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Setting the scene

• The purpose of the UCP in section 6.4 of [Ref 1] is to allow synchronous 802.16 systems to coexist on a co-channel basis with asynchronous systems.
• The primary asynchronous system of interest is 802.11. Additionally, the features are structured to meet the requirements of the 3.65 GHz band in the US as regulated by the FCC.
• As we continue to refine the simulations and analysis, enhancements come to light that can improve coexistence.
Background

• Only systems communicating via the CXP protocol of section 15.5 [Ref 1] have sufficient information available to adjust power or refrain from transmitting when necessary to enable simultaneous transmit.

• Therefore uncoordinated systems shall only share in time and shall not intentionally attempt to transmit in the same frame at the same time as neighboring systems.
What DMA seeks to address

- Bring together asynchronous/synchronous systems at the 802.16 frame boundary
- Provides for controlled reacquisition of the medium from asynchronous systems by synchronous systems
- Subsequent release of the medium to asynchronous systems
- Minimize interference with co-channel asynchronous systems
- Aim to provide fair sharing of the medium
The DMA frame structure

Notes:
This example presents 3 802.16 systems sharing.
Each system updates its own DMA algorithm before monitoring of a frame begins.
DMA Algorithm - Reclaiming the medium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case: $T_{medium_quiet} &gt; FRST_n$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium Busy (802.11 or preceding 802.16 transmission)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$MAX_{FRST}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{CMACMA}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$FRST_n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{medium_quiet}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{FRAME_END_OFFSET}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case: $T_{medium_quiet} &lt; FRST_n$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium Busy (802.11 or preceding 802.16 transmission)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$MAX_{FRST}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{CMACMA}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$FRST_n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{medium_quiet}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{FRAME_END_OFFSET}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$MIN_{FRST} = T_{CMACMA} + T_{FRAME\_END\_OFFSET}$

$T_{FRAME\_END\_OFFSET} = 50\mu s$ (minimum time to Rx/Tx and send FRS)

$T_{CCA} = 4/8/16\mu s$ (20MHz/10MHz/5MHz channels) – aligned with 802.11 values

$MIN_{FRST} = 54/58/66\mu s$

$MAX_{FRST} = 4000\mu s$

802.16 parameters

- 5ms 802.16 frame duration
- 47 symbols per frame [DL=28, UL=19] symbol duration ~102\mu s
- $TTG = 5\mu s$
The DMA algorithm

\[ UtilizationRatio = \left( \frac{UtilizationGoal}{CurrentUtilization} \right)^K \]

\[ FRST_n = \text{MIN}(MAXFRST, \text{MAX}(UtilizationRatio \times FRST_{n-1}, \text{MINFRST})) \]
The DMA algorithm

- $FRST_n$ - Frame Reservation Start Time
- $MAXFRST$ - The maximum value of $FRST$
- $MINFRST$ - the minimum value of $FRST$
- $UtilizationGoal$ - the “fair” channel occupancy for this system
- $CurrentUtilization$ - the currently achieved channel occupancy for this system
- $UtilizationRatio$ - the metric indicating the level to which the $UtilizationGoal$ has been achieved
The DMA algorithm – variation in FRSTₙ
Simulation Assumptions

- Results are based on parameters contained within the 802.19 3.65GHz simulation parameters document [Ref 2].
- Each BS (Base Station)/AP (Access Point) has a single associated SS (Subscriber Station)/STA (Station).
- One 802.16 system (10MHz channel) with full access to the channel sees a maximum throughput rate:
  - DL = ~17.8Mbps.
  - UL = ~9.1Mbps
- One 802.11 system (10MHz channel) with full access to the channel sees a maximum throughput rate:
  - DL = ~13.5Mbps.
  - UL = ~13.5Mbps.
- Two 802.16 system (10MHz channel) with full access to the channel sees a maximum throughput rate:
  - DL = ~8.9Mbps.
  - UL = ~4.5Mbps
- Two 802.11 system (10MHz channel) with full access to the channel sees a maximum throughput rate:
  - DL = ~6.6Mbps.
  - UL = ~6.6Mbps.
Simulation Configurations

