**Related Literature**

**Routing Protocols**

Routing protocols dictates where and how the router distributes packets. There are a lot of different routing protocols currently available and each of them has its own design and serves different purposes (Cisco Networking Academy, 2014).  
The key considerations that raised the need for efficient routing when implementing mesh networks are the overhead of ID per hop jumped, maintenance of nodes, send/receive overhead, power consumption, and interference. It is also important to consider that table based protocols grows bigger as nodes increase and packet header grows bigger as more nodes are included when choosing the proper routing protocol for your network ().

**Current classifications of routing protocols that are relevant to the study**

**Dynamic Routing Protocols –** According to Cisco Networking Academy (2014), this “…allow routers to dynamically share information about remote networks and automatically add this information to their own routing tables”. Because of this sharing of information, the network automatically adapt with its topology. This also allows routers to discover new networks and repair broken ones.

**I.** External Gateway Protocols (EGP) **–** Used for routing systems that are handled by different organizations.

**II.** Interior Gateway Protocols (IGP) **–** Used for routing routers that are handled by a single organization.

**a.** Distance Vector Routing Protocols –Routers that use this routing protocol are not aware of the entire map of its network. The router only knows the distance and the vector to a device connected to the network. Vector is the direction of the next hop and distance is how many hop counts or bandwidth or some other metrics, it will take to reach a destination (Cisco Networking Academy, 2014). Most routing protocols that are under this classification enable its routers to send periodic updates to all devices in the network to maintain a relevant distance and vector values (Thomas, 2008).

**a.i.** Ad-hoc On-Demand Distance Vector Routing (AODV) **-** a Distance Vector Routing Protocol specifically designed for mobile ad-hoc networks. Nodes only search for a route when it needs to transmit/retransmit a message, hence on-demand. It does not need periodic advertisements and only uses connection when needed; this means that there is less traffic in the network allowing it to have a bandwidth that is significantly higher than other routing protocols (Perkins & Royer 2003).

**b.** Link State Routing Protocols – Routers that use this routing protocol is aware and “has a complete view” of all the connections in its network (Cisco Networking Academy, 2014). It first completes a map of the entire network then calculates the best path to a destination using an algorithm. This process allows updates to converge faster at the expense of additional overhead due to the flooding it causes(Alberghetti, 2015).

**b.i.** Optimized Link State Routing Protocol (OLSR) – A revision of Link State routing protocol. OLSR is designed for mobile ad hoc networks wherein all devices connected to the network act as a node. One of its main differences from link state routing is that every node in OLSR sets a multipoint relays (MPR) (Clausen & Jacquet, 2003). Nodes will only receive transmissions from these MPR and allows them to control its traffic (Retrieved in August 17, 2016 from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3V19nPxpMp8). MPR are selected in such a way that the node that selected them will receive all transmissions in the network but with less duplicates. These duplicates contribute to the flooding that is experienced by nodes in link state routing.

**b.ii.**

**References**

1. Kozierok C., 2005, The TCP/IP Guide, <http://www.tcpipguide.com/free/t_OverviewOfKeyRoutingProtocolConceptsArchitecturesP.htm>. Retrieved August 16, 2016.

2. Perkins & Royer, 2003, <https://www.cs.cornell.edu/people/egs/615/aodv.pdf>, Retrieved August 16, 2016.

3. Cisco Networking Academy, 2014 <http://www.ciscopress.com/articles/article.asp?p=2180210&seqNum=4>, Retrieved August 16, 2016.

4. Thomas J., 2008 <http://www.omnisecu.com/cisco-certified-network-associate-ccna/introduction-to-link-state-routing-protocols.php>, Retrieved August 17, 2016.

5. Alberghetti, D, 2015 <http://www.danscourses.com/CCNA-2/link-state-routing-protocols.html>, Retrieved August 17, 2016.

6. Clausen T, Jacquet P., 2003 <https://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc3626.txt>, Retrieved August 17, 2016

7.