

Dynamic Rendezvous based Routing Algorithm on Sparse Opportunistic Network Environment

Jiradett Kerdsri

School of Information, Computer,
and Communication Technology (ICT),

Sirindhorn International Institute of Technology, Thailand

Email: jiradett.k@dti.or.th

Komwut Wipusitwarkun

School of Information, Computer,
and Communication Technology (ICT),

Sirindhorn International Institute of Technology, Thailand

Email: komwut@siit.tu.ac.th

Abstract—Opportunistic network is a challenge network where the nodes need to communicate with each other even either direct or indirect routes between them may not permanently exist due to the nodes' random movement. Most routing algorithms in this dynamic network environment employ *store-carry-forward* paradigm by which a node can keep the receiving messages, carrying the messages with them when moving and then forwarding the messages (or the copies) to the opportunistic meeting nodes when possible. This routing model works well in the networks with high-to-moderate node density in which the opportunity that the moving nodes can meet with each other is rather high. On the other hand, it has been reported that the delivery ratio becomes remarkably low in the sparse network environment especially when there is strict constraint on message delivery deadline. In this paper, we introduce the novel concept of rendezvous place where the passing nodes can announce, deposit or pickup their own messages without having to meet the other nodes carrying the desired message. In the proposed scheme, the rendezvous place can be detected automatically and its area's size and shape are dynamically changed according to the interaction among nodes passing around the area. The results from intensive simulations show that our proposed routing algorithm can achieve higher delivery ratio and utilize lower energy consumption than traditional opportunistic routing algorithms especially in sparse network environment.

I. INTRODUCTION

Opportunistic Network (OppNet) is an extreme type of Delay Tolerant Networks (DTNs) where the source and destination nodes might never be fully connected at the same time, thus there is no guarantee on the existence of a complete path between two nodes wishing to communicate [1]. This intermittent connections may result from several factors such as high node mobility, low node density, environmental interference and obstruction, short radio range and malicious attacks [2] etc. The node movement in OppNet is extremely random in some networking environment, thus the probability of message delivery from source to destination is difficult to assure. Example of such networks are sparse mobile ad hoc network [3], military tactical networks [4], [5] or sensor networks, such as ZebraNet [6], SWIM [7] which are wireless sensor networks in which nodes move throughout an environment working to gather and process information about their surroundings. Commonly, the key differentiating factors among those scenarios are the amount of predictability and control over the contacts between the message carriers [8]. A key concept behind

Opportunistic Routing (OR) is overhearing and cooperation among relaying nodes to overcome the drawback of unreliable wireless transmission [9]. Since the mobile nodes are not always connected to each other, the forwarding algorithms in such network commonly follow a store-carry-forward (SCF) paradigm. This SCF employs storage space and node mobility to overcome the intermittent connectivity [10]. The messages sent from the source node are carried by intermediate nodes to other geographical area and transferred to adjacent nodes until the destination node receives this message. Since this fundamental SCF routing model realistically requires a certain sufficient occasion of *direct* encounter among moving nodes to exchange messages, its routing performance will highly degrade in the low-node-density sparse network [11]. Although there are several existing OppNet routing solutions [5], [12]–[16] proposed in the literature, very few proposals address the problem in this sparse network environment especially when the OppNet nodes are energy-constrained [17], [18] and the direction of their movement cannot be controlled. One interesting application of such OppNet environment is the sensor OppNet for wildlife monitoring and tracking [6], [7].

