





Geo-Routing

Chapter 2

Application of the Week: Mesh Networking (Roofnet)



- Sharing Internet access
- Cheaper for everybody
- Several gateways → fault-tolerance
- Possible data backup
- Community add-ons
 - I borrow your hammer, you copy my homework
 - Get to know your neighbors



Rating

- Area maturity

First steps

Text book

- Practical importance

No apps

Mission critical

- Theory appeal

Booooooring


Exciting

Overview

- Classic routing overview
- Geo-routing
- Greedy geo-routing
- Euclidean and Planar graphs
- Face Routing
- Greedy and Face Routing
- 3D Geo-Routing


Classic Routing 1: Flooding

- What is Routing?
- „Routing is the act of moving information across a network from a source to a destination.“ (CISCO)
- The simplest form of routing is “flooding”: a source s sends the message to all its neighbors; when a node other than destination t receives the message the first time it re-sends it to all its neighbors.
- + simple (sequence numbers)
- a node might see the same message more than once. (How often?)
- what if the network is huge but the target t sits just next to the source s ?
- We need a smarter routing algorithm




Classic Routing 2: Link-State Routing Protocols

- Link-state routing protocols are a preferred iBGP method (within an autonomous system) in the Internet
- Idea: periodic notification of all nodes about the complete graph
- Routers then forward a message along (for example) the shortest path in the graph
- + message follows shortest path
- every node needs to store whole graph, even links that are not on any path
- every node needs to send and receive messages that describe the whole graph regularly



Classic Routing 3: Distance Vector Routing Protocols


- The predominant method for wired networks
- Idea: each node stores a routing table that has an entry to each destination (destination, distance, neighbor)
- If a router notices a change in its neighborhood or receives an update message from a neighbor, it updates its routing table accordingly and sends an update to all its neighbors
- + message follows shortest path
- + only send updates when topology changes
- most topology changes are irrelevant for a given source/destination pair
- every node needs to store a big table
- count-to-infinity problem



Discussion of Classic Routing Protocols

- **Proactive** Routing Protocols
- **Reactive** Routing Protocols
- Both link-state and distance vector are “proactive,” that is, routes are established and updated even if they are never needed.
- Flooding is “reactive,” but does not scale
- If **mobility is high** and data transmission rare, reactive algorithms are superior; in the extreme case of almost no data and very much mobility the simple flooding protocol might be a good choice.
- If there is **almost no mobility**, proactive algorithms are superior because they never have to exchange information and find optimal routes easily.

There is **no “optimal” routing protocol**; the choice of the routing protocol depends on the circumstances. Of particular importance is the mobility/data ratio.




Routing in Ad-Hoc Networks

- **Reliability**
 - Nodes in an ad-hoc network are not 100% reliable
 - Algorithms need to find alternate routes when nodes are failing
- **Mobile Ad-Hoc Network (MANET)**
 - It is often assumed that the nodes are mobile (“Car2Car”)
- 10 Tricks → 2^{10} routing algorithms
- In reality there are almost that many proposals!
- Q: How good are these routing algorithms?!? **Any hard results?**
- A: Almost none! Method-of-choice is simulation...
- “If you simulate three times, you get three different results”




Geometric (geographic, directional, position-based) routing

- ...even with all the tricks there will be flooding every now and then.
- In this chapter we will assume that the nodes are location aware (they have GPS, Galileo, or an ad-hoc way to figure out their coordinates), and that we know where the destination is.
- Then we simply route towards the destination




Geometric routing

- Problem: What if there is no path in the right direction?
- We need a guaranteed way to reach a destination even in the case when there is no directional path...
- Hack: as in flooding nodes keep track of the messages they have already seen, and then they backtrack* from there




*backtracking? Does this mean that we need a stack?!?


Geo-Routing: Strictly Local



Greedy Geo-Routing?



Greedy Geo-Routing?




What is Geographic Routing?

- A.k.a. geometric, location-based, position-based, etc.
- Each node knows its own position and position of neighbors
- Source knows the position of the destination
- **No routing tables stored in nodes!**
- Geographic routing makes sense
 - Own position: GPS/Galileo, local positioning algorithms
 - Destination: Geocasting, location services, source routing++
 - **Learn about ad-hoc routing in general**




Greedy routing

- Greedy routing looks promising.
- Maybe there is a way to choose the next neighbor and a particular graph where we always reach the destination?




