

## “IEEE 802.11b Wireless Class Room Network Performance and Methodology”

Dr. Atul M. Gonsai (Asst. Prof.)

Department of Computer Science, Saurashtra University Rajkot, Gujarat  
[atulgosai@yahoo.com](mailto:atulgosai@yahoo.com)

### Abstract

The advent of mobile computers and wireless networks enables the deployment of wireless servers and clients in short-lived ad hoc network environments, such as classroom area networks. This paper outlines wireless network infrastructure establishment in a classroom environment and provides experimental methodology and test site for an ad hoc IEEE 802.11b wireless LAN, using a wireless-enabled server, several wireless clients, and a wireless network analyzer. The experimental focus is on the wireless performance and network throughput achievable in the wireless classroom area network environment.

### Key Words

Wireless network performance, delay, throughput, bandwidth, error rate, network protocol, network measurement

### 1 Introduction

Wireless LANs (Local Area Networks) are typically installed and maintained by Information Technology (IT) staff members. These types of individuals do not generally possess detailed knowledge of wireless network performance or even a basic idea of the coverage area they can expect to achieve with a wireless LAN network. This is especially difficult because wireless networks can often experience an unexpected RF (radio frequency) environment when they are used indoors.

For this reason this paper has suggested a methodology to conclude optimum model

out of a set of models and it can be used to evaluate throughput based on indoor RF propagation. The models can be used to evaluate the throughput by any user at any location in the coverage area of a wireless LAN access point. This paper also analysis measurement campaign results of actual wireless LANs by other researcher and the methods used to calculate the parameters of the empirical throughput.

### 2 Network Performance Statistics

The literature on wireless LAN network performance present measurements using various different statistics. The different network statistics used are often ill-defined. For this reason, this paper defines the different statistics as they will be used.

#### Delay: Latency and Round Trip Time

One of the key statistics used in evaluating the performance of a network connection is the delay experienced by data which travels from one host to another. The term latency is used to describe this concept. However, care must be taken in the use of the term because it is not always clear whether latency refers to the time to travel from one host to another, or the time required in transmitting a packet and receiving an acknowledgment, or some other delay. A related term to latency is the round trip time (RTT) of a network connection. The RTT of a connection is the time required for a data packet to travel from one host to another and to return back to the original host. Latency and round trip times are

typically measured in milliseconds for IP-based networks.

### **Throughput**

Throughput is a measurement of the average rates that data (in bits) that can be sent between a one user and another and is typically reported in kilobits per second or megabits per second. As with latency, care must be taken in the definition of this term. The throughput of the same network connection can vary greatly depending on the protocol used for transmission (e.g., UDP, TCP, etc.), the type of data traffic being sent (e.g., HTTP, FTP, VoIP or other traffic) as well as the quality and data bandwidth of a network connection. This is quite different from latency which generally does not vary for different protocols or traffic types. Throughput is measured at the highest protocol level possible to reflect as accurately as possible the performance that will be experienced a user. Throughput is, thus, computed using the amount of data in the payload area of the highest protocol layer (e.g., the UDP payload size) of the transmitted packets. Overhead due to protocol headers and checksums are not included in the calculations of throughput.

### **Data Bandwidth**

The data bandwidth or channel data rate is the maximum available, raw rate at which data can be transmitted over a network connection. The data bandwidth of a connection is similar to the throughput of a connection except that the data bandwidth is the theoretical maximum rate at which data can be transmitted if all of the overhead and checksums of the protocols used is included and the multiple access protocol is completely efficient. Like throughput, data

bandwidth is measured in units of bits per second or bps. However, the data bandwidth of a network connection is always larger than the measured throughput of the connection? For example, wireless LAN connections with 11 Mbps data bandwidths have been measured to have throughputs of 2 Mbps.

