Finite Greed:

Limits to Greedy Routing in Located Meshes

Nick Moore / Ahmet Şekercioğlu / Gregory K Egan

Center for Telecommunications and Information Engineering, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia.

Abstract

Greedy forwarding provides a very simple, but unreliable, method of location-based routing for traffic in mesh networks. This paper investigates 'supergreedy routing', an extension to greedy forwarding which increases routing reliability without adding significantly to protocol complexity.

Revision: 1.1 Date: 2005/06/24 02:39:50

Finite Greed 3/10



Nick Moore / Ahmet Şekercioğlu / Gregory K Egan

Finite Greed 4/10



Given a method findclosest(dest,s) which finds the closest neighbour to location dest with stratum \leq s:

```
method findbest(dest)
{
    \mathtt{s} \leftarrow \infty
    do {
        best \leftarrow findclosest(dest,s)
        if (!best) return NULL
        dest \leftarrow best.location
        s \leftarrow best.stratum - 1
    } while (s)
    return best
}
```

Testing

- -400 nodes in a 1km \times 1km area
 - node range varying from 70 to 110 meters
 - Routability measured by testing all 159600 possible routes
- -6400 nodes in a 4km \times 4km area
 - Node ranges varying from 90 to 110 meters
 - testing 10000 randomly selected routes

Finite Greed 7/10



Figure 1: Routability tests of a 400-node mesh network: Five sets of experiments were conducted by varying the transmission range of the nodes to 70, 80, 90, 100 and 110 m.

Finite Greed 8/10



Figure 2: Routability tests of a 6400-node mesh network: Three sets of experiments were conducted by varying the transmission range of the nodes to 90, 100 and 110 m.

$\underline{\mathbf{Costs}}$

- Larger neighbourhoods require more information to be broadcast.
- Cost increases rapidly with neighbourhood size.

Conclusions

Supergreedy routing provides a significant improvement in routing reliability at a small cost in broadcast traffic and a very small increase in algorithmic complexity.

Further Work

When supergreedy routing fails, it is because a node knows of no neighbour closer to the packet destination than itself: its neighbourhood is insufficiently large. When this occurs, a node could solicit for suitable *n*-neighbours and amend its routing table. Additionally, *n*-neighbours which do not increase the reliability of forwarding could be dropped from the routing table.