

# Joint Scheduling and Channel Allocation in Wireless Mesh Networks

Nguyen H. Tran, Choong Seon Hong  
Department of Computer Engineering, Kyung Hee University  
Giheung, Yongin, Gyeonggi, 449-701 Korea  
Email: nguyenth@networking.khu.ac.kr, cshong@khu.ac.kr

**Abstract—** In wireless mesh network, efficient channel allocation and link scheduling is essential for throughput improvement. We investigate the problem of how to schedule a maximal set of feasible transmission under physical interference model by using the Spatial TDMA access scheme and channel allocation which relieves the interference effect between nearby transmissions. We also consider the fairness enhancement to prevent some border nodes of the network from starvation. By using Minimum Spanning Tree as network subgraph constructed from original network graph, we propose centralized algorithms for scheduling and channel allocation to maximize the aggregate throughput and to provide the fairness of the network. We also evaluate our algorithms through extensive simulations and the results show that our algorithms can achieve good performance.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Recently, several works have focused on many typical problems of Wireless Mesh Networks (WMNs) like channel allocation, routing, scheduling [4], [6], [8], [9], [13]. One of the important factors to improve the network capacity is spatial reuse [9], the total number of concurrent transmissions that can be accommodated in the network. Another popular MAC protocol that attracts most of the recent work is CSMA/CA proposed in IEEE 802.11 standard. But, due to its conservative mechanism with carrier sensing and collision avoidance characteristics, when a node transmits, a number of its neighbors must be inactivated. This leads to the fact that high traffic demand can not be satisfied, especially with WMN. In mesh networks, one of the major problems caused by concurrent transmissions is the reduction of capacity due to *interference*. Mesh routers with multiple radios can greatly alleviate this problem. With multiple radios, nodes can transmit and receive simultaneously or can transmit on multiple channels simultaneously. However, due to the limited number of channels available, the interference can not be completely eliminated. So an efficient channel allocation must be done to mitigate the effect of interference. Recently, most of the interest challenges relating to WMN have been investigated under two main interference models: *protocol* and *physical* interference models, which were first proposed in [12]. Until now, the protocol interference model mostly has been used due to the fact of its simplicity. In the physical

interference, the transmission between two nodes is successful if the SNIR at the receiver is not lower than a certain threshold. In this way, more than one transmission can take place as long as the condition of SNIR at the receivers is satisfied. We see that the characteristic of physical model is suitable with spatial reuse. Moreover, as the majority of traffic is transferred to and from gateways, traffic flows will likely aggregate at the mesh routers close to the gateways. Therefore, without effective channel allocation and scheduling algorithm, there is probably the data starvation of the mesh clients of border mesh routers. So, besides targeting to improve the overall throughput of the system, the transmission scheduling also takes into account the fairness problem to give the communications between border nodes a higher chance for transmission. Based on discussion above, we present two centralized heuristic algorithms. One of them is for channel allocation problem which efficiently mitigates the interference effect and the other is to address the problem of scheduling using STDMA access scheme under the physical interference model to reach the objective of throughput improvement with fairness for the system. We also present extensive simulation results to evaluate throughput improvement and fairness of our algorithms.

The remainder of our paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we summarize related work in the literature and highlight the major differences between existing work and our work. We state our models, assumptions and definitions in Section 3. Next, we describe our algorithms for scheduling and channel allocation in Section 4 and section 5. We evaluate the performance of our algorithm in Section 6. Finally, we present our conclusions and discuss the future work in Section 7.

## II. RELATED WORK

In literature, there are many works of scheduling mechanisms proposed for STDMA access scheme defined by Nelson and Kleinrock [7] for both protocol and physical interference model. Only a few works have considered physical interference in this context [1], [2], [3], [5]. In [2], Gronkvist and Hasson compare the use of physical interference in STDMA to an approach that considers interference up to a certain distance from a node. Jain et al. [5] consider throughput optimization by formulating the problem of scheduling under both protocol and physical interference model as an LP problem. However, this formulation can be

This research was supported by the MIC, Korea, under the ITRC support program supervised by the IITA (IITA-2006-(C1090-0602-0002)) and Dr. C.S Hong is the corresponding author.

computationally intensive to achieve close to optimal performance. About channel allocation problems, in [17], Ramachandran et al. presents an interference-aware channel allocation algorithm and protocol for multi-radio wireless mesh networks. His proposed solution assigns channels to radios to minimize interference within the mesh network and between the mesh network and co-located wireless networks. In [16], Brzezinski et al. considers the interaction between channel allocation and distributed scheduling in WMNs. Heuristic approaches [9], [10] on channel allocation and load-aware routing are proposed to improve the aggregate throughput of WMNs and balance load among gateways.

