Overview of Sensor Network Routing Protocols

WeeSan Lee weesan@cs.ucr.edu 11/1/04

Outline

- Background
- Data-centric Protocols
 - Flooding & Gossiping
 - SPIN
 - Directed Diffusion
 - Rumor Routing
- Hierarchical Protocols
 - LEACH
- Location-based Protocols
- QoS-based Protocols

Background

Sensor nodes

- Small, wireless, battery powered
- Energy, bandwidth constrained
- Data sensing, relaying, aggregating
- No global addressing scheme
- Sink nodes
 - More powerful nodes
 - Usually gateway to wired networks
 - Data collecting and processing

The Goal

To disseminate data from sensor nodes to the sink node in energy-awareness manner, hence, maximize the lifetime of the sensor networks.

Data-centric Protocols

- The ability to query a set of sensor nodes
- Attribute-based naming
- Data aggregation during relaying
- For example:
 - Flooding & Gossiping
 - SPIN
 - Directed Diffusion
 - Rumor Routing

Flooding & Gossiping

- In flooding, sensor broadcasts packets to all its neighbors till dst reached or packets' ttl == 0
- In gossiping, sensor sends packets to a randomly selected neighbor which does the same

Flooding & Gossiping (cont)

- Pros
 - Simple
 - No routing, no state maintenance
 - Cons
 - Implosion
 - Overlap
 - Resource blindness
 - Delay in Gossiping



SPIN – Sensor Protocols for Information via Negotiation

- 3-way handshake: ADV, REQ, DATA
 - Event-driven



SPIN – Sensor Protocols for Information via Negotiation (cont)

Pros

Solve the classic problems

- Topological changes are localized
- Cons
 - No guarantee on the delivery of data

Directed Diffusion

- Sink node floods named "interest" with larger update interval
- Sensor node sends back data via "gradients"
- Sink node then sends the same "interest" with smaller update interval
 - Query-driven



10

Directed Diffusion (cont)

Pros

- On demand route setup
- Each node does aggregation and caching, thus good energy efficiency and low delay

Cons

- Query-driven, not a good choice for continuous data delivery
- Extra overhead for data matching and queries

Rumor Routing

- A trade-off between Query & Event flooding
- An agent, a long-lived packet, is generated when events happen
 - The agent propagate the event to distant nodes





http://www.cs.ucr.edu/~weesan/sensor_networks/routing.pdf

12

Rumor Routing (cont)

Pros

- Avoid query flooding
- Cons
 - Performs well only when # of events is small
 - Overhead to maintain agents and event-tables

Hierarchical Protocols

- Form a cluster, have sensor nodes communicate with cluster head
- Cluster head aggregates and relays data to the sink node
- For example:
 - LEACH
 - PEGASIS
 - TEEN & APTEEN

LEACH – Low-Energy Adaptive Clustering Hierarchy

- Each node decides if it becomes a clusterhead randomly
- Cluster-head broadcasts Adv, other nodes decide which cluster they belong to based on the strength of Adv signal
- Cluster-head creates xmit schedule
- Nodes can sleep when not their turn to xmit
- Cluster-head aggregates data & sends to sink
- Cluster head rotates randomly

LEACH – Low-Energy Adaptive Clustering Hierarchy (cont)

- Pros
 - Distributed and no global knowledge of network required
 - Cons
 - Extra overhead to do dynamic clustering

Location-based Protocols

- Use location information to route data in an energy efficient way
- Mostly for MANET, applicable to Sensor Nets
- For example:
 - MECN & SMECN
 - GAF
 - GEAR

QoS-based Protocols

- Consider e2e delay
- Some enforce soft real-time
- For example:
 - Maximum lifetime energy routing
 - Maximum lifetime data gathering
 - Minimum cost forwarding
 - SAR
 - Energy-Aware QoS Routing Protocol
 - SPEED

References

- A Survey on Routing Protocols for Wireless Sensor Networks: http://www.cs.umbc.edu/~kemal1/mypapers/Akkaya_Younis_JoA dHocRevised.pdf
- SPIN: http://wind.lcs.mit.edu/papers/spin-mobicom99.ps.gz
- Directed Diffusion: http://lecs.cs.ucla.edu/~estrin/papers/diffusion.ps
- Rumor Routing: http://lecs.cs.ucla.edu/~daveey/work/lecs/rumorroute.pdf
- LEACH: http://wind.lcs.mit.edu/papers/leach-hicss.ps