In this paper, we proposed a novel Dynamic Rendezvous based Routing Algorithms (DRRA) to increase message exchanging opportunity even in the sparse network environment. We utilize the fact that there should be some node-gathering (Rendezvous) places forming somewhere at some specific time in the real network. These Rendezvous places may be either predictable such as along the river in the wildlife monitoring application, or non-predictable such as disaster and emergency networks. An energy constrained node should maximize its resource usage to communicate with the others only when entering into the rendezvous area. In the proposed scheme, the rendezvous place is dynamically marked by the help of a special controllable Rendezvous node and the proposed rumor protocol to let nodes in the rendezvous area exchange messages more efficiently without having to directly meet with the other nodes.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In section II, we discuss the overview of SFC routing models and existing works. The detail of rendezvous based routing model is elaborated in section III. In section IV, we present the result of our simulation and show the performance of our scheme



Fig. 1. Store Carry and Forward routing model

under different conditions. We conclude the paper and point out some future research directions in section V.

II. THE SCF ROUTING MODELS AND EXISTING WORKS

In OppNet, the messages are delivered using Store-Carry-Forward routing by which the nodes can exchange data whenever they come in close. If there is no direct connection from source to destination, data holding nodes will discover their nearest neighbor nodes to forward messages toward the destination node as shown in Fig. 1. There are several existing works in the literature [5], [16], [19]–[23] with the aim for 100% delivery ratio which is quite difficult to achieve especially in sparse network with constraints in energy consumption and message delivery deadline.

Vahdat et al [16] proposed the epidemic routing using uncontrolled flooding algorithm in which the replication of source data is not restricted with any limits in order to route the message from source to destination in the intermittently connected network. However, this type of routing incurs significant demand on both bandwidth and buffer. To address the excess traffic overhead, Khaled et al [19] proposed a Controlled Flooding scheme which can limit the flooding by three parameters: Willingness probability, Time-to-Live, and Kill Time. Nevertheless, flooding based routing performance degrading has been reported in a very sparse network [20].

Lindgren et al [21] proposed a prediction based routing called PROPHET (Probabilistic Routing Protocol using History of Encounters and Transitivity) by estimating the delivery predictability to indicate the probability of success in delivering a message to the destination from the local node. In this prediction based routing category, Brun et al [22] also proposed a protocol utilizing the motion vector of mobile nodes to predict the future location of mobile nodes by using the knowledge of relative velocities of a node and its neighbor nodes to predict the closest distance between two nodes. Although the prediction based approach can reduce traffic overhead in the network, but it lacks of the aim to improve the performance in extremely low node density and failed in some certain cases which leads to the delivery ratio reduction.

To refine the prediction based routing, Boldrini et al [23] proposed the History based routing (HiBOp) which exploits current context information for data forwarding decisions. Even though, this context based routing approach can reduce the resource consumption in terms of network traffic and

storage but it increases the delay which results in significantly less efficient than Epidemic algorithm. Kerdsri et al [5] proposed DORSI protocol with the concept of content based routing which aims to classify the data in the network by messages' significance level in order to guarantee the delivery of more important data. However, the decreasing in network performance under sparse environment is not mentioned in this proposed protocol. Overall, the performance of most existing algorithms are degrading in very sparse node density and the energy consumption does not take in to the consideration which is a crucial factor in such mobile sensor devices such as in wildlife monitoring.

III. THE PROPOSED RENDEZVOUS BASED OPPNET SYSTEM

A. System model

The proposed system is designed to efficiently use the node-gathering area, i.e. Rendezvous place, for depositing the delivered messages as much as possible so that the messages can be picked up by the destination node without requiring the exact timing of direct contact between the node carrying a message and the desired destination node. In addition, all nodes should reserve its energy as much as possible when they are out of the Rendezvous area.

As shown in Fig. 2, the OppNet node, N_c , whose movement direction is uncontrollable, moves in the system using *Power Saving Mode* until it reaches the Rendezvous place where it will turn itself to *Full Power Mode* in order to announce its arrival, deposit its carried messages and pick up the messages destined to itself, to/from the Rendezvous place. The Rendezvous Rumor protocol and Rendezvous Node Sweeping mechanism are used inside the Rendezvous area to let messages being exchanged more effectively without the need of direct contact between the OppNet node and the high-resource direction-controllable Rendezvous node, N_{rv} , which is act as the center of the Rendezvous place. The Rendezvous nodes will move around the OppNet network to create suitable Rendezvous places according to the proposed *Rendezvous Place Searching algorithm*.