About the fairness problem, in [1], Ben Salem et al. propose a scheduling that ensures per-client fairness with solution assigns transmission rights to the links in a STDMA fashion and is collision-free by constructing maximal cliques. However, due to the fact that clique enumeration problem is proven to be NP-hard, her solution just can be used for small size WMNs. In [14], Jian Tang et al. consider the bandwidth allocation problem by using a simple max-min fairness model to achieve the tradeoff between maximizing throughput and enhancing the fairness. They address the problem by considering Lexicographical Max-Min bandwidth allocation under an interference constraint in a multi-channel multi-hop wireless network.

### III. SYSTEM MODEL, ASSUMPTIONS, AND DEFINITIONS

#### A. Network Model

We consider the backbone of WMN modeled by a *network graph*  $G(V, E)$ , where  $V$  is the set of nodes (mesh routers) and  $E$  is the set of links. We assume that time is slotted, denote by  $t$ , and that the packet length is normalized in order to be transmittable in a unit time slot. We denote  $Q_e(t)$  the number of packets waiting to be transmitted on link  $e$  by the end of time slot  $t$ , also known as queue length of  $e$ . In each period, the priority of a link will be based on its queue length at the end of previous period. Each node in the system is equipped with one or more wireless interface cards, referred to as radios in this paper. We assume there are  $K$  orthogonal channels are available in the network.

#### B. Interference Model

1) *Physical Interference Model*: Denoting  $RSS_j^i$  is the signal strength of node  $j$  when node  $i$  transmits to node  $j$ , and  $ISS_j^k$  is interfered signal strength from another node  $k$  also transmitting. Packets along the link  $(i, j)$  are correctly received if and only if:

$$\frac{RSS_j^i}{N + \sum_{k \in V_s} ISS_j^k} \geq \alpha \quad (1)$$

where  $N$  is the white noise,  $V_s$  is the subset of nodes in  $V$  that are transmitting concurrently, and  $\alpha$  is the threshold. The set of links that interfere with each other can be

represented by using *interference graph* [5].




Fig. 1. Network graph and weighted interference graph

2) *Interference graph*: In an interference graph, a node  $v'$  represents for the edge  $e$  in network graph and the directed edge between two nodes has a weight. This weight is the ratio of maximum permissible noise and interference level at the receiver of link contributed by other concurrent transmissions. The interference graph must be weighted because the more the links on the same channel are active concurrently, the more interference each link will be affected by each other until they become unacceptable for the packet reception at the receivers. Consider an example in Figure 1, the communications between node  $u$  and  $v$ ,  $i$  and  $j$  are on the same channel (the same red color). We can construct the interference graph based on the network graph as Figure 1(b). The weight value  $w_{e_2}^{e_1}$  represents for the interference contributed by  $e_1$  to  $e_2$  is:

$$w_{e_2}^{e_1} = \frac{\max(ISS_j^v, ISS_j^u)}{\frac{RSS_j^i}{\alpha} - N} \quad (2)$$

#### C. Conditions

Given the network graph  $G(V, E)$  and the interference graph  $G'(V', E')$  of a specific channel, we can find the conditions to determine whether a certain set of transmissions on the same channel  $G_T' = \{e_1, \dots, e_k\} \subseteq E$  is feasible.

*A necessary condition*: We observe that two links incident on the same node can not be activated simultaneously on the same channel. So the set  $G_T'$  is feasible only if none of its edges is incident with each other on the same node

*A sufficient condition*: Because each of links in  $G_T'$  interferes with each other, we have to check every receiver of all links whether its SNIR is above the desired threshold  $\alpha$ . In order for  $G_T'$  to be feasible, the condition on the SINR must be fulfilled at every receivers of all links in  $G_T'$ .

