INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INNOVATIVE RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT

ISSN 2278 – 0211 (Online)

A Survey on Performance Evaluation of MANET Routing Protocols

Aviral Kumar
School of Engineering and Technology, Galgotias University
Nishank Tyagi
School of Engineering and Technology, Galgotias University
Vipin Kumar
School of Engineering and Technology, Galgotias University

Abstract:
The task of finding and sustaining routes in Mobile Ad-hoc Networks (MANETS) is an important factor in determining the efficiency of any MANET protocol. MANET characteristically is an autonomous system of mobile nodes connected by wireless links without any centralised infrastructure. The absence of fixed infrastructures and host mobility, thus network may experience rapid and unpredictable topology changes. Hence, routing is required in order to perform communication between the entire networks. There are several routing protocols namely proactive, reactive and hybrid etc. In this paper we will discuss the active research work on these routing protocols and its performance evaluation. To this end, we adopt a simulation approach, which is more suitable to this kind of analysis

Key words: *MANET, Proactive and Reactive and Hybrid routing protocols, Unicasting, Multicasting*

1. Introduction

In the next generation of wireless communication systems, there will be a need for the rapid deployment of independent mobile users. Mobile Ad Hoc Networks (MANETs) provide communication between all nodes in the network topology without the presence of a centralized authority; instead all nodes can function as routers. This gives the MANETs two of its most desirable characteristics; adaptable and quick to deploy. In particular, a very large no. of recent studies focused on Mobile Ad-Hoc Networks (MANETs) [1] [2]. This kind of self organizing network is very useful when the fixed infrastructure is economically practical or physically possible such as battlefield Scenarios, natural disaster, and etc.

Many routing protocols are proposed for MANET. The protocols are mainly classified into three categories: Proactive, Reactive and Hybrid. Proactive routing protocols attempt to maintain consistent, up-to-date routing information from each node to every other node in the network. Reactive routing protocols create routes only when desired by the source node. Once a route has been established, it is maintained by a route maintenance procedure. Hybrid routing protocols are proposed to combine the merits of both proactive and reactive routing protocols and overcome their shortcomings.

Based on the method of delivery of data packets from the source to destination, classification of MANET routing protocols could be done as follows:

- **Unicast Routing Protocols:** The routing protocols that consider sending information packets to a single destination from a single source.
- **Multicast Routing Protocols:** Multicast is the delivery of information to a group of destinations simultaneously, using the most efficient strategy to deliver the messages over each link of the network only once, creating copies only when the links to the destinations split. Multicast routing protocols for MANET use both multicast and unicast for data transmission.

This paper aims to achieve a short description of three main classes of protocol namely proactive, reactive and hybrid is presented. Then, these routing protocols are compared in terms of performance metrics. The purpose of referring to performance metrics in this paper is to compare proactive and reactive and hybrid protocols according to these metrics. Many publications have compared the performance of the routing protocols using the packet delivery ratio, control overhead, hop count, and end-to-end delay. However, the performance of routing protocols in this paper is mostly evaluated in terms of: Loop freedom, control overhead, memory overhead, and scalability of the routing algorithms.

2. Routing Protocol Performance Issues

QoS consists of a set of characteristics or constraints between the source and the destination that a connection must guarantee during the communication in order to meet the requirements of an application [1] [2]. To judge the merit of a routing protocol, one needs metrics both qualitative and quantitative, with which to measure its suitability and performance [3]. Generally, there are four main metrics presented in [4] as parameters of QoS which are probability of packet loss (or packet delivery ratio), delay (route latency), jitter (delay variance), and bandwidth. Table 1 provides a list of popular qualitative and quantitative properties of MANET routing protocols based on RFC2501 [3]. Some of the metrics in [3] are applied to compare the proactive and reactive and hybrid routing protocols in terms of overhead, scalability, and loop-freedom.

Quantitative metrics	Qualitative metrics
End-to-End Delay	Loop-freedom
Throughput	Route stability
Overhead	On-demand or proactive
Packet Delivery Ratio	Scalability
Mobility	Reliability

Table 1: MANET Routing Protocols Performance Metrics

3. Proactive Routing Protocols

These protocols are also called as Table-Driven protocols since they maintain the routing information even before requiring of this information [10]. Each and every node maintains routing information to every other node in the network. Route information is generally kept in the routing tables and is periodically updated as the network topology changes.

