Design, Analysis and Optimization of Energy Harvesting Based Communications

Mohit Sharma

mohit@ece.iisc.ernet.in Signal Processing for Communications Lab Dept. of ECE, IISc

July 15, 2014

(ロ) (同) (三) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

Outline

- Motivation
- System Model
- PDP Analysis
- Optimal SoC-unaware Policies
- Simulation Results
- Future Work



▲□▶▲□▶▲□▶▲□▶ □ のQ@

Motivation

- EH technology presents prospects of perpetual operation
- Energy is garnered from ambience for eg. solar, wind etc
- Energy availability is sporadic
- Energy buffer (eg. battery) is used to mitigate the sporadicity
- Energy neutrality constraint: Cumulative energy used cannot exceed the total harvested energy

< □ > < 同 > < 三 > < 三 > < 三 > < ○ < ○ </p>

Energy Management Policies

- Central issue: design of energy management policies to optimize a utility function
- Policy: prescription of the transmit power on the basis of available system-state information
- Performance depends on the accuracy of the system-state information
- System-state components of EH based communication system
 - State of charge (SoC) of the battery
 - Channel state information (CSI)

 Accurate SoC measurement is difficult [Testa et al., ISIT 2014]

(ロ) (同) (三) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

Impact of Inaccurate SoC Information



Figure : Performance of optimal battery-aware policy under SoC estimation error. The root-mean-square and the maximum error in the SoC estimation are 5% and 30%, respectively.

Reciever

- Energy Source
 - Generally, receiver is assumed to be connected to mains [Zhang et al., TSP 2012, Ozel et al., JSAC 2011, Anup et al., JSTSP 2013]
 - For full EH networks, deployed for distributed processing and data relaying applications, EH receiver is required
- Data Processing
 - In [Bhargav et al., Globecomm 2009, Anup et al., JSTSP 2013] an ARQ based retransmission scheme is considered

(ロ) (同) (三) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

- Erroneously received packet is discarded
- For HARQ-CC, the receiver uses all the copies of the packet received so far

System Dynamics



< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □

Coordinated Sleep-Wake Protocol

Time



Figure : Coordinated sleep-wake protocol, A: Awake and S: Sleep

Accomplishments

- Packet drop probability (PDP) of dual EH links is analyzed
- Closed-form expressions for the PDP of both ARQ and HARQ-CC are obtained
- Using closed-form expressions we obtained PDP optimal SoC-unaware policies
- Both slow and fast fading channels are considered
- Results for mono EH links are special case of results obtained

< □ > < 同 > < 三 > < 三 > < 三 > < ○ < ○ </p>

Transmit Policy and Battery Evolution

EHN transmits at predetermined energy levels

$$\{P_1 T_p \triangleq L_1 E_s, P_2 T_p \triangleq L_2 E_s, \dots, P_K T_p \triangleq L_K E_s\}$$
$$P_{\ell} : \text{Transmit power level in } \ell^{th} \text{ attempt}$$

Tx EHN's battery evolves as

$$B_{n+1}^{tx} = \begin{cases} \min(B_n^{tx} + E_s - L_\ell E_s, B_{cap}^{tx}), & \text{w.p. } \rho_t \\ B_n^{tx} - L_\ell E_s, & \text{w.p. } 1 - \rho_t \end{cases}$$

 B_n^{tx} : Tx EHN's battery level in n^{th} slot B_{cap}^{tx} : Tx EHN's battery capacity

- ► Rx node consumes $P_r T_p = RE_s$ units of power to receive and decode a packet
- ► Communication happens, if $B_n^{tx} \ge L_\ell E_s$, and $B_n^{tx} \ge P_r T_p$

Packet Drop and NACK

- Packet drop: if Tx EHN doesn't receive ACK by the end of the frame
- ▶ In ℓth attempt a NACK is received if

 $\gamma_\ell < \gamma_{\rm O}$

where,

- γ_{ℓ} : received SNR
- γ_0 : required SNR

ARQ

$$p_{\text{out}} = \Pr[\gamma_{\ell} < \gamma_0] = \Pr[P_{\ell} | h_{\ell} |^2 < \gamma_0]$$

HARQ-CC

$$p_{\text{out}} = \Pr[\gamma_{\ell,\text{ac}} < \gamma_0] = \Pr\left[\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} P_i |h_i|^2 < \gamma_0\right]$$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □

Packet Drop Probability Analysis

- Process evolution, within a frame, is modeled as a discrete time Markov chain
- State of this DTMC: $(B_n^{tx}, B_n^{rx}, U_n)$
- Feedback state: $U_n \in \{-1, 0, 1, \dots, (K-1)\}$:

$$U_n = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{ACK received} \\ 0 & \text{Start of transmission} \\ i & i \text{ NACKs received, } i \in \{1, \dots, K\} \end{cases}$$

