

Impact of Node Heterogeneity in ZigBee Mesh Network Routing

Nia-Chiang Liang¹, Ping-Chieh Chen¹, Tony Sun¹, Guang Yang¹, Ling-Jyh Chen², and Mario Gerla¹

¹ Computer Science Department, University of California at Los Angeles
{ncliang, jcchen, tonysun, yangg, gerla}@cs.ucla.edu

²Institute of Information Science, Academia Sinica, Taiwan
ccljj@iis.sinica.edu.tw

Abstract—Based on the IEEE 802.15.4 LR-WPAN standard, the ZigBee standard has been proposed to interconnect simple, low rate, and battery powered wireless devices. The deployment of ZigBee networks is expected to facilitate numerous applications, such as home-appliance networks, home healthcare, medical monitoring, consumer electronics, and environmental sensors. An effective routing scheme in a ZigBee network is particularly important in that it is the key to achieve resource (e.g., bandwidth and energy) efficiency in ZigBee networks. Routing in a ZigBee network is not exactly the same as in a MANET. In particular, while Full Function Devices (FFD) can serve as network coordinators or network routers, Reduced Function Devices (RFD) can only associate and communicate with FFDs in a ZigBee network. Therefore, different from traditional MANET routing algorithms, which only take into account node mobility to figure out a best route to a given destination, node heterogeneity plays an important role in ZigBee network routing. In this paper, we perform extensive evaluation, using NS-2 simulator, to study the impact of node heterogeneity on ZigBee mesh network routing. The results show that the ZigBee mesh routing algorithm exhibits significant performance difference when the network is highly heterogenous. We also reveal that the node type and the role of the node plays a critical role in deciding routing performances.

I. INTRODUCTION

With wireless networking technologies permeating into the very fabrics of our working and living environment, simple appliances and numerous traditional wired services can now be wirelessly and efficiently connected. This provides simple yet effective control/monitoring conveniences, while allowing very interesting applications to be developed on top of these wireless gadgets. The ZigBee standard [1], designed to interconnect simple devices that previously have not been networked, is the latest attempt to address this wireless network vision. In the context of a business environment, this wireless movement can facilitate better automated control/management of facilities and assets. Moreover, there are also many applications for home-appliance networks, as well as in the area of home healthcare, medical monitoring, consumer electronics, and environmental sensors.

ZigBee is a network and application layer specification developed by a multi-vendor consortium called the ZigBee

Alliance [2]. Backed by 150+ member companies, the ZigBee standard was ratified in late 2004, and was publicly released for non-commercial use in June of 2005. Various ZigBee compliant product prototypes and application scenarios have already been developed by the industry, yet the performance and the supporting facilities of ZigBee networks have not been thoroughly evaluated. In particular, knowledge of how nodal mobility and nodal diversity (i.e nodes of different networking capabilities) affects the workings of the ZigBee routing protocols is of significance.

Routing in a ZigBee enabled network is very similar to the one in a Mobile Adhoc NETWORK (MANET). In both cases, maintaining an end-to-end route is challenging since the network topology may change very frequently due to node failures, mobility, and many other factors. Various MANET routing protocols have been proposed in the last few years [3][4][5][6][7][8][9]. Among them, Adhoc On-demand Distance Vector Routing (AODV) [3] and Dynamic Source Routing (DSR) [4] are two of the most popularly deployed schemes. These routing algorithms of MANET aim to figure out the best route, even if the network is highly dynamic, toward a given destination at any time by consuming minimal messages/time overhead. Moreover, every participating node in MANET routing is implicitly assumed to be MANET router capable, and assumed to operate with the same set of functionalities.

However, such general yet implicit assumption in MANET routing does not hold in ZigBee networks. In a ZigBee network, each participating node plays the role as either a Full Function Device (FFD) or a Reduced Function Device (RFD), depending on its function capabilities (e.g. amount of memory, computation capability, energy level, and etc). While FFDs can serve as network coordinators or network routers (thus capable of routing), RFDs can only associate and communicate with FFDs (and are not allow to participate in network routing). As a result, traditional MANET routing schemes can't be applied to ZigBee networks. It turns out that node heterogeneities must be taken into account in designing an effective routing scheme for ZigBee networks.

