<u>Project: IEEE P802.15 Working Group for Wireless Personal Area Networks (WPANs)</u> Submission Title: [Two Hopeful Technologies for TG4a --- DS-UWB and CS-UWB] Date Submitted: [05, November, 2004]

**Source:** [Huan-Bang Li, Kenichi Takizawa, Shigenobu Sasaki, Shinsuke Hara, Makoto Itami Tetsushi Ikegami, and Ryuji Kohno]

Company [National Institute of Information and Communications Technology (NICT)] E-Mail: [lee@nict.go.jp]

**Re:** [ ]

**Abstract** [This document has been prepared for an official proposal in January 2005. Two possible technologies of direct-sequence UWB(DS-UWB) and chirp-signal UWB(CS-UWB) are investigated in performance on BER, ranging resolution, complexity, power consumption, SOP and so on. The performance comparison is concluded by a few differences in performance but we need to modify these primitive technologies so as to match with requirements. ]

**Purpose:** [Providing technical contributions to IEEE 802.15.4a. ]

**Notice:** This document has been prepared to assist the IEEE P802.15. It is offered as a basis for discussion and is not binding on the contributing individual(s) or organization(s). The material in this document is subject to change in form and content after further study. The contributor(s) reserve(s) the right to add, amend or withdraw material contained herein.

**Release:** The contributor acknowledges and accepts that this contribution becomes the property of IEEE and may be made publicly available by P802.15.

# Two Hopeful Technologies for TG4a --- DS-UWB and CS-UWB

Huan-Bang Li, Kenichi Takizawa, Shigenobu Sasaki, Shinsuke Hara, Makoto Itami, Tetsushi Ikegami, and Ryuji Kohno

National Institute of Information and Communications Technology (NICT), Japan

### **Outline of presentation**

- Requirements of TG4a
- DS-UWB and CS-UWB (Chirp signal UWB)
  - ✓ Advantages of using DS-UWB and CS-UWB
  - ✓ Correlation characteristics
  - ✓ Coexistence
  - ✓ Frequency bandwidth
  - ✓ Link budget
  - ✓ Performance examples
  - ✓ Ranging issue
  - $\checkmark$  Summary and comparison

### Conclusion

## **Technical Requirements**

- Low complexity, low cost, and low power consumption.
- Precision ranging by PHY --- tens of centimeters.
- Communication distance is ~30m (can be extended)
- Better robustness and mobility than 802.15.4
- Low bit rate (individual link) >= 1 kbps.
- High bit rate (aggregated) >= 1 Mbps.

### Advantages

### Both DS-UWB and CS-UWB are available for

- High precision ranging
  - Be up to tens of centimeters
  - Depend on pulse width (bandwidth)
- Low complexity
  - Simple ADC (2 or 3-bit)
- High frequency efficiency
  - Uniform use of frequency within the band.
- High robustness against noise and multipath
  - Correlated processing
- Low power consumption

### **Generation of CS-UWB**

• CS-UWB can be generated by passing a pulse signal through a distributed delay line(DDL) such as a SAW DDL.



## **Correlated processing**

• Correlated processing produces not only high precision ranging but also robustness against noise and multipath.



### **Characteristics of correlation**



### **Cross correlation coefficient**



### Coexistence

• Coexistence between DS-UWB and CS-UWB



# **Robustness against multipath**



Due to the good correlation characteristics, correlator can detect a signal even under heavy multipath channel.

# Frequency Band

 We consider the use of UWB band here, and give examples of link budgets for use of the following two bandwidth.

BW=2 GHz (3.1GHz – 5.1GHz)

BW=500 MHz (3.1GHz - 3.6GHz)



#### November 2004

### DS-UWB Link Budget (BW=2GHz)

Parameter	Value	Value	Notes
Data rate (Rb)	1	1024	(kbps)
Modulation	BPSK		Coherent detection
Coding rate (R)	1/2		(24,12)-Extended Golay Hard- decision decoding
Raw Symbol rate (Rs)	2	2048	Rs=Rb/R (ksymbol/second)
Pulse duration (Tp)	0.662		(ns)
Spreading code length (Ns)	1024	64	
Chip rate (Rc)	2.048	131.072	=Rs*Ns (MHz)
Chip duration	488.3	7.63	=1/Rc (nsec)

Parameter	Value	Value	Unit
Distance (d)	30	10	m
Peak payload bit rate (Rb)	1	1024	kbps
Average Tx power (Pt)	-10.5		dBm
Tx antenna gain (Gt)	-3.	00	dBi
Frequency Band	3.1 -	5.1	GHz
Geometric center frequency (fc)	3.9	98	GHz
Path loss @ 1m (L1)	(L1) 44.43		dB
Path loss @ d m (Ld) 29.54 20.00		dB	
Rx antenna gain (Gr)	-3.00		dBi
Rx power (Pr)	-90.47	-80.93	dBm
Average noise power per bit (N)	-144.00	-113.90	dBm
Rx Noise Figure (Nf)7.00		dB	
Average noise power per bit (Pn)	-137.00	-106.90	dBm
Minimum required Eb/N0 (S) 6.25		dB	
Implementation loss (I)	3.00		dB
Link Margin	37.28	16.72	dB
Min. Rx Sensitivity Level	-127.75	-97.65	dBm

## DS-UWB Link Budget (BW=500MHz)

Parameter	Value	Value	Notes
Data rate (Rb)	1	1024	(kbps)
Modulation	BPSK		Coherent detection
Coding rate (R)	1/2		(24,12)-Extended Golay Hard- decision decoding
Raw Symbol rate (Rs)	2	2048	Rs=Rb/R (ksymbol/second)
Pulse duration (Tp)	2.649	2.649	(ns)
Spreading code length (Ns)	1024	64	
Chip rate (Rc)	2.048	131.072	=Rs*Ns (MHz)
Chip duration	488.3	7.63	=1/Rc (nsec)