< □ > < 同 > < 三 > < 三 > < 三 > < ○ < ○ </p>

Packet is dropped if and only if $U_{\mathcal{K}} \neq -1$

Packet Drop Probability Analysis

Packet drop probability is

$$P_{\mathsf{D}}(K) = \sum_{i,j} \pi(i,j) P_{\mathsf{D}}(K|i,j,r=0)$$

 $\pi(i,j)$: stationary probability that EHNs have (iE_s, jE_s) energy

$$\pi(i_2, j_2) = \sum_{(i_1, j_1)} \Pr\left[(B_{n+1}^{\text{tx}} = i_2, B_{n+1}^{\text{rx}} = j_2) | (B_n^{\text{tx}} = i_1, B_n^{\text{rx}} = j_1) \right] \pi(i_1, j_1)$$

$$P_{D}(K|i, j, r = 0) = \sum_{m_{t}=0}^{K} \sum_{m_{r}=0}^{K} {\binom{K}{m_{t}}\binom{K}{m_{r}} \rho_{t}^{m_{t}} \rho_{r}^{m_{r}} (1 - \rho_{t})^{K-m_{t}}}$$

(1 - \rho_{r})^{K-m_{r}} \rho_{D}(i, j, m_{t}, m_{r})

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ - 三 - のへぐ

- $p_D(i, j, m_t, m_r)$ for ARQ
 - Slow fading $(T_c = T_m)$

$$p_{\mathsf{D}}(i,j,m_t,m_r) = \Pr\left\{ \bigcap_{\ell=1}^{\Psi_1} \left(|h|^2 < \frac{\gamma_0 \mathcal{N}_0}{P_\ell} \right) \right\}$$
$$= \Pr\left\{ \left(|h|^2 < \frac{\gamma_0 \mathcal{N}_0}{P_{\Psi_1}} \right) \right\} = p_{\mathsf{out}}(P_{\Psi_1})$$
$$\Psi_1 = \min\{K, \kappa_t, \kappa_r\}$$
$$\kappa_t = \max\{k_i | E_{\mathsf{avl}}^{\mathsf{tx}} - \sum_{k=1}^{k_i} P_k T_p \ge 0\}$$
$$\kappa_r = \max\{k_j | E_{\mathsf{avl}}^{\mathsf{tx}} - k_j P_r T_p \ge 0\}$$

► $E_{avl}^{tx} \approx \min\{i + m_t, B_{cap}^{tx}\}$ and $E_{avl}^{tx} \approx \min\{j + m_r, B_{cap}^{rx}\}$ ► Fast fading $(T_c = T_p)$

$$p_{\mathsf{D}}(i,j,m_t,m_r) = \prod_{\ell=1}^{\Psi_1} p_{\mathsf{out}}(P_\ell)$$

$p_D(i, j, m_t, m_r)$ for HARQ-CC

Slow fading

$$p_{\mathsf{D}}(i, j, m_t, m_r) = \mathsf{Pr}\left[|h|^2 < \frac{\gamma_0 \mathcal{N}_0}{\sum_{n=1}^{\Psi_1} P_n}
ight] = 1 - e^{-rac{\gamma_0 \mathcal{N}_0}{\sigma_c^2 \sum_{n=1}^{\Psi_1} P_n}}$$

Fast fading: using a result in [Misra ITR Dec1997]

$$p_{\mathsf{D}}(i, j, m_t, m_r) = \mathsf{Pr}\left[\sum_{n=1}^{\Psi_1} L_n |h_n|^2 < \frac{\gamma_0 \mathcal{N}_0 T_p}{E_s}\right]$$
$$= 1 - \left(\prod_{j=1}^{a} \beta_j^{r_j}\right) \sum_{k=1}^{a} \sum_{\ell=1}^{r_k} C_{k,\ell} (-\beta_k) \frac{\left(\frac{\gamma_0 \mathcal{N}_0 T_p}{E_s}\right)^{r_k - 1} e^{-\beta_k \frac{\gamma_0 \mathcal{N}_0 T_p}{E_s}}}{(r_k - \ell)! (\ell - 1)!}$$

for *a* distinct $L_i = \frac{1}{\beta_i}$, and $\sum_{i=1}^{a} r_i = \Psi_1$, and $r_i \ge 1$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへで

Simulation Results: Slow Fading



Figure : Slow fading channel: Comparison of analytical expressions and simulations. The parameters chosen are $E_s = 12 \text{ dB}$, $\gamma_0 = 10 \text{ dB}$, K = 4, $P_r = 2$. The transmission policy used is [0.5 1.5 2.5 3.5].

Simulation Results: Fast Fading



Figure : Fast fading channel: Comparison of analytical expressions and simulations. The parameters chosen are $E_s = 5 \text{ dB}$, $\gamma_0 = 12 \text{ dB}$, K = 4, $P_r = 2$. The transmission policy used is [0.5 1.5 2.5 3.5].