### **Error Rates**

The error rate of a data connection, until recently, has not been a common metric of the network performance of a connection. Packets can be lost by routers over long trips across backbone networks due to collisions, but over short, LAN connections, typical wired or fiber optic transmission mediums have raw bit error rates on the order of  $10^{-6}$  to as low as  $10^{-14}$ . With the addition of error checking in many packet transmission protocols, bit errors in wired and fiber-based data transmissions are insignificant and, therefore, not often measured for local area networks. However, with the growing popularity of Voice over IP (VoIP), real-time video streaming and the use of wireless in data networks has meant that data packets are often dropped or excessively delayed with respect to the real-time requirements or shortcomings in wireless media. Thus, the error rate of a network connection is of importance. This has resulted in increased interest in bit error rates and packet error rates. The Bit Error Rate (BER) is the percentage of bits that are received in error or not received of those that are sent. The Packet Error Rate (PER) is the percentage of packets that are dropped or received incorrectly of those that are sent. Care must be exercised in the use the term BER because it can be used to imply the percentage of errors in only the payload data bits (e.g., excluding the header, footer and checksum bits) or to the raw data bits (e.g.,

including all overhead and non payload data bits).

### Delay Variation or Jitter

Delay variation or jitter is an important metric for quantifying data network performance, especially for VoIP and video streaming applications in which the protocol relies on regular arrival rates of data packets. As a result, the delay of a packet sent from one host to another is extremely important, but so is the Delay Variation or Jitter. The delay variation or jitter of a packet is defined to be of the average variation in the arrival time of a packet and is reported in milliseconds or other appropriate time scale [1].

### 3 Network Protocols

The overwhelming majority of network measurements are carried out using either Transmission Control Protocol (TCP) or User Datagram Protocol (UDP) packets. This is not surprising since most of the traffic on the Internet consists of mainly these two protocols. UDP or User Datagram Protocol is a simple protocol. UDP does not guarantee whether or not packets will arrive, or if they do arrive they are not guaranteed to arrive in the order they were sent. In either case the sender will not receive an acknowledgment of the transmission. These characteristics makes UDP ideal for video or voice streaming applications in which retransmissions and acknowledgments are a waste of bandwidth and the transmissions can make use of the low overhead associated with UDP. TCP or Transmission Control Protocol guarantees that packets arrive and arrive in the order transmitted. TCP also attempts to avoid network congestion by sometimes delaying the transmission of packets. TCP however has a higher overhead than UDP. This overhead is not

significantly larger than for UDP though, so it is widely used in non-streaming applications.

### 4 Network Performance Measurement Techniques

There are many techniques and software tools available to measure the network performance of any data network which supports Internet Protocol (IP) transmissions, such as IEEE 802.11 wireless LANs. However, a relatively small number of methods have been applied to the actual measurement of wireless networks. This section outlines some of the popular techniques for wireless LAN measurement and the prior research that has gone into measuring the performance of wireless LAN connections. Additional information about how each of these techniques has been used in the literature is shown in following Table

Measurement Technique or Software	Prediction Technique	Reference
A variant of ttcp, a UNIX, command line based program	None	[2]
Test file transfer using FTP	None	[3]
Test file transfer using FTP	None	[4]
Chariot 3.1, Test Packet Based Software	Test Packet Based Software	[5]
Harris WLAN Evaluation Software, Test Packet Based Software	Predicted minimum adjacent channel interference power ratio for different channel settings	[6]

Table 1: Network Performance Measurement Techniques Used in Wireless LAN Research

Due to the diverse array of techniques available for the measurement of network performance statistics, an overview of the popular techniques is presented here. The following network performance measurement techniques and software products are intended to quantify the network performance of the network connection between two hosts. In general, the measurement solutions will send some

sort of test data from one host to another using a certain protocol and a certain test pattern. Measurements are repeatedly made of the test data and then averaged for better accuracy.

### **UNIX Command Line Based Software**

There are several command line utilities that run under UNIX operating systems. These command line utilities are simple and intuitive to use (for individuals familiar with IP networks), and are often used to quickly test and diagnose problems with networks on a daily basis. Some examples of these programs include ping, and TTCN, but there are great deals of others. Ping is a simple program that allows the user to send packets to a specific Internet host which acknowledges the packet. Ping allows the user to control the size of the data in a packet and to send repeated packets. However, the accuracy of Ping is low (on the order of 1 millisecond for the latency) and it is only capable of measuring the average latency for a packet to travel from one host to another and the packet error rate. Ping has the advantage of not requiring a second software program to answer the test packets sent by the originating host since this is done by the operating system software. Alternatively, TTCN sends packets from one host to another and provides users with significantly more control of the way packets are sent between two hosts. TTCN allows the user to transmit data using the TCP or the UDP protocol and measures the latency and throughput of a network connection.

