

# How wireless networks scale: the illusion of spectrum scarcity

David P. Reed  
May 17, 2002

## Agenda

- ◆ Scalability matters
- ◆ Does spectrum have a capacity?
  - “Spectrum, a non-depleting but limited resource”
- ◆ Interference and information
- ◆ Capacity, architecture, and scaling laws
- ◆ How do networks create value?
- ◆ Property vs. physics and architecture


5/17/2002

Copyright © 2002 David P. Reed

2

## Scalability matters

- ◆ Pervasive computing must be wireless
- ◆ Mobility leads to demand for connectivity that changes constantly at all time scales
- ◆ Density of stations will increase over time



5/17/2002

Copyright © 2002 David P. Reed

3

## 70 years of FCC and regulation

*MV Mesaba to Titanic: "Ice report...much heavy pack ice and great number of large icebergs also field ice."  
Titanic: "Keep out, I'm working Cape Race !"*

FCC created when tank circuits were hard to build

20 years *before* Shannon created Information Theory, before RADAR, digital electronics, and distributed computing

We have had 50 years to begin applying these to radio networking

But radio policy based in 1932 technology, practice

5/17/2002

Copyright © 2002 David P. Reed

4

## Metaphor, reality, technology change

- ◆ Legal evolution based on metaphor (abstract model)
- ◆ Precedent = fitting the new into an existing metaphor
- ◆ Economics, Law, Technology connect via metaphor (e.g. property)
- ◆ Property laws and Newton's laws

5/17/2002

Copyright © 2002 David P. Reed

5

## Does spectrum have a capacity?

$$C = W \log\left(1 + \frac{P}{N_0 W}\right)$$


C = capacity, bits/sec.

W = bandwidth, Hz.

P = power, watts

$N_0$  = noise power, watts.

Channel capacity is roughly proportional to bandwidth.




5/17/2002

Copyright © 2002 David P. Reed

6

## We don't know the answer.



"Standard" channel capacity is for one sender, one receiver – says nothing about multiple senders.

"The capacity of multi-terminal systems is a subject studied in multi-user information theory, an area of information theory known for its difficulty, open problems, and sometimes counter-intuitive results."  
[Gastpar & Vetterli, 2002]

5/17/2002

Copyright © 2002 David P. Reed

7

## Interference and information




•Regulatory interference = damage

•Radio interference = *superposition*

•No information is lost

•Receivers may be confused

•Information loss is a design and architectural issue, not a physical inevitability




5/17/2002

Copyright © 2002 David P. Reed

8

## Capacity, Architecture, and Scaling Laws

Network of N stations  
(transmit & receive)  
Scattered randomly in a  
fixed space



Each station chooses  
randomly to send a  
message to some  
other station

What is total capacity in  
bit-meters/second?

$$C_T = \frac{\sum_{s,r \in N} b_{s,r} \cdot d_{s,r}}{t}$$

5/17/2002

Copyright © 2002 David P. Reed

9

## Capacity of a radio network architecture

N – number of stations

B – bandwidth

$C_T(N, B)$

increases linearly in B


but what function of N?

5/17/2002

Copyright © 2002 David P. Reed

10

## Traditional, intuitive “Spectrum capacity” model



5/17/2002

Copyright © 2002 David P. Reed

11

## New Technologies

- ◆ Software defined radio
  - “agile radio”
- ◆ Spread spectrum
- ◆ Ultra-wideband
- ◆ “Smart antennas”

All of these are “constant factor”  
improvements – make more capacity, but  
scaling still bounded


5/17/2002

Copyright © 2002 David P. Reed

12

## Repeater networks

If nodes repeat each other's traffic then transmitted power can be lower, and many stations can be carrying traffic concurrently – what is capacity?



5/17/2002

Copyright © 2002 David P. Reed

13

## $C_T(N, B)$ depends on technology and architecture

Tim Shepard and Gupta&Kumar each demonstrate that  $C_T$ , measured in bit-meters/sec grows with  $N$  if you allow stations to cooperate by routing each others' traffic

$$C_T(N, B) \sim \sqrt{N} \text{ (planar)}$$

$$C_T(N, B) \sim N^{2/3} \text{ (volume)}$$

But that is a *lower bound* – because other potential approaches may do better.


