International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)
ISSN (Online): 2319-7064
Index Copernicus Value (2013): 6.14 | Impact Factor (2013): 4.438

Reliable Data Delivery using RPL

Archana R. Chemate[1], S. P. Pingat[2]

[1]PG Student, Pune University, STES's, Smt. Kashibai Navale College of Engineering, Pune, Maharashtra, India

[2] Professor, Pune University, STES's, Smt. Kashibai Navale College of Engineering, Pune, Maharashtra, India

Abstract: ***As of late, for helping IPv6 routing for resource-limited devices in home, industrial and urban context, the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) routing protocol standardized the IPv6 routing protocol for low-power and Lossy networks (RPL) for low-power and lossy networks (ROLL) working group. Be that as it may, a number of studies have demonstrated that RPL may encounter extremely low delivery rates, especially in substantial scale deployments. An in-depth evaluation of protocol attributes and design decisions that create such irregularity issues can be provided. At that point, novel protocol of the RPL standard for the Contiki operating system is illustrated and assessed to enhance data delivery dependability. The most important feature of RPL protocol is to embrace an adaptable cross-layering plan that gives basic steering enhancements, improved link estimation capacities, and effective management of neighbor tables. An advanced metering infrastructure (AMI) as a careful investigation is utilized to validate the efficiency of RPL protocol. Results acquired utilizing Cooja emulator as a part of two sets of experiments, separated by the vicinity or absence of duty cycling; demonstrate that RPL protocol performs better than the one gave in Contiki regarding average packet delivery rates by up to 200% in networks with 100 nodes. The drawback of IETF Routing protocol is it is limited small scale networks. In future, examination of how to utilize procedures, for example, data compression, system coding and opportunistic transmissions, in combination with RPL to further expand packet delivery can be done.***

Keywords: Advanced metering infrastructure (AMI), routing protocol for Low-power and Lossy networks (RPL), Contiki operating system

1. Introduction

Wireless is increasingly important to computer networking. As the technological progress behind Moore's Law [6] has reduced computer prices and form factors, networking has come to include not only servers and desktops, but laptops, palmtops, and cellphones. As computing device costs and sizes have shrunk, small wireless sensors, actuators, and smart objects have emerged as an important next step. The sheer number of such low-power networked devices means that they cannot depend on human intervention (e.g., adjusting position) for good connectivity: they must have routing protocols that enable them to self-organize into multihop networks. Energy is a fundamental challenge in these devices. Convenience and ease of use requires they be wireless and therefore battery powered. Low power operation is a key concern for these sensors and actuators so as to allow them to function for months and years without interruption. Cost points and energy limitations [15] cause these devices to have very limited computational and storage resources: a few KB of RAM and a few MHz of CPU is typical. As energy efficiency does not improve with Moore's Law, these limitations are not temporary. This trend towards smaller, lower power and more numerous devices has led to new low-power wireless link layers to support them. In practice, wireless networks observe much higher loss rates than wired ones do, and low-power wireless is no exception. Furthermore, many of these networks will include powered as well as energy constrained nodes. In the previous decade, noteworthy endeavors have been committed by the IETF to the outline of complete IPV6-based network architecture for LLNs to give interoperability existing IP devices and services [7]. The two noteworthy turning points acquired by IETF are the detail of the 6LowPAN adjustment layer, which defines how to convey IPV6 datagrams over constrained links [10], and, all the more as of late, Routing Protocol for Low-Power and Lossy Networks (RPL) [16]. RPL is a genuinely basic distance vector routing protocol that fabricates a Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG) routing structure over a physical network utilizing a mixture of routing measurements and approaches that are intended to satisfy the routing prerequisites of discriminating applications. Particularly, the configuration standards of RPL are to: 1) minimize memory utilization (e.g., the span of routing tables); 2) depend on basic routing and information sending instruments; and 3) minimize routing flagging [4].

