

Routing Protocols in MANET's

B. Uppalaiah^{#1}, K. Anand Kumar^{*2}, Prof. J. Sasi Kiran^{#3}, K. Kanthi Kumar^{#4}, Prof. G. Charles Babu^{#5}

^{#1,#5}Computer Science Engineering Department, Holy Mary Institute of Technology & Science (HITS COE)
Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh, India

¹bnp.uppalaiah@gmail.com

⁵babu_gundupalli@yahoo.co.in

^{*2}Computer Science Engineering Department, Anurag Engineering College (AEC)
Anantagiri, Kodad, A. P, India

³kongara527@gmail.com

^{#3,#4}Computer Science Engineering Department, Vidya Vikas Institute of Technology (VVIT)
Chevella, R.R Dist., A. P, India

²jsasikiranj@yahoo.co.in

³kkanhik@gmail.com

Abstract— Mobile ad-hoc networks (MANET) are characterized as networks without any physical connections. In these networks there is no fixed topology due to the mobility of nodes, interference, multipath propagation and path loss. Hence a dynamic routing protocol is needed for these networks to function properly. Many Routing protocols have been developed for accomplishing this task. MANET routing protocols can be categorized as Proactive or Table-driven Routing Protocols Reactive or On Demand routing protocols and Hybrid routing protocols. This paper presents the three types of routing protocols in MANET and makes a comparative discussion of the features of each type of that routing protocol.

Keywords— MANET, Ad hoc Networking, Routing, Routing Protocol.

I. INTRODUCTION

Mobile Ad hoc Network (MANET) is the new emerging technology which enables users to communicate without any physical infrastructure. MANET is self-organizing and adaptive network. Device in mobile ad hoc network should be able to detect the presence of other devices and perform necessary set up to facilitate communication and sharing of data and service. Ad hoc networking allows the devices to maintain connections to the network as well as easily adding and removing devices to and from the network. Due to the mobility nature of MANET, the network topology may change rapidly and unpredictably over time. Message routing is a problem in a decentralize environment where the topology fluctuates. While the shortest path from a source to a destination based on a given cost function in a static network is usually the optimal route, this concept is difficult to extend in MANET. The routing concept basically involves, two activities: firstly, determining optimal routing paths and secondly, transferring the information groups (called packets) through an internetwork. Routing protocols for wired networks typically do not need to handle mobility of nodes within the system. On the contrary, mobility and resource constraints are basic features in MANET. Mobile Ad hoc networks also do not have trusted entities such as routers, since every node in the network is expected to participate in the routing function. Therefore, routing protocols need to be specifically

designed for MANET. Routing is the most fundamental research issue in MANET and must deal with limitations such as high power consumption, low bandwidth, high error rates and unpredictable movements of nodes. Generally, current routing protocols for MANET can be categorized as: Proactive or Table-driven Routing Protocols [1][2], Reactive or On Demand routing protocols [4][5] and Hybrid routing protocols[9][10].

The aim of this paper is to presents the routing protocols in MANET and comparison between these protocols in term of routing methods and overhead that associated with each method.

The paper is organized as follows Section 2 present the routing concept extends with the problem with routing in MANET. Section 3 provides an overview of the routing methods in MANET. Section 4 discusses different routing protocols for each method as well as comparison between reviewed routing protocols. Section 5 concludes the paper.

II. ROUTING IN MANET

All the routing concept basically involves, two activities: firstly, determining optimal routing paths and secondly, transferring the information groups (called packets) through an internetwork. Since the topology of the network is constantly changing, the issue of routing packets between any pair of nodes becomes a challenging task. Most protocols should be based on reactive routing instead of proactive. Multi cast routing is another challenge because the multi cast tree is no longer static due to the random movement of nodes within the network. Routes between nodes may potentially contain multiple hops, which is more complex than the single hop communication.

III. PROBLEM WITH ROUTING IN MANET

Routing is the most fundamental research issue in MANET and must deal with limitations such as high power consumption, low bandwidth, high error rates and unpredictable movements of nodes.

The following is the problems with routing in MANET:

– Asymmetric links: Fixed networks rely on the symmetric links which are always fixed. But in ad-hoc networks the nodes are mobile and constantly changing their position within network.

