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Data Dissemination in Sensor Nets

- Sensor net: many low power, wireless “motes”
  - 1-10 KB RAM, 4-8MHz CPU, 10-100Kbs radio
- Dissemination: deliver a data item to every mote in a network
  - Configuration constants
  - Code updates, virtual programs
- Requires a continuous protocol
  - Transient disconnections, network repopulation
- Two metrics: energy efficiency, rate
Broadcast-based Protocols

• Every node forwards
• Energy efficient
  – Can use physical density, opportunistic receptions
• Slow: can’t immediately forward
  – Suppression mechanisms, timers
  – CSMA: broadcast storms
  – RTS/CTS: control packet exchange latency
Routing-based Protocols

• One node forwards
• Fast
  – Next hop can immediately retransmit
• **Energy inefficient**: naming
  – Need many routes to reach entire network
  – Naming every node unfeasible
Firecracker Dissemination

- Combine routing and broadcasts
  - Routing’s speed
  - Broadcasting’s efficiency
- Seeding phase
  - Route data to distant points in the network
- Propagation phase
  - Start broadcasting from routes
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Sensor Networking

- Energy is critical, communication is costly
- Local wireless broadcast primitive
  - Unique node identifiers
- Many application requirements, many network protocols
  - Collection
  - Any-to-any (logical coordinates: GEM, BVR, etc.)
  - Local aggregation
  - Dissemination
    - Trickle
Trickle Algorithm

- Periodically broadcast metadata $M$
- Suppression interval of length $T$
- Pick a random point $b$ in $T$
  - Broadcast unless you hear $M$
- When $T$ expires, double it (up to a max)
- If you hear $M+$, make $T$ very small (1 sec)
- If you hear $M-$, send an update
- Trickle plots
Experimental Methodology

- TOSSIM, a TinyOS simulator
- Compiles applications into a simulator engine
- Radio loss model based on empirical distributions
  - Asymmetric
  - Highly variable
- Unit disk interference model
- Bit-level or packet-level simulation
  - We used packet-level
Trickle Plot

- 20x20 grid (400 nodes)
- New datum
- 15 foot spacing
- 32 hop network
- Time to reception in seconds
- Wave of activity
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Firecracker

- Start dissemination by seeding network
- Route data to a few distant points
- Start broadcast dissemination along paths
  - Destination, route, snooping
- Example: corners on a grid-based protocol
  - Nodes can forward to manhattan neighbors
  - If two options, select randomly
  - Network density ensures manhattan links exist
- Same methodology as Trickle example
Basic Trickle
Adjacent Corners
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Routing Reduces Cost

- Routing happens quickly
  - Synchronizes nodes
  - Trickle performance improves
- Fewer nodes need metadata exchanges
  - Metadata is most of the traffic
Hybrid Approach is Beneficial

- Distant seed points
  - Improves rate
  - Reduces cost
- Can’t assume knowing what distant points exist
  - Can’t store all the names
  - Need a way to select seeds
  - Randomization prevents corner cases
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Experimental Methodology

- Use same grid arrangement
- Run twenty experiments, average results
Four Policies

- From corner to one random node in the grid
- From corner to three random nodes
- From center to three random nodes
- From corner to three random distant nodes
Histograms

One from corner

Three from corner

Three from center

SIGOPSEW

Three distant from corner
Results

- Picking random nodes works OK
  - Adding more does not improve results a great deal
- Coverage improves from center
- Distant nodes works best
- Need route to edge of the network
  - Logical coordinate spaces support this
Outline

• Data dissemination
• Sensor networking, Trickle
• Firecracker
• Randomized Seeds
• Conclusion
Network Protocols

- Varying communication requirements
  - Collection (n to one)
  - Dissemination (one to n)
  - Diffusion (m to n)
  - Local Aggregation
- Forwarding predicates
  - Density estimation
- Predicate and media access interaction
- Routing’s scoping enables fast propagation
- Slower broadcasts fill in the holes
Any-to-Any Routing

- Current protocols use logical coordinates
  - GEM (Graph Embedding, polar coordinates)
  - BVR (Beacon Vector Routing, n-dimensional)
- GPSR uses geographic coordinates
  - Requires localization
  - Virtual coordinates may be possible
- Data dissemination benefits from being able to name a distant node (*network* distance)
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Routing, With Snooping