### **Wireless Mesh Networks**



#### COS 463: Wireless Networks Lecture 6

#### **Kyle Jamieson**

[Parts adapted from I. F. Akyildiz, B. Karp]

### **Wireless Mesh Networks**

- Describes wireless networks in which each node can communicate directly with any other node
- Traditional wireless network traffic goes through APs
- Mesh networks: Remove this restriction
  - Multiple paths: Mesh



### **Distance Vector & Link State Routing**

- Both assume each router knows single-hop routing information:
  - Address of each neighbor
  - Cost of reaching each neighbor (metric)
- Distance Vector: Router knows just the metric to each destination
- Link State: Router knows entire network topology, computes shortest path to each destination

# Today

- 1. Distance Vector Routing
  - New node join
  - Broken link
  - Route changes
- 1. Destination Sequenced Distance-Vector Routing (DSDV)
- 2. Dynamic Source Routing (DSR)
- 3. Roofnet

### **Distance Vector Routing**

- Every node maintains a routing table
  - For each destination in the mesh:
    - The number of hops to reach the destination (metric)
    - The next node on the path towards the destination
- All nodes periodically, locally broadcast their routing table
   Traffic overhead due to broadcasting



• **D** joins the network



- **D** joins the network
- D's broadcast first updates C's table with new entry for D



- Now **C** broadcasts its routing table
  - B and D hear and add new entries, incrementing metric (hops)



- Now **B** broadcasts its routing table
  - A and C hear and add new entries, incrementing metric (hops)



### Today

#### 1. Distance Vector Routing

- New node join
- Broken link
- Route changes
- 1. Destination Sequenced Distance-Vector Routing (DSDV)
- 2. Dynamic Source Routing (DSR)
- 3. Roofnet

### **Distance Vector – Broken Link**

• Suppose link  $C \leftrightarrow D$  breaks



### **Distance Vector – Broken Link**

#### 1. C hears no advertisement from D for a timeout period

- C sets D's metric to  $\infty$ 



### **Distance Vector – Broken Link**

- 1. C sets D's metric to  $\infty$
- 2. B broadcasts its routing table
  - C now accepts B's entry for D ( $3 < \infty$ )



# **Broken Link: Counting to Infinity**

- 1. C sets D's metric to  $\infty$
- 2. B broadcasts its routing table
- 3. C broadcasts its routing table
  - **B accepts C's new metric** (previous next-hop: **C**)



# **Broken Link: Counting to Infinity**

- 1. C sets D's metric to  $\infty$
- 2. B broadcasts its routing table
- 3. C broadcasts its routing table
- 4. B broadcasts its routing table
  - A, C accept B's new metric (previous next-hops: B)



### Today

#### 1. Distance Vector Routing

- New node join
- Broken link
- Route changes
- 1. Destination Sequenced Distance-Vector Routing (DSDV)
- 2. Dynamic Source Routing (DSR)
- 3. Roofnet

### **Distance Vector – Route Change**

• D moves to another place and broadcast its routing table



### **Distance Vector – Route Change**

• D moves to another place and broadcast its routing table



### **Distance Vector – Route Change**

- D moves to another place and broadcast its routing table
- **B** broadcast its routing table



### Today

- 1. Distance Vector Routing
- 2. Destination Sequenced Distance-Vector Routing (DSDV) – New node join
  - Broken link
  - Route advertisement
- 3. Dynamic Source Routing (DSR)
- 4. Roofnet

# Destination Sequenced Distance-Vector (DSDV) Routing

- Guarantees loop freeness
- New routing table information: Sequence number
- 1. Per-destination information
- 2. Originated by destination
- 3. Included in routing advertisements

Destination	Next	Metric	Seq. Nr
Α	A	0	550
В	В	1	102
C	В	3	588
D	В	4	312

### **DSDV: Route Advertisement Rule**

• Rules to set sequence number:

- Just before **node N**'s broadcast advertisement:
  - Node N sets:
    - Seq(N)  $\leftarrow$  Seq(N) + 2

- Node N thinks neighbor P is no longer directly reachable
  - **Node N** sets:
    - Seq(P) ← Seq(P) + 1
    - Metric(P)  $\leftarrow \infty$

- **D** joins the network
- D's broadcast first updates C's table with new entry for D









### Today

- 1. Distance Vector Routing
- 2. Destination Sequenced Distance-Vector Routing (DSDV)
  - New node join
  - Broken link
  - Route advertisement
- 3. Dynamic Source Routing (DSR)
- 4. Roofnet