- Routing Overhead: because the node in ad hoc networks often change their location within network. So, some stale routes are generated in the routing table which leads to unnecessary routing overhead.
- Interference: in mobile ad hoc networks links come and go depending on the transmission characteristics, one transmission might and can corrupt the total transmission.
- Dynamic Topology: The mobile node might move or medium characteristics might change. In ad-hoc networks, routing tables must somehow reflect these changes in topology and routing algorithms have to be adapted.

IV. ROUTING PROTOCOLS IN MANET'S

Generally Routing protocols in MANETs are classified into three different categories according to their functionality: Proactive or Table-driven Routing Protocols, Reactive or On Demand routing protocols and Hybrid routing protocols.

A. Proactive or Table-driven Routing Protocols

Proactive protocols maintain the routing information even before it is needed [1][2]. These protocols are attempts to maintain consistent, up-to-date routing information from each node to every other node in the network. Routes information are generally store in number of different tables to use to forward a packet when needed. These tables are periodically updated as the network topology changes. This can be seen in Wireless Routing Protocol (WRP) [3] and Destination-Sequenced Distance-Vector (DSDV)[1].

1) Destination-sequenced distance-vector(DSDV):

Destination-Sequenced Distance Vector (DSDV) is a traditional table-driven protocol for MANET [1]. In DSDV routes are established based on constant control traffic and they are available all the time. Each node maintains one or more tables that contain route information to other nodes in the network. Nodes continuously update the tables to provide fresh view of whole network. Updates are so frequent that the advertisement must be made regularly enough to make sure that every node can almost always find every other node in the network.

2) Wireless routing protocol (WRP)

Wireless routing protocols (WRP) [3] is a loop free routing protocol. WRP is a path-finding algorithm with the exception of avoiding the count-to-infinity problem by forcing each node to perform consistency checks of predecessor information reported by all its neighbors.

B. Reactive or On Demand routing protocols

Reactive or On demand routing protocols create routes only when they are needed. Reactive protocols use two different operations to find and maintain routes: the route discovery process operation and the route maintenance operation. When a node requires a route to destination, it initiates route discovery process within the network. This process is completed once a route is found or all possible route permutations are examined. Route maintenance is the process of responding to

changes in topology that happens after a route has initially been created. The nodes in the network try to detect link breaks on the established routes. Examples of on-demand protocols are Dynamic Source Routing (DSR) [5], Ad Hoc On-Demand Distance Vector (AODV)[4], Temporally-Ordered Routing Algorithm (TORA) [6] and Dynamic MANET On-Demand (DYMO) [7]. In reactive approach, the sending node has to discover a route to the destination, this process makes the initial delay before data is exchanged between two nodes is be long.

1) Dynamic source routing (DSR)

DSR is a reactive routing protocol [5]. Thus, routes get created only when they are needed and there is no periodic routing traffic for creating or maintaining routes. DSR also makes use of source routing. In source routing, when a node originates a data packet it puts in the header of the packet all the hops that the packet needs to traverse to get to the destination. DSR has two main components: route discovery and route maintenance. When a node needs a new route to a destination it initiates the route discovery process by sending a route request message. The route request is broadcast by the originator and contains the address of the originator and the destination. The route request also has a unique identity associated with it. When a node receives the route request, it checks the unique identity to determine whether it has seen this request before. If it has not seen the request before, it appends its address in the route request message and then broadcasts the message to its neighbors. If the node has seen this request before, it just ignores it. Once the destination receives the route request message, it sends back a route reply message that contains the route information accumulated in the route request message.

2) Ad hoc on-demand distance vector (AODV)

AODV is a reactive routing protocol in which the network generates routes at the start of communication [4][8]. AODV obtains the routes purely on-demand which is makes it a very useful and desired algorithm for MANETs. AODV routing protocol consists of two protocol operations: route discovery and route maintenance. When a node does a route discovery towards a destination node, it broadcasts a Route Request (RREQ) message to all its neighbors. If the node is the destination or the node has a route to the destination that meet the freshness requirement, it unicasts a route reply (RREP) back to the source node. The source node or the intermediate nodes that receive RREP messages will update their forward route to destination in the routing tables. Otherwise, they continue broadcasting the RREQ. If a node receives a RREQ message that has already processed, it discards the RREQ and does not forward it.