3.1. Dynamic Destination-Sequenced Distance-Vector Routing Protocol (DSDV)

The protocol Destination-Sequenced Distance-Vector routing (DSDV) [6] is a Proactive routing protocol that solves the major problem associated with distance vector routing of wired networks i.e., Count-to-infinity, by using destination sequence number. In this routing protocol, each mobile node in the network keeps a routing table. Each of the routing table contains the list of all available destinations and the number of hops to each. Each table entry is tagged with a sequence number, which is originated by the destination node. Periodic transmissions of updates of the Routing tables help maintaining the topology information of the network. If there is any new significant change for the routing information, the updates are transmitted immediately. So, the routing information updates might either be periodic or event driven. The routing updates could be sent in two ways: one is called a ‘‘full dump’’ and another is ‘‘incremental.’’ In case of full dump, the entire routing table is sent to the neighbors, where as in case of incremental update, only the entries that require changes are sent.

3.2. Wireless Routing Protocol (WRP)

This routing protocol defined as the set of distributed shortest path algorithms that calculate the paths using information regarding the length and second-to-last hop of the shortest path to each destination. WRP reduces the number of cases in which a temporary routing loop can occur. For the purpose of routing, each node maintains four things: 1. A distance table 2. A routing table 3. A link-cost table 4. A message retransmission list (MRL). WRP uses periodic update message transmissions to the neighbors of a node. Each time the consistency of the routing information is checked by each node in this protocol, which helps to eliminate routing loops and always tries to find out the best solution for routing in the network.

3.3. Cluster Gateway Switch Routing Protocol (CGSR)

This protocol modifies DSDV by using a hierarchical cluster-head-to-gateway routing approach to route traffic from source to destination. Gateway nodes are nodes that are within the communication ranges of two or more cluster heads. A packet sent by a node is first sent to its cluster head, and then the packet is sent from the cluster head to a gateway to another cluster head, and so on until the cluster head of the destination node is reached. The packet is then transmitted to the destination from its own cluster head. By forming several clusters, this protocol achieves a
distributed processing mechanism in the network. However, one drawback of this protocol is that, frequent change or selection of cluster heads might be resource hungry and it might affect the routing performance.

3.4. Global State Routing (GSR)

In GSR protocol [6], nodes exchange vectors of link states among their neighbors during routing information exchange. Based on the link state vectors, nodes maintain a global knowledge of the network topology an optimize their routing decisions locally. Functionally, this protocol is similar to DSDV, but it improves DSDV in the sense that it avoids flooding of routing messages.

3.5. Fisheye State Routing (FSR)

This protocol reduces the amount of traffic for transmitting the update messages. The basic idea is that each update message does not contain information about all nodes. Instead, it contains update information about the nearer nodes more frequently than that of the farther nodes. Hence, each node can have accurate and exact information about its own neighboring nodes. The novelty of FSR is that it uses a special structure of the network called the ‘‘fisheye.’’

4. Reactive Routing Protocols

Another approach used for routing is reactive approach [6,7].This type of routing creates routes only when desired by the source node. When a node requires a route to a destination, it initiates a route discovery process within the network.

4.1. Ad-Hoc On-Demand Distance Vector (AODV) Routing Protocol

AODV [9] is a single-path, reactive routing protocol. Route discovery is using a route request (RREQ) – route reply (RREP) cycle. When a source node has data to be sent to a destination node and does not know the route to the destination node, floods a route request (RREQ) packet throughout the network. Several RREQ packets, each travelling on a different path, will reach the destination. The destination node replies (RREP packet) only to the first RREQ packet and drops subsequent RREQ packets with the same source sequence number and broadcast ID. The RREQ packet that arrived at the earliest is likely to have traversed a path with low delay and/or hop count. Representing the weight of each link in the network by the delay incurred on the link, AODV reduces to finding a minimum-weight path between the source and the destination.

4.2. Dynamic Source Routing (DSR) protocol

This protocol requires each transmitted packet to carry the full address from the source to the destination likewise the mechanism used in AODV. It [10] uses shortest hop path from the source to the destination. Thus, the source learns multiple route to the destination and stores them in the route cache. It does not check for node disjoint or link disjoint properties before using these routes. DSR fits into the category of routing protocols based on minimum weight path routing.

4.3. Temporally Ordered Routing Algorithm (TORA)

TORA [11] is a scalable, highly adaptive distributed routing algorithm designed to operate in a highly dynamic mobile networking environment. TORA is based on the concept of “link reversal”. The protocol is particularly designed to localize algorithmic reactions to topology changes by maintaining multiple routes to the destination. Shortest hop paths are given secondary importance and longer routes are often used to reduce the overhead of discovering newer routes. Thus, TORA fits under the stability category. In addition, TORA supports multicasting but it should be used in conjunction with lightweight adaptive multicast algorithm (LAM) to support multicasting. The disadvantage of this protocol is producing temporary invalid routes similar to the LMR.

