Axel Sikora   Marion Berbineau
Alexey Vinel   Magnus Jonsson
Alain Pirovano   Marina Aguado (Eds.)

Communication Technologies for Vehicles

6th International Workshop
Nets4Cars/Nets4Trains/Nets4Aircraft 2014
Offenburg, Germany, May 6–7, 2014
Proceedings

Springer

Axel Sikora Marion Berbineau
Alexey Vinel Magnus Jonsson
Alain Pirovano Marina Aguado (Eds.)

Communication Technologies for Vehicles

6th International Workshop
Nets4Cars/Nets4Trains/Nets4Aircraft 2014
Offenburg, Germany, May 6-7, 2014
Proceedings

Springer

Volume Editors

Axel Sikora
Offenburg University of Applied Sciences, Offenburg, Germany
E-mail: axel.sikora@hs-offenburg.de

Marion Berbineau
IFSTTAR, Villeneuve d'Ascq, France
E-mail: marion.berbineau@ifsttar.fr

Alexey Vinel
Tampere University of Technology, Tampere, Finland
E-mail: alexey.vinel@tut.fi

Magnus Jonsson
Halmstad University, Halmstad, Sweden
E-mail: magnus.jonsson@ide.hh.se

Alain Pirovano
Ecole Nationale de l'Aviation, Toulouse, France
E-mail: alain.pirovano@enac.fr

Marina Aguado
University of the Basque Country, Bilbao, Spain
E-mail: marina.aguado@ehu.es

Lecture Notes in Computer Science   8435

Preface

The Communication Technologies for Vehicles Workshop series provides an international forum on the latest technologies and research in the field of intra- and inter-vehicles communications and is organized annually to present original research results in all areas related to physical layer, communication protocols and standards, mobility and traffic models, experimental and field operational testing, and performance analysis.

First launched by Tsutomu Tsuboi, Alexey Vinel, and Fei Liu in Saint Petersburg, Russia (2009), Nets4Cars workshops have been held in Newcastle-upon-Tyne, UK (2010), Oberpfaffenhofen, Germany (2011), Vilnius, Lithuania (2012) and Villeneuve d'Ascq, France (2013). These proceedings contain the papers presented at the 6th International Workshop on Communication Technologies for Vehicles (Nets4Cars- Nets4Trains-Nets4Aircraft 2014), which took place at Offenburg University of Applied Sciences, Germany, in May 2014, with the technical support of IFSTTAR, France, and Halmstad University, Sweden. The sponsor of the event was Alcatel - Lucent Stiftung für Kommunikationsforschung.

Our call for papers resulted in 15 submissions. Each of them was assigned to the Technical Program Committee members and 10 submissions were accepted for publication. Each accepted paper got at least two independent reviews. In addition, four invited papers were accepted. The order of the papers in these proceedings corresponds to the workshop program.

This year the keynote speakers were:

- Hans-Peter Mayer "Car Specific Services in 5G Frameworks," Lead Next Generation Wireless, Bell Labs, Stuttgart, Germany
- Thomas Hogenmüller "Overview and Challenges of Automotive E/E-Architecture with Ethernet," Team Manager E/E-Architectures Communication Technologies and Gateways, R. Bosch GmbH, Stuttgart, Germany
- Torsten Braun "Routing Protocols for and Deployment of Flying Ad-hoc Networks," Professor of Computer Science, University of Bern, Switzerland
- Marion Berbineau "Wireless Communications for Railway Applications: State of Knowledge and Future Trends," Research Director, Deputy Manager COSYS Department (COmponents and SYStems), IFSTTAR, France

We extend a sincere "thank you" to all the authors who submitted the results of their recent work, to all the members of our hard-working comprehensive Technical Program Committee, as well as the thoughtful external reviewers.

Also, we extend a special "thank you" to Nikita Lyamin for the preparation of the proceedings and Bertram Birk for managing the website.

We invite all the experts in the field to join us in St. Petersburg, Russia, for Nets4Cars-Fall in October 2014.