B. OppNet node's operational modes: "Full Power" and "Power Saving"

The OppNet node (N_c) is a mobile node equipped with the radio interface whose transmission range is adjustable in range of $[r_c^{min}, r_c^{max}]$. The node will operate in either *Full Power mode* or *Power Saving mode* according to its location.

1) *Full power mode*: In this mode, the node will use its full transmission power, r_c^{max} , to search for nearby nodes and exchange messages. It will switch to this mode only when getting into the Rendezvous area.

2) *Power saving mode*: The node, by default, operates in this mode if it is outside the Rendezvous place. In this mode, it will alternately change its transmission range between r_c^{min} and r_c^{max} in the process of searching for nearby nodes. However, if it receives the searching signal from the other node, it will switch to its full r_c^{max} immediately in order to increase opportunity to exchange messages with the encountered node




Fig. 2. System model




Fig. 3. Operational modes

as much as possible. Then, it will switch back to minimum r_c^{min} when departing from the communicating node. Besides the r_c^{min} and r_c^{max} values, the ratio of the time interval being in it full r_c^{max} over the whole time period is a configurable parameter, τ_s , as shown in Fig. 3.

C. Rendezvous place and its Rumor protocol

The Rendezvous place is a dynamic area centered by a special controllable Rendezvous node, N_{rv} . This N_{rv} node is full of resources such as large message storage and high radio power with maximum transmission range R_{rv} . The Rendezvous place is controlled by the Rendezvous node using Rendezvous rumor protocol.

The area in Rendezvous place is not fixed as the maximum radio range, R_{rv} , of the Rendezvous node, instead it is virtually determined by the covering radio range of the most outer OppNet nodes which can relay the data messages from the Rendezvous node, as shown in Fig. 2

When an OppNet node detects the *Rendezvous Area rumor message (RA)* broadcasted from the Rendezvous node, it learns that it enters to the Rendezvous area. Then, it will switch its operational mode to *Full Power mode* and try to rebroadcast such *Rendezvous Area* rumor message so that the other reachable nearby nodes can learn about Rendezvous place and can adaptively expand the area on-demand. Additionally, the OppNet node in the Rendezvous area will periodically announce its arrival and upload its carried data messages to the Rendezvous node via the *Keep-Alive* rumor message (*KA*) and the *Deposit* rumor message (*DP*) respectively. Note that



Fig. 4. Rendezvous Place

all types of rumor messages will be automatically repeated with *duplication filtering* function throughout the area by other OppNet nodes.

Once the rendezvous node receives the *Keep-alive* rumor message which contains the sending node ID, it will gather all data messages destined to the node ID from its message storage, encapsulate those found messages into the created *Pick-up* rumor message and then broadcast the *Pick-up* message (*PU*) throughout the Rendezvous area. On the other hand, the Rendezvous node will keep all of data messages contained in the received *Deposit* rumor messages in its storage for later sending out to the area when the target node appears later as seen in Fig. 4.

In addition to the Rendezvous rumor protocol, the Rendezvous node implements the rumor message sweeping algorithm in order to increase the chance to collect as many rumor messages as possible. Instead of always being stationary at the center location of the Rendezvous place, the rendezvous node will periodically move to its four directions (North, East, West, South) by the distance of its radio transmission range as shown in Fig. 5. This design lets the OppNet nodes on the edge of Rendezvous node's radio range, whose radio signal may not reach to the Rendezvous node due to the difference in their radio transmission range, can speak back to the Rendezvous node.

D. Rendezvous place searching algorithm

In the proposed system, the Rendezvous node should move to find the node-gathering area corresponding with the real behavior of OppNet node.

