# **Mobile Systems M**



Alma Mater Studiorum – University of Bologna CdS Laurea Magistrale (MSc) in Computer Science Engineering

> Mobile Systems M course (8 ECTS) II Term – Academic Year 2022/2023

#### **02 – Mobile Ad Hoc Network (MANET) and Routing**

Paolo Bellavista [paolo.bellavista@unibo.it](mailto:paolo.bellavista@unibo.it)

#### **What is exactly an Ad Hoc Network?**



**MANET and Routing - Mobile Systems M** 



# **Primary Features of Wireless Ad Hoc Networks**

- ❑ *Created dynamically* (on-the-fly) to satisfy needs and reqs that are typically *temporary*
- ❑ *Immediate and highly reconfigurable deployment* (NO fixed infrastructure)
- ❑ High "volatility"
	- ➢ *Mobility, failures/faults*, node resources that vary over time
- ❑ Nodes with very differentiated features (*heterogeneity*)
- ❑ Nodes with *limited energy (battery-operated)*
- ❑ Any node can play the *role of potential router*
	- ➢ *Multi-hop communications*



- - ❑ Limited transmission range
	- □ Broadcast nature of the wireless medium (e.g., hidden terminal)
	- ❑ Packet loss due to transmission errors
	- ❑ *Mobility*
		- ➢ *Modifications to routing and established paths due to mobility*
		- ➢ *Packet loss* induced by mobility
		- ➢ *Network partitioning* is possibly frequent
	- □ Energy constraints
	- ❑ Easy "snooping" of wireless transmissions (associated security issues)



#### **Possible Application Areas for MANETs**

But a *vast spectrum* of possible application areas :

- □ Personal Area Networking
	- ➢ Cellphones, laptops, wrist watches, human body sensors, …
- ❑ Civil environments
	- ➢ Meeting rooms, stadiums, ships/planes groups, …
- ❑ Military environments
	- ➢ War scenarios, realization of dynamic coalitions while in the war field, lack of infrastructure in enemy fields/areas
- ❑ Rescue/emergency operations
	- ➢ Search&rescue, police actions, firemen, …
- ❑ Sensor and actuator networks
	- ➢ Groups of sensors/actuators embedded in the environment (e.g., smart home) or "scattered" in geographical wide area



# **Several Variants are Possible…**

- ❑ Fully *symmetric* environments
	- ➢ Any node has the *same capabilities and responsibilities*

#### ❑ *Asymmetric capabilities*

- ➢ Different coverage ranges and differentiated *wireless* transmission techniques
- ➢ Different *battery life*
- ➢ Different *computing capabilities*
- ➢ Different *mobility degrees* (e.g., speed ranges)

#### ❑ *Asymmetric responsibilities*

- ➢ Only some nodes can perform *packet routing*
- ➢ Only some nodes play the role of *leader* for their neighbors (e.g., clusterheads)
- ➢ Differentiated *traffic characteristics*
	- ➢ Bandwidth, latency, reliability; unicast/broadcast/multicast/geocast



- ❑ They can also *co-exist and cooperate* with infrastructurebased networks
- ❑ Different *mobility patterns*
	- ➢ People seated in waiting rooms (*limited mobility*)
	- ➢ Taxi cabs (*high mobility*)
	- ➢ Military movements (most of them are *clustered*?)
	- ➢ Personal area networks (also in this case, most movements are *clustered*?)

#### ❑ *Mobility features*

- ➢ Speed
- ➢ *Predictability* (direction, pattern, triggers, …)
- **Uniformity or lack of uniformity** in the mobility of different cooperating nodes



#### **Routing in MANETs: Overview**

#### First issue: ROUTING

- ❑ Why MANET routing is specifically hard and challenging? The answer to you  $\mathbb{Q}$ ...
- ❑ *3 routing protocols*, described below
	- ➢ Dynamic Source Routing (*DSR*)
	- ➢ Ad hoc On-demand Distance Vector routing (*AODV*)
	- ➢ Greedy Perimeter Stateless Routing (*GPSR*)