In this paper, we have proposed another RPL usage for the Contiki OS to enhance the reliability of data transmissions. The striking peculiarity of our RPL usage is to embrace a cross-layering design approach that cooks for routing advancements, improved link estimation abilities, and more productive policies for neighbor table management. All the more exactly, we design coordinated policies to oversee RPL and IP neighbor tables, which empower a probabilistic and versatile investigation of nodes' neighborhoods. Moreover, we utilize a hybrid methodology for link estimation, which consolidates reciprocal techniques going from short-term probing of newfound links to data-driven passive link monitoring [8], [12]. At that point, the RPL routing engine dynamically chooses the most effective link estimation system focused around the hub status and the qualities of the link to be checked. At last, proposed techniques are backward-perfect with the RPL standard on the grounds that they don't require any change to the structure and functionality of RPL control messages.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section II gives the brief introduction and methodology of the previously developed system in the same field. The Section III finally, concludes the paper, with some future works to be studied later.

2. Literature Survey

The Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) has classified the general low-power and lossy networks (LLNs) by following characteristics:

1) LLNs are the networks, which contain multiple wireless embedded devices, which are having limited battery, memory, and processing power.
2) LLNs make use of different low-power technologies for comm.-unication, power line comm.-unication. These are affected by the connectivity.
3) In LLNs, the predominant traffic patterns are more frequent, i.e. Multipoint-to-point; whereas the unicast and point-to-multipoint are less frequent.

RPL is a gradient-based routing that makes a Destination Oriented (DO) DAG rooted at an information authority or sink node [4]. The gradient is called rank, and it is fundamentally a representation of the node's individual position in respect to different nodes concerning the DODAG root. In this manner, sending a packet to the DODAG root generally comprises in picking the neighbor node with the most reduced rank. A routing Objective Function (OF) characterizes how RPL nodes figure their rank values and select their parents (i.e., neighbor nodes with lower rank).

The RPL standard offers a high level of implementation adaptability. In spite of the fact that this empowers the appropriation of implementation-particular decisions that are enhanced for the focused on application, it likewise opens the route for implementation tradeoffs that may contrarily influence RPL execution. In light of proof from past studies [11], [13]; a few constraints are distinguished in ContikiRPL. The main real issue in ContikiRPL is the approach that is utilized to gather link statistics. Because of the Trickle algorithm, DIO messages are not intermittent. Thusly, it is hard to actualize traditional link-quality estimators focused around probe packets as proposed in other directing protocols for sensor networks [2], [14]. Therefore, ContikiRPL decided on aloof link-monitoring procedures that adventure existing data activity to quantify link qualities. The second significant issue in ContikiRPL is the transaction between the little data structures that are utilized for keeping up neighborhood information at distinctive layers of the protocol stack, which may prompt RPL utilizing conflicting or antiquated link information [3].

A few cases, packet overhearing may prompt wrong link-quality estimates in light of the fact that:

1) It is for the most part entangled for resource-obliged devices to process all overhead traffic;
2) Most MAC protocols for LLNs don't help retransmission sequence numbers, yet they utilize an one-bit flag to recognize beginning transmissions and retransmissions [5], [9]; and
3) Packet misfortunes happen on the overhead link and not on the link from the monitoring node and its neighbor that has sent the overhead packet.

To adapt to the ambiguity of retransmissions, we take after the methodology proposed in [12]. The neighbor tables, in which integration and routing information are kept up, are normally little. Given that in a thick network a node may have a couple of great neighbors and a lot of people low-quality links to different nodes, neighborhood management policies are fundamental to choose whether to keep up insights to newfound nodes (insertion policy), and which passages to supplant with the new nodes (replacement policy) [1].

3. Conclusion

The ContikiRPL encounters high packet misfortune rates. Packet misfortunes don't fundamentally increment with path length. Furthermore When a node chooses a parent with an awful link, it might be not able to change to a finer parent in light of the fact that ContikiRPL embraces a conservative methodology for link estimation. It just assesses the links that are right now being utilized. To address the aforementioned issues, we have received a cross-layering design methodology to backing upgraded capacities for link-quality assessment; and a more proficient and versatile administration of neighborhood information. These new systems permit a RPL node to effectively investigate the quality of individual links and to execute a more educated next-hop determination. The proposed RPL execution attains observable upgrades of packet delivery rates. Besides, we have demonstrated that asynchronous duty cycling decreases delivery rates as an outcome of expanding network discord and wireless impacts. This study is a venture to seeing how to enhance route discovery in RPL networks.