May 2014

Axel Sikora
Marion Berbineau
Alexey Vinel
Magnus Jonsson
Alain Pirovano
Marina Aguado

Organization

Nets4Cars 2014 was organized by Offenburg University of Applied Sciences, Offenburg, Germany.

Executive Committee

General Co-chairs

Axel Sikora	HS Offenburg, Germany
Marion Berbineau	IFSTTAR, France
Alexey Vinel	TUT, Finland

TPC Co-chairs

Magnus Jonsson	HH, Sweden
Alain Pirovano	ENAC, France
Marina Aguado	UPV/EHU, Spain

Web Chair

Bertram Birk	HS Offenburg, Germany

Publication Chair

Nikita Lyamin	HH, Sweden

Steering Committee

Marion Berbineau	IFSTTAR, France
Xu Li	State University of New York, USA
Antonella Molinaro	University of Calabria Region, Italy
Joel Rodrigues	University of Beira Interior, Portugal
Tsutomu Tsuboi	Hamamatsu Agency for Innovation, Japan
Axel Sikora	HS Offenburg, Germany
Thomas Strang	DLR, Germany
Alexey Vinel	Tampere University of Technology, Finland
Yan Zhang	Simula Research Lab and University of Oslo, Norway

Technical Program Committee

Onur Altintas	Toyota InfoTechnology Center, Japan
Petros Belimpasakis	Bang & Olufsen, Germany
Erwin Biebl	Technische Universität München, Germany
Hervé Boeglen	Laboratoire XLIM-SIC, France
Mohamed Boucadair	France Telecom, France
Torsten Braun	University of Bern, Switzerland
Teodor Buburuzan	Volkswagen Group Research, Germany
Marcello Caleffi	UNINA, Italy
Claudia Campolo	University Mediterranea of Reggio Calabria, Italy
Eduardo Cerqueira	UFPA, Brazil
Marilia Curado	University of Coimbra, Portugal
Robil Daher	German University in Cairo, Egypt
Thierry Delot	University of Lille North of France, France
Konrad Doll	HS Aschaffenburg, Germany
Dhavy Gantsou	UVHC, France
Benoit Geller	ENSTA Paris Tech, France
Javier Goikoetxea	CAF, Spain
Javier Gozalvez	UMH, Spain
Geert Heijenk	University of Twente, The Netherlands
Benoit Hilt	University of Haute Alsace, France
Muhammad Ali Imran	University of Surrey, UK
Uwe Kucharzyk	Bombardier Transportation, Germany
Anis Laouiti	TELECOM SudParis, France
Andreas Lehner	DLR, Germany
Katrin Lüddecke	DLR, Germany
Juliette Marais	IFSTTAR, France
Francesca Martelli	IIT - CNR, Italy
Michael Meyer zu Hoerste	DLR, Germany
Brian Park	University of Virginia, USA
Paolo Santi	IIT-CNR, Italy
Vasco Soares	Polytechnic Institute of Castelo Branco, Portugal
Thomas Strang	DLR, Germany
Markus Strassberger	BMW Group Research and Technology Germany
Jouni Tervonen	University of Oulu, Finland
Ozan Tonguz	Carnegie Mellon University, USA
Teresa Vazão	Inesc-ID/Instituto Superior Técnico, Portugal
Michelle Wetterwald	EURECOM, France

Technical Sponsors

- IFSTTAR, France
- Halmstad University, Sweden

Financial Sponsor

- Alcatel - Lucent Stiftung für Kommunikationsforschung

Table of Contents

Automotive Issues

Car-to-Car

Aviation Issues

In-Car

Infrastructures

Evaluation of WiFi for Kart Racing Monitoring

Harri Viittala[1], Matti Hämäläinen[1], Jari Iinatti[1], and Simone Soderi[2]

[1] Centre for Wireless Communications, University of Oulu, Oulu, Finland
{harri.viittala,matti.hamalainen,jari.iinatti}@oulu.fi
[2] GE Transportation Systems, Florence, Italy
simone.soderi@ge.com

Abstract. The focus of this paper is to study the throughput and jitter performances of the IEEE 802.11-2012 standard based solution for monitoring young kart racing drivers. At the low-level of kart racing, the speed of a kart is about 80 km/h. The PropSim channel emulator is applied to study performance of standard compliant radios in a vehicular environment. We will also study the impact of interference and shadowing on the system performance. The results indicate that it is feasible to use low-cost radios based on the IEEE 802.11 standards for this specific application if the need for bandwidth is not in Mbps.