C. Hybrid routing protocols

Hybrid routing protocols aggregates a set of nodes into zones in the network topology [9][10]. In each zone the proactive approach is used to maintain routing information. To route packets between different zones, the reactive approach is used. Consequently, in hybrid

schemes, a route to a destination that is in the same zone is established without delay, while a route discovery and a route maintenance procedure is required for destinations that are in other zones. The Zone Routing Protocol (ZRP)[13] and Zone-based Hierarchical Link State (ZHLS) routing protocol provide a compromise on scalability issue in relation to the frequency of end-to-end connection, the total number of nodes, and the frequency of topology change. The key idea of ZRP is to utilize the features of both proactive and reactive routing. With proactive routing inside a limited zone, the connection establishment) time can be reduced. Reactive routing reduces the amount of control traffic by discovering the path on demand for destinations outside the routing zone. The most dominant parameter influencing on the efficiency of ZRP is the zone radius. Furthermore, these protocols can provide a better trade-off between communication overhead and delay, but this trade-off is subjected to the size of a zone and the dynamics of the zone. Thus, the hybrid approach is an appropriate candidate for routing in a large network.

Table1 show the compressions between features of the three types of routing protocols on MANET

TABLE I
FEATURE OF ROUTING PROTOCOLS IN MANET

Routing protocols	Features
proactive routing protocols	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not suitable for larger networks. - need to maintain node entries for each node in the routing table of every node. - overhead in the routing table leading to consumption of more bandwidth.
reactive routing protocols	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - routes are always available (regardless of need), with the consumption of signaling traffic and power. - Both categories of routing protocols have been improving g to be more scalable, secure, and to support higher quality of service.
Hybrid routing protocol	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - utilize the features of both proactive and reactive routing. - Reduce connection establishment time (proactive routing inside zone). - reduces the amount of control traffic (reactive routing outside zone). - candidate for routing in a large network.

V. CONCLUSION

Routing is the most fundamental research issue in MANET. The routing concept basically involves, two activities: firstly, determining optimal routing paths and secondly, transferring the information groups (called packets) through an internetwork. Ad hoc network need to specifically design for routing protocol. Generally, current routing protocols for MANET can be categorized as: Proactive or Table-driven Routing Protocols, Reactive or On Demand routing protocols and Hybrid routing protocols. Overall, a significant amount of work has been done on routing protocol in MANET. Clearly the problem in MANET is that the routing must deal with limitations such as high power

consumption, low bandwidth, high error rates and unpredictable movements of nodes.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We thank International Journal of Computer Science Engineering and Technology (IJCSET). Also we thanks to Holy Mary Institute of Technology and Science (HITS COE) & Vidya Vikas Institute of Technology (VVIT), Hyderabad & Anurag Engineering College (AEC), Kodad for finding and supporting this research.