> < 同 > < 回 > < 回 >

Harvesting Unconstrained Regime

Slow Fading: Tx and Rx operates in HUR

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{t=1}^{K} L_t p_{\text{out}}(L_{t-1}) < \rho_t$$
$$\frac{R}{K} \sum_{t=1}^{K} p_{\text{out}}(L_{t-1}) < \rho_r$$

Fast Fading: For Tx and Rx operates in HUR

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{t=1}^{K} L_t \prod_{\rho=1}^{t-1} p_{\text{out}}(L_\rho) < \rho_t$$
$$\frac{R}{K} \sum_{t=1}^{K} \prod_{\rho=1}^{t-1} p_{\text{out}}(L_\rho) < \rho_r$$

HUR characterization is valid only for *infinite energy buffer*

HUR: Finite Battery



Figure : Harvesting Unconstrained Regime achievability of the ARQ based EH link, with finite energy buffer for slow fading channel. The average energy consumed per frame is, $E_{av}^c \approx 2.4E_s$. The transmission policy used is [0.5 1.5 2.5 3.5]. The parameters chosen are $\gamma_0 = 10$ dB, $E_s = 15$ dB, and K = 4.

SoC-unaware Optimal Policies

$$\min_{\{P_1,...,P_K\}}\sum_{i=0}^{B_{\text{cap}}^{\text{tx}}}\pi(i)P_{\text{D}}\left(K|i,r=0\right)$$

Lemma 1

The packet drop probability P_D is minimized if and only if each $P_D(K|i, r = 0)$ is minimum for all *i*

We have

$$P_{\mathsf{D}}(K|i,r=0) = \sum_{m=0}^{K} {\binom{K}{m}} \rho_t^m (1-\rho_t)^{K-m} \rho_{\mathsf{D}}(i,m)$$

(ロ) (同) (三) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

For links operating in HUR: minimize $p_D(i, m)$

Convexity of $p_D(i, m)$ for Fast Fading

Lemma 2 For ARQ with i.i.d. fast fading channels, if $P_n \ge \frac{\gamma_0 N_0}{2\sigma_c^2}$, for all $1 \le n \le K$, then

$$p_D(i, m) = \prod_{\ell=1}^{K} p_{out}(P_\ell)$$

s.t. $\sum_{n=1}^{K} P_n = P$

is convex in the domain of HUR achieving policies.

Lemma 3

An EH communication link, operating in HUR s.t. $\sum_{i=1}^{K} P_i = P$

1. For basic ARQ with i.i.d. fast fading channel, and $P_i \ge \frac{\gamma_0 N_0}{2\sigma_c^2}$ for all $1 \le i \le K$, then

$$\min_{\{P_1,\ldots,P_K\}} \left\{ \prod_{\ell=1}^K P_{\text{out}}(P_\ell) \right\} = \left(P_{\text{out}}\left(\frac{P}{K}\right) \right)^K$$

2. For HARQ-CC with i.i.d slow fading channels

$$\min_{\{P_1,\ldots,P_K\}} \Pr\left[|h_n|^2 < \frac{\gamma_0 \mathcal{N}_0}{\sum_{n=1}^K P_n}\right] = \max_{\{P_1,\ldots,P_K\}} \Pr\left[|h_n|^2 < \frac{\gamma_0 \mathcal{N}_0}{\sum_{n=1}^K P_n}\right]$$

3. For HARQ-CC with i.i.d fast fading channels, and min $P_i \ge \frac{\gamma_0 N_0}{2(K+1)\sigma_c^2}$

$$\min_{\{P_1,\ldots,P_K\}} \Pr\left[\sum_{n=1}^K L_n |h_n|^2 < \frac{\gamma_0 \mathcal{N}_0 T_\rho}{E_s}\right] = \Pr\left[\sum_{n=1}^K |h_n|^2 < \frac{\gamma_0 \mathcal{N}_0 T_\rho K}{P}\right]$$

Optimality of EPTS

Theorem

For an EH communication link, operating in HUR, in the following cases it is optimal to transmit at equal power across all the attempts

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ■ ののの

- 1. Basic ARQ on i.i.d. fast fading channels
- 2. HARQ-CC on slow fading channels
- 3. HARQ-CC on fast fading channels

Optimality of EPTS



Figure : Optimality of equal power transmission schemes in HUR: Performance comparison of EPTS [2 2 2 2] and [0.5 1.5 2.5 3.5], for a mono EH link.

Conclusion

- Analyzed the PDP of the dual EH links
- For mono EH links the results can be obtained as a special case of the results presented

(ロ) (同) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

Obtained the optimal SoC-unaware policies

Publications

Conference

- Mohit K. Sharma and Chandra R. Murthy, Packet Drop Probability Analysis of ARQ and HARQ-CC with Energy Harvesting Transmitters and Receivers, Submitted to GlobalSIP 2014.
- Adithya M. Devraj, Mohit K. Sharma and Chandra R. Murthy, Power Allocation in Energy Harvesting Sensors with ARQ: A Convex Optimization Approach, Submitted to GlobalSIP 2014.

Journal

1. Mohit K. Sharma and Chandra R. Murthy, Design and Analysis of State-of-Charge Unaware Policies for Energy Harvesting Communication, (under preparation)

Future Work

 Characterize the quality of service (QoS) performance limits of EH networks, given a physical layer EH infrastructure

< □ > < 同 > < 三 > < 三 > < 三 > < ○ < ○ </p>

Joint scheduling for multiple QoS constraints etc