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Routing in Sensor Networks

• Large scale sensor networks will be deployed, and require richer inter-node communication
  - In-network storage (DCS, GHT, DIM, DIFS)
  - In-network processing
  - “Fireworks routing”

• Need point-to-point routing to scale
  - Many nodes
  - Many flows
  - Different densities
Design Goals

1. Simple – minimum required state, assumptions
2. Scalable – low control overhead, small routing tables
3. Robust – node failure, wireless vagaries
4. Efficient – low routing stretch
GPSR: Greedy Perimeter Stateless Routing for Wireless Networks

Brad Karp, H.T. Kung
Harvard University
GPSR: Motivation

• Ad-hoc routing algorithms (DSR, AODV)
  - Suffer from out of date state
  - Hard to scale

• Use geographic information for routing
  - Assume every node knows position (x,y)
  - Keep a lot less state in the network
  - Require fewer update messages
**GPSR Algorithm: Greedy Forwarding**

- Each node knows the geographic location of its neighbors and destination.
- Select the neighbor that is geographically closest to the destination as the next hop.

![Diagram of GPSR Algorithm](image)
GPSR Algorithm: Greedy Forwarding (Cont.)

• Each node only needs to keep state for its neighbors

• Beaconing mechanism
  - Provides all nodes with neighbors’ positions.
  - Beacon contains broadcast MAC and position.
  - To minimize costs: piggybacking
GPSR Algorithm: Greedy Forwarding

(Cont.)

- Greedy forwarding does not always work!
Getting Around Void

• **The right hand rule**
  - When arriving at node \( x \) from node \( y \), the next edge traversed is the next one sequentially counterclockwise about \( x \) from edge \( (x,y) \)
  - Traverse the exterior region in counter-clockwise edge order
Planarized Graphs

- A graph in which no two edges cross is known as \textit{planar}.
  - Relative Neighborhood Graph (RNG)
  - Gabriel Graph (GG)
Relative Neighborhood Graph

An edge \((u, v)\) exists between vertices \(u\) and \(v\) if the distance between them, \(d(u, v)\), is less than or equal to the distance between every other vertex \(w\), and whichever of \(u\) and \(v\) is farther from \(w\). In equational form:

\[
\forall w \neq u, v : d(u, v) \leq \max[d(u, w), d(v, w)]
\]
An edge \((u, v)\) exists between vertices \(u\) and \(v\) if no other vertex \(w\) is present within the circle whose diameter is \(uv\). In equational form:

\[
\forall w \neq u, v : d^2(u, v) < [d^2(u, w) + d^2(v, w)]
\]
Final Algorithm

• Combine greedy forwarding + perimeter routing
  - Use greedy forwarding whenever possible
  - Resort to perimeter routing when greedy forwarding fails and record current location \( L_c \)
  - Resume greedy forwarding when we are closer to destination than \( L_c \)
Protocol Implementation

• Support for MAC-layer feedback
• Interface queue traversal
• Promiscuous use of the network interface
• Planarization of the graph
Simulation and Evaluation

- 50, 112, and 200 nodes with 802.11 WaveLAN radios.
- Maximum velocity of 20 m/s
- 30 CBR traffic flows, originated by 22 sending nodes
- Each CBR flows at 2Kbps, and uses 64-byte packets
Simulation and Evaluation

• Packet Delivery Success Rate
Simulation and Evaluation

- Routing Protocol Overhead
Simulation and Evaluation

- Path Length
Simulation and Evaluation

- Effect of Network Diameter
Simulation and Evaluation

- State per Router for 200-node
  - GPSR node stores state for 26 nodes on average in pause time-0
  - DSR nodes store state for 266 nodes on average in pause time-0
Pros and Cons

• **Pros:**
  - Low routing state and control traffic $\Rightarrow$ scalable
  - Handles mobility

• **Cons:**
  - GPS location system might not be available everywhere.
  - Geographic distance does not correlate well with network proximity.
  - Overhead in location registration and lookup
  - Planarized graph is hard to guarantee under mobility
Beacon Vector Routing
Scalable Point-to-point Routing in Wireless Sensor Networks
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Beacon Vector Routing