And, in addition, some elements of *the more sophisticated TORA*



# **How to Properly Perform Routing in MANETs?**

- ❑ Usually ad hoc networks *involve mobile nodes*
	- ➢ Most relevant exception (only partial): Wireless Sensor Networks (WSN)
	- ➢ Thus, mainly Mobile Ad hoc NETworks (MANETs)

❑ *Several routing protocol proposals in the related literature*

- ➢ Some of them specifically designed for MANETs
- ➢ Other ones adapted from existing protocols, previously proposed for usage in wired networks
- □ *No single protocol has demonstrated to be optimal* **in** any possible deployment environment and scenario
	- ➢ Some proposals also towards the development of *adaptive protocols*

### **Why Routing is Different in MANETs?**

#### ❑ *Host mobility*

- ➢ Link failure/repair operations in response to mobility may have different characteristics if compared with management operations reacting to other problems
- ❑ *Frequency* (*rate*) of *link failure/repair operations* may be high in the case of high mobility
- ❑ Need of exploiting *new criteria for performance evaluation*, for example
	- ➢ *Stability* of routing paths *depending on mobility*
	- ➢ *Energy consumption*



# **MANET Routing Protocols**

#### ❑ *Proactive protocols*

- ➢ *Maintain valid routes independently on ongoing traffic*
- ➢ Generally, minor latency and greater overhead
- ➢ Traditional routing solutions such as link-state and distance-vector are proactive

#### ❑ *Reactive protocols*

- *Maintain valid routes only if needed (on-demand)*
- ❑ *Geographic protocols*
	- ➢ Usage of knowledge of destination *location* to perform forwarding

#### ❑ *Hybrid protocols*

#### Which is the best approach? *It depends on traffic and mobility patterns*



# **Trivial Solution (level 0): Flooding**

#### ❑ *Advantages*

- ➢ Simplicity
- ➢ More efficient when *transmission frequency is very low* (no need of discovery/maintaining valid routes or paths)
- ➢ *Potentially higher reliability* (exploitation of *multiple paths*)
- ➢ More suitable for *high mobility patterns*

#### ❑ *Disadvantages*

- ➢ Potentially high overhead
- ➢ Potentially low reliability (broadcast exploitation, *no reliable broadcast* always available at low-layers of the employed wireless connectivity protocol)

Some protocols use *flooding for control packets*, typically for routing discovery (overhead mortgaged over the successive longer sequence of data transmissions)



- **Source routing:** it is the source that tries to establish and embeds *the whole path* (from source to destination) in the exchanged packets
- □ How does the source determine the valid path in DSR?
	- ➢ When a node S is willing to send a packet to node D, but it does not know yet a valid route to D, *S starts an operation of route discovery*
		- S performs *flooding of a Route Request* (RREQ) packet
		- **EXT** Any node *appends its own identifier* to the packet header when forwarding the received RREQ packet

# **Route Discovery in DSR (1)**





Represents RREQ transmission

[X,Y] Represents the list of identifiers appended to RREQ

# **Route Discovery in DSR (2)**





❑ Nodes J and K both perform RREQ broadcast to node D ❑ Since nodes J and K may be *hidden nodes* the one of the other, their*trasmissions may be colliding*

# **Route Discovery in DSR (3)**





Node D *does not perform forwarding* of the RREQ packet because it realizes to be the *desired destination* for the route discovery operation





- Destination D, once received the first RREQ packet, sends a reply packet called *Route Reply (RREP)*
- ❑ RREP is sent on the *inverse path* wrt the one contained in the received RREQ packet
- ❑ RREP *includes data about the path* from S to D, i.e., the one used by RREQ to reach D

#### **Route Reply in DSR: Example**









# **How to Perform Data Routing in DSR?**

- ❑ Node S, after receiving RREP, can *cache the path*  included in the RREP message
- ❑ When node S is willing to send a data packet to D, *the whole routing path is included in the packet header*  (this is the reason why this is called source routing)
- ❑ *Intermediary nodes use the source route* included in the data packet to *determine to which node the packet has to be forwarded*

#### **Data Messages in DSR**





*The packet header size grows with the path length*



- *Path caching (or route caching)* is an add-on optimization
- Any node can perform caching of new paths that it happens to discover, in any possible way
- ❑ Advantages
	- ➢ *Accelerates* the route discovery process
	- ➢ *Reduces* the *RREQ propagation* process
	- ➢ Helps the exploitation of additional alternate paths
- Disadvantages
	- ➢ *Invalid caches* (*stale caches*) may negatively affect on the overall performance
		- How to invalidate the distributed caches?

