**TRUSTWORTHY MANET ROUTING ESTAODV IMPLEMENTATION USING DEEP REINFORCEMENT LEARNING**

Sajith Chamara Gunawardene Liyanage

IT14098888

Degree of Bachelor of Science Special (Honors) in Information Technology

Department of Software Engineering

Sri Lanka Institute of Information Technology

Sri Lanka

September 2018

**TRUSTWORTHY MANET ROUTING ESTAODV IMPLEMENTATION USING DEEP REINFORCEMENT LEARNING**

Sajith Chamara Gunawardene Liyanage

IT14098888

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Science Special (Honors) in Information Technology

Department of Software Engineering

Sri Lanka Institute of Information Technology

Sri Lanka

September 2018

# DECLARATION

“I declare that this is my own work and this dissertation” does not incorporate without acknowledgement any material previously submitted for a Degree or Diploma in any other University or institute of higher learning and to the best of my knowledge and belief it does not contain any material previously published or written by another person except where the acknowledgement is made in the text.

Also, I hereby grant to Sri Lanka Institute of Information Technology the non-exclusive right to reproduce and distribute my dissertation, in whole or in part in print, electronic or other medium. I retain the right to use this content in whole or part in future works (such as articles or books).

**Author:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Registration No | Signature | Date |
| Liyanage S.C.G. | IT14098888 |  |  |

The above candidate has carried out research for the B.Sc. Dissertation under my supervision.

**Supervisor:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Signature | Date |
| Mr. Prabath Lakmal Rupasinghe |  |  |

# Abstract

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1. Introduction

1.1.         Purpose

1.2.         Scope

1.3.         Definitions, Acronyms, and Abbreviations

1.4.         Overview

2. Statement of the work

2.1.    Background information and overview of previous work based on literature survey

2.2. Identification and significance of the problem

2.3.    Technical objectives (specify s/w and h/w requirements)

2.4.    Detail design (Technical approach)

2.5.    Sources for test data & analysis

2.6. Anticipated benefits

3. Project plan or schedule

4. Research constraints

5. Specified deliverables

6. Supporting Information

      6.1 Table of contents and index (place at the beginning)

      6.2 Appendices

# LIST OF FIGURES

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Page |
| Figure 1.1 | Sample network diagram with 3 network nodes | 4 |
| Figure 1.2 | Spiral Model | 6 |
| Figure 2.1 | System Diagram | 14 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# LIST OF TABLES

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Page |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Table 3.4 | Backup Table | 19 |

# Introduction

## **Purpose**

The purpose of Preliminary Progress Review (PPR) is to provide a detailed overview of the research with comprehensive literature survey along with the proposed solution. This documentation is a collection of written information and graphical information that is used to convey overall idea of the research thoroughly.

It is important to note that this PPR does not contain all the details about final outcome of the project. The functionalities and the other factors can be modified or improved according to the technical feasibilities and the advice from the supervisor.

## **Definitions, Acronyms, and Abbreviations**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Abbreviation** | **Description** |
| ABED | Ant Based Evidence Distribution |
| AODV | Ad hoc On Demand Distance Vector |
| CP | Control Packets |
| DP | Data Packets |
| DT | Direct Trust |
| GRE | Generalized Reputation Evidence |
| IDM | Intrusion Detection Model |
| IRM | Intrusion Response Model |
| MANET | Mobile Ad hoc Network |
| NFC | Near Field Communication |
| REP | Recommendation Exchange Protocol |
| RERR | Route Error |
| RL | Reinforcement Learning |
| RREQ | Route Request |
| TL | Trust Level |
| TRR | Trust Recommendation Request |

## **Overview**

Trustworthiness of nodes in ad hoc network will be evaluated by global trust value which is a combination of direct trust and indirect trust values. Direct trust is the trust which builds with the experience among directly connected nodes and when a node takes recommendations regarding a particular node from other neighbor nodes, simply it can be considered as taking the indirect trust. Based on the global trust value nodes will be categorized as trustworthy, partially trustworthy, selfish and malicious nodes. There malicious category can further divide into pure malicious and collaborative malicious through the **Spiral model** which will be reviewed ahead in this documentation.