4.4. Associativity-Based Routing (ABR)

The ABR [12] protocol uses a query-reply technique to determine the routes to the destinations. However, in ABR route selection is primarily based on stability. In order to select stable route each node maintains an associativity tick with its neighbors and the links with higher associativity tick are selected in preference to the ones with lower associativity tick. The disadvantage of ABR is that it does not maintain multiple routes or a route cache so the alternate routes will not be immediately available.

4.5. Cluster-Based Routing Protocol (CBRP)

This is a hierarchical protocol, and this protocol is grouped into the clusters. Each cluster has its cluster-head which coordinates the data transmission within the cluster and the other clusters. The advantage of CBRP is that only cluster heads exchange the information, therefore the number of the control packets transmitted through the network is less than traditional flooding methods significantly. The disadvantage of this hierarchical method is the large number of overhead associated with cluster formation and maintenance and it has also temporary routing loops.

5. Hybrid Routing Protocols

Hybrid routing protocols are proposed to combine the merits of both proactive and reactive routing protocols and overcome their shortcomings.

5.1. Zone Routing Protocol (ZRP)

Zone routing protocol is a hybrid routing protocol which effectively combines the best features of proactive and reactive routing protocol [13,14]. Each node defines a zone around itself and the zone radius is the number of hops to the perimeter of the zone. The reactive global search is done efficiently by querying only a selected set of nodes in the network [15]. The number of nodes queried is in the order of [r zone / r network]2 of the number of nodes queried using a network-wide flooding process [13].Unless the zone radius is carefully chosen, a node can be in multiple zones and zones overlap.

5.2. Zone-Based Hierarchical Link State Routing Protocol(ZHLS)

In ZHLS protocol [10], the network is divided into non overlapping zones as in cellular networks. Each node knows the node connectivity within its own zone and the zone connectivity information of the entire network. The link state routing is performed by employing two levels: node level and global zone level. The zone level topological information is distributed to all nodes. Since only zone ID and node ID of a destination are needed for routing, the route from a source to a destination is adaptable to changing topology. The zone ID of the destination is found by sending one location request to every zone.

Routing class	Proactive	Reactive
Availability of route	Always available	Determined when needed
Control Traffic volume	Usually high	Lower than proactive routing protocols
Storage Requirements	High	Depends on the number of routes kept or required. Usually lower than proactive protocols
Delay level	Small since routes are predetermined	Higher than proactive
Scalability problem	Usually up to 100 nodes.	Source routing protocols up to few hundred nodes. Point-to-point may scale higher
Handling effects Of mobility	Occur at fixed intervals. DREAM alters periodic updates based on mobility	Usually updates ABR introduced LBQ (Local Broadcast Query) AODV uses local route discovery
Security Support	No	No
Quality of service support	Mainly shortest path as the QoS metric	Few can support QoS , Although most support shortest path

Table 2: Shows compare the main characteristics of routing protocols

6. A Comparison of Reactive and Proactive and Hybrid Routing Protocols in MANETs

In this paper a classification of several routing schemes according to their routing strategy is provided A comparison of these two categories of routing protocols is presented, highlighting their features, differences, and characteristics in Table 4. By looking at performance metrics in Table 4 such as control traffic, control overhead, route acquisition delay, delay level, and characteristics of presented categories, a number of conclusions can be made from each category.

In proactive routing flat addressing can be simple to implement, however this method may not scale good for large networks

By using a device such as GPS: Like in DREAM protocol where the nodes in the network just exchange their location information rather than complete links-state or distance-vector information.

By using conditional updates rather than periodic: For example in STAR updates occur based on conditions.

FSR have reduced the routing overhead by localizing the update message propagation.

AODV which are flooding based have scalability problem. The Route discovery and route maintenance which are two main mechanisms of reactive routing protocols can be controlled in order to improve the scalability.

The CBRP protocol attempts to minimize the control overhead in route discovery phase by introducing a hierarchical on-demand routing protocol.

ABR routing protocol a localized broadcast query (LBQ) is initialized when a link goes down.

ZRP protocol attemps in order to reduce the control overheads and delays.