### **Route Error (RERR)**





□ *J sends an RERR packet to S* along the JFES path when its forwarding of a data packet from S to D fails, e.g., due to node mobility

❑ Nodes that listen to the RERR packet can update their path cache and *remove the JD link*

# **DSR: Pros and Cons**



#### ❑ *Advantages*

- ➢ Paths are maintained only among nodes that need to communicate (reduced overhead)
- ➢ Caching can reduce the overhead associated with routing discovery
- ➢ Each discovery can lead to the determination of *multiple paths* to destination because of intermediaries that reply based on local caches

#### ❑ *Disadvantages*

- ➢ *Growth of packet header size*
- ➢ *RREQ flooding*
- ➢ Necessary mechanisms to avoid RREQ collisions among neighbors
- ➢ Increase of channel conflicts when sending RREP (*RREP storm issue*; overhearing and local decision based on shortest path)
- ➢ RREPs that use *stale cache* (affecting other caches in cascading)
	- Static timeout for caching, or
	- Adaptive timeout based on expected mobility, statistics about link usage, probability of link failure



### **Ad hoc On-demand Distance Vector (AODV)**

(Perkins&Royer, Sun&UCSB, 1999)

- DSR may lead also to *large-size headers* and consequent performance degradation
	- $\triangleright$  In particular, when typical payloads are small
- ❑ *AODV* tries to improve the DSR efficiency *by maintaining lightweight routing tables, suitable for MANET nodes*
	- $\triangleright$  Data packets do not include path info at all
- ❑ AODV maintains the positive feature of DSR that *paths are stored only on the nodes that need to communicate* (by need)



- ❑ *Route requests (RREQ) are forwarded similarly* to analogous packets in *DSR*
- ❑ When a node performs re-broadcasting of a RREQ packet, it initializes and starts an *inverse path that is directed* to the source node
- ❑ When the target destination receives an RREQ, it replies with a *Route Reply (RREP) packet*
- ❑ *RREP travels along the inverse path that is configured during the forwarding chain* of RREQ and *consequently configures the entries of the routing tables* only of the *traversed nodes*

### **RREQ/Reverse Path Setup in AODV (1)**







# **RREQ/Reverse Path Setup in AODV (2)**





Represents the links for the inverse path Backpointers are stored over the path nodes

# **RREQ/Reverse Path Setup in AODV (3)**





D does NOT perform RREQ forwarding because it is THE destination of RREQ

### **Route Reply in AODV**





Represents the link on the path used by RREP *Forward links* are configured when the RREP packet passes through the inverse path

### **Data Transmission in AODV**





❑ The entries of the local routing tables are used to perform forwarding of data packets ❑ Differently from DSR, the path is not included in the header

#### **Examples of AODV Routing Tables**





node 2's route table



#### **Timeout**



❑ Any entry of a routing table that includes an *inverse path is discarded after a given timeout*

- ➢ Why? If *RREQ did NOT get to reach its destination, or if RREP did NOT correctly return back*, the related entry would occupy local memory in a completely useless way
- ➢ *Timeout must be sufficiently long* to allow *RREP packets to return back*
- ❑ Any entry of a routing table that includes a *forward path*  is removed if not used for a given interval called active\_route\_timeout (longer than the timeout for inverse paths)
	- ➢ Why? The path may *become invalid in short time* in highly mobile networks