So, we can state the following corollary.

**COROLLARY 1.** *A set  $G_T' \in E$  of concurrent transmission on the same channel in a given network graph  $G(V, E)$  is feasible under physical interference model if every vertex of the corresponding interference graph  $G'(V', E')$  satisfies:*

$$\sum_{v_k \in V' - \{v\}} w_e^{e_k} \leq 1 \quad (3)$$

Proof: We have the set of links  $\{e_k = (i_k, j_k), k = 1, 2, \dots\}$  transmitting concurrently with link  $e = (i, j)$ . Therefore, in respective interference graph, we will have of all edges incident on  $v$  represents all interfering signals of all links  $e_1, \dots, e_k$  to link  $e$ . From Eq.(1), packets are received correctly at receiver of link  $e$  when:

$$\frac{RSS_j^i}{N + \sum_{(i_k, j_k) \in G_T'} ISS_j^{i_k}} \geq \alpha$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{\sum_{(i_k, j_k) \in G_T'} ISS_j^{i_k}}{RSS_j^i - N} \leq 1 \Leftrightarrow \sum_{v_k \in V' - \{v\}} w_e^{e_k} \leq 1. \quad \square$$

#### IV. FAIR SCHEDULING ALGORITHM

In this section, we present a greedy algorithm to construct a feasible schedule for a set of transmissions under physical interference model. Instead of considering for the whole network, proposed algorithm just investigates in a subgraph. The reason is to improve the fairness characteristic. If we consider the feasible schedule for whole network, the links close to gateways have higher priority will take over the right to be scheduled first. It leads to some links at the border of system may not have a chance to transmit the data. When setting feasible schedule for a subgraph in each period, the number of high priority links has been reduced, so the border links can transmit with higher probability. Consequently, we decide to choose Minimum Spanning Tree (MST) as the subgraph of the network graph  $G(V, E)$  in our algorithm because MST has all characteristics appropriate for the purpose of our algorithm. First, MST is a spanning subgraph that contains all vertices of  $G(V, E)$  so it gives an equal chance for all links incident with all nodes to be considered in each period of the schedule. Second, MST of a graph defines the cheapest subset of edges that keeps the graph in one connected component. So each link in a MST will have the higher priority than the others incident on the same node with it. It satisfies the condition that links with higher priority will be considered to be scheduled first. Finally, it can be computed quickly and easily, e.g. Kruskal's minimum spanning tree algorithm [15] can have the running time  $O(|E| \log |V|)$ . It's an important factor to reduce time complexity of our algorithm. Figure 2 is an example of MST (the bold lines) constructed from a WMN. There are total 7 links operating on channel 1 contend to be scheduled for whole network while in this MST, there are just 4 links. So with the priority criterion, links of border nodes will have

higher chance to be in a schedule. The fair scheduling algorithm is as follows.

1. Construct MST from network graph
- forall**  $k = 1..K$  orthogonal channels in the MST
2. Order the set of links on the same channel  $k$  according to the decrease of queue lengths.
3. Find the maximal feasible set  $E_M^k$ . Beginning with the highest queue length link, transform next ordering links into vertices of the interference graph until there is a link making the interference graph unsatisfied with corollary 1.
4. Schedule each link in  $E_M^k$  from slot 0 to slot  $Q_e(t)$ .

**endfor**

Finally, we have aperiodic time slotted schedules in which the set of feasible transmission satisfies corollary 1 in every slot. The length of a period depends on the link which has the maximum queue length in set  $E_M^k$ ,  $T = \max_{e \in E_M^k} Q_e(t)$  with  $k = 1..K$ . And the algorithm schedules each edge  $e$  of  $E_M^k$  in  $Q_e(t)$  time slots.




Fig. 2. A Minimum Spanning Tree of WMNs.

#### V. CHANNEL ALLOCATION ALGORITHM

The channel allocation algorithm is as follows.