1) *Predictable behavior OppNet nodes*: In some applications, the movement of OppNet node is somehow predictable. Take a wildlife monitoring as an example, most animals are




Fig. 5. Sweep mechanism




Fig. 6. Rendezvous place searching

usually cyclically gathering in the high supplies area such as along side of the main river of some specific place at some specific time [24]. In these applications, the Rendezvous nodes can be programmed to be located at those areas at the proper time in order to maximize the effectiveness of the proposed system.

2) *Non-Predictable behavior OppNet nodes*: Without any priori knowledge about OppNet node, the proposed *dynamic Rendezvous Place Searching Algorithm* can be used to guide the Rendezvous nodes to the node-gathering area. The Rendezvous node will decide to move to the new node gathering location if the number of OppNet node in the current Rendezvous place (η_c) falls below the predefined departure node threshold, H_d . The movement direction, $\vec{\Delta}$, will be determined periodically based on the collected statistical data from both previously contacting OppNet nodes and other neighboring Rendezvous nodes as in Eq.1. In the equation, \vec{w}_c is the departure directional unit vector of the contacted OppNet nodes, \vec{w}_r is the directional unit vector of the other Rendezvous nodes and the φ is a configurable weighting factor between group of OppNet nodes and group of other Rendezvous nodes in the area.

$$\vec{\Delta} = \sum_{i=1}^C \vec{w}_c^i + \varphi \sum_{j=1}^R \delta(d_j) \vec{w}_{rv}^j \quad (1)$$

While the $\delta(d_j)$ is the on-off function to include only the other Rendezvous nodes whose distance d_j is the range of cut-

off distance perimeter, D_{cc} , and the C and R are the number of contacted OppNet nodes and the number of other Rendezvous nodes respectively.

$$\delta(d_j) = \begin{cases} 1 & ; \quad d_j \leq D_{cc} \\ 0 & ; \quad d_j > D_{cc} \end{cases}$$

The Rendezvous node will decide to stop at the expected node-gathering area when the number of OppNet nodes in the current Rendezvous place (γ_c) become greater than the predefined Rendezvous place node threshold, Γ_c as shown in Fig. 6.

IV. EVALUATION

The objective of the evaluations is to analyze the performance of our proposed protocol on the sparse network environment comparing with traditional OppNet protocols. We compare both predictable and non-predictable behavior OppNet nodes with the commonly well-known Epidemic protocol [16] under different node density environments.

A. Simulation setup

We setup a simulation environment using ONE (Opportunistic Network Environment) [25], which is a powerful tool designed for running opportunistic network simulation with various routing protocols and different movement models. All the results are obtained by averaging over a few hundreds independent simulation runs with different seeds. For the OppNet simulation model, the main parameter that largely effected the evaluation performance is the movement model. In our evaluation, we deploy Group movement model instead of the most commonly used, Random Way Point (RWP) model [26], to correctly capture the the actual behavior of node movements. In fact, several multi-hop wireless network scenarios are most realistically represented using Group movement model [27] which represents the random motion of a group of mobile nodes as well as the random motion of each individual mobile node within the group. This is the vital case for modeling the routing simulation in OppNet since the movements in several cases are in swarm behavior, in which nodes are aggregates together and moving in some directions, such as the movement of animals or military tactical operations. The other parameters that mainly effect the evaluation performance are the area of operation, the wireless range of the nodes, node velocity and spatial location of the nodes [26]. In our simulation, we fix the number of nodes while increasing and decreasing the area of operation which results in wide range of node density parameter for evaluation. Node density (λ) is defined as the number of nodes per unit area. If N nodes are distributed in a square grid of size $M \times M$ m^2 then the λ is given by $\lambda = \frac{N}{M^2}$. The wireless range of our OppNet node can be adjusted depending on the environment while the node velocity is equal to the normal human walking speed. The common parameters are summarized in Table I.