- **Scenario A**: 1 x 802.16 system alone \([K = 1]\)
- **Scenario B**: 1 x 802.11 system alone \([K = 1]\)
- **Scenario C**: 2 x 802.16 systems alone \([K = 1]\)
- **Scenario D**: 2 x 802.11 systems alone \([K = 1]\)
- **Scenario E**: 1 x 802.16 system + 1 x 802.11 system \([K = 1]\)
- **Scenario F**: 2 x 802.16 systems + 1 x 802.11 system \([K = 1]\)
- **Scenario G**: 1 x 802.16 system + 2 x 802.11 systems \([K = 1]\)
- **Scenario H**: 2 x 802.16 systems + 2 x 802.11 systems \([K = 1]\)
- **Scenario I**: 3 x 802.16 systems + 2 x 802.11 systems \([K = 1]\)
- **Scenario J**: 2 x 802.16 systems + 3 x 802.11 systems \([K = 1]\)
- **Scenario K**: 3 x 802.16 systems + 3 x 802.11 systems \([K = 1]\)
- **Scenario L**: 1 x 802.16 system + 1 x 802.11 system \([K = 2]\)
- **Scenario M**: 1 x 802.16 system + 1 x 802.11 system \([K = 4]\)
- **Scenario N**: 1 x 802.16 system + 1 x 802.11 system \([K = 1]\) \{802.16 load fixed at channel capacity\}
- **Scenario O**: 1 x 802.16 system + 1 x 802.11 system \([K = 1]\) \{802.16 load fixed at channel capacity\}

Scenarios A through M consider an increasing offered load where the increase in load is the same for the case of both 802.16 and 802.11.
Simulation Scenarios

Simulation Space
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Why is channel occupancy a good metric for analysis?

*MAC level fairness*: At THE MAC level, the amount of time that a system is radiating energy on the channel, including overhead, ACKs, CTS, whatever, is assumed to be “good use of the channel”. Systems shouldn’t be penalized because they are inherently more “good” in their use of the channel. For instance, if the MAC level simulation shows equal opportunity to transmit, yet one system gets higher throughput and better access latency, that’s just because that particular system is inherently more efficient.
Scenario A
Scenario B

![Graph showing Occupancy vs. Offered load (kbps) for different protocols (0 x 802.16 and 1 x 802.11) with two separate plots for FER (%)].

- Occupancy increases with offered load for both protocols.
- FER (%) also increases with offered load for both protocols.

Legend:
- 0 x 802.16
- 1 x 802.11
Scenario C

[Graph showing Occupancy and FER (%) for offered load (kbps)]

- Occupancy
- FER (%)

- 2 x 802.16
- 0 x 802.11
Scenario D

![Graph showing Occupancy vs. Offered load (kbps)]

- Occupancy
- Offered load (kbps)

![Graph showing FER (%) vs. Offered load (kbps)]

- FER (%)
- Offered load (kbps)

Legend:
- 0 x 802.16
- 2 x 802.11
Scenario E

![Graph showing Occupancy and FER vs Offered load for 1 x 802.16 and 1 x 802.11]

- **Occupancy**
  - Blue line: 1 x 802.16
  - Pink line: 1 x 802.11

- **FER (%)**
  - Blue line: 1 x 802.16
  - Pink line: 1 x 802.11

---

The graph illustrates the impact of offered load on occupancy and FER for two scenarios: 1 x 802.16 and 1 x 802.11. As the offered load increases, both occupancy and FER decrease, indicating improved efficiency and reduced errors at higher loads.
Scenario F

