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

Submission Title: UWB for data streaming use cases
Date Submitted: March 15th 2021
Source: Frederic Nabki (Spark Microsystems)
Address: 1201 rue Barré Suite 201, Montreal QC, Canada
E-Mail: frederic.nabki@sparkmicro.ca

Re: IEEE 802.15 IG NG-UWB Plenary Meeting

Abstract: Technical characteristics of UWB for data streaming

Purpose: Discuss low-power & low latency data communications applications

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.

PAR key points to improve UWB data streaming

- Preamble and modulation schemes to support improved link budget and/or reduced air-time
- Interference mitigation techniques to **support higher density and higher traffic use cases**
- Schemes to reduce complexity and power consumption
- Mechanisms supporting low-power low-latency streaming as well as high data-rate streaming
- Support for peer-to-peer, peer-to-multi-peer, and station-to-infrastructure protocols are in scope

• Keeping in mind **low-cost** of implementation

Class of Devices	Application / Use cases	Link budget requirement	Payloads requirement	Current consumption. (in active state)	Technical Characteristics
Data streaming	Audio Real time / low latency streaming - Headphones, hearables, audio devices	- moderate (PL≈ 80 dB, d ≈ 30 m) - proximity (PL≈ 60 dB, d ≈ 3m)	Continuous payload, moderate duty cycles (e.g. 1.5-5 Mbps payload at low latency) with clear channel assessment mitigation	up to 3 mA	 3 ms audio latency 0.25 nJ/bit TX energy efficiency 1.15 nJ/bit RX energy efficiency Data-rate up to 96 KSps, 24 bit, Stereo Possible dual transceiver
	Audio/Video real time / low latency streaming - AR with multi-channel a/v (Gaming)	- moderate (PL≈ 80 dB, d ≈ 30 m) - proximity (PL≈ 60 dB, d ≈ 3m)	Continuous payload, moderate duty cycles (e.g. 4-10 Mbps payload at low latency) with clear channel assessment mitigation	up to 5 mA	 5-10 ms audio latency 10 ms video latency Possible dual transceiver
	Network of objects - Sensors network (Medical , Transport, Agriculture) - BAN (Medical, Vital signs monitoring) - PAN (Wireless peripherals, Home office)	- moderate (PL≈ 80 dB, d ≈ 30 m) - proximity (PL≈ 60 dB, d ≈ 3m)	Short payloads Low duty cycles (e.g. 1-5 Mbps payload at low latency)	 Sub 100 μA Sensors Up to 1.5 mA peripherals 	 50 μs airtime for 1 kb ~20 μW system power consumption for Battery-less IoT sensors



- 3 Mbps half duplex payload UWB link with ARQ via SPI interface (wireless SPI)
- Payload airtime: 90 µs
- Timeslot duration: 250 μs
- Power consumption TX+RX: 9 mW at 3.3V (1.5 Mbps uplink + 1.5 Mbps downlink)
- Loaded latency from SPI to SPI: 0.658 ms
- Low power/cost timing using a 32.768 kHz XTAL only

Start		•										▼ Annotations	+
		-	ms 🕻	1 +0.2 ms		+0.4 ms	+0.5 ms	+0.6 ms		+0.8 ms	+0.9 ms		
	٥			1								A1 - A2 = 0.658568 ms	
	٥	+F								į			
	٥	+f											
	٥	+£											
	٥	+ F											
	٥	+F		1.32017							1.320835 s	▼ Analyzers	+
	٥	+£											
		+5											
	¥	· 3			<u> Loa</u>	dec	_atenc\	1.0.62	<u>a ms</u>				
	٥												
	٥	+F		1									
	٥	+f										 Decoded Protocols 	*
	٥	+f	<u> </u>	1									
	٥	+F		1								MOSI: 0x08; MISO: 0x00 MOSI: 0x11; MISO: 0x00	



Submission





7

	HRP-ERDEV PHY	LRP-ERDEV PHY
Transmit center frequency	+/- 20 ppm	No requirement, as long as fits in spectral mask
Chip rate clock	+/- 20 ppm	+/- 2 ns
Carrier and chip rate clock	Derived from same oscillator	Independent
Detection	Coherent	Non-coherent
Max payload rate	28 Mbps	5 Mbps

- Duality between the two PHYs:
 - Frequency/timing: accurate (HRP) vs. approximate (LRP)
 - Detection: phase coherent (HRP) vs. Energy detection (LRP)
 - Performance: maximum link budget and data rate (HRP) vs. Moderate link budget and data rate (LRP)
 - Power consumption: high (HRP) vs. Moderate (LRP)
- There is merit in HRP-like data rates with LRP-like implementation cost