Next step is to determine the best route path in the ad hoc network using **Reinforcement learning (RL) model.** Before step into that model since system has already categorized network nodes as mentioned in above we could expect some performance wise efficient in the system.

# Statement of the work

## **Background information and overview of previous work based on literature survey**.

### **Authentication using trust to detect misbehaving nodes in mobile ad Hoc networks using Q-Learning [1]**

Authentication which is the key factor to be considered in MANET can be categorized into two sections called pre-authentication and post-authentication. As the name denotes pre-authentication is initial network deployment and post-authentication is mechanism to detect nodes in the network over a period of time. According to S.Sivagurunathan, K.Prathapchandran and A.Thirumavalavan, trust can be defined as “*the reliability, timeliness, and integrity of message delivery to a node’s intended next hop*” [1].

Nodes in ad hoc network will eventually be categorized into three sections such as trustworthy, partially trusted and untrusted; based entirely on their direct trust. So, it is unwise to come to conclusions based only on their direct trust value. There could also exist indirect aspects throughout the network which might affect the trust between nodes. In that case, apart from the direct trust, an indirect trust value which would consider such indirect factors should be calculated. Afterwards, a global trust value can be defined based on the average value of both direct and indirect trust values and that global trust can be used for rewarding system within the network.

### **Information theoretic framework of trust modeling and evaluation for ad hoc networks [2]**

It is preferred to consider the recommendation values from other nodes to fulfill the requirement of calculating indirect trust. Yan Lindsay Sun, Wei Yu, Zhu Han and K.J. Ray Liu have proposed an information theoretic framework as a solution. According to them, trust is a “*measure of uncertainty with its value represented by entropy”* [2].

This is a better approach than the 2.1.1 solution to detect misbehaviors of nodes because it defines a combination of two trust models named ‘entropy-based model’ and ‘probability-based model’. Under entropy-based model they have come up with an equation to calculate TABC which is same as the indirect trust between node A and C.



**Figure SEQ Figure \\* ARABIC 1.1: Sample network diagram with 3 network nodes**

TABC = RABTBC

RAB is the recommendation value from node A to B and TBC is the trust value from node B to C. Probability-based model will calculate the multipath trust propagation and concatenation using probability equations. Probability values for the trust relationship can be converted into trust values using entropy-based equations. In order to calculate indirect trust, it is required to request recommendations from other nodes. A new control packet has introduced as TRR (Trust Recommendation Request) to get the trust value of a particular node by requesting from the other neighbor nodes.

According to the Figure 1.1, if node A wants to know the indirect trust value of node C, node A can send a TRR message to node B by requesting for the trust value of node C.  That trust value is only available in node B’s trust table. Finally, TABC can be evaluated as in the above equation. Based on that trust value they are attempting to detect malicious nodes.

One drawback of this solution is that malicious nodes can collaboratively provide wrong recommendations for other nodes. Therefore, a mechanism should be required to detect collaborative malicious nodes. By analyzing this past history of network node interactions, we came up with a solution to categorize nodes into levels based on the global trust which can be utilized to identify the malicious nodes. Network nodes can be trustworthy, partially trustworthy, selfish, pure malicious or collaborative malicious nodes.

### **Different ways to achieve trust in MANET [3]**

It is important to study the existing trust calculation schemes. Each scheme has different unique features, merits and findings. There are five main trust schemes in MANETs.

* Protocol based scheme - Basically, security protocols have been implemented in this scheme. ABED (Ant Based Evidence Distribution) scheme utilizes swarm intelligence paradigm [4] to model the protocol-based schema. Communication among network nodes happened through agents similar to ants [3] in ABED. Ants collected information which is called as pheromones [3].  Based on pheromones, ants find optimal path for measure trust evidence. Generalized Reputation Evidence (GRE) [3], is another instance for protocol-based scheme.
* System level-based scheme - Under system level-based, it will give rewards to trustworthy nodes and give penalty to malicious or selfish nodes. Because of this purpose, they have defined some trust models. Watchdog trust model can detect selfish nodes and Collaborative Reputation trust scheme will distinguish selfish nodes and malicious nodes.
* Cluster based scheme
* Maturity based scheme
* PKI (Public Key Infrastructure) based scheme

They have not yet implemented a way to further categorize malicious nodes.

