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MANET Routing Protocols

- **Proactive protocols**
  - Maintain routes to all nodes
  - Distance vector, link state
  - DSDV, OLSR

- **On-demand protocols**
  - Discover and maintain routes only when needed
  - Lower overhead, higher throughput than proactive routing protocols
  - Longer latency than proactive protocols
  - DSR, AODV, TORA

- **Hybrid protocols**
  - ZRP
MANET Performance Evaluation

- Previous simulation-based studies
  - UDP traffic
    - Compared routing protocols
    - Varied offered traffic, node mobility
  - TCP traffic
    - One TCP connection
    - Only throughput measured

- Our study
  - Mixed UDP and TCP traffic
  - Multiple TCP connections
  - Performance metrics other than throughput
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Ad hoc On-demand Distance Vector (AODV)

- DV routing table, one entry per destination
- Destination sequence numbers as in DSDV
- Routes acquired on demand via request-reply cycle (route discovery)
- Unused routes are expired to avoid using stale route information
- Route error packets notify precursor nodes of link failure
- Local route repair
Dynamic Source Routing (DSR)

- Uses source routing, nodes maintain route caches
- Multiple routes per destination
- On-demand route discovery
- Route error packets notify source of link failures
- Snooping, gratuitous route reply
- Intermediate node salvaging
- Stale routes can be a problem
Adaptive Distance Vector (ADV)

- A hybrid approach which seeks to combine the best features of proactive and on-demand protocols
- Distance vector algorithm
- Uses sequence numbers to avoid long-lived loops
- Proactive characteristics
  - Uses partial and full updates to disseminate routing information
Adaptive Distance Vector (ADV)

- On-demand characteristics
  - Only routes to active receivers are maintained
  - Routing updates are triggered adaptively based on network load and mobility conditions

- ADV has been show to outperform on-demand algorithms for UDP traffic from CBR sources in networks with fairly high node mobility (Boppana and Konduru, Infocom 2001)
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Simulation Environment

- **ns-2 simulator with CMU extensions**
  - 50 nodes in a 1000m x 1000m field
  - Random waypoint mobility model with wraparound
  - High node mobility
    - Mean node speed of 10 m/s
    - Continuous movement (pause time = 0)

- **100 sec warm-up + 900 sec simulation**

- **Results averaged over 50 different scenarios**
Simulated Network Traffic

- **UDP Traffic**
  - 10 and 40 CBR connections
  - Packet size: 512 bytes
  - Traffic loads from 50 to 200 Kb/s

- **TCP Traffic**
  - Packet size: 1460 bytes
  - Maximum window size: 8 packets
  - Number of connections varied from 1 to 10

- Ratio of TCP traffic to UDP traffic varied from 3:1 to 8:1
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1 TCP Connection

- **TCP Connect Time**
  - For lower number of connections, stale routes result in long connect times for DSR
  - ADV’s proactive nature yields lowest connect times

- **TCP Throughput**
  - For 10 CBRs, ADV and AODV comparable
  - Stale routes hurt DSR throughput
  - More connections lowers AODV throughput
  - For 40 CBRs, ADV clearly performs better
Summary of Performance Analysis

1 TCP Connection

- UDP Packet Latency
  - Increases with higher offered traffic
  - Highest for ADV, comparable for DSR and AODV
  - None of the three algorithms saturate for the loads offered

- UDP Packet Delivery Fraction
  - Does not change much with load
  - ADV gives slightly higher delivery rate than AODV and DSR
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Multiple TCP Connections

- **TCP Connect Time**
  - Times increase but not indicative of saturation
  - ADV gives shortest connect times

- **TCP Throughput**
  - ADV performs the best
  - As number of TCP and CBR connections increases, DSR outperforms AODV
Summary of Performance Analysis
Multiple TCP Connections

- **UDP Packet Latency**
  - Increases with number of TCPs, no saturation
  - ADV latency twice that of DSR and AODV

- **UDP Packet Delivery Fraction**
  - ADV did much better than on-demand protocols
  - Biggest impact on ADV’s TCP throughput
  - AODV delivered more packets than DSR
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Conclusions

- DSR suffers from stale route problem at low traffic loads, but its aggressive use of route caching and snooping pays off as traffic increases.
- AODV is a steady performer, but its routing overhead can be a problem as the number of connections increases.
Conclusions

- ADV’s hybrid approach to routing yields better performance for TCP traffic
- ADV does a better job of handling UDP traffic simultaneously with TCP flows
- Mixed traffic scenarios are important
  - More like real world traffic
  - Can’t predict interaction of TCP and UDP flows based on wired network experience