Routing Class	PROACTIVE	REACTIVE	HYBRID
Routing Structure	Both Flat and Hierarchical Structure	Mostly Flat	Flat
Periodic Updates	Yes, some may use conditionally.	Not required.Some nodes may require.	Yes.
Control Overhead	High	Low	Medium
Route Acquisition Delay	Low	High	Lower for Intra-zone Higher for Inter-zone
Bandwidth Requirement	High	Low	Medium
Power Requirement	High	Low	Medium

Table 3: Comparison between Proactive, Reactive and Hybrid Protocols

7. Conclusion

In this paper we presented an exhaustive survey about existing routing protocols, and we comparison between the different papers, most of its conclusions pointed to a phenomenon, not a routing protocol can adapt to all environments, whether it is Table-Driven, On-Demand or a mixture of two kinds, are limited by the network characteristics; highlighting their features, differences. While it is not clear that any particular algorithm or class of algorithm is the best for all scenarios, each protocol has definite advantages and disadvantages and is well suited for certain situations. Often it is more appropriate to apply a hybrid protocol rather than a strictly proactive or reactive protocol as hybrid protocols often possess the advantages of both types of protocols.

More and more efficient routing protocols for MANET might come in front in the coming future, which might take security and QoS (Quality of Service) as the major concerns. So far, the routing protocols mainly focused on the methods of routing, but in future a secured but QoS-aware routing protocol could be worked on. There are still many issues and challenges which have not been considered. This will be subjected to further investigations.

8. References

1. S. Hongxia, H. Hughes, Adaptive QoS routing based on prediction of local performance in ad hoc networks, Computing vol. 2, pp. 503 513, 2002.
2. S. Corson, J. Macker, Mobile Ad Hoc Networking (MANET): Routing Protocols Performance Issues and evaluation, RFC2501,1999
3. A.S. Tanenbaum, Computer Networks, 4th edition, Prentice-Hall PTR, 2003.
4. Tsuchiya PF (1988) The Landmark Hierarchy: A New Hierarchy for Routing in Very Large Networks. Computer Communication Review,Volume 18, Issue 4:35–42
5. T-W Chen and M. Gerla, "Global State Routing: A New Routing Scheme for Ad-hoc Wireless Networks," Proceedings of IEEE ICC, pp. 171 – 175, June 1998.
6. C.–F. Chiasserini and R. R. Rao, "Routing Protocols to Maximize Battery Efficiency," Proceedings of IEEE MILCOM, pp. 496 – 500, Vol. 1, October 2000.
7. J.J. Garcia Luna Aceves, C. Marcelo Spohn, Source tree routing in wireless networks, Proceedings of the Seventh Annual International Conference on Network Protocols Toronto, Canada, p. 273, October 1999.
8. C. E. Perkins and E. M. Royer, "Ad Hoc On-demand Distance Vector Routing," Proceedings of the 2nd Annual IEEE International Workshop on Mobile Computing Systems and Applications, pp. 90 –100, February 1999.
9. D. B. Johnson, D. A. Maltz and J. Broch, "DSR: The Dynamic Source Routing Protocol for Multihop Wireless Ad Hoc Networks," Ad Hoc Networking, edited by Charles E. Perkins, Chapter 5, pp.139 – 172, Addison Wesley, 2001.
10. V. D. Park and M. S. Corson, "A Highly Adaptive Distributed Routing Algorithm for Mobile Wireless Networks," Proceedings of IEEE INFOCOM, pp. 1405 – 1413, April 1997.
11. S. Guo and O. W. Yang, "Performance of Backup Source Routing in Mobile Ad Hoc Networks," Proceedings of IEEE WCNC, pp. 440-444, 2002.
12. C. Siva Ram Murthy and B.S. Manoj. Ad Hoc Wireless Networks Architectures and Protocol, volume ISBN:81-297-0945-7. Pearson Education, first indian reprint,2005 edition,2005.
13. E. Topalis S. Giannoulis, C. Antonopoulos and S. Koubias. Zrp Versus DSR and TORA: A Compressive Survey on ZRP Performance. 10th IEEE Conference, ETFA 2005, 1(ISBN:0-7803-9401-1), Sept 2005.
14. Z. J. Haas, M. R. Pearlman and P. Samar, "The Bordercast Resolution Protocol (BRP) for Ad Hoc Networks," draft- ietf-manet-zone-brp-02.txt, work in progress, July 2002.
15. V. Devarapalli, A. A. Selcuk and D. Sindhu, "Multicast Zone Routing (MZR) Protocol," Internet Draft, draft-vijay-manet-mzr-01.txt, work in progress, June 2001