

Ahmed Amokrane¹, Rami Langar¹, Raouf Boutaba², Guy Pujolle ¹

 1 LIP6, Pierre and Marie Curie University, Paris 6, France

² University of Waterloo, Ontario, Canada

December 11, 2013

Overview and Motivation	Problem Setting	Our Proposal	Conclusion
Outline			



- 2 Problem Setting
- Our Proposal
- Performance Evaluation Results
- **5** Conclusion and Future Work

Overview and Motivation	Problem Setting	Our Proposal	Conclusion
Outline			



- 2 Problem Setting
- 3 Our Proposal
- Performance Evaluation Results
- **5** Conclusion and Future Work

Overview and Motivation	Problem Setting	Our Proposal	Conclusion
Overview			



▲□▶ ▲圖▶ ▲国▶ ▲国▶ 三国

Overview and Motivation	Problem Setting	Our Proposal	Conclusion
Overview			



Overview and Motivation	Problem Setting	Our Proposal	Conclusion
Overview			



Overview and Motivation	Problem Setting	Our Proposal	Conclusion
Overview			



<ロ> (日) (日) (日) (日) (日)

2

Overview and Motivation	Problem Setting	Our Proposal	Conclusion
Overview			



э

Overview and Motivation	Problem Setting	Our Proposal	Conclusion
A '			



Overview and Motivation	Problem Setting	Our Proposal	Conclusion
Overview			



イロン イヨン イヨン イヨン

Overview and Motivation	Problem Setting	Our Proposal	Conclusion
A '			



Overview and Motivation	Problem Setting	Our Proposal	Conclusion
Overview			



Overview and Motivation	Problem Setting	Our Proposal	Conclusion
Overview			



Overview and Motivation	Problem Setting	Our Proposal	Conclusion
Overview			



Overview and Motivation	Problem Setting	Our Proposal	Conclusion
Overview			



Overview and Motivation	Problem Setting	Our Proposal	Conclusion
Overview			



・ロト ・聞ト ・ヨト ・ヨト

Overview and Motivation	Problem Setting	Our Proposal	Conclusion
Overview			



Overview and Motivation	Problem Setting	Our Proposal	Conclusion
Overview			



Overview and Motivation	Problem Setting	Our Proposal	Conclusion
Overview			



Overview and Motivation	Problem Setting	Our Proposal	Conclusion
Outline			



- 2 Problem Setting
- 3 Our Proposal
- 4 Performance Evaluation Results
- **5** Conclusion and Future Work

- An Application for a central controller
 - Use the global view of the network (links, flows)
 - Route new coming flows
 - Dynamic reconfiguration in case of:
 - User mobility
 - New user coming
 - User leaving
 - Topology

GIVEN:

- A physical topology represented by the graph G(V, E), which is described by the connectivity and interference matrices M and I, respectively.
- A set of m gateways in the WMN.
- A set L of flows originating from clients, each one with its bandwidth demand b_l and delay constraint d_l .
- The coverage matrix A of MAPs.

• The previous attachment of clients and their flows' routes FIND:

 The optimal attachment of each user to one of the covering MAPs and the optimal routing of its corresponding flow that minimizes the network operation and reconfiguration costs, subject to QoS constraints (i.e., bandwidth and delay).

- Decision variables:
 - w_{li} indicates whether the client originating the flow l is attached to the MAP $i \in V$
 - $f_{e,k,l}$ indicates whenever the flow l uses the channel k on link e on its route
- Energy consumption model of a MAP:

$$P_i = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} P_R & \text{ If the MAP is used as a mesh router only} \\ P_{AR} & \text{ If the MAP is used as an AP and a mesh router} \\ P_{AG} & \text{ If the MAP is used as an AP and a gateway} \\ P_{RG} & \text{ If the MAP is used as a mesh router and a gateway} \\ P_{ARG} & \text{ If the MAP is used as an AP, a mesh route and a gateway} \\ P_S & \text{ In the MAP is in sleep mode.} \end{array} \right.$$