- ❑ *A neighbor node is considered active* for one entry in the routing table if *one of its packets has been forwarded by using that entry* in the last active\_route\_timeout time interval
- ❑ When a *link* towards a next node included in the routing table *fails*, all *active neighbors are informed*
- ❑ A node generates *RERR in response to a broken path* to destination D
	- ➢ When S receives RERR, it starts a *new route discovery process*  towards D



**In addition: Link Failure Detection**

❑ *Hello messages*: *neighbor nodes periodically exchange alive messages*

❑ *Lack of hello messages* is used as an indication of possible *fault/failure of a link*

❑ Alternatively, *the lack of a series of received ACKs at the MAC layer* can be used as an indication of probable link failure *(cross-layer monitoring)*



### **How to Limit Flooding during the Phase of Route Discovery?**

- ❑ Optimization: *gradual expansion of the search, ring shaped*
- ❑ RREQ messages are sent initially with *limited TTL*, in order to limit their propagation
	- ➢ DSR also may exploit (and several versions of it do that) a similar optimization
- ❑ If no RREP message is received, then the approach is to *try again with larger TTL*
	- ➢ Sending of a new RREQ

#### Therefore, we are looking for a more balanced *tradeoff among which factors*?



- ❑ *Possible additional optimization*: an intermediate node with a route to D can reply to RREQ
	- ➢ Faster operation
	- ➢ Decreases the issue of route request flood
- ❑ This optimization can cause loops in presence of link failures
# **AODV: Routing Loops**





- Assume that link C-D fails and node A does not know about it (RERR packet from C is lost)
- ❑ C performs a route discovery for D
- Node A receives the route request (via path C-E-A)
- Node A replies, since A knows a route to D via node B
- ❑ *Results in a loop: C-E-A-B-C*



- ❑ Each node X maintains a *sequence number*
	- ❑ acts as a time stamp
	- □ incremented every time X sends any message
- $\square$  Each route to X (at any node Y) also has X's sequence number associated with it, which is Y's latest knowledge of X's sequence number
- ❑ *Sequence number relates to 'freshness' of the route* – higher the number, more up to date is the route



# **Use of Sequence Numbers in AODV**



*Loop freedom*: intermediate node replies with a route (instead of forwarding request) only if it has a route with a higher associated sequence number



### **DSN = Destination Sequence Number**



Link failure increments the DSN at C (now is 10) If C needs route to D, RREQ carries the DSN (10) A does not reply as its own DSN is less than 10

# **Mobility-related Path Maintenance**





❑ Movement not along the active path triggers no action

- ➢ If source moves, reinitiate route discovery
- ❑ When destination or intermediate node moves
	- ➢ upstream node of break broadcasts RERR messages
	- ➢ RERR contains list of all destinations no longer reachable due to link break
	- ➢ RERR propagated until node with no precursors for destination is reached



## **Greedy Perimeter Stateless Routing (GPSR; Karp&Kung, Harvard, 2000)**

*Geographic routing exploits location information* to facilitate reaching the destination

❑Assumption#1: *source node knows the destination location* 

### ❑Assumption#2: nodes maintain *lists of neighbor nodes and their locations*

➢Need to include *location info in hello messages* (beacons) that are periodically exchanged

### *Two schemes for data forwarding*:

- ❑ *Greedy forwarding*: data are sent to the neighbor node that is estimated as the closest one towards the destination (usage of only the location info of neighbor nodes for data forwarding)
- ❑ If *greedy forwarding fails*, switch to a different scheme, i.e., *perimeter forwarding*

## **Greedy Forwarding (1)**





E is the S's neighbor that is closest to D ("closest" in terms of Euclidean distance)

## **Greedy Forwarding (2)**





F is the E's neighbor node closest to D J is the F's neighbor node closest to D

## **Possible Failures in Greedy Forwarding**





In the case that E is not in the coverage range of D (assumption of the figure)

*No node among the E's neighbors is closer to D than E* Forwarding failure! But a useful path would exist: [S, A, B, C, D]



