

Ain Shams University Faculty of Engineering Computer & Systems Engineering Department

Energy Efficient Routing Protocol for Wireless Sensor Networks

Thesis submitted for the partial fulfillment of Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) in Computer & Systems Engineering

Submitted by

Eng. Maher Nabih Mohamed Maher Elshakankiri

M.Sc. in Computer & Systems Engineering, Ain Shams University

Supervised by

Prof. Dr. Yasser Hisham Dakroury Dr. Mohamed Nabil Moustafa

Computer & Systems Engineering Department, Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University

Cairo 2009

In the Name of

Allah,

Most Gracious,

Most Merciful

Ain Shams University Faculty of Engineering Computer & Systems Engineering Department

Energy Efficient Routing Protocol for Wireless Sensor Networks

Thesis submitted for the Partial Fulfillment of Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) in Computer & Systems Engineering

Submitted by

Eng. Maher Nabih Mohamed Maher Elshakankiri

Examiners Committee

 Prof. Dr. Mohamed Gamal-eldeen Darw 	vish
• Prof. Dr. Hussein Ismail Shahein	
• Prof. Dr. Yasser Hisham Dakroury	

Examination Date: 03/08/2009

Acknowledgements

Praise be to Allah, lord of the universe, most gracious, most merciful. Thanks to Allah for his uncountable blessings and for helping me finishing the thesis.

With all love and respect, I would like to thank my great supervisor **Prof. Dr. Yasser Dakroury**, for a long time of kind support, reliable guidance, and class supervision. No doubt, he has a great impact on my academic skills, and I will never forget his favor.

Many thanks to **Dr. Mohamed Nabil**. He has given me a lot of his time and effort, and with his permanent support, he has a significant effect on the thesis.

I would like to thank the committee members, **Prof. Dr. Gamal Darwish** and **Prof. Dr. Hussein Shahein** for accepting discussing the thesis and for their thoughtful comments and guidance.

I am much appreciated to all my teachers at the German School in Cairo (DEO) and at Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University, especially the lecturers at Computer Engineering Department.

Thanks to my father for his wonderful memory, and to my mother for being my first and best teacher, for all her sacrifices, and her permanent encouragement. Deepest thanks to my brother for his help and support especially during the last time.

My kids Hamza, Ganna, and Salma Elshakankiri, the flowers of my life, worth many thanks for their patient and prayers, which have always been of great support to me.

With great love, heartfelt thanks to my wife and best friend, Heba A. Hussein, for her unlimited support and care. Thanks also for her many times stopping working on her own thesis to allow me finish mine.

Abstract

In the last few years, wireless sensor networks (WSNs) have gained a lot of interest in both research and industrial fields. Recent advances in wireless communications and electronics have enabled the development of low power, low cost, multifunctional sensor nodes that are small and able to communicate in short distances. A WSN consists of small nodes with sensing, computation, and wireless communications capabilities. These sensors have the ability to communicate either among each other or directly to a sink.

WSN are currently used for gathering data in many applications and according to this, many routing protocols have been proposed for WSNs. Most of the hierarchical protocols proposed for WSNs concentrate mainly on maximizing the lifetime of the network by trying to minimize the power consumption. Delay is almost not considered, while it is an important metric especially in time critical applications. In addition, previous protocols assume that all sensor nodes have the same energy level at startup, which is not always the case.

We propose Pairs Energy Efficient Routing (PEER) protocol, a new routing protocol for wireless sensor networks that uses dual power management and focuses on minimizing both the energy dissipated and the transmission delay. The protocol consists of three phases: joining pair phase, transmission phase, and changing pair phase.

The joining pair phase is based on grouping the randomly deployed sensor nodes into pairs. Each two nodes forming a pair should be chosen to be close to each other to ensure minimum energy consumption for the transmission between both nodes. We have used random graph theory as a mathematical model for forming pairs.

In the transmission phase, each node has a dual power assignment. One node of a pair transmits data toward the sink using high power level, and the other node transmits data to its partner using low power level. The roles of two nodes forming a pair should be changed periodically to fairly distribute the far-transmission load between both nodes.

The third phase is the changing pair phase. Only nodes that loose their partners due to partner death will be concerned with this phase to form a new pair.

In the simulations, four important metrics have been taken into consideration, namely, energy consumption, network lifetime, distribution of nodes alive, and average delay. In addition, two models have been simulated for the protocol. In the first model, all the sensor nodes have been given the same amount of energy at startup; while in the second model, sensors start the simulation with different energy levels.

