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## Introduction

- Intermittently connected environments (ICE)
- A fully connected path between source and sink may not always exist
- Contact schedules of nodes not known in advance
- E.g. ad-hoc environments without permanent networking infrastructure
- Opportunistic forwarding protocols
- Leverage forwarding opportunities created by intermediate nodes
- Portable, wireless communication devices embedded in mobile entities (e.g. humans, vehicles)
- Nodes follow store and forward paradigm
- Tolerant to delays and disruptions
- Challenge: Choosing the best forwarding opportunity based on limited contact information


## Related Work

- Focus: Analytical characterization of mobility traces
- Aggregate inter-contact durations (ICD) between human pairs follows power-law distribution[Chaintreau]
- ICD is dichotomous: power-law followed by exponential decay[Karagiannis][Cai]
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- CREST
- Forwarding metric based on characterization of mobility traces
- Metric based on conditional residual time


## Collection of Mobility Traces

- Environment profile
- Open research lab environment
- Mobile workspaces, meetings rooms, cafeteria
- 4 floors
- Participant profile
- 52 participants, each carrying Ekahau wireless tag
- Researchers from 2 research groups, student interns
- Project leaders in business divisions, department managers
- System administrators, administrative staff
- Data Logging
- Location coordinates: X, Y, floor
- Timestamp, tag ID, signal quality
- 30-day traces, 5 second interval
- Pairs within 5 meters on same floor are considered to be in contact


## Dataset Characterization

- Approach
- Analyze the aggregate ICD of the office dataset
- Derive bounds for the delay performance of DTN protocols
- Model the pairwise ICD and propose a new link metric
- Assume data transfer time negligible compared to wait time until next contact


## ICD

Time elapsed between two successive contacts of a pair of nodes.

## Residual time:

Time remaining until next contact between nodes $i$ and $j$.

## Aggregate Inter-Contact Duration



- CCDF of aggregate ICD for office dataset is dichotomous
- Pareto ( $\alpha=0.1497$ ) followed by exponential tail $\left(\lambda=7.87 * 10^{-6}\right)$
- Characteristic time $=3$ hours


## Delay Bounds

## Direct hop protocol

- Single hop transmission to destination directly from source
- Mean end-to-end delay for office dataset 35 hours
- Provides upper delay bound for DTN protocols
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## Flooding protocol

- Forward copy of message to every node in contact that does not already have a copy
- Mean end-to-end delay for office dataset 4.66 hours
- Provides lower delay bound for DTN protocols

Delay expression for pareto and exponential cases for both protocols derived in paper

## Pairwise Inter-Contact Durations

- Aggregate ICD does not accurately represent contact behavior of different node pairs

- Pairwise ICD provides better basis for link metric
- Most pairwise ICD in office dataset lognormally distributed (K-S statistic)
- Different parameters $\mu_{i j}$ and $\sigma_{i j}$
- Means span over three orders of magnitude
- Contact behavior between individual pairs not memoryless


## CREST Link Metric

## Conditional Residual Time (CRT)

Time remaining before node $i$ and $j$ meet, conditioned on the information that they last met $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{ij}}$ time slots ago.
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## For lognormal pairwise ICD ( $T(i, j)$ ):

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tilde{\mathrm{t}}_{\mathrm{ij}}=\exp \left(\operatorname{erf}^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{erf}\left(\frac{\ln \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{ij}}-\mu_{i j}}{\sigma_{i j} \sqrt{2}}\right)\right) \sigma_{i j} \sqrt{2}+\mu_{i j}\right)-\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{ij}} . \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

## Median CRT

- Lognormal parameters for office dataset:
- $8.0 \leqslant \mu_{i j} \leqslant 11.0$
- $2.5 \leqslant \sigma_{i j} \leqslant 3.5$

- Behavior of median CRT depends on distribution of ICD
Lognormal (not memoryless):
monotonically increases
with time elapsed since last contact ( $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{ij}}$ )
Exponential (memoryless): residual time independent of $t_{i j}$
Constant: decreases with $t_{i j}$
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## Office Dataset: Single Copy



- DR within 1 day: Flooding ( $100 \%$ in 21 hours), CREST ( $80 \%$ ), PROPHET (60\%), MEED (36\%), MED (34\%)
- CREST more adaptive to ICD behavior compared to PROPHET


## Office Dataset: Multiple Copies

Figure: Can CREST perform as well as Flooding but with fewer message copies?


- Source generates $m$ copies
- Delivery ratio improves with m

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 90 \% \text { DR: } 40 \mathrm{hrs}(m=1) \\
& 24 \mathrm{hrs}(m=2) \\
& 18 \mathrm{hrs}(m=5)
\end{aligned}
$$

- Performance stable beyond $m>5$
- CREST has low overhead
- CREST: $95 \%$ delivery in 21 hrs with $\mathrm{m}=5$
- Flooding: $100 \%$ in 21 hrs with 196 transmissions


## Haggle Dataset: Single Copy
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## Inferences

- Contact data logged by iMotes
- 41 conference participants, 4-day period
- ICD is lognormal
- CREST has lower delay, higher delivery ratio compared to MED, PROPHET
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## Conclusions

- Data characterization
- Mobility traces from real environments show human contact behavior not memoryless
- Median CRT: a novel link metric for opportunistic forwarding
- CREST protocol
- Decentralized decision making based on local contact information
- More effective in different ICEs
- Low overhead
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- Future work
- Mobility-based metrics capture transient contact behavior
- Combine with metrics that capture social structure