TABLE I
SIMULATION VARIABLES

Parameters	N_c	N_{rv}
Message Size	500 KB - 1 MB	
Maximum Radio Range	30 Meters	100 Meters
Transmission Speed	54 Mbps	
Router	DRRA — Epidemic	
Moving Speed	0.5 - 1.5 m/s	
Movement Model	Group Movement Model	

B. Metric

Opportunistic routing protocols are commonly evaluated by delivery ratio, median latency and network overhead. However, we required specific composite metrics in order to clearly observe the performance of our proposed protocol. In our evaluation we consider the following metrics:

a) *Delivery ratio* (D_r): is defined as the ratio of the total number of messages successfully delivered within the deadline ($M_{delivered}$) to the total number of messages created from the source nodes that need to be delivered ($M_{created}$) as shown in Eq. 2.

$$D_r = \frac{M_{delivered}}{M_{created}} \quad (2)$$

b) *Delivery performance* (D_p): is a composite metrics defined as a delivery ratio per energy consumption unit in order to clearly analyze our protocol performance. Basically, the relation between energy consumption and radio range can be determined by Eq.3 [28], [29].

$$E_T = L \cdot \epsilon_{fs} \cdot d^\alpha \quad (3)$$

E_T is the amounts of transmission energy consumed at a node for transmitting an L-length message, where α is the power loss component with $\alpha \in [2, 4]$ and $\epsilon_{fs} [J/(bit/m^\alpha)]$ is the amount of energy consumed by an amplifier to transmit one bit data at an acceptable quality level. In this protocol, we approximately determine the relationship between unit of consumed energy and radio radius of node in the term of exponential equation. We assume the simplicity of energy model by only accounting for the communication energy consumption of a wireless interface and do not consider other resources such as computation, location services or mobility. In fact, the messages generated from protocol are accounted for the delivery performance. As a result, the energy consumption can be simply derived as Eq. 4.

$$E_P \propto M_P \cdot r_P^2 \quad (4)$$

Therefore, the delivery performance can be calculated from Eq. 5.

$$D_P = \frac{D_r^P}{E_{P,B}} = \frac{D_r^P}{\left(\frac{M_P \cdot r_P^2}{M_B \cdot r_B^2} \right)} \quad (5)$$




Fig. 7. Delivery Ratio per Node Density




Fig. 9. Number of Created Messages per Node Density




Fig. 8. Delivery Performance per Node Density

In this Equation, P is the target protocol while B is the baseline protocol (Epidemic protocol, for example) to be used as comparative energy reference. M is the message number transmitted by OppNet nodes, excluding Rendezvous node in Rendezvous place. The average transmission radius is referred as r while α is the power consumption exponent factor [2,4] which we are using the value of 2 for our simulation.

C. Simulation Results

This section shows the results of the different simulations that have been performed evaluating the impact in the performance. The following subsections include the results of each set of simulations.

1) *Delivery performance*: Firstly, the comparison of delivery ratio is shown in Fig. 7 while x -axis represents the node density (the number of nodes in the area of 1 km^2) and y -axis shows the delivery ratio. In our simulation, we assume the environment with 1 Rendezvous node and the ratio of time interval factor between full power and power saving, τ_s of 0.5.

Fig. 7 shows that our proposed protocols gain slightly better delivery ratio in the dense environment. On the other hand, the proposed protocols gain significantly higher delivery ratio in the sparse environment by maintaining the ratio up to 80%, even when node density is as low as 50 nodes/km^2 in non-predictable behavior or as low as 5 nodes/km^2 nodes in predictable behavior. Over all in average, our proposed protocols gain approximately 40% higher delivery ratio than existing traditional Epidemic routing.

The reason behind the behaviors from this result is that the Rendezvous concept can be clearly performed better when the node density becomes sparse since all nodes can effortlessly exchange messages in the dense network. However, in the sparse network, the Rendezvous nodes can help facilitating the messages exchange mechanism among OppNet nodes which resulting in much higher delivery ratio. In addition, with the knowledge of node gathering-area, the delivery ratio can be further increased especially in the extremely low node density.