• Solution: fake geography
  - Create a routing gradient from connectivity information rather than geography
    • Nodes assigned positions based on connectivity
    • Greedy forwarding on this space
Beacon-Vector: Algorithm

• 3 pieces
  - Deriving positions
  - Forwarding rules
  - Lookup: mapping node IDs → positions
1. \( r \) beacon nodes \((B_0,B_1,\ldots,B_r)\) flood the network; a node \( q \)'s position, \( P(q) \), is its distance in hops to each beacon
   \[ P(q) = \langle B_1(q), B_2(q), \ldots, B_r(q) \rangle \]
2. Node \( p \) advertises its coordinates using the \( k \) closest beacons (we call this set of beacons \( C(k,p) \))
3. Nodes know their own and neighbors' positions
4. Nodes also know how to get to each beacon
Beacon-Vector: forwarding

1. Define the distance between two nodes P and Q as

\[ \text{dist}_k (p, q) = \sum_{i \in C(k,q)} \omega_i |B_i(p) - B_i(q)| \]

2. To reach destination Q, choose neighbor to reduce \( \text{dist}_k(*) , Q \)

3. If no neighbor improves, enter Fallback mode: route towards the beacon which is closer to the destination

4. If Fallback fails, and you reach the beacon, do a scoped flood
Simple example
Simple example

Route from 3,2,1 to 1,2,3

Fallback towards B₁
Evaluation - Simulation

- Packet level simulator in C++
- Simple radio model
  - Circular radius, “boolean connectivity”
  - No loss, no contention
- Larger scale, isolate algorithmic issues
Evaluation - Implementation

• Real implementation and testing in TinyOS on mica2dot Berkeley motes
• 4KB of RAM!
  - Judicious use of memory for neighbor tables, network buffers, etc
• Low power radios
  - Changing and imperfect connectivity
  - Asymmetric links
  - Low correlation with distance
• Two testbeds
  - Intel Research Berkeley, 23 motes
  - Soda Hall, UCB, 42 motes
Simulation Results
Effect of the number of beacons

Can achieve performance comparable to that using true positions
Scaling the number of nodes

Number of beacons needed to sustain 95% performance

Beaconing overhead grows slowly with network size (less than 2% of nodes for larger networks)
Great benefit for deriving coordinates from connectivity, rather than positions.
Scope of floods

![Graph showing the average scope of flood against the number of beacons for 3200 nodes, 10 routing beacons.](image-url)
Other results from simulation

• **Average stretch was consistently low**
  - Less than 1.1 in all tests

• **Performance with obstacles**
  - Modeled as walls in the network ‘arena’
  - Robust to obstacles, differently from geographic forwarding
Simulation Results

- Performance similar to that of Geographic Routing (small fraction of floods)
- Small number of beacons needed (<2% of nodes for over 95% of success rate w/o flooding)
- Scope of floods is costly
- Resilient to low density and obstacles
- Low stretch
Implementation Results
Routing performance

- Soda Testbed, 3100+ random pairs

88.4% success w/o flood
4.57% flood (avg. dist 2.6)
0.5% stuck (no good neighbor to forward)
6.5% drops (contention and radio drops)
Coordinate stability

- Coordinates were found to be very stable
  - E.g., almost 80% of the nodes had 2 or fewer changes, and over 90% of the changes were smaller than 3 hops
Implementation Results

- Success rates and flood scopes agree with simulation
- Sustained high throughput (in comparison to the network capacity)
- Coordinates were found to be stable
  - Few changes observed, small changes
**Conclusions and Future Work**

- BVR is simple, robust to node failures, scalable, and presents efficient routes
- Using connectivity for deriving routes is good for low density/obstacles
- The implementation results indicate that it can work in real settings
- We still need to
  - Better study how performance is linked to radio stability, and to high churn rates
  - Implement applications on top of BVR