- for**  $i =$  first-hop level to last-hop level from the gateway
- for all** links in  $i$ -hop level
1. sort links by increasing delay value
  2. assign higher capacity channels in  $K$  orthogonal channels to higher priority links that does not conflict with their neighbors
  3. **if** notfound channels in Step 2  
assign random channels
- endif**
- endfor**
- endfor**

The channel allocation problem for mesh networks is similar to the *list coloring* problem. The list coloring problem is NP-complete [15]. Therefore, we rely on an approximate algorithm for channel allocation. Our channel allocation

algorithm is also based on the MST subgraph of network graph. The rationale behind the use of MST subgraph is intuitive: we still satisfy our goal described in previous section of giving channel allocation priority to links starting from the gateway and then in decreasing levels of priority to links fanning outward towards the edge of the network. Before using the channel allocation algorithm, the gateway uses the neighbor information collected from all routers to get the link delay information. Neighbor information sent by a router can contain the identity of its neighbors delay to each neighbor. The channel allocation algorithm is summarized above. The algorithm starts with all links emanating from the gateway which we called the first-hop level links. These links are sorted by increasing delay values (step 1). The link delay can be calculated using the Expected Transmission Time (ETT) metric [13]. ETT of a link is derived from the link's bandwidth and loss rate. A more detailed description of the metric can be found in [13]. This sort is performed in order to give higher priority to the better links emanating from the gateway. After that, it will assign the channel having better capacity to the link having higher priority that will not conflict with channel allocations of its neighbors to mitigate the effect of interference (step 2). If a non-conflicting channel is not available, a channel will be chosen randomly to be assigned (Step 3). The algorithm continues with links of second-hop level until the last-hop level, gradually fan-out from the gateway to border mesh routers.

## VI. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

In this section, through simulation, we evaluate the performance of our algorithms by comparing with the algorithms of Alicherry, et al. [4], which use 802.11 CSMA/CA access scheme, whose behavior is similar to protocol interference model. We present two sets of simulation results. The first set evaluates throughput improvement and the second set evaluates the fairness. We have implemented our algorithm in ns-2 (ver2.29). In particular, we have modified in ns-2 such that the interference perceived at a receiver is the collective aggregate interference from all the concurrent transmissions. There's a complete 802.11 MAC model in ns-2. We use two-ray propagation model. In case of 802.11, each node has the transmission range of  $150\text{ m}$ , carrier sense range of  $300\text{ m}$ . The simulations are carried out for a  $800 \times 800\text{ m}^2$  area in which 50 nodes are placed randomly. We use the default transmission rates 11 Mbps to reflect realistic 802.11b data rates. We also use constant bit rate (CBR) over UDP and use Adhoc On-demand Distance Vector (AODV) as the base routing protocol. We choose Kruskal's algorithm [15] to construct the MST from the network for our algorithms.

### A. Throughput Improvement Evaluation

We compare our algorithms and 802.11 based on the effect number of channels and number of radios. We vary the number of orthogonal channels available from 1 to 8 and the number of radios is from 1 to 4 respectively. From Figure 3, we see that our algorithm can exploit effectively the increasing number of channels with different number of radios. For

example, as the number of channels goes from 1 to 8, the network throughput goes from 1.3 Mbps to 4.6 Mbps, from 2.9 Mbps to 11.7 Mbps, from 5.8 Mbps to 16.86 Mbps and from 6.75 Mbps to 18.9 Mbps in case of 1, 2, 3 and 4 radios respectively. Compared with 802.11, we can see the average increase of our algorithms is respectively 45%, 36%, 30% and 25%.




Fig. 3. Throughput Improvement Evaluation




Fig. 4. Fairness Evaluation

### B. Fairness Evaluation

To evaluate the fairness of our algorithms and 802.11, we compare the aggregate throughput of nodes starting from the border of network towards the nodes which are near the gateway. Therefore, the nodes are sorted with the order of increasing queue length. We also vary number of radios (2 and 4 radios) to show their effects on fairness evaluation. We choose the fixed number of orthogonal channels in the network  $K = 8$ . From Figure 4, it can be observed that the border nodes throughput of our algorithm is higher than that of 802.11. The number of nodes which are starved in case of 802.11 is significant (nearly 20 nodes). With our algorithm, the fairness has been improved much when the border nodes still can transmit the data.

