Comparing Delay Tolerant Network Routing Protocols for Optimizing L-Copies in Spray and Wait Routing for Minimum Delay

Anjula Mehto[*]

Department of Computer Science & Engg., Maulana Azad National Institute of Technology, Bhopal
Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh, 462051, India

Meenu Chawla

Assoc. Professor, Department of Computer Sci. & Engg., Maulana Azad National Institute of Technology, Bhopal
Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh, 462051, India
E-mail: chawlam@manit.ac.in
www.manit.ac.in

Abstract

Delay Tolerant Network (DTN) is special type of wireless mobile ad hoc network characterized by intermittent connectivity, long or variable delay, asymmetric data rate and high error rates. In this paper we compare some of the well-known routing protocols namely Epidemic, Spray and Wait (SaW), Probabilistic ROuting Protocol using History of Encounters and Transitivity (PROPHET), and MaxProp. Simulation results show that delivery ratio is almost equal for both MaxProp and SaW and the overhead ratio is much less for SaW as compared to MaxProp. Average delay of SaW is slightly higher. Simulation results also show that 20%-25% L copies of the total number of nodes in the network gives better delivery ratio and less overhead with minimum average delay in SaW.

Keywords: Delay tolerant network, routing protocols, delivery ratio, average delay and overhead ratio.

1. Introduction

Delay Tolerant Network[1] (DTN) is evolved from Mobile ad hoc Network. It is Intermittent and sparsely connected because of limited transmission range and mobility. DTN is characterized by intermittent connectivity, long or variable delay, asymmetric data rate and high error rates. DTN uses "Store and Forward" strategy for routing of messages where message is successively moved and stored in the buffer throughout the network in hops that it will finally reach its destination. In these challenging environments the traditional ad-hoc routing protocols such as Ad hoc On-Demand Distance Vector[2] (AODV) or Dynamic Source Routing[3] (DSR) do not work well in DTN because they require fully connected path between source and destination for communication to be possible.

The rest of paper is organized as follows. Section II, reviews routing in DTN and presents routing protocols in DTN. Section III describes simulation setup and performance metrics. Section IV describes the simulation results to analyze the routing protocols. Section V concludes this paper.

2. Routing Protocol in DTN

Routing protocols in DTN are classified according to the type of information gathered by nodes to take the routing decision. They can be broadly classified as flooding based routing protocol and forwarding based routing protocol. Flooding based routing protocols from Refs 4, 5 and 6 spread the message and it's replica in the network. They vary according to their spreading mechanism and number of copies forwarded.

---

[*] Anjula Mehto, M.Tech. Scholar,Department of Computer Science & Engg. Maulana Azad National Institute of Technology, Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh
Email-anjula_mehto@yahoo.co.in

Forwarding based routing protocols from Refs 7, 8, 9 and 10 uses different mechanism to efficiently selecting the relay nodes to enhance the delivery probability in case of limited resources and storage. They gather information about other nodes in the network to select relay nodes.

2.1. *Epidemic routing*

Epidemic routing[4] was historically the first DTN routing protocol. It is flooding based routing in nature. In Epidemic routing, every node continuously replicates messages to newly arrived nodes that do not already have the message copy. The message distribution is transitive through ad hoc networks, with messages eventually reaching their destination. Epidemic routing protocol provides guaranteed transmission of message irrespective of delivery delay. It has very high overhead and has a large number of message copies in a network which results in network congestion.

2.2. *Spray and wait*

Spray and Wait[5] protocol limits the blind forwarding message strategy of Epidemic routing by associating a number L to messages that indicates the maximum allowable copies of the message. It consists of two phases spray phase and wait phase. In the spray phase the source node initially spray L number of message copies to L distinct relay nodes. After receiving the message copy all L relay nodes go into the wait phase and wait till the direct transmission to the destination. There are two types of SaW namely Source Spray and Wait and Binary Spray and Wait. In Source Spray and Wait the source node forward all L copies to the first L distinct nodes it encounters. In Binary Spray and Wait the source of a message initially starts with L copies. When it encounters first node with no copies then it hands over $\lceil L/2 \rceil$ copies to that node and keeps $\lfloor L/2 \rfloor$. Now this process is repeated for both source and relay that has L > 1 message copies, and when the node either is left with only one copy, it switches to wait phase and wait till the direct transmission to the destination.