❑ It can *always reach a destination if a useful valid path exists*

➢Route *around the so-called "holes"*

❑ Each node calculates *Relative Neighborhood Graph (RNG) or Gabriel Graph (GG)*

➢RNG is a *non-directed graph* defined on a set of points in the Euclidean plane that are compliant with this constraint: connecting two points A and B with an arc *if and only if there is no point C that is closest to both A and B (C-to-A and C-to-B distances minor than A-to-B distance) - G. Toussaint, 1980* 

### **RNG is traversed** by using the right-hand rule

➢Basically, the idea is of *visiting the nodes that determine the perimeter* around a hole



- □ During graph traversing, if a packet meets a node that is closest to destination if compared with the node where greedy forwarding had failed, *the decision is to operate a new switch towards greedy forwarding*
- ❑ *We can have loops* if perimeter forwarding is used and whenever the destination is not reachable ➢GPSR is capable of detecting the situation and of discarding the involved packet









TORA is proposed to operate in a *highly dynamic* mobile networking environment

- ❑ *Highly adaptive, loop-free, highly distributed*
- ❑ Based on the concept of *link reversal*
- Key design concepts of TORA:
- ❑ *Localization of control messages* to a very small set of nodes *near the occurrence of a topological change*
- ❑ To this purpose, nodes need to maintain *routing info about neighbors*
- ❑ The *height metric* is used to model the routing state of the network

Three basic functions:

- ❑ *route creation*
- ❑ *route maintenance*
- ❑ *route erasure*



- During route creation and maintenance, nodes establish a Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG)
- ❑ *A logical direction* is imposed on links towards destination
- ❑ *Source-initiated*
- ❑ Provides *multiple routes* for any desired source/destination pair
- Starting from any node in the graph, a destination can be reached by *following the directed links*
- ❑ *Highly adaptive, efficient, scalable, distributed algorithm*
- ❑ *Multiple routes from source to destination*







Three major tasks

- ❑ Route creation query (QRY) and update (UPD) packets
- Route maintenance
- $\Box$  Route erasure broadcast of clear packet (CLR)

Using *unique node ID and unique reference ID for packets*

## *1) Route creation: demand-driven «query/reply»*

Performed only when a node requires a path to a destination but does not have any directed link

- ❑ A QRY packet is flooded
- ❑ An UPD packet propagates back if routes exist

## *2) Route maintenance: «link reversal» algorithm*

- React only when necessary
- ❑ Reaction to link failure is *localized in scope*

## *3) Route erasure*

A CLR packet is flooded to erase invalid routes



## **TORA Metrics**

- ❑ *Assigns a reference level (height) to each node*
- ❑ *A local DAG is maintained for each destination*
- ❑ *Synchronized clock* is relevant, accomplished via GPS or a dedicated protocol such as Network Time Protocol (NTP)

Timing is an important factor in TORA because the «height» metric is dependent on the logical time of a link failure

- ❑ Logical time of a link failure
- ❑ The unique ID of the node that defined the new reference level
- ❑ A reflection indicator bit
- ❑ A propagation ordering parameter
- The unique ID of the involved node

### *Adjust reference level to restore routes on link failure*



### • Route creation of TORA





### **Route creation**









Step 1 The network has converged.



Step 2

Some of the mobile nodes move, breaking links and forming new ones.



Step 3

The nodes react to the new topology and adjust their height



#### Step 4

The network converges with a directed graph. Notice how the changes were localized.





In summary…

### *Advantages:*

❑ *Less control overload* – by limiting the control packets for route *reconfiguration to a small region*

### *Disadvantages:*

- ❑ Local reconfiguration of paths *results in non-optimal routes*
- ❑ Concurrent deduction of partitions and subsequent deletion of routes could *result in temporary oscillations and transient loops*



## **Moreover, many other MANET routing algos in the literature…**

Think about optimizations that stem from

- ❑ Application requirements
- Most probable characteristics of deployment scenarios
- ❑ Rate between mobility&dynamicity vs communication rate
- ❑ Which information assumed to be known at participating nodes?
- ❑ Which node coordination and associated overhead?
- □ How much proactive? How much reactive?
- □ How much optimistic? How much pessimistic?