Furthermore, the proposed protocols utilize less energy consumption which is a vital factor in opportunistic network because the mobile nodes in this scheme are usually equipped with limited power resources that the performance can be seen in Fig. 8. Similar to graph of delivery ratio, we compare the delivery performance (y -axis) on node density (x -axis), in which the D_p can be calculated from Eq. 5. It can be obviously seen that the proposed protocols in Fig. 8 can save about half of energy consumption in order to achieve the same delivery ratio in the dense environment. Nevertheless, the propose protocol use only 25% power consumption in sparse environment. The better delivery performance results from the lower messages number of our proposed protocols compare to the Epidemic counter part as can see in Fig. 9. Additionally, the other factor that impact the higher delivery performance is the lower average wireless transmission of our proposed protocol.

2) *Power saving factor*: In this section, we study the factors effecting the power saving and the trade-off between power




Fig. 10. The Optimum between Delivery Ratio and Delivery Performance




Fig. 11. Multiple Rendezvous Nodes

consumption and delivery ratio. We define the Power Saving Factor, n_{ps} as the energy consumption parameter to analyze the power utilization of our proposed protocol which can be determined as in Eq. 6. In the simulation, we select the density of 100, 200 and 300 nodes to study the impact of power saving factor to the delivery ratio on different density environment.

$$n_{ps} = \tau_s \cdot \frac{r_c^{max} - r_c^{min}}{r_c^{max}} \quad (6)$$

From Fig. 10, the graph presents the declining in the delivery ratio when the value of n_{ps} increases. This implies that in the attempt of saving the energy, the deliverable of messages are effected from the wireless range reduction. On the other hand, the delivery performance is increasing with the value of power saving factor which shows that the higher the n_{ps} , the higher the delivery performance. Overall, the key point of Fig. 10 is the cross point between delivery ratio and delivery performance which can see at $n_{ps} = 0.55$ which is the optimum point of our method.




Fig. 12. R_c^{max}/R_{rv} ratio

3) *Rendezvous node factor*: We investigate the main parameters effecting the environment of N_{rv} in this part. In Fig. 11, the number of N_{rv} are varied from one to four nodes in our simulation. The result shows similar trend of overall delivery ratio which slightly declining when the node density decreases. Nevertheless, the delivery ratio increase when more rendezvous nodes are injected into the environment. The results suggest that more number of rendezvous node can gain higher delivery ratio. Fig. 12 shows the relationship between R_c^{max} and R_{rv} over the delivery ratio, starting from R_c^{max}/R_{rv} ratio of 0.1 to 1.0. This graph shows moderate incrementing in delivery ratio when the ratio of R_c^{max}/R_{rv} increases. The result suggests that the value of R_c^{max} has slightly effect on delivery ratio.

V. CONCLUSION

Opportunistic Routing techniques can be applied in plentiful variety of scenarios such as military network or wildlife monitoring. In this paper, we investigate the use of rendezvous points in opportunistic network routing to increase the delivery ratio in extreme sparse network environment. This novel protocol proposes the two new types of node, Rendezvous node and OppNet node, which can help maintaining the messages in one place as long as possible in order to bridge the gap of time and space domain. In this Rendezvous place, the passing nodes can announce, deposit and pickup their own messages without meeting with other nodes that carried desired messages. The size and shape of Rendezvous place can be adapted to the environment of OppNet nodes in the area. We define our routing model in two functions: predictable and non-predictable behavior OppNet node functions. The result suggest that our protocols perform significant higher in delivery performance which is the trade off of delivery ratio per energy consumption. We can simply imply that if the location of rendezvous place can be predicted, we can achieve highest network performance. Our experiment also suggest that the OppNet node can gain higher delivery performance