## VII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have investigated how to assign channels and how to schedule links in WMNs by using STDMA access scheme under physical interference model. We proposed heuristic algorithms to solve this problem. Our algorithms not only improves system throughput but also guarantees the fairness for all nodes in the system, which are proven through extensive simulations.

We have identified several future research avenues. One of them is the possibility to joint our fair scheduling and channel allocation algorithm with routing to give the better performance. Another interesting problem to be addressed is developing distributed algorithms to reduce the overhead of exchanging interference measurement information between gateway and mesh routers.

## REFERENCES

- [1] N. Ben Salem, J.P. Hubaux, "A Fair Scheduling for Wireless Mesh Networks", Proc. IEEE Workshop on Wireless Mesh Networks (WiMesh), 2005.
- [2] J. Gronkvist and A. Hansson, "Comparison Between Scheduling," Proc. MobiHoc 2001, pp. 255–258.
- [3] J. Gronkvist, J. Nilsson, and D. Yuan, "Throughput of Optimal Spatial Reuse TDMA for Wireless Ad-Hoc Networks," Proc. IEEE Vehicular Technology Conference, pp. 2156–2160, 2004.
- [4] M. Alicherry, R. Bathia, L. Li, "Joint Channel Assignment and Routing for Throughput Optimization in Multi-Radio Wireless Mesh Networks", Proc. ACM Mobicom, pp. 58–72, 2005.
- [5] K. Jain, J. Padhye, V. Padmanabhan, L. Qiu, "Impact of Interference on Multi-Hop Wireless Network Performance", Proc. ACM Mobicom, pp. 66–80, 2003.
- [6] M. Kodialam, T. Nandagopal, "Characterizing the Capacity Region in Multi-Radio Multi-Channel Wireless Mesh Networks", Proc. ACM Mobicom, pp. 73–87, 2005.
- [7] R. Nelson and L. Kleinrock, "Spatial-TDMA: A Collision-free Multihop Channel Access Protocol," IEEE Trans. on Communication, Vol. 33, pp. 934–944, Sept. 1985.
- [8] J. Tang, G. Xue, W. Zhang, "Interference-Aware Topology Control and QoS Routing in Multi-Channel Wireless Mesh Networks", Proc. ACM MobiHoc, pp. 68–77, 2005.
- [9] A. Raniwala, K. Gopalan, T. Chiueh, Centralized channel assignment and routing algorithms for multi-channel wireless mesh networks, ACM Mobile Computing and Communications Review (MC2R), Vol. 8(2), 2004, pp. 50–65.
- [10] A. Raniwala, T. Chiueh, "Architecture and Algorithms for an IEEE 802.11-Based Multi-Channel Wireless Mesh Networks", Proc. IEEE Infocom, pp. 2223–2234, 2005.
- [11] P. Kyasanur, N. Vaidya, "Routing and Interface Assignment in Multi-Channel Multi-Interface Wireless Networks", Proc. IEEE WCNC, 2005.
- [12] P. Gupta, P. R. Kumar, "The capacity of wireless networks", IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, Vol. 46(2), 2000, pp. 388–404.
- [13] R. Draves, J. Padhye, and B. Zill, "Routing in multi-radio, multi-hop wireless mesh networks", Proceedings of ACM MobiCom'2004, pp. 114–128.
- [14] J. Tang, G. Xue, W. Zhang, "Maximum throughput and fair bandwidth allocation in multi-channel wireless mesh networks", Proceedings of IEEE INFOCOM'2006, pp. 568–578.
- [15] Thomas H. Cormen, Charles E. Leiserson, Ronald L. Rivest, Clifford Stein, Introduction to Algorithms (2nd Edition), MIT Press, September 2001.
- [16] A. Brzezinski, G. Zussman, E. Modiano, "Enabling Distributed Throughput Maximization in Wireless Mesh Networks: A Partitioning Approach", Proc. ACM Mobicom, (2006).
- [17] K. Ramachandran, M. Buddhikot, "Interference-Aware Channel Assignment in Multi-Radio Wireless Mesh Networks", Proc. of IEEE Infocom, (2006)