## **For instance: Multi-hop Routing vs. Energy Consumption**

Energy consumption to transmit a packet:

- ➢Constant cost to power on the circuitry
- ➢Proportional to packet size
- ➢Proportional to distance \* distance

❑ Multi-hop routing can *reduce the consumption* of energy (the consumed energy is basically proportional to distance \* distance) but this can generate non-negligible *latencies*

Which per-hop distance?

 $\geq$ Too short => the dominant part of the energy cost is for powering on the circuitry

➢Too large => the dominant part is for packet transmission; *reduction of re-usability of bandwidth in space*; overhead for scheduling because the number of nodes at 1-hop-distance grows



Clustering (grouping) to *decrease resource consumption*

- ❑ Split the network in *clusters (groups)*, each of them including an "analogous" number of nodes
- ❑ *Clusterheads* are the *natural backbone* also in order to perform routing
- ❑ *Optimal clustering is an NP-complete problem*
- ❑ Very relevant: anyway mobility tends to *degrade the optimality of the determined clustering*

Specific usefulness for sensor networks: to combine "cluster-level readings" into a single data packet (*data aggregation*)

## **Clustering as a Routing Backbone**





## **Very shortly: Clustering Examples**



### LEACH

- ❑*Local decision* if a node should serve as clusterhead or not (random number choice and completely local election)
- ❑Any non-clusterhead node performs overhearing and *selects the closest clusterhead*
- ❑The clusterhead role *is periodically re-assigned (node rotation)* to balance energy consumption
- ❑*Communication is first to clusterhead, then to cluster members*
- ❑*No guarantee of optimality in clustering determination*

## HEED

- ❑*Residual energy* to consider in the clusterhead election
- ❑Clusterheads are elected after an iterative protocol:
	- ➢ A node announces its *intention and cost* as a clusterhead
	- ➢ Any non-clusterhead node selects its candidate with minor cost by following a probabilistic metric, possibly choosing itself



### ❑A clusterhead can *ideally support n nodes*

- ➢ Ensures efficient MAC functioning
- Minimizes delay and maximizes throughput

### ❑A clusterhead uses *more battery power*

- ➢ Does extra work due to packet forwarding
- $\triangleright$  Communicates with more nodes

### ❑A clusterhead should be *less mobile*

- $\triangleright$  Helps to maintain same configuration
- ➢ Avoids frequent WCA invocation

### ❑A *better power usage with physically closer nodes*

➢ More power for distant nodes due to signal attenuation



# **Is Wi-Fi Direct a MANET technology?**

Given our current understanding of MANET, let us go back to Wi-Fi Direct…

- ❑ In a typical Wi-Fi network, client scans and associate to wireless networks available, which are created and announced by Access Points (AP)
- ❑ *Wi-Fi Direct allows specifying these roles as dynamic*, and hence a Wi-Fi Direct device has to implement both the role of a client and the role of an AP
- ❑ These roles are therefore *logical roles that could even be executed simultaneously by the same device*, this type of operation is called *Concurrent mode*



- ❑ Wi-Fi Direct devices communicate by *establishing a P2P group*
- ❑ The *device implementing AP-like functionality* in P2P group is referred to as the *P2P Group Owner (P2P GO)*, and devices acting as clients are known as P2P clients
- ❑ Once P2P group is established, other P2P clients can join the group as in a traditional Wi-Fi network
- ❑ When the device acts as *both as P2P client and as P2P GO, the device will typically alternate between the two roles by time-sharing the Wi-Fi interface*
- ❑ Like a traditional AP, a P2P GO announces itself through beacons, and has to support power saving for its associated clients



# **Wi-Fi Direct Architecture**



Wi-Fi direct supported topologies and use cases.