### **File Transfers Using FTP**

A simple and inexpensive method for measuring the throughput of a connection is available using FTP software. In this technique, test files of a known size are

transferred from one host to another host. The time required to transfer the file is then used to calculate the throughput. This technique, however, does not give any information about the latency of the connection. In addition, it is limited in that most of the data is sent in a single direction, and has a steady stream of maximally sized packets sent continuously. Thus, the measured throughput using this technique tends to be optimistic because many network applications have vastly different network traffic characteristics, including packet size variations and fewer unidirectional transfers of data.

### **Test Packet Based Measurement Software and Chariot software Tool**

Chariot is a popular network measurement software tool. The from NetIQ Corporation, is representative of a class of network measurement software packages that precisely control the characteristics of test packets sent over a connection to measure a range of network performance statistics. Chariot is capable of emulating a wide range of traffic types, such as Web traffic or Voice over IP traffic, and a wide range of network protocols such as TCP, UDP and IPX [7]. For any of these protocols or traffic types, Chariot can measure the throughput, latency, jitter, and packet error rates [7]. The advantage of a software product such as Chariot is accurate control of the test traffic, combined with the ability to measure a wide range of network performance statistics. The difficulty with these types of products is that they can often be too costly for research and, thus, are not necessarily practical to use as a standard for comparing network performance.

## **5 Network Performance Measurements and Prediction Research**

This part presents the survey of some of the research on wireless LAN network performance measurement, prediction and modeling. None of these references present a simple means for predicting the throughput or other network performance statistic. However, the diverse array of research does show how measurements of the network performance of wireless data networks have been performed. Additionally, several papers indicate the plausibility of predicting throughput based on a small number of parameters such as the path loss at a receiver location.

### **BER and Throughput Correlation to Delay Spread**

Maeda, Takaya and Kuwabara published a measurement of wireless LAN performance and the validity of a ray-tracing technique to predict the performance of a wireless LAN [8]. The measurements were tracked in a small, highly-controlled radio frequency (RF) environment and indicated that the wireless LAN throughput and BER were correlated to the delay spread of the wireless channel. The researchers have not, however, presented any way to actually predict the bit error rate or throughput from the predicted delay spread profile output by a ray-tracing technique.

### **Early Wireless LAN Network Performance Measurements**

Xylomenos and Polyzos explored the performance of UDP and TCP packets sent over several fixed IEEE 802.11 wireless LAN network connections in [9] and [2]. The research focused on throughput limitations caused by software

implementation issues and operating system shortcomings. The researchers used their own modified version of the command line utilities `ttcp`, `tcpdump` and `nstat` under Linux to perform UDP and TCP throughput tests. All measurements were taken between three fixed locations and focused on varying the wireless LAN card types (PCMCIA or ISA) and the end-user computer hardware (i.e., Pentium 150 with 48 MB of RAM versus a Pentium 200 MMX with 64 MB of RAM). The researchers make recommendations for changes in the implementation of network protocols and Linux operating system enhancements. The measurements did not consider the effects of different physical locations, signal strength, or the effect of variations in the wireless communications channel on the network throughput.

### **IEEE 802.11 Throughput Measurements in a Hallway**

Duchamp and Reynolds presented packet throughput measurement results for varying distances for IEEE 802.11 wireless LANs [10]. These measurements were performed in a single hallway. Thus, these measurements, too, suffer from failing to measure a representative environment. The researchers do not present a model to predict their results nor do they attempt to validate any sort of computer prediction technique. Their work does not consider multiple users and was more focused on estimating the potential range of the wireless LAN in a nearly free space environment.