- Occupancy
  - 2 x 802.16
  - 1 x 802.11

- FER (%)
  - 2 x 802.16
  - 1 x 802.11

Graphs show the occupancy and FER (%) as a function of offered load (kbps) for different scenarios.
Scenario G

- Occupancy vs. Offered load (kbps)
  - 1 x 802.16
  - 2 x 802.11

- FER (%) vs. Offered load (kbps)
  - 1 x 802.16
  - 2 x 802.11
Scenario H

![Graph showing occupancy and FER with offered load (kbps)]
Scenario I
Scenario J

![Graph showing occupancy and FER percentages for offered load (kbps)]

- Occupancy
- FER (%)

- 2 x 802.16
- 3 x 802.11
Scenario K

- **Occupancy**
  - 3 x 802.16
  - 3 x 802.11

- **FER (%)**
  - 3 x 802.16
  - 3 x 802.11

- **Offered load (kbps)**
  - Range: 0 to 30000
Scenario A, L, M Sensitivity to K factor
Scenario N

802.16 load is fixed at channel capacity

- Occupancy
  - 1 x 802.16
  - 1 x 802.11

- FER (%)
  - 1 x 802.16
  - 1 x 802.11

Offered load (kbps) vs. Occupancy and FER (%) for 1 x 802.16 and 1 x 802.11.
Scenario O

802.11 load is fixed at channel capacity

Offered load (kbps)

Occupancy

1 x 802.16
1 x 802.11

FER (%)

1 x 802.16
1 x 802.11

Offered load (kbps)
Interim conclusions

The conclusions to be drawn from the simulation results presented are thus:

• Equitable system sharing is achieved with the cited enhancements to LBT.
• Sharing is achieved with a demonstrably low FER.
• For this specific simulation configuration the sensitivity of *channel occupancy* to *K* factor is low.

Concerning scenarios N and O:

- Scenario N shows that for the case where 802.16 has high loading then 802.16 demonstrates high occupancy for the case where 802.11 loading is low. As the 802.11 load increases then fair sharing is demonstrated.
- Scenario O shows high occupancy of 802.11 where its loading is high, and where 802.16 loading is low. This is for the case where the loading scenario is reversed to that given in scenario N. Again this shows fair sharing for the case where high loading is apparent for both systems.
Extending analysis to spatially distributed scenarios
Extending analysis to spatially distributed scenarios
FRS (Frame Reservation Signal)

- FRS Transmission capability
- CTS Reception capability
- UL Map relevance – modified due to the usage of an FRS (Frame Reservation Signal)
802.16 FRS transmission strategy

*FRS transmission in the DL subframe protecting the UL transmission*

*FRS not transmitted in the DL subframe due to no UL transmission*

*FRS transmission in the UL subframe protecting the following frame as claimed by DMA algorithm*
Spatially distributed scenarios

- ‘FRS only’ – FRS transmission capability by 802.16
- ‘CTS only’ – CTS reception capability by 802.16
Spatially distributed scenarios (cont.)

![Graph showing FER (%) vs. Offered load (kbps) for different scenarios involving 802.16 BS and 802.11 AP with various combinations of FRS/CTS and CTS only.]
Spatially distributed scenarios (cont.)

802.11 Uplink

- 1 802.16 BS + 1 802.11 AP w/ FRS/CTS
- 1 802.16 BS + 1 802.11 AP w/o FRS/CTS
- 1 802.16 BS + 1 802.11 AP w/ FRS only
- 1 802.16 BS + 1 802.11 AP w/ CTS only
- 2 802.11 AP w/o RTS/CTS

Offered load (kbps) vs. FER (%)
Spatially distributed scenarios (cont.)

802.16 Uplink

- 1 802.16 BS + 1 802.11 AP w/ FRS/CTS
- 1 802.16 BS + 1 802.11 AP wo/ FRS/CTS
- 1 802.16 BS + 1 802.11 AP w/ FRS only
- 1 802.16 BS + 1 802.11 AP w/ CTS only
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