when the time interval of power saving mode is longer and the minimum radio range is higher. In the future work, this concept of smart node can be further extend to increase the intelligence of the node since the technologies are advanced rapidly.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was supported by Sirindhorn International Institute of Technology, Thammasat University, Thailand and Basic Research Program from Data Communication Laboratory, Research and Development Department at Defense Technology Institute Thailand.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Zeng, Kai and Lou, Wenjing and Li, *Taxonomy of Opportunistic Routing: Principles and Behaviors*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2011, ch. Taxonomy o, pp. 27–38.
- [2] A. T. Prodhon, R. Das, H. Kabir, and G. C. Shojha, “TTL based routing in opportunistic networks,” *Journal of Network and Computer Applications*, vol. 34, no. 5, pp. 1660–1670, Sep. 2011.
- [3] K. Alekeish and P. Ezhilchelvan, “Consensus in sparse, mobile ad hoc networks,” *Parallel and Distributed Systems, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 467–474, March 2012.
- [4] K. Scott, “Disruption tolerant networking proxies for on-the-move tactical networks,” in *Military Communications Conference, 2005. MILCOM 2005. IEEE*, 2005, pp. 3226–3231 Vol. 5.
- [5] J. Kerdsri and K. Wipusitwarkun, “DORSI : Data-wise Opportunistic Routing with Spatial Information,” *Journal of Convergence Information Technology*, vol. 8, no. August, pp. 91–103, 2013.
- [6] P. Zhang, C. M. Sadler, S. A. Lyon, and M. Martonosi, “Hardware design experiences in ZebraNet,” in *Proceedings of the 2nd international conference on Embedded networked sensor systems - SenSys '04*, 2004, p. 227. [Online]. Available: <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1031522>
- [7] T. Small and Z. J. Haas, “The Shared Wireless Infostation Model - A New Ad Hoc Networking Paradigm (or Where there is a Whale , there is a Way) ,” pp. 233–244, 2003.
- [8] T. Kärkkäinen, M. Pitkanen, and J. Ott, “Applications in Delay-Tolerant and Opportunistic Networks,” in *Mobile Ad Hoc Networking*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2013, pp. 315–359. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9781118511305.ch9>
- [9] H. Liu, B. Zhang, H. T. Mouftah, X. Shen, and J. Ma, “Opportunistic routing for wireless ad hoc and sensor networks: Present and future directions,” *Communications Magazine, IEEE*, vol. 47, no. 12, pp. 103–109, 2009.
- [10] Y. Ma and A. Jamalipour, “Opportunistic geocast in large scale intermittently connected mobile ad hoc networks,” in *The 17th Asia Pacific Conference on Communications*, no. October. IEEE, Oct. 2011, pp. 445–449.
- [11] T. Spyropoulos, R. Rais, T. Turletti, K. Obraczka, and A. Vasilakos, “Routing for disruption tolerant networks: taxonomy and design,” *Wireless Networks*, vol. 16, no. 8, pp. 2349–2370, 2010.
- [12] Y. Zhang, Z. Wang, J. Li, M. Song, Y. Teng, and B. Liu, “Opportunistic Networks Architecture with Fixed Infrastructure Nodes,” *Pervasive Computing and the Networked World*, vol. 7719, pp. 862–868, 2013.
- [13] C.-M. Huang, K. chan Lan, and C.-Z. Tsai, “A survey of opportunistic networks,” in *Advanced Information Networking and Applications - Workshops, 2008. AINAW 2008. 22nd International Conference on*, March 2008, pp. 1672–1677.
- [14] T. Spyropoulos, K. Psounis, and C. Raghavendra, “Single-copy routing in intermittently connected mobile networks,” in *Sensor and Ad Hoc Communications and Networks, 2004. IEEE SECON 2004. 2004 First Annual IEEE Communications Society Conference on*, Oct 2004, pp. 235–244.