### **Secure routing with AODV protocol for mobile ad hoc networks [6]**

T. Farid and A. Prahladachar have basically defined two types of security attacks and two types of models as the proposed solution. Compromised network nodes and selfish network nodes could make ‘internal attacks’. When a network node does not send or forward data packets and become inactive when other nodes need them and become active only for its own benefits, it can be named as a ‘selfish node’. There is also another type of attack called ‘external attack’ which is occurred due to invalid cryptographic information. Intrusion Detection Model (IDM) and Intrusion Response Model (IRM) comes into front as the solution. IDM uses neighbor node information to detect misbehaving nodes. If misbehavior count is greater than threshold value, it will broadcast about that misbehaving node to other nodes. Under IRM, if two or more network nodes report about the same node, Purge packet [6] is transmitted to isolate the malicious node from the network.

### **QoS assertion in manet routing based on trusted AODV (ST-AODV) [7]**

In order to increase Quality of Service (QoS) [12] in ad hoc networks, Sridhar Subramanian and Baskaran Ramachandran have proposed a trusted AODV called “ST-AODV”. The trust level (TL) value is calculated as below.

TL = T(RREQ)\*Qr + T(RREP)\*Qp + T(DATA)\*Qd

There Qr, Qp and Qd are the intermediate values to calculate request rate, reply rate and data transmission rate of network nodes respectively. And time factor to evaluate the route request, route reply and data sent are measured via T(RREQ), T(RREP) and T(DATA) accordingly. For a given network node, if TL is less than or equals to threshold value, then it is considered as an untrustworthy node who might drop packets. Otherwise, it is a trustworthy node who should be allowed to stay in the network for a better secured communication.

### **EBoX: Evidence of behavior information exchange mechanism against selfish attacks [8]**

Evidence of Behavior Information Exchange (EBox) mechanism could detect selfish nodes and misbehaving nodes in the ad hoc network and ignore such nodes from the network. It uses a reputation-based schema to award penalty points for selfish network nodes and credit points for trustworthy network nodes. Santhosh J and Malini V K proposed this mechanism to estimate trust values by comparing their predefined threshold values.

### **QoS of MANET through trust based AODV routing protocol by exclusion of black hole attack [9]**

Radha Krishna Bar, Jyotsna Kumar Mandal and Moirangthem Marjit Singh have proposed to evaluate trust values for nodes in the ad hoc networks based upon two criteria which their ability to forward data packets and forward RREQ for a given network node. Finally trust value is calculated as a multiplication of forwarded data packets ratio and forwarded RREQ packets ratio. Then trust value is recorded in the routing table to take routing decisions.

## **Identification and significance of the problem**

Nodes in mobile ad-hoc networks (MANET) can move randomly without any centralized structure or any time pattern. Due to this self-configuration and self-optimization characteristics, such networks can be called as self-organized networks [1]. It is difficult to provide security for such dynamic environments than traditional networks. Ad hoc networks like MANET are vulnerable to various attacks due to this dynamic and distributed behaviors of nodes. This can lead to many IoT device failure with resource constrained environments. Therefore, there should be mechanisms which allow a node to measure the reliability and security of other nodes. Then trustworthy nodes can avoid dealing with malicious nodes. As a result, it can improve both network performance and security aspects.