Keywords: Communication, Karting, WiFi.

1 Introduction

Kart racing is a form of motorsport where vehicles are open and four-wheeled, namely karts. It is the most popular motorsport among youngsters and used commonly as the stepping stone to higher and more expensive classes of motorsport. The Finnish Formula One champions, Keke Rosberg, Mika Häkkinen and Kimi Räikkönen, all started their careers in kart racing. There are several classes covering different age groups in karting. It is typically started at the age of 6-7 years; and, after the age of 10, the first national competitions are available. At this level, the karts are reaching top speeds of about 80 km/h. The top-level of karting is KF1 which is open to the best drivers aged 15 and up. It is possible to reach top speeds up to 140 km/h and 70 km/h, on average, with this level of karts depending on the racing circuit layout. [1]

The length of homologated circuits varies between 748 m and 1700 m and is typically compacted into a small area. For example, the karting circuit located in Pori, Finland has a circuit length of 1045 m and outer dimensions of about 250 m x 200 m. [2]

At the lowest level of karting, driving skills are the most valuable asset because the karts are very similar to each other in terms of performance. By analyzing driver's actions when entering and exiting a curve, development of a young driver can be enhanced. Since the first classes of karting are the most low-budgeted, a need for an affordable, easy-to-deploy, reliable and portable monitoring system is present.

WiFi based on the 802.11 standards is a mature technology providing reliable communication and broad coverage with reasonably priced commercial components,

and availability of the components makes fast adaptation possible. The schema of the monitoring system is depicted in Fig. 1. A karting circuit is typically an open-space without any major blocking objects. By using WiFi, one access point (AP) can basically cover a whole kart racing circuit. If connection is lost, the driving information is stored locally and transmitted right after a connection recovery. An analysis of the driver's performance is performed in a service area or pit.

The 802.11 physical (PHY) layer, i.e., orthogonal frequency division multiplexing (OFDM) defined in [3] has shown its strength as a PHY layer for vehicle-to-vehicle (V2V) and vehicle-to-infrastructure (V2I) communications. The 802.11a amendment was used as a basis for the 802.11p amendment which is applied as a PHY layer of wireless access in vehicular environment (WAVE) applications [4]. WAVE uses the 5.9 GHz frequency band dedicated for road safety, and includes V2V and V2I communications [4]. The 802.11p amendment uses licensed 5.9 GHz frequency band [4].

Due to price and use of licensed frequency band of the 802.11p, it is not feasible to low-cost driving analysis application. The present study focuses on the performance of commercial, affordable, off-the-shelf (COTS) WiFi radios in a vehicular environment. The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 presents the related work, Section 3 introduces the measurement setup, and Section 3 continues with the discussion on measurement parameters. In Section 4, the results from the measurement campaign are presented and analyzed. Finally, the paper is concluded in Section 5.

| # | Time | Speed | Gear | Braking force | Acceleration |

Analysis and presentation

Fig. 1. Schema of the kart monitoring system

2   Related Work

In [5], it is studied the throughput efficiency and the average delay performance of the IEEE 802.11 by using a Markov chain model. The OPNET simulations were carried

out with the packet size of 1500 bytes having the channel bit rate of 11 Mbps. The results show that the throughput efficiency is 57.7 % for two stations with the contention window (CW) size of 32. Doubling the CW size decreases the throughput efficiency 3.5 percentage points. When the number stations are increased from 2 to 6, it has a slight influence on the throughput efficiency.