- [15] M. Grossglauser and D. Tse, “Mobility increases the capacity of ad hoc wireless networks,” *Networking, IEEE/ACM Transactions on*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 477–486, Aug 2002.
- [16] A. Vahdat and D. Becker, “Epidemic Routing for Partially-Connected Ad Hoc Networks,” Technical Report CS-200006, Duke University, Tech. Rep.
- [17] L. Xie, Y. Shi, Y. Hou, and A. Lou, “Wireless power transfer and applications to sensor networks,” *Wireless Communications, IEEE*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 140–145, August 2013.
- [18] Z. A. Eu, H.-P. Tan, and W. K. Seah, “Opportunistic routing in wireless sensor networks powered by ambient energy harvesting,” *Computer Networks*, vol. 54, no. 17, pp. 2943–2966, Dec. 2010. [Online]. Available: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1389128610001581>
- [19] K. A. Harras, K. C. Almeroth, and E. M. Belding-Royer, “Delay Tolerant Mobile Networks (DTMNs): Controlled Flooding in Sparse Mobile Networks,” in *Proceedings of the 4th IFIP-TC6 International Conference on Networking Technologies, Services, and Protocols; Performance of Computer and Communication Networks; Mobile and Wireless Communication Systems*, ser. NETWORKING’05. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2005, pp. 1180–1192. [Online]. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/11422778_95
- [20] V. V. Neena and V. M. A. Rajam, “Performance analysis of epidemic routing protocol for opportunistic networks in different mobility patterns,” *2013 International Conference on Computer Communication and Informatics*, pp. 1–5, Jan. 2013.
- [21] A. Lindgren, A. Doria, and O. Schelén, “Probabilistic routing in intermittently connected networks,” *SIGMOBILE Mob. Comput. Commun. Rev.*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 19–20, Jul. 2003.
- [22] B. Burns, O. Brock, and B. N. Levine, “Mv routing and capacity building in disruption tolerant networks,” in *In Proc. IEEE INFOCOM*, 2005, pp. 398–408.
- [23] C. Boldrini, M. Conti, J. Jacopini, and A. Passarella, “Hibop: a history based routing protocol for opportunistic networks,” in *World of Wireless, Mobile and Multimedia Networks, 2007. WoWMoM 2007. IEEE International Symposium on a*, June 2007, pp. 1–12.
- [24] C.-M. Yu, C.-S. Lu, and S.-Y. Kuo, “Habitual Behavior-Based Opportunistic Data Forwarding in Wildlife Tracking,” *2007 4th International Symposium on Wireless Communication Systems*, pp. 807–808, Oct. 2007.
- [25] A. Keränen, J. Ott, and T. Kärkkäinen, “The ONE simulator for DTN protocol evaluation,” *Proceedings of the Second International ICST Conference on Simulation Tools and Techniques*, 2009. [Online]. Available: <http://eudl.eu/doi/10.4108/ICST.SIMUTOOLS2009.5674>
- [26] S. Batabyal and P. Bhaumik, “Improving network performance with affinity based mobility model in opportunistic network,” *Wireless Telecommunications Symposium 2012*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 1–7, Apr. 2012.
- [27] K. Blakely and B. Lowekamp, “A structured group mobility model for the simulation of mobile ad hoc networks,” *Proceedings of the second international workshop on Mobility management & wireless access protocols - MobiWac '04*, p. 111, 2004. [Online]. Available: <http://portal.acm.org/citation.cfm?doid=1023783.1023805>
- [28] W. Yang, W. Liang, and W. Dou, “Energy-Aware Real-Time Opportunistic Routing for Wireless Ad Hoc Networks,” *2010 IEEE Global Telecommunications Conference GLOBECOM 2010*, pp. 1–6, Dec. 2010.
- [29] Q. Wang, M. Hempstead, and W. Yang, “A Realistic Power Consumption Model for Wireless Sensor Network Devices,” *2006 3rd Annual IEEE Communications Society on Sensor and Ad Hoc Communications and Networks*, pp. 286–295, 2006.