• Objective Function to Minimize:

$$\underbrace{\alpha_E \sum_{i \in V} P_i}_{\text{Energy Cost}} + \underbrace{\alpha_S \sum_{i \in V} (y_i^+ cs_i^+ + y_i^- cs_i^-)}_{\text{Switching on/off cost}} + \underbrace{\alpha_R \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{l \in L} (r_{il}^+ cr_{il}^+ + r_{il}^- cr_{il}^-)}_{\text{Flow Rerouting Cost}} + \underbrace{\alpha_R \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{l \in L} (r_{il}^+ cr_{il}^+ + r_{il}^- cr_{il}^-)}_{\text{Flow Rerouting Cost}} + \underbrace{\alpha_R \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{l \in L} (r_{il}^+ cr_{il}^+ + r_{il}^- cr_{il}^-)}_{\text{Flow Rerouting Cost}} + \underbrace{\alpha_R \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{l \in L} (r_{il}^+ cr_{il}^+ + r_{il}^- cr_{il}^-)}_{\text{Flow Rerouting Cost}} + \underbrace{\alpha_R \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{l \in L} (r_{il}^+ cr_{il}^+ + r_{il}^- cr_{il}^-)}_{\text{Flow Rerouting Cost}} + \underbrace{\alpha_R \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{l \in L} (r_{il}^+ cr_{il}^+ + r_{il}^- cr_{il}^-)}_{\text{Flow Rerouting Cost}} + \underbrace{\alpha_R \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{l \in L} (r_{il}^+ cr_{il}^+ + r_{il}^- cr_{il}^-)}_{\text{Flow Rerouting Cost}} + \underbrace{\alpha_R \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{l \in L} (r_{il}^+ cr_{il}^+ + r_{il}^- cr_{il}^-)}_{\text{Flow Rerouting Cost}} + \underbrace{\alpha_R \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{l \in L} (r_{il}^+ cr_{il}^+ + r_{il}^- cr_{il}^-)}_{\text{Flow Rerouting Cost}} + \underbrace{\alpha_R \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{l \in L} (r_{il}^+ cr_{il}^+ + r_{il}^- cr_{il}^-)}_{\text{Flow Rerouting Cost}} + \underbrace{\alpha_R \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{l \in L} (r_{il}^+ cr_{il}^+ + r_{il}^- cr_{il}^-)}_{\text{Flow Rerouting Cost}} + \underbrace{\alpha_R \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{l \in L} (r_{il}^+ cr_{il}^+ + r_{il}^- cr_{il}^-)}_{\text{Flow Rerouting Cost}} + \underbrace{\alpha_R \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{l \in L} (r_{il}^+ cr_{il}^+ + r_{il}^- cr_{il}^-)}_{\text{Flow Rerouting Cost}} + \underbrace{\alpha_R \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{l \in L} (r_{il}^+ cr_{il}^+ + r_{il}^- cr_{il}^-)}_{\text{Flow Rerouting Cost}} + \underbrace{\alpha_R \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{i \in V} (r_{il}^+ cr_{il}^+ + r_{il}^- cr_{il}^-)}_{\text{Flow Rerouting Cost}} + \underbrace{\alpha_R \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{i \in V} (r_{il}^- cr_{il}^- cr_{il}^- cr_{il}^-)}_{\text{Flow Rerouting Cost}} + \underbrace{\alpha_R \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{i \in V} (r_{il}^- cr_{il}^- cr_{il}^- cr_{il}^- cr_{il}^-)}_{\text{Flow Rerouting Cost}} + \underbrace{\alpha_R \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{i \in V} (r_{il}^- cr_{il}^- cr_{il}^- cr_{il}^- cr_{il}^- cr_{il}^-)}_{\text{Flow Rerouting Cost}} + \underbrace{\alpha_R \sum_{i \in V} \sum_{i \in V} (r_{il}^- cr_{il}^- cr_{il}$$

- Subject to:
 - Satisfy clients bandwidth demands
 - Not violating clients' delay constraints
 - No routing over non existing links
 - The proportion of utilization of interfering links should be less than one
 - Not exceeding links capacities
 - Not exceeding gateways capacities

Overview and Motivation	Problem Setting	Our Proposal	Conclusion
Limitations			

- Changes may be too frequent
 - $\Rightarrow \mathsf{Computation} \text{ overhead}$
 - \Rightarrow Instability in the network (QoS degradation)
- The ILP is NP-Hard

Overview and Motivation	Problem Setting	Our Proposal	Conclusion
Outline			

- Overview and Motivation
- 2 Problem Setting
- 3 Our Proposal
 - 4 Performance Evaluation Results
- **5** Conclusion and Future Work

 Once a flow is received, find a routing path the minimize the energy consumption (without reconfiguring existing flows)
 ⇒ Reduce the frequent reconfigurations

Our Proposal for Solution Approximation

- Once a flow is received, find a routing path the minimize the energy consumption (without reconfiguring existing flows)
 ⇒ Reduce the frequent reconfigurations
 - We use a modified version of the shorts path algorithm
 - The cost is not the number of hops but the additional amount of needed power to route the flow
 - $\bullet\,$ Choose among K alternative paths, the path with the minimum additional needed power