### **Idealized Wireless LAN Performance Measurements**

Bing presented measured results of the performance of an IEEE 802.11 Wireless LAN. In [11], Bing presents delay and throughput measurements as well as theoretically based throughput and delay

estimations for various wireless LAN configurations. The results are given as optimal results and were measured on a lab bench rather than in an actual building environment. Therefore, the results presented are an upper bound on best possible results and do not extend into a site-specific wireless LAN performance prediction technique.

### **Causes of Throughput Variation in IEEE 802.11 Networks**

Demir, Komar, and Ersoy compared the effects of different system configuration factors on IEEE 802.11, 2-Mbps DSSS wireless LAN performance as measured by throughput [4]. The authors measured the throughput of an FTP-based file transfer and the signal strength percentage reported by the wireless LAN card hardware for 1, 2 and 3 simultaneous users. The authors used a 2k factorial design and sign table, which is a technique to determine what factors have the most significant impact on the throughput experienced by a wireless LAN user. The authors considered the SNR, the number of simultaneous users, and the file size used in the data transfer. The authors concluded that the number of simultaneous users has the greatest effect on the throughput experienced by a single user, that the SNR level had a moderate effect on throughput, and that the file size had no effect on the throughput. The difficulty with these results is that the authors have not used their data to present a model for predicting throughput; the SNR measurements are for an arbitrary, unknown vendor.

### **Wireless LAN Performance Issues**

Prasad, review many of the important factors in wireless LAN deployment, including a basic review of the IEEE 802.11 standard, standard indoor propagation

models and interference and coexistence concerns with wireless LANs [12]. The authors also present some measurement results, although without any information about how the results were produced, in which an IEEE 802.11b wireless LAN user's throughput is compared to the received signal strength. The results show that the user achieves a consistent throughput of about 4.8 Mbps until the received signal strength reaches about -85 dBm. From this point, the throughput in Mbps falls in an almost linear fashion relative to the dBm value of the received signal strength until it reaches zero at approximately -97 dBm. These results seem reasonable for a single user in a highly controlled environment.

### **Multiple-User Measurements of a Wireless LAN**

Chariot was used by Kamerman and Aben to measure the throughput for on a wireless LAN using TCP packet transfers for each of the four data bandwidths defined in the IEEE 802.11b standard [5]. The authors performed the measurements for 1, 3 and 5 simultaneous users and compared it to an analysis of the data bandwidth which is used by various overhead, collisions and unused bandwidth. The authors claim a maximum actual throughput of 0.82, 1.52, 3.41 and 5.17 Mbps for the data bandwidths of 1, 2, 5.5 and 11 Mbps, respectively. It should be noted that these results are for ideal RF scenarios in which the data bandwidth has been forced to a desired setting.

### **Impact of Using Overlapping DSSS Channels in Close Proximity**

An exhaustive means of evaluating the interference between overlapping DSSS channels of IEEE 802.11 access points has been performed by Leskaroski and Mikael

[6]. In this work, the authors used a simple network measurement tool called LANEval which was available from Harris/Intersil, the maker of several popular wireless LAN chipsets. The measurement tool sends test packets from a client to a server and quantifies the throughput on the link between the two hosts. The authors have used this tool to measure the performance of a wireless LAN link operating on channel 1 in the presence of another interfering LAN operating on a varying channel between 1 and 6. The authors have used this data to calculate a minimum path loss between clients that allows the clients to operate without significant impact on the throughput of one another. This is an extremely useful and practical result [13].

## 6 Experimental Setup

Our network traffic measurement experiments are conducted on an IEEE 802.11b wireless LAN in a classroom at the Saurashtra University Rajkot Gujarat. The configuration, shown in Figure 1, consists of about 8 mobile clients and one server. In addition, we use a wireless network analyzer to monitor the wireless channel.

The server machine is a Zenith running Window2003 with 800 MHz Pentium III. Most of the client machines are similarly configured but running the Windows 2000 operating system. Two Compaq machine running clients with windows XP were also used.

Each wireless device (server and clients) has a D-link wireless card DWL +520 Series Adapter for access to the IEEE 802.11b wireless LAN. The wireless cards are configured to operate in ad hoc mode. For simplicity, we do not consider node

mobility, multihop, or ad hoc routing issues in our experiments.