An analytical model for the enhanced distribution channel access (EDCA) mechanism in the IEEE 802.11p MAC layer is proposed in [6]. The model is validated against simulations. The model takes into account different features of EDCA, such as CW, different access classes (AC) and internal collisions. The normalized throughput was approximately 45% in the simulations where the packet payload was 512 bytes and the channel rate was 6 Mbps The measurements where the suitability of the IEEE 802.11 standard for the V2I communication is evaluated are presented in [7]. The user datagram protocol (UDP) throughput was measured with 802.11g and 802.11b also comparing different packet sizes. A fixed access point (AP) was passed with a car speeding up to 120 km/h. The authors concluded that the throughput is slightly smaller with this speed than in a static case showing that IEEE 802.11 is feasible for such velocities.

The WAVE performance measurement results for a V2I link are given in [8], where frame success ratio (FSR) is measured with various modulation-coding schemes, packet lengths and velocities. The maximum coverage of 700 m was reported for FSR > 0.25 at the data rate of 3 Mbps.

The V2I measurement results where the IEEE 802.11a and 802.11p are compared are reported in [9]. The packet size was set to 100 bytes. The connection time between a roadside unit (RSU) and a car was much longer when 802.11p was used, mainly because 802.11p does not require any authentication process, whereas it is needed to 802.11a to establish connection. In addition, it was found out that the packet losses of 802.11p were lower than 802.11a. The measurement devices applied the nominal channel bandwidths which are 10 MHz and 20 MHz for 802.11p and 802.11a, respectively. The selection of smaller bandwidth doubles the timing parameters of 802.11 improving the system performance in channels with a high delay spread. It is also possible to use 10 MHz bandwidth with 802.11a [3].

In our study, the focus is to evaluate if the affordable COTS WiFi radios are capable to perform in a vehicular environment.

3   Measurement Setup

The measurement setup contains commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) WiFi radios, a PropSim channel emulator [10], and laptops as illustrated in Fig. 2. One of the WiFi radios is tuned to work as an AP and another as a station (STA). Antenna connectors of the radios are connected to the PropSim so that 2x2 multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) channels for an uplink and a downlink are formed. The throughput and jitter performance are measured by using the Iperf network testing tool installed in each laptop which, in turn, are connected to each radio with Ethernet cables. The WiFi radios are compliant with the IEEE802.11-2012 standard without optional features such as space-time block coding (STBC).

Fig. 2. Measurement setup

3.1   Ipert Network Testing Tool

The Iperf client generates 300 bytes user datagram protocol (UDP) data packets with a specified rate of 10 Mbps in this study. The packet size covers the data to be transmitted at the application layer. The Iperf server computes throughput, jitter and packet loss at an application layer. It counts lost datagrams based on an ID number of each datagrams. The size of the UDP packet varies between 8 – 65 535 bytes and usually consists of several internet protocol (IP) packets. Losing one IP packet will lose the whole UDP packet. The UDP packet size was set to 300 bytes. When the maximum transmission unit (MTU) is 1500 bytes, we can call a datagram as a packet, and the number of lost datagrams is equal to lost packets. [11]

3.2   PropSim Channel Emulator

A channel emulator is applied to model a wireless channel for studying performance of real hardware. Complex set-ups can be built in a laboratory environment so as to closely emulate a real scenario. The emulation is based on pre-calculated files, i.e., channel impulse response and other related parameters. The PropSim channel emulator includes several standard channel models; but, it is also possible to create a unique channel model when needed parameters are known. [10]

A work flow with PropSim starts by defining a channel impulse response tap by tap. For each channel tap, properties such as delay, amplitude distribution, Doppler spread, correlation, etc. can be adjusted. The next step is to connect a generated channel to RF inputs and outputs. Finally, the channel is emulated and measurements can be done.