The simplicity and thriftiness of direct transmission with the speed of Epidemic routing make SaW well in the terms of performance than Epidemic routing.

2.3. *PROPHET*

To improve the delivery probability and reduce the wastage of network resources in Epidemic routing a new type of routing protocol has proposed called PROPHET.[7] In PROPHT if a node has visited a location several time then there is a possibility that this pattern will repeated in the future. In PROPHET every node uses probabilistic metric called delivery predictability to transfer messages to a reliable node. The higher delivery predictability for a node indicates that it is more reliable than other nodes to forward message to destination. PROPHET outperforms Epidemic routing. However, PROPHET has higher average delay than Epidemic routing when the buffer size of nodes are decreased. PROPHET has lower overhead than Epidemic routing.

2.4. *MaxProp*

MaxProp[8] is forwarding based routing protocol. In MaxProp routing each node initially set a probability of meeting to all the other nodes in network and also exchanges these values to its neighbor nodes. The probability value is used to calculate a destination path cost. Each node forwards messages through the lowest cost path. MaxProp also uses an ordered queue which is divided into two parts according to an adaptive threshold. MaxProp assigns a higher priority to new messages and forward it first with low hop count and drops a message with the highest cost path when buffer is full. MaxProp has poor performance when nodes have small buffer sizes because of the adaptive threshold calculation. MaxProp performance is better with large buffer size.

3. Simulation Setup and Performance Metrics

3.1. *Model*

There are some assumptions that have been taken for the purpose of simulation. Similar assumptions have been made in previous works see Refs. 4, 5, 7 and 8. Each node has an unlimited buffer for messages that they originate.[8] For relaying the messages originated at other nodes a fixed size buffer is assumed. A first-in-first-out (FIFO) queuing system has been implemented for scheduling and dropping of messages in Epidemic, SaW, and PROPHET. The movement model is Shortest Path Map Based Movement (SPMBM).

Table.1. Number of L copies

Network size	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Small network(N=10)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Large network(N=100)	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100

Table.2. Small network parameter

Parameter	Pedestrians	Vehicle
Number of hosts	5	5
Speed(m/s)	0.5-1.5	2.7-13.9
Packet Inter arrival time	250-350 sec	250-350 sec
Buffer size	2-10 MB	2-10 MB
Packet TTL	5 hours	5 hours
Simulation time	12 hours	12 hours
Transmission speed	5 MBps	5MBps
Number of L copies in SaW	5	5
Movement	SPMBM	SPMBM

Table.3. Large network parameters

Parameter	Pedestrians	Vehicle
Number of hosts	60	40
Speed(m/s)	0.5-1.5	2.7-13.9
Packet Inter arrival time	25-35 sec	25-35 sec
Buffer size	10-50 MB	10-50 MB
Packet TTL	5 hours	5 hours
Simulation time	12 hours	12 hours
Transmission speed	5 MBps	5MBps
Number of L copies in SaW	20	20
Movement	SPMBM	SPMBM

3.2. *Simulation setup to analyze impact of varying buffer size on performance metrics*

To realize the performance of routing protocols discussed in section 2, they have been implemented on Opportunistic Networking Environment (ONE) simulator.[12]Two experiments have been conducted with different number of nodes, N. The first experiment simulates a small network with N =10. The second experiment have a large network with N=100. Table 2 and 3 show the simulation parameters for small network and large network respectively. The impact of varying the buffer size has been studied with a large Time to Live (TTL) value on the three metrics namely Delivery ratio, Average delay and Overhead ratio.

3.3. *Simulation setup to analyze the impact of varying L copies on the performance metrics*

To realize the performance of SaW, the algorithm has been implemented with different percentage of L copies of the total number of nodes in the network on ONE simulator. Two experiments have been conducted with

small (N=10) and large (N=100) network by varying L (number of copies) from 10% to 100% of the total number of nodes in the network in a step of 10. Table 2 and 3 shows the simulation parameters for small network and large network respectively. Table 1 shows the varying number of L copies.