We have compared our results with LEACH, a well-known recognized hierarchical wireless sensor protocol. In terms of energy consumption, network lifetime, and average delay, our protocol has performed better than LEACH by more than 200%, 200%, and 400%, respectively. Moreover, in PEER protocol the nodes alive are distributed over all regions, while in LEACH nodes alive are always concentrated near the sink with all nodes in far regions dead. Finally, PEER with nodes having different power levels at startup has almost the same performance as PEER with an insignificant difference of about 5% increase in energy consumed and less than 5% decrease for the network lifetime. In LEACH, the change in energy levels will lead to a significant change of about 25% increase in energy consumption and 20% decrease in network lifetime.

Contents

ACKNOW	VLEDGEMENTS	V
ABSTRAC	CT	VII
CONTEN	TS	IX
LIST OF	FIGURES	XIII
LIST OF	ΓABLES	XIX
LIST OF	ABBREVIATIONS	XXI
CHAPTE	R 1: WIRELESS SENSOR NETWORKS	1
1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	Problem Statement	6
1.3	DIFFERENCE BETWEEN WSN AND MANET	8
1.3.1	Application Specific	8
1.3.2	Environment Interaction	9
1.3.3	Scale	9
1.3.4	Energy	9
1.3.5	Self Configurability	9
1.3.6	Dependability and QoS	10
1.3.7	Data Centric	10
1.3.8	Simplicity	10
1.3.9	Mobility	11
1.4	HISTORY OF SENSORS NETWORKS	11
1.4.1	Early Research on Military Sensor Networks	12
1.4.2	Distributed Sensor Networks	13
1.4.3	Military Sensor Networks in the 1980s and 1990s	14
1.4.4	Sensor Network Research in the 21st Century	14
1.5	SENSOR NODE COMPONENTS	15
1.5.1	Sensing Unit	16
1.5.2	Processing Unit	16
1.5.3	Power Unit	17

1.5.4	Communication Unit	19
1.6	APPLICATIONS	20
1.6.1	Military Applications	21
1.6.2	Environmental Monitoring	23
1.6.3	Human-Centric Applications	26
1.6.4	Commercial Applications	27
1.6.5	Applications to Robotics	28
1.7	Architectural Challenges	28
1.7.1	Power Consumption	29
1.7.2	Production Cost	29
1.7.3	Hardware Constraints	30
1.7.4	Environment	30
1.7.5	Transmission Media	30
1.7.6	Remote Management	30
1.7.7	Usability	31
1.7.8	Standardization	31
1.8	TECHNICAL CHALLENGES	32
1.8.1	Ad Hoc Network Discovery	32
1.8.2	Network Control and Routing	32
1.8.3	Collaborative Signal and Information Processing	34
1.8.4	Tasking and Querying	35
1.8.5	Security	35
СНАРТЕ	R 2: WSN ROUTING PROTOCOLS	37
2.1	ROUTING CHALLENGES AND DESIGN ISSUES	39
2.1.1	Network Dynamics	39
2.1.2	Node Deployment	39
2.1.3	Energy Consideration	40
2.1.4	Data Reporting Method	40
2.1.5	Node Capabilities	41
2.1.6	Data aggregation	42
2.1.7	Fault Tolerance	42
2.1.8	Scalability	43
2.1.9	Classification of Routing Protocols	43

2.2	FLAT ROUTING PROTOCOLS	44
2.2.1	Sensor Protocols for Information via Negotiation	45
2.2.2	Directed Diffusion	48
2.2.3	Gradient-Based Routing	51
2.2.4	Energy-Aware Routing	52
2.2.5	Rumor Routing	53
2.2.6	Information-Driven Sensor Querying and Constrained Anis	otropic
	Diffusion Routing	55
2.2.7	COUGAR	56
2.2.8	ACQUIRE	57
2.3	HIERARCHICAL ROUTING PROTOCOLS	59
2.3.1	LEACH	59
2.3.2	PEGASIS and Hierarchical-PEGASIS	62
2.3.3	TEEN and APTEEN	65
2.3.4	Self Organizing Protocol	66
2.4	FLAT VERSUS HIERARCHICAL	68
2.5	LOCATION-BASED ROUTING PROTOCOLS	70
2.5.1	MECN and SMECN	70
2.5.2	Geographic and Energy-Aware Routing	72
2.5.3	Geographic Adaptive Fidelity	74
2.5.4	Two-Tier Data Dissemination	76
2.6	NETWORK FLOW AND QOS-AWARE PROTOCOLS	77
2.6.1	Maximum Lifetime Energy Routing	78
2.6.2	Minimum Cost Forwarding Algorithm	79
2.6.3	Maximum Lifetime Data Gathering	80
2.6.4	Sequential Assignment Routing	81
CHAPTE	R 3: MATHEMATICAL MODEL	83
3.1	Protocol Algorithms	84
3.1.1	Joining Pair Phase	
3.1.2	Transmission Phase	
3.1.3	Changing Pairs Phase	
3.2	RANDOM GRAPH THEORY	
3.2.1	The Erdős-Rényi model	
5.4.1	The DI was Italy i model	100