References

[1] A. Woo, T. Tong, and D. Culler, “Taming the underlying challenges of reliable multihop routing in sensor networks,” in Proc. ACM Conf. Embedded Netw. Sens. Syst. (ACM SenSyns’03), 2003, pp. 14–27.

[2] D. S. J. De Couto, D. Aguayo, J. Bicket, and R. Morris, “A high-throughput path metric for multi-hop wireless routing,” in Proc. ACM Int. Conf. Mobile Comput. Netw. (ACM Mobicom’03), 2003, pp. 134–146.

[3] E. Ancillotti, R. Bruno, and M. Conti, “Reliable Data Delivery With the IETF Routing Protocol for Low-Power and Lossy Networks”, IEEE Transactions On Industrial Informatics, Vol. 10, No. 3, August 2014.

[4] E. Ancillotti, R. Bruno, and M. Conti, “The role of the RPL routing protocol in smart grid communications”, IEEE Comm. Mag., vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 75–83, Jan. 2013.

[5] G. Anastasi, M. Conti, and M. Di Francesco, “A comprehensive analysis of the MAC unreliability problem in IEEE 802.15.4 wireless sensor networks,” IEEE Trans. Ind. Informat., vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 52–65, Feb. 2011.

[6] G. E. Moore, “Moore’s Law or How Overall Processing Power for Computers will Double Every Two Year”, 1970. Accessed on 13th Dec, 2014, http://www.mooreslaw.org/

[7] G. Moritz, F. Golatowski, C. Lerche, and D. Timmermann, “Beyond 6LowPAN: Web Services in Wireless Sensor Networks,” IEEE Trans. Ind. Informat., vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 1551–3203, Nov. 2013.

[8] H. Zhang, A. Arora, and P. Sinha, "Link estimation and routing in sensor network backbones: Beacon-based or data-driven?" IEEE Trans. Mobile Comput., vol. 8, no. 5, pp. 653–667, May 2009.

[9] I. Demirkol, C. Ersoy, and F. Alagoz, "MAC protocols for wireless sensor networks: A survey," IEEE Commun. Mag., vol. 44, no. 4, pp. 115–121, Apr. 2006.

[10] J. Hui and P. Thubert, "Compression Format for IPv6 Datagrams over IEEE 802.15.4-Based Networks", IETF RFC 6282, Sep. 2011.

[11] J. KO Et Al., "ContikiRPL and TinyRPL: Happy together," in Proc. Workshop Extend. Int. Low power and Lossy Netw. (IP+SN'11), Chicago, IL, USA, Apr. 2011, pp. 1–6.

[12] K.-H. Kim and K. Shin, "On accurate and asymmetry-aware measurement of link quality in wireless mesh networks," IEEE/ACM Trans. Netw., vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 1172–1185, Aug. 2009.

[13] N. Accettura, L. Grieco, G. Boggia, and P. Camarda, "Performance analysis of the RPL routing protocol," in Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Mechatron. (IEEE ICM'11), 2011, pp. 767–772.

[14] O. Gnawali, R. Fonseca, K. Jamieson, D. Moss, and P. Levis, "Collection tree protocol," in Proc. ACM Conf. Embedded Netw. Sens. Syst. (ACM SenSyns'09), 2009, pp. 1–14.

[15] S. A. Nikolidakis, D. Kandris, D. D. Vergados, and C. Douligeris, "Energy Efficient Routing in Wireless Sensor Networks Through Balanced Clustering", Algorithms 2013, 6(1), 29-42.

[16] T. Winter et al., "RPL: IPv6 Routing Protocol for Low-Power and Lossy Networks", IETF RFC 6550, Mar. 2012.