### **DSDV – Broken Link**

Suppose link C ← → D breaks



### **DSDV – Broken Link**



### **DSDV: Routing Table Update Rule**

• Rules to update routing table entry:

- Node N gets routing advertisement from neighbor Node P:
  - Update routing table entry for node E when:
    - Seq(E) in P's advertisement > Seq(E) in N's table

### **DSDV – Broken Link**

• **B** next broadcasts its routing table

No affect on <u>C's entry for D</u> (because 001 > 000)

• No loop  $\rightarrow$  no count to infinity



### Today

- 1. Distance Vector Routing
- 2. Destination Sequenced Distance-Vector Routing (DSDV)
  - New node join
  - Broken link
  - Route advertisement
- 3. Dynamic Source Routing (DSR)
- 4. Roofnet

### **Distance Vector – Route Advertisement**

• D moves to another place and broadcasts its routing table



### **Distance Vector – Route Advertisement**

- D moves to another place and broadcasts its routing table
- **B** broadcasts its routing table



34



### Today

- 1. Distance Vector Routing
- 2. Destination Sequenced Distance-Vector Routing (DSDV)
- 3. Dynamic Source Routing (DSR)
- 4. Roofnet

# **Dynamic Source Routing (DSR)**

- No periodic "beaconing" from all nodes
- When node S wants to send a packet to node D (but doesn't know a route to D), S initiates a route discovery
- S network-floods a *Route Request (RREQ)* 
  - Each node appends its own id when forwarding RREQ



Represents a node that has received RREQ for D from S



------> Represents transmission of RREQ

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



•••••• Represents transmission of RREQ

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



------> Represents transmission of RREQ

 Node C receives RREQ from G and H, but does not forward it again, because node C has already forwarded RREQ once



Represents transmission of RREQ

- Nodes J and K both broadcast RREQ to node D
- Since nodes J and K are hidden from each other, their transmissions may collide



Represents transmission of RREQ

• Node D does not forward RREQ, because node D is the intended target of the route discovery

### **Route Reply in DSR**

- On receiving first RREQ, D sends a Route Reply (RREP)
  - RREP sent on route obtained by reversing the route in the received RREQ
  - RREP includes the route from S to D over which D received the RREQ



# **Dynamic Source Routing (DSR)**

- On receiving RREP, **S** caches route included therein
- When S sends a data packet to D, includes entire route in packet header
- Intermediate nodes use the source route included in packet to determine to whom packet should be forwarded



### Today

- 1. Distance Vector Routing
- 2. Destination Sequenced Distance-Vector Routing (DSDV)
- 3. Dynamic Source Routing (DSR)

#### 4. Roofnet

- Wireless mesh link measurements
- Routing and bit rate selection
- End-to-end performance evaluation

### Context, ca. 2000-2005

- Mobile ad hoc networking research
  - Mobile, hence highly dynamic topologies
  - Chief metrics: routing protocol overhead, packet delivery success rate, hop count
  - Largely evaluated in simulation
- Roofnet, a real mesh network deployment
  - Fixed, PC-class nodes
  - Motivation: shared Internet access in community
  - Chief metric: TCP throughput
  - "Test of time" system, led to Cisco Meraki

# **Roofnet: Design Choices**

- 1. Volunteer users host nodes at home
  - Open participation without central planning
  - No central control over topology
- Omnidirectional rather than directional antennas
   Ease of installation: no choice of neighbors/aiming
   Links interfere, likely low quality
- 3. Multi-hop routing (not single-hop hot spots)
  - Improved coverage (path diversity)
  - Must build a routing protocol
- 4. Goal: high TCP throughput

# **Roofnet: Goals and non-goals**

 Each part of the mesh architecture had been previously examined in isolation

• Paper contribution: A systematic evaluation of whether architecture can achieve goal of providing Internet access

- Stated non-goals for paper:
  - Throughput of multiple concurrent flows
  - Scalability in number of nodes
  - Design of routing protocols

### **Roofnet deployment**



• Each node: PC, 802.11b card, roof-mounted omni antenna

### Hardware design

- PC Ethernet interface provides wired Internet for user
- Omnidirectional antenna in **azimuthal** direction
  - 3 dB vertical beam width of 20 degrees
    - Wide beam sacrifices gain but removes the need for perfect vertical antenna orientation
- 802.11b radios (*Intersil Prism 2.5* chipset)
  - 200 mW transmit power
  - All share same 802.11 channel (frequency)