\* *Total* system radiated power also declines as  $N$  increases: incentive to cooperate, safety benefits

5/17/2002

Copyright © 2002 David P. Reed

14

## Repeater Network Capacity



5/17/2002

Copyright © 2002 David P. Reed

15

## Better architectures

Cellular, with wired backbone network:

$C_T$  grows linearly with  $N$

Space-time coding, joint detection, MIMO

$C_T$  can grow linearly with  $N$


5/17/2002

Copyright © 2002 David P. Reed

16

## Cellular with wired backbone

Add cells to maintain constant number of stations per backbone access point



5/17/2002

Copyright © 2002 David P. Reed

17

## Space-time coding

BLAST (Foschini & Gans, AT&T Labs) –  
diffusive medium & signal processing


$R = [R_1, R_2, \dots]$  received signals

$S = [S_1, S_2, \dots]$  transmitted signals

$G$  = impulse response matrix

$R = S \times G$

$S = R \times G^{-1}$



5/17/2002

Copyright © 2002 David P. Reed

18

## Counterintuitive results for multiuser information theory, network architectures, and physics


- ◆ Multipath increases capacity
- ◆ Repeating increases capacity
- ◆ Motion increases capacity
- ◆ Repeating reduces energy (safety)
- ◆ Distributed computation increases battery life
- ◆ Channel sharing decreases latency and jitter

5/17/2002

Copyright © 2002 David P. Reed

19

## Combining relay channels, space-time coding, etc.



Potential  $C_T$  proportional to  $N$  or better?


What is the tradeoff space given technology advance?

5/17/2002

Copyright © 2002 David P. Reed

20

## Network Capacity Scales w/Demand



5/17/2002

Copyright © 2002 David P. Reed

21

## How do networks create value?

- ◆ Value depends on capacity
- ◆ But also on “optionality”:
  - Flexibility in allocating capacity to demand (dynamic allocation)
  - Flexibility in “random addressability” (e.g. Metcalfe’s Law)
  - Flexibility in group forming (e.g. Reed’s Law)
- ◆ And security, robustness, etc.

5/17/2002

Copyright © 2002 David P. Reed

22

## Economics and “spectrum property”

Property rights are a solution to the “tragedy of the commons” by allocating property to its most valuable uses

But property rights assume property is *conserved*

*Yet spectrum capacity increases with the number of users, and if proportional to N, each new user is self supporting!*


5/17/2002

Copyright © 2002 David P. Reed

23

## Partitioning problems – Coase and Transaction cost economics

- ◆ “Guard bands” – each time a band partitioned in space or time, capacity wasted
- ◆ Partitioning impacts flexibility value:
  - Burst allocation capped
  - Random addressability & group-forming value severely harmed
- ◆ Robustness reduced, security reduced.



5/17/2002

Copyright © 2002 David P. Reed

24

## Increasing returns

- ◆ Increasing returns + spectrum ownership lead to “winner takes all” where scale trumps efficiency
- ◆ Having “taken all” winner has reduced incentive to innovate rather than just raise prices.

5/17/2002

Copyright © 2002 David P. Reed

25

## Calls to action

- ◆ Research needed to create efficient wireless architectures that are based on networks that cooperate dynamically in spectrum use
- ◆ New incentive structures (regulatory or economic) need to be in place to encourage use of efficient architectures. Property models (e.g., auctions, band management) likely incompatible with dynamic cooperation needed for dense scalability
- ◆ Architectures for cooperation -- “hourglass”-like Internet -- enabling variety of underlying technologies and variety of services/apps to be under constant innovation and evolution

5/17/2002

Copyright © 2002 David P. Reed

26

## Summary

Spectrum regulation should recognize physics  
Spectrum regulation should recognize rapid change and learning, especially technical innovation  
Commons is one simple idea to allow for free innovation.

5/17/2002

Copyright © 2002 David P. Reed

27