As revealed in 2.1.1, only the direct trust is calculated to evaluate the trustworthiness of nodes. That will cause problems in capturing indirect behaviors of network nodes that brings harm. There is no way to prove complete trustworthiness is only depend on direct interactions among each node in the network. There might have chances of getting high accuracy for trust values by getting recommendations from other network nodes. At the same time could not come to a better decision only depending on indirect trust value. That will arise the requirement of calculating the average value of direct trust value and indirect trust value when taking a better conclusion on trustworthiness of nodes. On the other hand, definition for trust among the network nodes is similar to trust among human beings. Direct trust is the trust which builds with the experience among each other. When someone has suspects about that trust, going to take recommendations from others which is the indirect trust. Therefore, measuring both direct trust and indirect trust is a vital factor.

According to 2.1.2, they do not consider about collaborative behaviors of malicious nodes. Sometimes group of malicious nodes provide wrong recommendations to make a node in their team as more trustworthy. Eventually it also contributes to a considerable amount of packet drops. Then there should be categories of malicious nodes such as pure malicious and collaborative malicious. Pure malicious nodes will misbehave individually, while collaborative malicious nodes misbehaving as a team in the network. Therefore, it is important to distinguish the type of malicious nodes.

## **Technical objectives (specify s/w and h/w requirements)**

ESTAODV protocol is a new enhancement which goes beyond the traditional MANET routing protocols. This new variant of protocol has to be tested against a mobile ad-hoc network. But unfortunately, it’s not feasible to tryout this new protocol only for one MANET environment. We should test this protocol for different MANET setups for e.g. number of nodes, distance between nodes, mobility speed of nodes etc. Therefore, network simulations are known to be the best solution when analyzing the results in such a situation.

Network simulators can model the behaviors of an actual network. There are two types of simulators called CLI (Command-Line Interface) driven and GUI (Graphical User Interface) driven simulators. Analyzing the network security and performance metrics after executing the proposed trust-based schema would help us to understand the importance of a trust-based schema for Mobile Ad-hoc Networks. NS-3 is a CLI based simulator which we can use for the simulation purposes.

## **Detail design (Technical approach)**

## **Spiral Model**

As the advanced categorizing of the malicious nodes, we have to go to the spiral model where we have the collaborative malicious node discovery process. In spiral model mainly, there are three different phases.

### **Collaborative malicious node discovery process**

This is the phase where we do the advanced categorization for the malicious nodes and identify the collaborative malicious nodes by analyzing the dynamic behavior of the nodes. Only using one record we cannot predict a collaborative malicious behavior, and we have to have more historical records or trust records. For this purpose, mainly, we are maintaining a backup table where we store the recent records of the trust table and each entry on the backup table is associated with a timeout. Initially, we have predetermined range for the trust with high trust value (HT) and low trust value (LT) and using the backup table records and current trust record we can compare the values against the time. For a given time period we can analyze the trust values, and after getting the analyzed report or plot, we can check for outliers within the given range HT – LT. If it contains any outliers or there are any sudden dynamic changes of the trust values we can suspect it as a collaborative malicious node. Otherwise, it can be a pure malicious node without any dynamic changing behavior. The range can be changed according to the user specification.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Neighbor node | Trust Value | Time duration/ Backup time | Analyzed results |
|  |  |  |  |

**Table 1: Backup Table**



**Penalty phase**

Same as the trust level identification phase here also we reduced the trust value of the particular recommending node with the help of a reduction factor. Reduction factor will be calculated based on the maturity level or the reputation of the node. Immediately after the trust reduction, old trust value in the trust table should be updated with the newly calculated value. According to the updated trust value, the particular neighbor nodes should be redirected to the trust level identification phase in order to re-categorize their trust levels.

**Procedure:** collaborative malicious node discovery Algorithm (Spiral model)

1: Get highest trust value and lowest trust value for the node for a given time range and marked them as value boundary for outliers

2: Then compare current trust value is in between the range or not.

3: If current trust value is in between the range, it's categorized as a pure malicious node.

4: Then it (the node who execute this) can delete that record from all of its tables and can broadcast message to aware others.

5: So that will terminate the pure malicious identified process.

6: If current trust value is not in between outliers it's categorized as collaborative malicious (CM) node.

7: Then it (the node who execute this) can edit its trust table blackList flag to true.

