

#### A Biologically-inspired Approach for Self-Adaptive Ad-Hoc Network Routing

Kenji Leibnitz Osaka University, Japan leibnitz@ist.osaka-u.ac.jp

Jeju International Ubiquitous Computing Conference 2006, Cheju National University, Jeju Korea, 11-12 April 2006.

# **Outline of the Talk**

- Introduction
- Adaptive response by attractor selection (ARAS)



- Application to ad-hoc routing
- Simple numerical examples
- Conclusion and outlook



21<sup>st</sup> Century COE Program New Information Technologies for Building a Networked Symbiosis Environment



# Introduction

- Biologically-inspired models applied to telecommunication networks:
  - sub-optimal performance is often acceptable



- learning algorithms require target patterns
- desired features: self-adaptive, robust
- examples:
  - swarm intelligence
  - ant-based routing





#### **Adaptive Response by Attractor Selection**

- Original model for E. coli cells to adapt to changes in the availability of a nutrient
- Activity term indicates environmental changes and the "goodness" of the system state
- Concept of attractors is often used in chaos theory





# **Mathematical Model**



- Formulation as (stochastic) differential equation system with mutual influence
- Activity α makes the first two terms become zero
  → system behaves like a random walk
- Attractor locations are entirely defined by the differential equations



#### **Attractor Selection Concept**



- Basic mechanism:
  - consider state space with magnets (= equilibrium solutions)
  - solution is a metal ball which is constantly in motion but stays locked at an attractor
  - activity influences which magnet is activated and the strength of the noise influence
- ARAS can be seen as a mapping of an input space *(environment)* to a set of discrete points *(attractors)*



# **Basic Concept of MARAS**



- MARAS: <u>Mobile Ad-Hoc Routing with Attractor</u> <u>Selection</u>
- Node has several possible next hops
- If it has no information, selection is randomly
- Otherwise the selection is evaluated for the next hop based on the "goodness" of the previous choice



### **Neighbor Set Maintenance**



- Assumption of location estimation (e.g. GPS)
- Each node only uses local information by querying the distances to the destination
- Distinction in 2 sets:
  - Neighbor set  $N_n$
  - Candidate set  $C_n$
- Next hop is selected randomly → reduction of selfishness



# **MARAS Algorithm**



- Each node uses ARAS to determine the next hop
- "Goodness" of selection:
  - number of hops
  - distance-path length ratio

$$\frac{d\alpha}{dt} = \delta(\alpha^* - \alpha) \quad \text{with} \quad \alpha^* = 1 - (1 - \rho) \left(1 - \frac{h_{\min}}{h}\right)$$



## **Summary of Algorithm**



10

# **Simulation Scenario**



- Nodes are randomly distributed with density  $\lambda$
- *src* is left-most, *dest* is right-most node
- Comparison to Greedy routing method (next hop is the one nearest to *dest*)
- Nodes in the transit area may fail with a certain probability *q*
- **Performance metrics**: *delivery rate*, *number of hops*



### **Delivery Rate**



- MARAS has better delivery performance than Greedy, especially when radius is small
- Small node densities and transmission radius reduce the delivery rate (connectivity problems!)



#### **Number of Hops**



- If greedy method finds solution it has less hops (since it deterministically uses best next hop)
- Number of hops is nearly unaffected by state change probability q



# Conclusion

- MARAS: Bio-inspired and self-adaptive ad-hoc routing scheme
- Different metrics can be used: hop count, distance ratio, energy consumption, ...
- MARAS can adapt easily to changes in topology with high delivery rate
- Future work:
  - consider different path metrics
  - more thorough comparison to other methods