**MANET and Routing – Mobile Systems M 66** 



- ❑ Only *the P2P GO is allowed to cross-connect* the devices in its P2P group to *an external network* (e.g., mobile in the previous figure)
- ❑ *This connection must be done at network layer*, typically implemented using Network Address Translation (NAT)
- ❑ *Wi-Fi direct does not allow transferring the role of P2P GO within the group*
- □ If P2P GO leaves the P2P group, then the group is broken down and has to re-established

### *Parallel and comparison with Bluetooth scatternets?*



Group Formation procedure involves two phases:

- ❑ Determination of P2P GO
	- ➢ *Negotiated* Two P2P devices negotiate for P2P GO based on desires and capabilities
	- **Selected** P2P GO role established at formation or at an application level
- □ Provisioning of P2P Group
	- ➢ Establishment of *P2P group session* using appropriate credentials
	- ➢ Using Wi-Fi simple configuration to exchange credentials

Three types of group formation techniques: *Standard, Autonomous, and Persistent cases*



# **Wi-Fi Direct Group Formation**

**Standard:** P2P devices have to discover each other, and then negotiate which device will act as P2P GO

It starts by performing a traditional Wi-Fi scan, by means of which they can discover existing groups and Wi-Fi networks



❑ To prevent conflicts when two devices declare the same GO Intent, a tie-breaker bit is included in the GO Negotiation Request, which is randomly set every time a GO Negotiation Request is sent



# **Wi-Fi Direct Group Formation**

**Autonomous:** a P2P device may autonomously create a P2P group, where it immediately becomes the P2P GO, by sitting on a channel and starting a beacon



- **Other devices can discover the established group** using traditional scanning mechanisms
- ❑ As compared to previous case, *discovery phase is simplified* in this case as the device establishing the group does not alternate between states, and indeed no GO negotiation phase is required



# **Wi-Fi Direct Group Formation**

**Persistent:** a P2P device can declare a group as persistent, by using flag in the P2P capabilities attribute present in beacon frames



After the discovery phase, if a P2P device recognizes to have formed a persistent group with the corresponding peer in the past

> any of the two P2P devices can use the *Invitation Procedure to quickly re-instantiate the group*



Wi-Fi Direct defines *two new power saving mechanisms*: the Opportunistic Power Save protocol and the Notice of Absence (NoA) protocol

**Opportunistic Power Save** protocol (OPS) allows a P2P GO to save power when all its associated clients are sleeping




**Notice of absence** protocol (NoA) allows a P2P GO to announce time intervals, referred to as *absence periods*, where P2P Clients are not allowed to access the channel

- P2P GO defines a NoA schedule using four parameters:
	- $\triangleright$  Duration that specifies the length of each absence period
	- Interval specifying time between consec absence periods
	- Time that specifies the start time of the first absence period after the current Beacon frame
	- Count that specifies how many absence periods will be scheduled during the current NoA schedule





- ❑ Wi-Fi Direct devices are required to implement *Wi-Fi Protected Setup (WPS)* to support a secure connection with *minimal user intervention*
- ❑ WPS allows establishing a *secure connection by introducing a PIN* in the P2P Client, or *pushing a button in the two P2P devices*
- ❑ Following WPS terminology, P2P GO is required to implement an internal Registrar, and the P2P Client is required to implement an Enrollee
- WPS operations consist of two parts
	- In the first part, the internal Registrar is in charge of generating and issuing the network credentials, i.e., security keys, to the Enrollee
	- In the second part, the Enrollee (P2P Client) disassociates and reconnects using its new authentication credentials



# **Wi-Fi Direct: some Refs to Additional Material**

Optional additional readings:

- ❑ IEEE 802.11-2013 Standard, Device-To-Device communication with Wi-Fi direct: Overview and experimentation, 2007
- ❑ Wi-Fi Alliance, P2P Technical Group, Wi-Fi Peer-to-Peer (P2P) Technical Specification v1.0, December 2009
- ❑ Wi-Fi Alliance, Wi-Fi Protected Setup Specification v1.0h, Dec. 2006
- ❑ IEEE 802.11z-2010 Wireless LAN Medium Access Control (MAC) and Physical Layer (PHY) specifications Amendment 7: Extensions to Direct-Link Setup (DLS)