Examples why greedy algorithms fail

- We greedily route to the neighbor which is closest to the destination: But both neighbors of x are not closer to destination D




- Also the best angle approach might fail, even in a triangulation: if, in the example on the right, you always follow the edge with the narrowest angle to destination t , you will forward on a loop $V_0, W_0, V_1, W_1, \dots, V_3, W_3, V_0, \dots$





Euclidean and Planar Graphs

- Euclidean: Points in the plane, with coordinates, e.g. UDG
- UDG: Classic computational geometry model, special case of disk graphs
- All nodes are points in the plane, two nodes are connected iff (if and only if) their distance is at most 1, that is $\{u,v\} \in E \Leftrightarrow |u,v| \leq 1$
- + Very simple, allows for strong analysis
- Not realistic: "If you gave me \$100 for each paper written with the unit disk assumption, I still could not buy a radio that is unit disk!"
- Particularly bad in obstructed environments (walls, hills, etc.)
- Natural extension: 3D UDG



Euclidean and Planar Graphs


- Planar: can be drawn without "edge crossings" in a plane



- A planar graph already drawn in the plane without edge intersections is called a **plane graph**. In the next chapter we will see how to make a Euclidean graph planar.


Breakthrough idea: route on faces

- Remember the faces...
- Idea: Route along the boundaries of the faces that lie on the source-destination line



Face Routing

0. Let f be the face incident to the source s , intersected by (s,t)
1. Explore the boundary of f ; remember the point p where the boundary intersects with (s,t) which is nearest to t ; after traversing the whole boundary, go back to p , switch the face, and repeat 1 until you hit destination t .




Face Routing Properties

- All necessary information is stored in the message
 - Source and destination positions
 - Point of transition to next face
- Completely local:
 - Knowledge about direct neighbors' positions sufficient
 - Faces are **implicit**



- **Planarity** of graph is **computed** locally (not an assumption)
 - Computation for instance with Gabriel Graph

Face Routing Works on Any Graph



Face routing is correct

- Theorem: Face routing terminates on any simple planar graph in $O(n)$ steps, where n is the number of nodes in the network
- Proof: A simple planar graph has at most $3n-6$ edges. You leave each face at the point that is closest to the destination, that is, you never visit a face twice, because you can order the faces that intersect the source—destination line on the exit point. Each edge is in at most 2 faces. Therefore each edge is visited at most 4 times. The algorithm terminates in $O(n)$ steps.

Definition: $f \in O(g) \rightarrow \exists c > 0, \forall x > x_0: f(x) \leq c \cdot g(x)$

Face Routing

- Theorem: Face Routing reaches destination in $O(n)$ steps
- But: Can be very bad compared to the optimal route



Ad Hoc and Sensor Networks – Roger Wattenhofer – 2/25

Is there something better than Face Routing?

How can we improve Face Routing?




Is there something better than Face Routing?

- How to improve face routing? A proposal called “Face Routing 2”
- Idea: Don't search a whole face for the best exit point, but take the **first** (better) exit point you find. Then you don't have to traverse huge faces that point away from the destination.
- Efficiency: Seems to be practically more efficient than face routing. But the theoretical worst case is worse – $O(n^2)$.
- Problem: if source and destination are very close, we don't want to route through all nodes of the network. Instead we want a routing algorithm where the cost is a function of the cost of the best route in the unit disk graph (and independent of the number of nodes).



Ad Hoc and Sensor Networks – Roger Wattenhofer – 2/27


Bounding Searchable Area



Ad Hoc and Sensor Networks – Roger Wattenhofer – 2/28


Adaptive Face Routing (AFR)

- Idea: Use face routing together with “growing radius” trick:
- That is, don't route beyond some radius r by branching the planar graph within an ellipse of exponentially growing size.



AFR Example Continued

- We grow the ellipse and find a path




AFR Pseudo-Code

0. Calculate $G = GG(V) \cap UDG(V)$
Set c to be twice the Euclidean source—destination distance.
 1. Nodes $w \in W$ are nodes where the path s - w - t is larger than c . Do face routing on the graph G , but without visiting nodes in W . (This is like pruning the graph G with an ellipse.) You either reach the destination, or you are stuck at a face (that is, you do not find a better exit point.)
 2. If step 1 did not succeed, **double** c and go back to step 1.
- Note: All the steps can be done completely locally, and the nodes need no local storage.



The $\Omega(1)$ Model

- We simplify the model by assuming that nodes are sufficiently far apart; that is, there is a **constant** d_0 such that all pairs of nodes have at least distance d_0 . We call this the $\Omega(1)$ model.
- This simplification is natural because nodes with transmission range 1 (the unit disk graph) will usually not “sit right on top of each other”.
- Lemma: In the $\Omega(1)$ model, all natural cost models (such as the Euclidean distance, the energy metric, the link distance, or hybrids of these) are equal up to a constant factor.
- Remark: The properties we use from the $\Omega(1)$ model can also be established with a backbone graph construction.




Analysis of AFR in the $\Omega(1)$ model

- Lemma 1: In an ellipse of size c there are at most $O(c^2)$ nodes.
- Lemma 2: In an ellipse of size c , face routing terminates in $O(c^2)$ steps, either by finding the destination, or by not finding a new face.
- Lemma 3: Let the optimal source—destination route in the UDG have cost c^* . Then this route c^* must be in any ellipse of size c^* or larger.
- Theorem: **AFR terminates with cost $O(c^{*2})$.**
- Proof: Summing up all the costs until we have the right ellipse size is bounded by the size of the cost of the right ellipse size.