V2I Channel Model

Our V2I channel model is based on the roadside-to-vehicle (RTV) Expressway channel model at 5.9 GHz presented in [12]. All parameters needed for channel emulation are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Channel model for RTV-Expressway

Tap no.	Path no.	Tap power [dB]	Relative path loss [dB]	Delay value [ns]	Rician K [dB]	Frequency shift [Hz]	Fading Doppler [Hz]	LOS Doppler [Hz]	Fading spectral shape
1	1	0.0	0.0	0	-5.3	769	70	770	Round
1	2	0.0	-36.4	1	n/a	-22	600	n/a	Round
1	3	0.0	-30.0	2	n/a	535	376	n/a	Round
2	4	-9.3	-12.3	100	n/a	754	117	n/a	Round
2	5	-9.3	-21.7	101	n/a	548	424	n/a	Round
2	6	-9.3	-24.9	102	n/a	-134	530	n/a	Flat
3	7	-20.3	-24.3	200	n/a	761	104	n/a	Round
3	8	-20.3	-25.4	201	n/a	88	813	n/a	Classic 3 dB
4	9	-21.3	-26.8	300	n/a	37	802	n/a	Classic 6 dB
4	10	-21.3	-28.5	301	n/a	752	91	n/a	Round
5	11	-28.8	-31.2	400	n/a	16	807	n/a	Classic 6 dB
5	12	-28.8	-41.8	401	n/a	-755	329	n/a	Round

Interference

In PropSim, there is also functionality to internally generate an interfering signal. A preliminary interference test was done by adding the filtered additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) with constant signal-to-noise power ratio (SNR) for each received antenna.

Shadowing

It is also possible to add slow fading to the channel emulating the effect of obstacles in the signal path. A shadowing feature of PropSim was applied to test the system response when an attenuation of a channel is increased. The channel gain was decreased with 0.1 s time intervals to -35 dB or -50 dB. After a breakpoint, the gain was increased back to 0 dB.

4   Measurement Parameters

During measurements, the radios were adjusted to use the 802.11a+n radio protocol with 5745 MHz channel center frequency and 5 dBm transmitted power which was the minimum available power level. Single-input single-output (SISO) and MIMO setups were applied. The radios did not have a support for STBC or other diversity methods. The transport protocol was UDP with a packet size of 300 bytes and a bandwidth of 10 Mbps. During a 3-minute measurement run, about 750 000 UDP packets were transmitted. In an interference measurement, a possible interference source is co-located exactly in the channel of a victim system covering the victim frequency band completely or partially. Two values of the maximum shadowing attenuation were applied, namely 35 dB and 50 dB. All the parameters are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. Measurement parameters

Parameter	Value
Radio protocol	802.11a+n
Frequency channel	5.745 GHz (#149)
Channel bandwidth	20 MHz
Transmitted power	5 dBm
Transport protocol	UDP
UDP packet size	300 B
UDP bandwidth	10 Mbps
Velocity	10, 50, 100 or 140 km/h
Interference center frequency	5.745 GHz
Interference bandwidth	5 or 20 MHz
SNR in interference measurement	10 or 15 dB
Maximum attenuation in shadowing measurement	35 or 50 dB

The link quality given by the software driver of the WiFi board was recorded before emulation to confirm operation of the setup. As it can be seen from Table 3, connections were perfectly functional in SISO and MIMO setups.

Table 3. Link quality before channel emulation

Setup	SISO	MIMO
Link quality	70/70	70/70
Bit rate	65 Mbps (MCS7)	130 Mbps (MCS15)
Signal level	-34 dBm	-35 dBm

5   Results

The results of the measurements are discussed in this chapter. The throughput and jitter performances of the system were measured at the application layer. The impact of velocity, interference and shadowing were studied to have a comprehensive understanding of the system performance.

5.1   Velocity

The performances of SISO and MIMO setups were measured by using velocities of 10, 50, 100 and 140 km/h. The corresponding maximum Doppler shifts are 53, 266, 531 and 745 Hz. The measurement results are presented in Fig. 3 and Fig. 4. A line represents an average result, whereas a bar depicts a standard deviation. For both