8: Identify all the neighbors of identified CM node and reduce their trust value since they have given the incorrect recommendations.

9: Broadcast to the other nodes

10: Go to the Identifying\_trust\_levels algorithm again.

BEGIN

p\_M =passed-in malicious node

IF trust value is not an outlier

THEN

Delete from trust table

Send Broadcast to delete node

ELSE

Mark node as blacklist in trust table

FOR each node which recommended p\_M DO

Calculate reduce factor

Recalculate indirect trust

Update global trust

END FOR

Broadcast neighbors about p\_M node

GOTO Identifying\_trust\_levels

END IF

END

Deep Reinforcement Learning Model

Reinforcement Learning (RL) Model is trained to achieve a particular goal through the optimal path. It will assign a positive reward for correct action and negative reward for incorrect action. RL model can predict more accurate result without utilizing more historical data of the relevant scenario.



As in the above diagram global trust value will be inputted to RL component. Then it will generate a q-value based on defined rewards. This q-value can determine the most trustworthy path to forward packets. If the q-value is high then it will consider as the more trustworthy route and if q-value holds a law value then it will be an untrustworthy route.


2.5. Sources for test data & analysis

Comment:  It should describe details as much as possible in the data collection procedures.  Describe the data analysis methods to be used too.

2.6. Anticipated benefits

* Can detect harmful malicious nodes and isolate them from the network.
* Can distinguish pure malicious nodes and collaborative malicious nodes in the ad hoc network.
* Can predict the best route to forward packets

3. Project plan



Specified deliverables

We will implement our trust-based framework in NS-3 for the AODV module. C++ and Python languages have been used for developed this framework. It will select the most trustworthy route for forwarding packets instead of selecting the shortest path always. Therefore, network nodes can prevent from existing security attacks defined in AODV protocol.

References

[1] S. S, P. K, and T. A, “Authentication Using Trust to Detect Misbehaving Nodes in Mobile Ad hoc Networks Using Q-Learning,” *Int. J. Netw. Secur. Its Appl.*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 47–64, 2016.

[2]     K. J. R. Liu, “Information theoretic framework of trust modeling and evaluation for ad hoc networks,” *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 305–317, 2006.

[3]       R. Dalal, “Different Ways to Achieve Trust in MANET,” *Int. J. AdHoc Netw. Syst.*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 53–64, 2012.

[4]       C. Fountas, “Swarm Intelligence: The Ant Paradigm,” Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2010, pp. 137–157.

[5]     P. Velloso, R. Laufer, D. De O. Cunha, O. C. Duarte, and G. Pujolle, “Trust management in mobile ad hoc networks using a scalable maturity-based model,” *IEEE Trans. Netw. Serv. Manag.*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 172–185, 2010.

[6]    T. Farid and A. Prahladachar, “Secure Routing with AODV Protocol for Mobile Ad Hoc Networks.”

[7] S. Subramanian and B. Ramachandran, “QOS Assestion in MANET Routing based on Trusted AODV,” Int. J. Ad hoc, Sens. Ubiquitous Comput., vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 135–143, 2012.

[8]   J. S. S.Uma, “Human Interaction Pattern Mining Using Enhanced Artificial Bee Colony Algorithm S.,” *Int. J. Innov. Res. Comput. Commun. Eng.*, vol. 3, no. 10, pp. 10131–10138, 2015.

[9] R. K. Bar, J. K. Mandal, and M. M. Singh, “QoS of MANet Through Trust based AODV Routing Protocol by Exclusion of Black Hole Attack,” *Procedia Technol.*, vol. 10, pp. 530–537, 2013.

[10]   Y. Yoo and D. P. Agrawal, “Why does it pay to be selfish in a MANET?,” *IEEE Wirel. Commun.*, vol. 13, no. 6, pp. 87–97, 2006.

[11] R. Neogy, C. Chowdhury, and S. Neogy, “Reliability of mobile agents for reliable service discovery protocol in MANET,” *arXiv Prepr. arXiv1111.1865*, vol. 3, no. 5, pp. 229–243, 2011