3.2.2	Subgraphs	103
3.2.3	Degree Distribution	104
3.2.4	Connectedness and Diameter	105
3.3	MODELING WSNs USING RANDOM GRAPH THEORY	106
3.3.1	Spatial Node Distribution	108
3.3.2	Connectivity Analysis	109
3.4	DUAL POWER MANAGEMENT IN WSNs	112
3.4.1	Dual Power Management Assignment	112
3.4.2	Dual Power Management Problem	114
3.4.3	Energy Consumption	116
CHAPTE	R 4: SIMULATION MODEL	119
4.1	RADIO MODEL	119
4.2	Network Model	120
4.3	Performance Evaluation	123
4.4	SIMULATION RESULTS	126
4.4.1	Percentage of Nodes Forming Pairs	126
4.4.2	Average Energy Dissipated	131
4.4.3	Number of Nodes Alive (Lifetime)	144
4.4.4	Distribution of Nodes Alive	154
4.4.5	Average Transmission Delay	159
4.4.6	Average Weighted Delay	164
CHAPTE	R 5: CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK	167
5.1	Conclusions	167
5.2	Future Work	169
5.2.1	General Direction	169
5.2.2	Networking Direction	170
5.2.3	PEER Enhancements	170
REFERE	NCES	173

List of Figures

Figure 1.1 Wireless Sensor Node (Mica2 mote)	2
Figure 1.2 Sensor nodes scattered in a sensor field	3
Figure 1.3 Components of a sensor node	15
Figure 2.1 The sensor networks protocol stack	37
Figure 2.2 Classification of routing protocols for WSN	44
Figure 2.3 The implosion problem	46
Figure 2.4 The overlap problem	46
Figure 2.5 SPIN protocol	47
Figure 2.6 Directed Diffusion protocol phases	49
Figure 2.7 COUGAR protocol architecture	57
Figure 2.8 Data gathering in a chain based binary scheme	64
Figure 2.9 Hierarchical clustering in TEEN and APTEEN	65
Figure 2.10 Relay region of transmit-relay node pair in MECN	71
Figure 2.11 Recursive geographic forwarding in GEAR	74
Figure 2.12 Virtual grid in GAF	75
Figure 2.13 State transitions in GAF	76
Figure 3.1 Joining Phase Flowchart Diagram	87
Figure 3.2 Area divided into two regions (using one bit)	88
Figure 3.3 Area divided into four regions (using two bits)	89
Figure 3.4 Area divided into eight regions (using three bits)	89
Figure 3.5 Area divided into 16 regions (using four bits)	89
Figure 3.6 Transmission phase (sink) flowchart diagram	90

Figure 3.7 Transmission phase (low node) flowchart diagram92
Figure 3.8 Transmission phase (high node) flowchart diagram95
Figure 3.9 Transmission phase (individual node) flowchart diagram96
Figure 3.10 Changing pair phase flowchart diagram99
Figure 4.1 Random 100-node topology for a 50m x 50m network122
Figure 4.2 Random 200-node topology for a 50m x 50m network122
Figure 4.3 Random 400-node topology for a 50m x 50m network123
Figure 4.4 Percentage of nodes forming pairs vs. low power coverage distance (m) for 100 random nodes in a 50m x 50m field
Figure 4.5 Percentage of nodes forming pairs vs. low power coverage
distance (m) for 200 random nodes in a 50m x 50m field127
Figure 4.6 Percentage of nodes forming pairs vs. low power coverage
distance (m) for 400 random nodes in a 50m x 50m field128
Figure 4.7 Percentage of nodes forming pairs vs. low power coverage distance (m) for 100, 200, and 400 random nodes in a 100m x 100m field
Figure 4.8 Percentage of nodes forming pairs vs. low power coverage
distance (m) for 100, 200, and 400 random nodes in a 200m x 200m field
Figure 4.9 Percentage of nodes forming pairs vs. low power coverage
distance (m) for different density values
Figure 4.10 Average Energy Dissipated (J) vs. Time (rounds) (0.25 Joule, 100 nodes, 50m x 50m)
Figure 4.11 Average Energy Dissipated (J) vs. Time (rounds) ($m = 0.25$
Joule, $\sigma = 0.1$, 100 nodes, 50m x 50m)