Parameter	Value	Value	Unit
Distance (d)	30	10	m
Peak payload bit rate (Rb)	1	1024	kbps
Average Tx power (Pt)	-10	dBm	
Tx antenna gain (Gt)	-3.	.00	dBi
Frequency band	3.1	- 3.6	GHz
Geometric center frequency (fc)	3.	34	GHz
Path loss @ 1m (L1)	42	.92	dB
Path loss @ d m (Ld)	29.54 20.00		dB
Rx antenna gain (Gr)	-3.00		dBi
Rx power (Pr)	-95.36 -85.82		dBm
Average noise power per bit (N)	-144.00 -113.90		dBm
Rx Noise figure (Nf)	7.	dB	
Average noise power per bit (Pn)	-137.00 -106.90		dBm
Minimum required Eb/N0 (S)	6.25		dB
Implementation loss (I)	3.00		dB
Link Margin	32.39	11.83	dB
Min. Rx Sensitivity Level	-127.75	-97.65	dBm

Slide 14 Li, Takizawa, Sasaki, Hara, Itami, Ikegami, Kohno, NICT

## CS-UWB Link Budget (BW=2GHz)

Parameter	Value	Value	Notes
Data rate (Rb)	1	1024	(kbps)
Modulation	Bl	PSK	Coherent detection
Coding rate (R)	1/2		(24,12)-Extended Golay Hard- decision decoding
Raw Symbol rate (Rs)	2	2048	Rs=Rb/R (ksymbol/s)
Chirp signal duration (Tc)	100		(ns)
Spreading code length (Ns)	1024	4	
Chip rate (Rc)	2.048	8.192	=Rs*Ns (MHz)
Chip duration	488.3	122.1	=1/Rc (nsec)

Parameter	Value	Value	Unit
Distance (d)	30	10	m
Peak payload bit rate (Rb)	1	1024	kbps
Average Tx power (Pt)	-1(	).5	dBm
Tx antenna gain (Gt)	-3.	00	dBi
Frequency band	3.1 -	5.1	GHz
Geometric center frequency (fc)	3.9	98	GHz
Path loss @ 1m (L1)	44.43		dB
Path loss @ d m (Ld)	oss @ d m (Ld) 29.54 20.00		dB
Rx antenna gain (Gr)	-3.00		dBi
Rx power (Pr)	-90.47	-80.93	dBm
Average noise power per bit (N)	-144.00	-113.90	dBm
Rx Noise figure (Nf)	7.00		dB
Average noise power per bit (Pn)	-137.00	-106.90	dBm
Minimum required Eb/N0 (S)	num required Eb/N0 (S) 6.25		dB
Implementation loss (I)	3.50		dB
Link Margin	36.78	16.22	dB
Min. Rx Sensitivity Level	-127.25	-97.15	dBm

Slide 15 Li, Takizawa, Sasaki, Hara, Itami, Ikegami, Kohno, NICT

## CS-UWB Link Budget (BW=500MHz)

Parameter	Value	Value	Notes
Data rate (Rb)	1	1024	(kbps)
Modulation	BPSK		Coherent detection
Coding rate (R)	1/2		(24,12)-Extended Golay Hard- decision decoding
Raw Symbol rate (Rs)	2	2048	Rs=Rb/R (ksymbol/s)
Chirp signal duration (Tc)	25		(ns)
Spreading code length (Ns)	1024	16	
Chip rate (Rc)	2.048	32.768	=Rs*Ns (MHz)
Chip duration	488.3	30.5	=1/Rc (nsec)

Parameter	Value	Value	Unit
Distance (d)	30	10	m
Peak payload bit rate (Rb)	1	1024	kbps
Average Tx power (Pt)	-16.9		dBm
Tx antenna gain (Gt)	-3.	00	dBi
Frequency band	3.1 -	- 3.6	GHz
Geometric center frequency (fc)	3.	34	GHz
Path loss @ 1m (L1)	42.92		dB
Path loss @ d m (Ld)	29.54 20.00		dB
Rx antenna gain (Gr)	-3.00		dBi
Rx power (Pr)	-95.36	-85.82	dBm
Average noise power per bit (N)	-144.00	-113.90	dBm
Rx Noise figure (Nf)	7.00		dB
Average noise power per bit (Pn)	-137.00 -106.90		dBm
Minimum required Eb/N0 (S) 6.25		25	dB
Implementation loss (I)	3.50		dB
Link Margin	31.89	11.33	dB
Min. Rx Sensitivity Level	-127.25	-97.15	dBm

Slide 16 Li, Takizawa, Sasaki, Hara, Itami, Ikegami, Kohno, NICT

### Simulation results (Single link)



### Simulation results (Single link)



### **Simulation block diagram for SOP**



### Simulation results for SOP



# Ranging issue

- Ranging precision depends on the frequency bandwidth used.
- Using a simple TOA, DS-UWB provides better precision than CS-UWB in principle.

# **DS-UWB and CS-UWB Summary**

++ good, + fair

	DS-UWB	CS-UWB
Low complexity	++	+
Peak-to- average ratio	+	++
Effect of SOP	+	++
Ranging precision	++	+

### Conclusions

- DS-UWB and CS-UWB are good candidates for 15.4a.
  - Have similar characteristics and advantages.
  - Present similar performances but have own strength at different aspects.
  - Can be further improved
- Both can meet the Technical Requirements.
  - Low complexity, low cost, low power consumption.
  - Precision ranging.
  - Robustness.
- More studies are on going and will be presented at January meeting.