Lower Bound

- The network on the right constructs a lower bound.
- The destination is the center of the circle, the source any node on the ring.
- Finding the right chain costs $\Omega(c^{*2})$, even for randomized algorithms
- Theorem: AFR is asymptotically optimal.



Non-geometric routing algorithms


- In the $\Omega(1)$ model, a standard flooding algorithm enhanced with growing search area idea will (for the same reasons) also cost $O(c^{*2})$.
- However, such a flooding algorithm needs $O(1)$ **extra storage** at each node (a node needs to know whether it has already forwarded a message).
- Therefore, there is a trade-off between $O(1)$ storage at each node or that nodes are location aware, and also location aware about the destination. This is intriguing.



GOAFR – Greedy Other Adaptive Face Routing

- Back to geometric routing...
- AFR Algorithm is not very efficient (especially in dense graphs)
- Combine **G**reedy and (**O**ther **A**daptive) **F**ace **R**outing
 - Route greedily as long as possible
 - Circumvent “dead ends” by use of face routing
 - Then route greedily again

Other AFR: In each face proceed to point closest to destination




GOAFR+ – Greedy Other Adaptive Face Routing

- Early fallback to greedy routing:
 - Use counters p and q . Let u be the node where the exploration of the current face F started
 - p counts the nodes closer to t than u
 - q counts the nodes *not* closer to t than u
 - Fall back to greedy routing as soon as $p > \sigma \cdot q$ (constant $\sigma > 0$)

Theorem: GOAFR is still asymptotically worst-case optimal...
...and it is efficient in practice, in the average-case.


- What does “practice” mean?
 - Usually nodes placed uniformly at random



Ad Hoc and Sensor Networks – Roger Wattenhofer – 2/37

Average Case


- Not interesting when graph not dense enough
- Not interesting when graph is too dense
- **Critical density range** (“percolation”)
 - Shortest path is significantly longer than Euclidean distance



Ad Hoc and Sensor Networks – Roger Wattenhofer – 2/38

Critical Density: Shortest Path vs. Euclidean Distance

- Shortest path is significantly longer than Euclidean distance




$$\frac{|p^*|}{|st|}$$


- Critical density range mandatory for the simulation of **any** routing algorithm (not only geographic)

Ad Hoc and Sensor Networks – Roger Wattenhofer – 2/39

Randomly Generated Graphs: Critical Density Range




Simulation on Randomly Generated Graphs




A Word on Performance

- What does a performance of 3.3 in the critical density range mean?
- If an **optimal path** (found by Dijkstra) has **cost c** , then **GOAFR+** finds the destination **in $3.3 \cdot c$ steps**.
- It does *not* mean that the *path* found is 3.3 times as long as the optimal path! The path found can be much smaller...
- Remarks about cost metrics
 - In this lecture “cost” $c = c$ hops
 - There are other results, for instance on distance/energy/hybrid metrics
 - In particular: With energy metric there is no competitive geometric routing algorithm




GOAFR: Summary



3D Geo-Routing

- The world is not flat. We can certainly envision networks in 3D, e.g. in a large office building. Can we geo-route in three dimensions? Are the same techniques possible?
- Certainly, if the node density is high enough (and the node distribution is kind to us), we can simply use greedy routing. But what about those local minima?!?
- Is there something like a face in 3D?
- The picture on the right is the 3D equivalent of the 2D lower bound, proving that we need at least OPT^3 steps.



How would you do 3D routing?



- **Without** position information:
 - Flooding
 - **does not scale**
 - Distance Vector Routing
 - **does not scale**
 - Source Routing
 - **increased per-packet overhead**
 - **no theoretical results, only simulation**
- **With** position information:
 - Greedy Routing
 - **may fail**: message may get stuck in a “dead end”
 - Geometric Routing
 - It is assumed that each node **knows its position**



Summary of Results

- If position information is available geo-routing is a feasible option.
- **Face routing** guarantees to deliver the message.
- By restricting the search area the efficiency is **OPT²**.
- Because of a lower bound this is asymptotically optimal.
- Combining greedy and face gives efficient algorithm.
- **3D** geo-routing is **impossible**.
- Even if there is no position information, some ideas might be helpful.

- Geo-routing is probably the only class of routing that is well understood.
- There are **many adjacent areas**: topology control, location services, routing in general, etc.



Open problem

- Geo-routing is one of the best understood topics. In that sense it is hard to come up with a decent open problem. Let's try something wishy-washy.
- We have seen that for a 2D UDG the efficiency of geo-routing can be quadratic to an optimal algorithm (with routing tables). However, the worst-case example is quite special.
- Open problem: How much information does one need to store in the network to guarantee only **constant overhead**?
 - Variant: Instead of UDG some more realistic model
 - How can one maintain this information if the network is dynamic?

