $S$ – payload size

- **Expectations**
  - The lower $t_{LPL}$ the more energy is consumed (i.e., higher duty cycle)
  - The bigger the payload $S$ is, the more energy is consumed
Influence of $t_{LPL}$

- Sending (mostly) more expensive than receiving
- Larger $t_{LPL}$ not always decreases energy consumption
- Optimal value for $t_{LPL}$ exists
- High fluctuation, depending on transmission and timing of transmissions
Influence of payload size $S$

- Receiver: Payload size makes no difference
  - $t_{CCA}$ dictates energy consumption

- Sender: 90 Bytes payload is slightly less expensive
  - Tx state is less expensive than Rx state

- Influence of MAC parameter more important!
  - Results only valid for CC2420 radio and TinyOS LPL!
Influence of hardware tolerances

- Node A consumes more energy than node B
- Independent of node role
- Experiments with all 20 testbed nodes give up to 10% deviation
Lessons learned

- Power on nodes asynchronously
  - Avoids timing based effects
  - Requires many runs of the same experiment setup
- Wait after startup
  - Nodes have to be powered on and off many times for evaluation
  - After startup current consumption of a node fluctuates for the first few seconds
- Be aware of hardware tolerances
  - Important with lifetime estimations and comparison of experiments run on different nodes
- Take your time and have space available
  - This way of evaluation is much more time consuming than simulation
  - We collected several gigabytes of raw measurement data (using only 9 kHz sampling frequency)
Conclusion

- Results of real measurements are worth time and effort
- Disproved some common beliefs
  - Energy consumption and data volume not necessarily correlate
  - Protocols cannot be evaluated in isolation
- Made aware of cross layer effects (e.g., MAC)
  - Is often more important than other parameters (communication)
- Summarized best practices
- Only trust (energy) evaluation results if cross-checked with reality

Future work

- Compare results with simulator tools
- Improve AVRORA where possible
  - Hardware tolerances
  - Energy model
- Goal: Make most evaluations by simulation, but be aware of reality
Thank you for your attention!
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