3.4. *Performance metrics*

The three metrics to measure the performance of the different protocols:

- Delivery Ratio: The delivery ratio is the ratio of total number of messages delivered to their destination to total number of created messages at source node.

$$\text{Delivery ratio} = \frac{D}{G} \qquad (1)$$

 where D is a number of messages delivered to destination, and G is a number of created messages.

- Overhead Ratio: The overhead ratio reflects how many redundant packets are relayed to deliver one packet. It simply reflects transmission cost in a network.

$$\text{Overhead Ratio} = \frac{R-D}{D} \qquad (2)$$

 where R is a number of messages forwarded by relay nodes, and D is a number of messages delivered to their destination.

- Average delay: The average delay is the time between messages is created and the messages are received at a destination.

$$\text{Average Delay} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n}(R_i - G_i)}{n} \qquad (3)$$

 where n is a number of messages delivered to their destinations, R_i is the time when a message i reaches to its destination, and G_i is the time when a message i is created.

4. Simulation Results

4.1. *Impact of varying buffer size*

As shown in Figures 1and 2, increasing buffer size increases delivery ratio for all the protocols for N=10and N=100 respectively because as buffer size inc-

Fig.1. Impact of varying buffer size on delivery ratio

Fig. 2. Impact of varying buffer size on delivery ratio

Fig. 3. Impact of varying buffer size on overhead ratio

Fig.4.Impact of varying buffer size on overhead ratio

reases more packets will be stored in the buffer leading to reduction in packets drop by buffer overflow. It can be seen that Maxprop and SaW give the better results as compare to Epidemic and PROPHET, and the delivery ratio is almost equal especially at large buffer size with large network size. This is because Maxprop uses

several complementary mechanisms, including acknowledgments, a head start for new packets, and lists of previous intermediaries from Ref. 8 and SaW uses L copies which prevent blind flooding of packets in the network and also prevent congestion because of blind flooding. For large network more number of nodes increase contact opportunity leading to improved delivery ratio.

As shown in Figures 3 and 4, the lowest transmission cost for delivering a packet in terms of network overhead and energy consumption, is achieved by SaW. This is because there is a bound on the total number of relay copies of a message called L copy. The overhead for Epidemic and PROPHET increases with increase in buffer size because more packets can be stored in the buffer and dropping of packets is reduced. Therefore, more packets are relayed through the network. PROPHET has lower overhead than Epidemic because PROPHET sends packets only to reliable nodes, while Epidemic sends packets to all possible nodes. In the case of Maxprop the overhead ratio decreases as increase in buffer size because it stores a list of previous intermediaries to prevent data from propagating twice to the same node and prevent unnecessarily relay of packets.


Fig.5. Impact of varying buffer size on average delay

Fig.6. Impact of varying buffer size on average delay

As Figure 5 and 6 indicates that MaxProp provides the

lowest average delay for delivered packets because of their effective buffer management scheme.[8] For other three protocols the Average Delay increase as buffer size increase because of reduction in packet drop and therefore packets with large hop count also reached to their destination but with slightly higher average delay as compared to MaxProp.

From all the above analysis it is clear that delivery ratio is almost equal for both Maxprop and SaW and the overhead ratio is much less for SaW as compared to Maxprop. Average delay of SaW is slightly higher at large buffer sizes. The Average Delay of SaW depends on the L copies of SaW see Ref. 5 for more details.

Fig. 7. Impact of varying L copies on delivery ratio

Fig.8. Impact of varying L copies on delivery ratio

4.2. *Impact of varying percentage of L copies of the total number of nodes*

As shown in the figure 7 and 8, 20%-25% of the L copies of the total number of nodes in the network give better delivery ratio for all the buffer size. Beyond this value any increase in buffer size does not show improvement in delivery ratio and it is almost constant. This is because after 20%-25% of the L copies of the total number of nodes, the increase in the number of L copies propagates almost same number of packets in the network. In figure 8 the delivery ratio is almost constant

for all the buffer size because with large networks there is more opportunity that contacts have been performed between nodes and therefore less number of L copies gives almost equal delivery ratio as number of L copies increase.

As shown in figure 9 and 10 the overhead ratio increases as number of L copies increase for N=10 and N=100 respectively. This is because as number of L copies increase number of relays to deliver a packet also increase. SaW performs exactly L number of transmission and therefore to deliver a packet in the same network with same buffer size more relays of a packet have been performed.