## **Other more Innovative Routing/Clustering Modes?**

Under some *simplifying assumptions*, which can significantly facilitate how to solve the problem

Again *cross-layer* or *possible static assumptions* about given and determined deployment environments

For example, *content sharing* scenarios in sport events with very large pubic of attendants (Olympic stadium in Turin 2006) and widespread distribution of pictures/videos recorded by spectators

❑ to provide an *entertainment service*, e.g., small multimedia contents, dynamically discovered, to a *large public* of users *concentrated in space and in time*

❑ to maintain *content availability* notwithstanding ingress/exit of spectators from the targeted physical locality



# **Dense MANET Assumption and Interaction with Application Layer**

#### **Assumptions**

#### ➢ *Dense MANET*

- *Large number of devices co-located* in a physical area that is relatively small
- *Node density* that is almost *invariant* over relatively long time intervals
- ➢ *Replication and read-only replicas*
- ❑ Non-functional requirements
	- ➢ Low *overhead* → Lightweight and approximated protocols
	- ➢ High *scalability* → Complete decentralization
	- ➢ Sufficient *accuracy* → Protocol ending based on heuristics



**Resource Name**

Alberto Tomba's

## **Replication in Dense MANETs (REDMAN)**

- Basic idea: to *disseminate replicas* of resources of common interest and to *maintain the desired replication degree*  independently from node mobility (unpredictable) in/out the targeted dense area
- ➢ *Delegates host replicas*, reply to retrieval requests, participate to dissemination
- **Managers:** responsible for maintaining the proper and desired replication degree





## **Middleware Approach: Application-layer Management**



#### **Issue: Identifying a Dense MANET**





❑ Dense MANET if and only if #*Neighbors > Threshold*

❑ *Decentralized and lightweight protocol* in which any node *autonomously decides* its own belonging condition

*Dynamicity:* lazy updates based on hello messages

#### **Issue: Manager Election**





#### *Manager Election*

- ➢Role is assigned to a node that is *topologically central*
- ➢Lightweight solution, *no optimal placement* (priority is avoiding exhaustive search)
- ➢Exploration strategy based on heuristics

#### *Dynamicity*

- ➢ Reactive response: new determination of farthest nodes every *Tr*
- ➢ Proactive response: new election every *Tp >> Tr*



#### ❑ *Optimal solution is considered to be found iff*:

- *1. currentINvalue* = *worstExploredValue* / 2
- ❑ Alternatively, *heuristics*:
	- *2. currentINvalue* ≤ *worstExploredValue* \* *DesiredAccuracy*
	- *3. maxConsecutiveEqualSolutions* have been explored without improving the current *bestValue*
- Of course, *DesiredAccuracy* and *maxConsecutiveEquals* determine (approximatively) the quality of the solution achieved (quantitatve indicator)



























#### **Degree of Replication: Approximated Consistency**

*It relaxes* the constraint of *anytime perfect consistency* for the number of available replicas



#### **Degree of Replication: Approximated Consistency**





#### **Degree of Replication: Approximated Consistency**





#### **Strategies for Replica Dissemination**

Different possible strategies:

❑ *Random* distribution

 $\sim$  …

❑ *Spatially uniform* distribution

#### REDMAN: distribution along *"straight lines"* (approxim.)

❑ No positioning equipment

**Straight lines: neighbors with** the *lowest number of neighbors shared* with the previous nodes

 $\mathbf{F}$ G Replica delegates

Nodes hosting IRPs









## **Strategies for Replica Retrieval**

Different possible strategies for *replica retrieval*:

- *Query* flooding (QF)
- Flooding of *Information about Replica Placement* (IRP)
- *k-hop Distance IRP Dissemination (k-DID)*



REDMAN exploits *Straight IRP Dissemination (SID)*

## **Strategies for Replica Retrieval**



Replica delegates

Nodes hosting IRPs

Replica searcher



*IRP* are distributed along the *same approxim. straight*  **lines** used for replica dissemination

*Retrieval along straight lines* (*non parallel* to the lines used for dissemination)

*Duality between replica distribution and retrieval*