Our Proposal for Solution Approximation

- Once a flow is received, find a routing path the minimize the energy consumption (without reconfiguring existing flows)
 ⇒ Reduce the frequent reconfigurations
 - We use a modified version of the shorts path algorithm
 - The cost is not the number of hops but the additional amount of needed power to route the flow
 - $\bullet\,$ Choose among K alternative paths, the path with the minimum additional needed power
- Periodically (Every period of time *t*) reconfigure using an Ant Colony based approach
 - Ant Colony Energy Efficient Online Flow Routing (AC-OFER)
 - Given K alternative paths for every flow (client)
 - Use the artificial ants to find a near optimal solution
 - \Rightarrow Reduce the computation time

Outling		

- 1 Overview and Motivation
- 2 Problem Setting
- 3 Our Proposal
- 4 Performance Evaluation Results
- **5** Conclusion and Future Work

- Mesh Network:
 - Grid topology with random gateways
 - Small topologies: $\mathbf{25}$ nodes and $\mathbf{3},\mathbf{4}$ gateways
 - $\bullet~$ Large topologies: $100~{\rm nodes}~{\rm and}~7-10~{\rm gateways}$
 - ${\scriptstyle \bullet }$ Wireless link capacity of $54~{\rm Mbps}$
 - Single channel
- Flows:
 - $\bullet\,$ Uniform bandwidth demand between 1 and 10 Mbps
 - $\bullet\,$ Poisson arrivals with rate λ and exponential lifetime of mean $1.5~{\rm hours}$
 - Uniform location for client

- Mesh Network:
 - Grid topology with random gateways
 - Small topologies: $\mathbf{25}$ nodes and $\mathbf{3},\mathbf{4}$ gateways
 - $\bullet~$ Large topologies: $100~{\rm nodes}~{\rm and}~7-10~{\rm gateways}$
 - ${\scriptstyle \bullet}\,$ Wireless link capacity of 54 Mbps
 - Single channel
- Flows:
 - $\bullet~$ Uniform bandwidth demand between $1~{\rm and}~10~{\rm Mbps}$
 - $\bullet\,$ Poisson arrivals with rate λ and exponential lifetime of mean $1.5~{\rm hours}$
 - Uniform location for client
- Baseline: Shortest Path, Minimum residual capacities routing metric, Load Balancing

Energy Consumption Results (25 nodes and 3 gateways)

• AC-OFER reduces energy consumption





Acceptance Ratio Results (25 nodes and 3 gateways)

• AC-OFER achieves higher acceptance ratio





• AC-OFER reduces the energy consumption but increases a bit the average path length



• AC-OFER reduces energy consumption for different network sizes



Overview and Motivation	Problem Setting	Our Proposal	Conclusion
Outline			

- 1 Overview and Motivation
- 2 Problem Setting
- 3 Our Proposal
- 4 Performance Evaluation Results
- **5** Conclusion and Future Work

Conclusion

Conclusions and Future Work

- Conclusions:
 - Online flow-based routing approach
 - Compliant with SDN
 - Meta-heuristic approach
- Future Work:
 - Power control in the WMN for interference mitigation and energy efficiency
 - Reconfiguration time computation





э

21

イロト イヨト イヨト イヨト

Conclusion

AC-OFER Algorithm

Algorithm 1 AC-OFER algorithm

```
IN: WMN with routed flows (i.e., previous routes solution)
OUT: A new routes solution (One path for each flow)
Set Parameters: q_0, \alpha_A, \beta_A, Q
Initialize pheromone trails and best solution to the previous solu-
tion
for nb = 1 \rightarrow Number of Iterations do
    //Construct Ant Solutions
    for all ant in A_{max} do
        current_solution \leftarrow \{\}
        for l = 1 \rightarrow Number of flows do
             p \leftarrow Random(0..1)
             if p < q_0 then
                 Choose path j among the K paths where
                 j = \operatorname{Argmax}_{k \in N_l} \left( \tau_{lk}^{\alpha_A} \times \eta_{lk}^{\beta_A} \right)
             else
                 Choose path j according to P_{lj} given in (13)
             end if
             Add the j<sup>th</sup> path for flow l to current_solution
        end for
        if current_solution is better than best_solution then
             best_solution \leftarrow current_solution
        end if
    end for
    //Update Pheromones for all flows l
    \tau_{lj} \leftarrow (1 - \rho)\tau_{lj} //Evaporate all pheromones
    if current_solution is the best solution for the current iteration
And j^{th} path is selected for flow l then
        \tau_{lj} \leftarrow \tau_{lj} + \Delta_{lj}^{best}
    end if
end for
Return best solution
```