Fig. 9. Impact of varying L copies on overhead ratio


Fig.10.Impact of varying L copies on overhead ratio

Fig.11.Impact of varying L copies on average delay

As shown in figure 11 and 12, 20%-25% of the L copies of the total number of nodes in the network give better average delay. This is because less number of L copies have large waiting phase and increasing L copies give small waiting phase. After 20%-25% of the L copies of the total number of nodes the average delay is almost constant for all the buffer sizes. This is more prominent especially with large number of nodes because of more number of contact opportunities between nodes.

5. Conclusion

DTN is wireless networks where end to end connection is not possible and frequent link disconnection due to mobility of nodes, the low density of nodes or when the network extends over long distances. Simulation results show that delivery ratio is almost equal for both MaxProp and SaW and the overhead ratio is much less for SaW as compared to MaxProp. Average delay of SaW is slightly higher at large buffer sizes.

Simulation results also show that 20%-25% L copies of the total number of nodes in the network gives better delivery ratio and less overhead with comparable average delay in SaW. Results also show that for small network and small buffer size the average delay is minimum for SaW and with large buffer size MaxProp gives better delay as compare to SaW. In future this work will extend with SaW for minimum delay as compare to MaxProp with large buffer size.

6. References

1. K. Fall, A Delay-Tolerant Network Architecture for Challenged Internets, *in Proc. ACM SIGCOMM Conf. on Application, technologies, architectures, and protocols for computer communications* (New York, NY, USA, 2003) pp. 27-34.

2. C.E. Perkins and E.M. Royer, Ad hoc On-Demand Distance Vector Routing, in *Proc. 2nd IEEE Workshop on Mobile Computing Systems and Applications*, (February 1999), pp. 90-100.

3. D.B. Jonhan., D. A. Maltz and J. Broch, *DSR: The Dynamic Source Routing Protocol for Multi-Hop Wireless Ad-hoc Networks,* Addison-Wesley Longman pub. Co., Inc., ch. 5(Boston, MA, USA, 2001)pp.139-172.

4. A. Vahdat and D. Becker, Epidemic routing for partially connected ad hoc networks*, in Technical Report CS-200006*, (Duke University, April 2000).

5. T. Spyropoulos, K. Psounis, and C. S. Raghavendra, Spray and wait: an efficient routing scheme for intermittently connected mobile networks, in *Proc. ACM SIGCOMM workshop on Delay-tolerant networking,* (Philadelphia, PA, USA, August 2005), pp. 252–259.

6. T. Spyropoulos, K. Psounis, and C. S. Raghavendra, Efficient routing in intermittently connected mobile networks: the multiple-copy case, *IEEE/ACM Trans. Networking* , **16**(1), (February 2008) pp.77–90.

7. A. Lindgren, A. Doria, and O. Schelen, Probabilistic routing in intermittently connected networks, *SIGMOBILE Mobile Computing and Communication* Review **7**(3) (July 2003), pp. 19–20.

8. J. Burgess, B. Gallagher, D. Jensen, and B. N. Levine, Max-prop: Routing for vehicle-based disruption tolerant networks, in *Proc. 25th IEEE Int. Conf. on Computer Communications*, (April 2006), pp. 1–11.

9. T. Abdelkader, K. Naik, and A. Nayak, An eco-friendly routing protocol for delay tolerant networks, in *Proc. 6th IEEE Int. Conf. on Wireless and Mobile Computing, Networking and Communications*, (Niagara Falls, Canada, October 2010).

10. T. Abdelkader, K. Naik, A. Nayak, and N. Goel, A socially-based routing protocol for delay tolerant networks, *in Proc. IEEE Global Telecommunications Conf.*, (Miami, Florida, USA, 2010).

11. T. Abdelkader, K. Naik, A. Nayak, N. Goel, and V. Srivastava, SGBR : A Routing Protocol for Delay Tolerant Networks Using Social Grouping, *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems.*

12. A. Keranen, J. Ott and T. Karkkainen**,** The ONE Simulator for DTN Protocol Evaluation, *in Proc. 2nd Int. Conf. on Simulation Tools and Techniques*, (Belgium 2009).