In this paper, we study the impact of network heterogeneity on ZigBee mesh routing. Particularly, we are interested to

*This work is supported in part by the National Science Foundation under the grant number CNS-0335302

find out how different mixture of mobile ZigBee routers and mobile ZigBee end devices influences the performance of ZigBee mesh routing. We present a rich set of simulation results illustrating the effect caused by the diversity in node capabilities. Our results reveal that routing performance does degrade when the network is comprised of an increasing number of ZigBee end devices. Moreover, compared to AODV routing results, we do see significant differences in routing performance when network nodes are not assumed to be equally capable. Additionally, we found that the routing performance is closely tied to the ZigBee node type used.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In section II, we give a brief overview of IEEE 802.15.4 and the ZigBee mesh routing specifications. Section III presents simulation results, illustrating the behavior of ZigBee mesh routing under different mobility speed and different level of nodal diversity. Finally, in section IV, we will summarize the impact of nodal diversity in ZigBee mesh network and conclude the paper.

II. OVERVIEW

A. IEEE 802.15.4

Based on the PHY and MAC layers specified by IEEE 802.15.4 WPAN standard [10], the ZigBee specification establishes the framework for the Network and Application layers. The protocol stack of ZigBee networks is detailed in Figure 1.




Fig. 1. ZigBee protocol stack in relation to IEEE 802.15.4 standard

At the PHY layer, IEEE 802.15.4 defines a total of 27 channels: 16 channels at a maximum rate of 250 kbps in the ISM 2.4-2.4835 GHz band, 10 channels at 40 kbps in the ISM 902 - 928 MHz band, and one channel at 20 kbps in the 868.0 - 868.6 MHz band. At the MAC layer, Carrier Sense Multiple Access with Collision Avoidance (CSMA/CA) or the optional slotted CSMA/CA mechanism are used, and respectively utilize by the beaconless and beamed modes. Table I summarizes the high level characteristics of the IEEE 802.15.4 standard.

TABLE I
CHARACTERISTICS OF IEEE 802.15.4 STANDARD

Frequency Band	868-868.6 MHz	1 channel; 20 kbps
	902-928 MHz	10 channels; 40 kbps
	2.4-2.4835 GHz	16 channels; 250 kbps
Channel Access	Slotted/Unslotted CSMA-CA	
Range	10 to 30 meters	
Addressing	Short 16-bit or IEEE 64-bit	

Two device types are specified within the IEEE 802.15.4 framework: full function device (FFD) and reduced function device (RFD). An FFD generally has more responsibilities in that they must maintain routing tables, participate in route discovery and repair, maintain beaconing framework, and handle node joins. Moreover, an FFD has the capability of communicating with any other devices within its transmission range. On the other hand, an RFD simply maintains the minimum amount of knowledge to stay on the network, and it does not participate in routing. RFDs can only associate and communicate with FFDs. FFDs and RFDs can be interconnected to form star or peer-to-peer networks.

B. ZigBee Mesh Routing

Based on IEEE 802.15.4, the ZigBee Alliance specifies the standards for the network layer and the application layer. More specifically, the ZigBee network layer defines how the network formation is performed and how the network address is assigned to each participating ZigBee node. Note that the assigned network address is the *only* address that is used for routing and data transmission in ZigBee networks. Three device types are defined in ZigBee: ZigBee coordinator, ZigBee routers, and ZigBee end devices. An RFD can only be a ZigBee end device; whereas an FFD can be either a ZigBee coordinator or ZigBee router. The ZigBee coordinator is responsible for starting a new network. ZigBee coordinator and routers are “routing capable”, while the ZigBee end devices can’t participate in routing and have to rely on their corresponding ZigBee parent routers for that functionality.

Every node in a ZigBee network has two addresses, namely a 16-bit short network address and a 64-bit IEEE extended address. The 16-bit network address is assigned to each node dynamically by its parent coordinator/router upon joining the network. This address is the only address that is used for routing and data transmission. It is analogous to the IP addresses that we use on the internet; whereas the extended address is similar to the MAC address, which is a unique identification of each device and is mostly fixed at the time the device is manufactured.

There are two addressing schemes (of the 16-bit short network address) allowed in ZigBee mesh networks, namely the static address allocation scheme and the tree address allocation scheme. Both schemes work in similar fashion. In both schemes, the parent nodes assign an address “block” to their child router, which is in turn allocated to their respective decedents. The Mesh coordinator/router is responsible to maintain the amount of free address spaces left, the address block size, and the address to be assigned next.

