

**Project: IEEE P802.15 Working Group for Wireless Personal Area Networks (WPANs)**

**Submission Title:** [Cyclic-redundancy-check Codes for Header-check Sequence]

**Date Submitted:** [14 Jan, 2008]

**Source:** [Makoto Noda, Hiroyuki Yamagishi, Keitarou Kondou, Masashi Shinagawa]

Company [Sony Corporation]

Address [5-1-12 Kitashinagawa Shinagawa-ku, Tokyo, 141-0001 Japan]

Voice:[+81 3 5448 4619], FAX: [+81 3 5448 4620], E-Mail:[MakotoB.Noda at jp dot sony dot com]

**Re:** [15-07-0693-03-003c-compa-phy-proposal.pdf]

**Abstract:** [Generator polynomial of CRCC for HCS is modified to fit the change of header and subheader lengths at the Atlanta Meeting]

**Purpose:** [Modification of generator polynomial of CRCC for HCS in the baseline document]

**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.

## Notes for this proposal

We have already proposed a new cyclic-redundancy-check code (CRCC) for a header-check sequence (HCS) as a part of the CoMPA's proposal at the Montreal Meeting in May 2007 (15-07-0693-03-003c).

In spite of the proposer's intention, the CRCC for HCS shown in the first cut of the baseline document was the conventional one, i.e. ITU-T (CCITT).

Furthermore, we would like to modify the generator polynomials of our CRCC because the header and subheader lengths were changed at the Atlanta Meeting.

Consequently, we hope modification of the generator polynomial of the CRCC in the baseline document.

## Motivation

- Undetected error of header possibly induces an improper file transfer.
- There exist some shortened cyclic-redundancy-check codes (CRCs) whose undetected-error probabilities are significantly lower than that of CCITT for header-check sequence (HCS).

## Technical notes

The optimum CRCC depends on the header length.  
Thus we modified the generator polynomial of CRCC for HCS to fit two changes at the Atlanta Meeting.

In this presentation, the generator polynomial for **combined PHY and MAC header** is changed from that proposed by CoMPA at the Montreal Meeting because the header length was changed from 128 bits to **176 bits** at the Atlanta Meeting.

Two generator polynomials are prepared because a **MAC subheader with a length of 656 bits** for a frame aggregation mode was also proposed at the Atlanta Meeting.


The HCS for 60 GHz PHY in 15.3c can be different from that for 2.4 GHz PHY in 15.3 because the protection mechanism used to validate the MAC header is PHY dependent, as is defined in Section 7.2.6 in the IEEE802.15.3-2003 Standard.

# Performance of proposed CRCC

## Generator polynomials


Proposed CRCC:  $x^{16} + (1-p)(x^{15} + x^8 + x) + p(x^{13} + x^2) + 1$

Referenced CRCC (CCITT):  $x^{16} + x^{12} + x^5 + 1$



Undetected-error probabilities as a function of bit-error rate

# Why the dual CRCC?



- If CRCC with  $p = 0$  is used for header and subheaders, the  $P_{ud}$  at  $n = 656$  is higher than that of CCITT.
- If CRCC with  $p = 1$  is used for header and subheaders, the  $P_{ud}$  at  $n = 176$  is 4.6% lower than that of CCITT. However, the  $P_{ud}$  of proposed CRCC with  $p = 0$  at  $n = 176$  is 5 digits lower than that of CCITT.



**It is better to change the value of "p" depending on the header.**



## Summary and conclusion

- The undetected-error probability of the proposed CRCC for combined PHY and MAC headers was significantly lower, e.g. 2 digits lower at a bit-error of  $10^{-3}$ , than that of CCITT.
- The undetected-error probability of the proposed CRCC for MAC subheaders was comparable with that of CCITT, but still approx. 3 % lower than that of CCITT.
- The increase of size of hardware by changing the parameter “p” was negligible for the proposed dual CRCC.

**There is no technical reason to choose CCITT for HCS.**