REFERENCES

[1] Charles E. Perkins. Ad Hoc Networking. Addison Wesley, 2001.
 [2] T. Clausen, et al. "Optimized link state routing protocol". In Proceedings of IEEE International Multi-Topic Conference(INMIC), Pakistan, 2001.
 [3] C.K.Toh, "Ad Hoc Mobile Wireless Networks: Protocols and Systems," rentice Hall Publications, 2002.
 [4] C. Perkins, E. Belding-Royer, and S. Das, "Ad Hoc On demand Distance Vector (AODV) Routing," IETF RFC 3561, July 2003.
 [5] [D. B. Johnson et al., "The Dynamic Source Routing Protocol for Mobile Ad Hoc Networks (DSR)," IETF Draft, draft-ietf-manet-dsr-10.txt, July 2004.
 [6] Vincent D. Park and M. Scott Corson, "A performance comparison of the Temporally-Ordered Routing Algorithm (TORA) and Ideal Link-State Routing", Proceedings of IEEE symposium on Computer and Communication, June 1998.
 [7] I. Chakeres, E. Belding-Royer, and C. Perkins. Dynamic MANET On demand (DYMO) routing. Internet draft, March 2006. Draft-ietf-manetdymo-04.txt.
 [8] Farooq Anjum and Petros Mouchtaris, "SECURITY FOR WIRELESS AD HOC NETWORKS", Copyright © 2007 by John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
 [9] Belding-Royer,E.M. and C.K. Toh, 1999. A review of current routing protocols for ad-hoc mobile wireless networks.IEEE Personal Communication magazine pp:46-55.
 [10] M. Frodigh, P. Johansson, and P. Larsson.—Wireless ad hoc networking: the art of networking without a network,□ Ericsson Review,No.4, 2000, pp. 248-263.
 [11] Broch,J., A.M David and B. David,1998. A Performance comparison of multi-hop wireless ad hoc network routing protocols. Proc.IEEE/ACM MOBICOM f98, pp: 85-97.
 [12] C.E.Perkins and P. Bhagwat, \Highly dynamic destination-sequenced distance vector routing for mobile computers., Comp, Comm. Rev., Oct.1994, pp 234-44
 [13] Haas, Zygmunt J., Pearlman, Marc R.: The Performance of Query Control Schemes for the Zone Routing Protocol, August 2001, IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking, Vol.9, No. 4.
 [14] Jie Wu , Fei Dai, —Broadcasting in Ad Hoc Networks: Based on Self-Pruning□, Twenty Second Annual Joint Conferences of IEEE Computer and Communication Societies, IEEE INFOCOM 2003
 [15] Y.Hu, A Perrig and D. Johnson, Ariadne: A secure Ondemand Routing Protocol for Ad Hoc Networks, in Proceeding of ACM MOBICOM'02, 2002.
 [16] S. Ahmed and M. S. Alam, "Performance Evaluation of Important Ad-hoc network Protocols", Proceedings of EURASIP Journal on Wireless Communications and Networking Volume 2006, Issue 2 (April 2006), pp- 42 – 42.
 [17] C.Siva Ram Murthy and B.S.Manoj. Ad Hoc Wireless Networks Architectures and Protocols. PRENTICE HALL, 2004.
 [18] Elizabeth M. Royer and Chai-Keong Toh. A review of current routing protocols for ad hoc mobile wireless networks. Technical report, University of California and Georgia Institute of Technology, USA, 1999.
 [19] David B. Johnson Josh Broch, David A. Maltz and Jorjeta Jetcheva. A performance comparison of multi-hop wireless ad hoc network routing protocols. Technical report, Computer Science Department, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA 15213, USA.
 [20] Broch,J., A.M David and B. David,1998. A Performance comparison of multi-hop wireless ad hoc network routing protocols. Proc.IEEE/ACM MOBICOM'98, pp: 85-97.
 [21] HaoYang, Haiyun & Fan Ye — Security in mobile ad-hoc networks : Challenges and solutions,□, Pg. 38-47, Vol 11, issue 1, Feb 2004.

AUTHORS PROFILE



B. Uppalaiah received Bachelor of Technology (Information Technology) from Kakatiya University. Master of Technology (Software Engineering) from Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University (JNTUH). My research interests include Data Mining, Network Security, Information Security and Web Services. Presently working as an Assistant Professor in the department of Computer Science at Holy Mary Institute of Technology and Science (HITS COE), India.



K. Anand received Master of Technology (Computer Science Engineering) from Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University (JNTUH). His research interests include Data Mining, Network Security, and Mobile Computing. Presently working as an Assistant Professor in the department of Information Technology at Anurag Engineering College (AEC), India.



Prof. J. Sasi Kiran currently pursuing Ph. D (CSE) in University of Mysore, and he received Master of Technology (Computer & Communication Engineering) from Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University Hyderabad in 2005. And he is currently working as a Professor & HOD in the department of Computer Science in Vidya Vikas Institute of Technology.



K. Kanti Kumar currently pursuing Ph. D (ECE) in Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University Kakinada, and he received Master of Technology (Computer & Communication Engineering) from Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University Hyderabad in 2005. And he is currently working as a Professor in the department of CS/IT in Vidya Vikas Institute of Technology.



Prof. G. Charles Babu currently pursuing Ph. D (Data Mining) in Acharya Nagarjuna University Guntur, and he received Master of Technology (Software Engineering) from Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University Hyderabad in 1999. And he is currently working as a Professor & HOD in the department of Computer Science in Holy Mary Institute of Technology and Science