Figure 4.12 Average Energy Dissipated (J) vs. Time (rounds) (0.25 Joule, 200 nodes, 50m x 50m)
Figure 4.13 Average Energy Dissipated (J) vs. Time (rounds) (m = 0.25 Joule, σ = 0.1, 200 nodes, 50m x 50m)
Figure 4.14 Average Energy Dissipated (J) vs. Time (rounds) (0.25 Joule, 400 nodes, 50m x 50m)
Figure 4.15 Average Energy Dissipated (J) vs. Time (rounds) (m = 0.25 Joule, σ = 0.1, 400 nodes, 50m x 50m)
Figure 4.16 Average Energy Dissipated (J) vs. Time (rounds) (0.25 Joule, 100 nodes, 100m x 100m)
Figure 4.17 Average Energy Dissipated (J) vs. Time (rounds) (m = 0.25 Joule, σ = 0.1, 100 nodes, 100m x 100m)
Figure 4.18 Average Energy Dissipated (J) vs. Time (rounds) (0.25 Joule, 200 nodes, 100m x 100m)
Figure 4.19 Average Energy Dissipated (J) vs. Time (rounds) (m = 0.25 Joule, σ = 0.1, 200 nodes, 100m x 100m)
Figure 4.20 Average Energy Dissipated (J) vs. Time (rounds) (0.25 Joule, 400 nodes, 100m x 100m)
Figure 4.21 Average Energy Dissipated (J) vs. Time (rounds) (m = 0.25 Joule, σ = 0.1, 400 nodes, 100m x 100m)
Figure 4.22 Average Energy Dissipated (J) vs. Time (rounds) (0.5 Joule, 100 nodes, 200m x 200m)
Figure 4.23 Average Energy Dissipated (J) vs. Time (rounds) (m = 0.5 Joule, σ = 0.2, 100 nodes, 200m x 200m)
Figure 4.24 Average Energy Dissipated (J) vs. Time (rounds) (0.5 Joule, 200 nodes, 200m x 200m)

Figure 4.25 Average Energy Dissipated (J) vs. Time (rounds) ($m = 0.5$
Joule, $\sigma = 0.2$, 200 nodes, 200m x 200m)
Figure 4.26 Average Energy Dissipated (J) vs. Time (rounds) (0.5 Joule,
400 nodes, 200m x 200m)
Figure 4.27 Average Energy Dissipated (J) vs. Time (rounds) ($m = 0.5$
Joule, $\sigma = 0.2$, 400 nodes, 200m x 200m)
Figure 4.28 Average Energy Dissipated (J) vs. Time (rounds) (0.5 Joule, 100 nodes, 200m x 200m, using extended radio model)
Figure 4.29 Average Energy Dissipated (J) vs. Time (rounds) (0.5 Joule, 200 nodes, 200m x 200m, using extended radio model)
Figure 4.30 Average Energy Dissipated (J) vs. Time (rounds) (0.5 Joule, 400 nodes, 200m x 200m, using extended radio model)
Figure 4.31 Number of Nodes Alive (%) vs. Time (rounds) (0.25 Joule, 100 nodes, 50m x 50m)
Figure 4.32 Number of Nodes Alive (%) vs. Time (rounds) (m = 0.25 Joule, σ = 0.1, 100 nodes, 50m x 50m)
Figure 4.33 Number of Nodes Alive (%) vs. Time (rounds) (0.25 Joule, 200 nodes, 50m x 50m)
Figure 4.34 Number of Nodes Alive (%) vs. Time (rounds) (m = 0.25 Joule, σ = 0.1, 200 nodes, 50m x 50m)
Figure 4.35 Number of Nodes Alive (%) vs. Time (rounds) (0.25 Joule, 400 nodes, 50m x 50m)
Figure 4.36 Number of Nodes Alive (%) vs. Time (rounds) (m = 0.25 Joule, σ = 0.1, 400 nodes, 50m x 50m)
Figure 4.37 Number of Nodes Alive (%) vs. Time (rounds) (0.25 Joule, 100 nodes, 100m x 100m)