### Internet gateways

- Node sends DHCP request on Ethernet then tests reachability to Internet hosts
  - Success indicates node is an Internet gateway
    - Gateways translate between Roofnet and Internet IP address spaces
- Roofnet nodes track gateway used for each open TCP connection they originate
  - If best gateway changes, open connections continue to use gateway they already do
- If a Roofnet gateway fails, existing TCP connections through that gateway will fail

### **Example: Varying link loss rates**



- $A \rightarrow C$ : 1 hop; high loss
- $A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C$ : 2 hops; lower loss
- But **does this happen** in practice?

### Hop count and throughput (1)



### Hop count and throughput



- Two-hop path is suboptimal
- Some 3-hop paths better, some worse than 2-hop

### Link loss is high and asymmetric



- Vertical bar ends = loss rate on 1 link in each direction
- Many links asymmetric and very lossy in ≥ 1 way
- Wide range of loss rates

# **Routing protocol: Srcr**

- Each link has an associated *metric* (not necessarily 1!)
- Data packets contain source routes
- Nodes keep database of link metrics
  - Nodes write current metric into source route of all forwarded packets
  - DSR-like: Nodes flood route queries when they can't find a route; queries accumulate link metrics
    - Route queries contain route from requesting node
  - Nodes cache overheard link metrics
- Dijkstra's algorithm computes source routes

### Link metric: Strawmen

- Discard links with loss rate above a threshold?
   Risks unnecessarily disconnecting nodes
- Product of link delivery rates  $\rightarrow$  prob. of e2e delivery?
  - Ignores inter-hop interference
    - Prefers 2-hop, 0% loss route over 1-hop, 10% loss route (but latter is **double throughput**)
- Throughput of highest-loss link on path?
  - Also ignores inter-hop interference

### **ETX: Expected Transmission Count**

- Link ETX: predicted number of transmissions

   Calculate link ETX using forward, reverse delivery rates
  - To avoid retry, data packet and ACK must succeed
  - Link ETX = 1 /  $(d_f \times d_r)$ 
    - $d_f$  = forward link delivery ratio (data packet)
    - *d<sub>r</sub>* = reverse link delivery ratio (ack packet)

• *Path ETX:* sum of the link ETX values on a path

### Measuring link delivery ratios

- Nodes periodically send broadcast probe packets
  - All nodes know the sending period of probes
  - All nodes compute loss rate based on how many probes arrive, per measurement interval
- Nodes enclose these loss measurements in their transmitted probes

- e.g. B tells node A the link delivery rate from A to B

### **Multi-bitrate radios**

- ETX assumes all radios run at same bit-rate
  - But 802.11b rates: {1, 2, 5.5, 11} Mbit/s

- Can't compare two transmissions at 1 Mbit/s with two at 2 Mbit/s
- Solution: Use expected time spent on a packet, rather than transmission count

### **ETT: Expected Transmission Time**

• ACKs always sent at 1 Mbps, data packets 1500 bytes

Nodes send 1500-byte broadcast probes at every bit rate *b* to compute *forward link delivery rates d<sub>f</sub>(b)* – Send 60-byte (min size) probes at 1 Mbps → *d<sub>r</sub>*

- At each bit-rate b,  $ETX_b = 1 / (d_f(b) \times d_r)$
- For packet of length S,  $ETT_b = (S / b) \times ETX_b$
- Link ETT =  $\min_b (ETT_b)$

### **ETT: Assumptions**

• Path throughput estimate *t* is given by

 $- t_i$  = throughput of hop *i* 



- *Does ETT maximize throughput?* No!
- Underestimates throughput for long (≥ 4-hop) paths
   Distant nodes can send simultaneously
- 2. Overestimates throughput when transmissions on different hops collide and are lost

### **Roofnet evaluation**

- TCP bulk transfers between all node pairs but always a single flow at a time
  - But background traffic present: users always active
- Results:
  - 1. Wide spread of end-to-end throughput across pairs
  - 2. "Chain forwarding" indeed creates interference
  - 3. Lossy links indeed useful in practice

#### Wireless Mesh Networks: Evolving Routing

DSDV took DV out of wired (more static) networks
 Better coped with dynamism

• DSR addressed protocol overheads of routing

ETX and ETT abolished hop-count as a viable metric

 Replaced it with throughput as the metric