Figure 1: Experimental Setup for Wireless Classroom Network Traffic Measurements

Network traffic measurements are collected using a wireless network analyzer. Decoding of the captured traces enables protocol analysis at the MAC, IP, TCP, and HTTP layers. These traces are used to assess wireless channel contention, TCP protocol behaviors, and HTTP transaction performance.

## 7 Conclusions

After extensive review of the current research into wireless LANs, it can be concluded that there is a need for simple, target throughput prediction models. Further, the ability to predict the throughput of a wireless LAN in different locations can be critical to design of an efficient wireless network. For this reason, this paper focuses on first developing a means to measure realistic, non-optimistic, site-specific throughput, testing this measurement technique with an extensive measurement campaign, and creating throughput prediction models to allow wireless LAN design using throughput as a design parameter.

## Reference

- [1] Feigin, J.; Pahlavan, K. "Measurement of Characteristics of Voice Over IP in Wireless LAN Environment," IEEE International Workshop on Mobile Multimedia Communications, 1999. (MoMuC '99), p236-240.
- [2] Xylomenos, G.; Polyzos, G. C. "TCP And UDP Performance Over A Wireless LAN," Eighteenth Annual Joint Conference of the IEEE Computer and Communications Societies, Proceedings. (INFOCOM '99), Vol. 2, p. 439-446, 1999.
- [3] Takaya, K.; Maeda, Y.; "Experimental And Theoretical Evaluation Of Interference Characteristics Between 2.4-GHz ISM-Band Wireless LANs," IEEE International Symposium on Electromagnetic Compatibility, 1998, Vol. 1, p. 80-85, 1998.
- [4] Demir, T.; Komar, C.; Ersoy, C. "Measured Performance of an IEEE 802.11 Wireless LAN," Proceedings of the Fifteenth International Symposium on Computer and Information Sciences, Istanbul, Turkey. p. 246-254, Oct 2000.
- [5] Kamerman, A.; Aben, G. "Throughput performance of wireless LANs operating at 2.4 and 5 GHz," Personal, Indoor and Mobile Radio Communications, 2000, The 11th IEEE International Symposium on, (PIMRC 2000), Vol 1, p. 190-195, 2000.
- [6] Leskaroski, D; Mikael, W. B. "Frequency Planning and Adjacent Channel Interference in a DSSS Wireless Local Area Network," Wireless Personal Communications: Bluetooth Tutorial and Other Technologies, p. 169-180, 2001.
- [7] <http://www.netiq.com/Products/Network Performance/Chariot/Default.asp>. "NetIQ Products - Chariot" Downloaded on: June 14, 2001.
- [8] Maeda, Y.; Takaya, K.; Kuwabara, N. "Experimental Investigation of Propagation Characteristics of 2.4 GHz ISM-Band Wireless LAN in Various Indoor Environments," IEICE Transactions in Communications, Vol. E82-B, No. 10, Oct 1999.
- [9] Xylomenos, G.; Polyzos, G. C. "Internet Protocol Performance Over Networks With Wireless Links," IEEE Network, Vol. 13, Iss 4, p. 55-63, July-Aug 1999.
- [10] Duchamp, D.; Reynolds, N. F., "Measured Performance of a Wireless LAN," Local Computer Networks, 1992. Proceedings., 17th Conference on. p. 494-499, 1992.
- [11] Bing, B. "Measured Performance of the IEEE 802.11 Wireless LAN," Local Computer Networks, 1999. Conference on. (LCN '99). p. 34-42. 1999.
- [12] Prasad, A.R.; Prasad, N.R.; Kamerman, A.; Moelard, H.; Eikelenboom, A. "Indoor

Wireless LANs Deployment” Vehicular Technology Conference Proceedings, 2000. IEEE 51st, (VTC 2000-Spring Tokyo.), Vol. 2, p. 1562-1566, 2000.

[13] Benjamin E. Henty “Throughput Measurements and Empirical Prediction Models for IEEE 802.11b Wireless LAN (WLAN) Installations” Blacksburg, Virginia