Two routing schemes are available in ZigBee networks, namely mesh routing and tree routing. The mesh routing scheme is similar to the Adhoc On Demand Vector (AODV) routing algorithm [3], while the tree routing scheme resembles the cluster tree routing algorithm as described in [11]. In this paper, we will only focus on mesh routing in ZigBee mesh networks. In ZigBee mesh routing, route requests (*RREQ*) are broadcasted on-demand when data is to be transmitted

to a destination of an unknown path. Routes are constructed based on the route replies (*RRPL* from intermediate nodes and destination node), and a route error (*RERR*) message is transmitted to the user when a path can't be found. The route repair mechanism repairs invalid routes when a previous route can not be found. Since only coordinators/routers (FFDs) can actively participate in mesh routing, the end devices (RFDs) have to rely exclusively on their parent nodes to perform mesh routing on their behalves.

The performance of AODV algorithm has been extensively studied (e.g., [12][13][14] and etc). Yet, previous evaluation studies are mostly IEEE 802.11 centric and would consider all participating nodes routing capable nodes. However, under the innate properties of IEEE 802.15.4 and ZigBee networks (i.e., the addressing structure and service assumptions), the performance bound of ZigBee mesh routing (which is AODV-like) is thus expected to be different than the ones from previous AODV studies. More specifically, when a node “associates” with a new parent node (when the node attaches to a new parent node in range), a new 16-bit network address will be inherited by the child node, and the routing protocol has to react accordingly in order to keep the routing table updated. Moreover, the fact that the ZigBee mesh routing accommodates different device types (device with unequal routing capacities) distinguishes itself from traditional AODV networks. We will examine the impact of node mobility and heterogeneity in ZigBee mesh networks in the next section, and to the best of our knowledge, this issue has not yet been considered in the literature.

III. EVALUATION

This section presents extensive simulation results that illustrate the impact of nodal diversity on the properties of ZigBee mesh routing and the original AODV routing. In particular, we will compare how the nodal composition of a network affects the workings of ZigBee mesh routing. AODV routing performance is used for baseline comparison on how a typical homogenous network would perform as oppose to a heterogenous network environment. We use the NS-2 simulator with Samsung's IEEE 802.15.4 extension [15], and wrote our own ZigBee mesh routing schemes according to the ZigBee standard. We will compare the delivery ratio of various ZigBee network configurations, focusing on the impact caused by various node types.

The simulation is set to closely mimic the settings of a household/factory deployment. Nodes are initially aligned in an equally spaced grid before a selected percentage of nodes become mobile. Nodes move within the set topology according to the random waypoint model developed and described in [16], and all results are averaged across 50 independent trials of the same configuration. We make use of the static addressing scheme described in section II for mesh routing. The percentage of ZigBee end devices to ZigBee router varies, while the mobile nodes are randomly chosen. Other standard ZigBee network settings apply, and general parameters used is summarized in II.

TABLE II
GENERAL SIMULATION PARAMETERS


Network Size	45m x 45m
Number of Nodes	36 nodes
Transmission Range	10 meters
Network Setup Time	30 seconds
Simulation Duration	300 seconds
Number of Concurrent Data Flows	2
Transmission Rate	10 packets/sec
Mobility Model	Random Waypoint
Traffic Type, Packet Size	CBR, 127bytes
$nwkMaxDepth(L_m)$	5
$nwkMaxChildren(C_m)$	10
$nwkMaxRouter(R_m)$	10

The parameters $nwkMaxDepth$, $nwkMaxChildren$ and $nwkMaxRouter$ are network values defined by the ZigBee standard, and are set at install time. $nwkMacDepth$ denotes the maximum depth of the network from the coordinator, $nwkMaxChildren$ is the maximum number of children allowed at each router, and $nwkMaxRouter$ specified the maximum number of routers a parent may have as children. Since ZigBee networks were intended to operate at low data rates, our simulation uses CBR flows of 10Kbps. We use packet delivery ratio as our performance evaluation matrices. Packet delivery ratio is averaged over the number of flows in the network to reflect the mean per-flow delivery ratio.


A. Varying Heterogeneity in Moderately Mobile ZigBee Network

This subsection studies the routing performance of ZigBee Mesh routing scheme when there are varying amount of ZigBee end devices in the network, focusing on the scenario when only 20% of the network are mobile nodes. AODV routing results are also graphed as a basis for performance comparison, although AODV is run on an all router topology (since AODV requires routing capability from all nodes), and does not change to the percentage of ZigBee end devices in the network. 20% of the network nodes are randomly chosen as mobile nodes, all moving at a speed of 1m/s using the random waypoint model. Two general mobility cases were simulated, focusing on the responses of different node types. In the first scenario, the sender remains stationary while the receiver is mobile. In the second scenario, we keep the receiver stationary while setting senders to be mobile. We repeat the same simulations with two node types, ZigBee router and ZigBee end devices. Source and destination are randomly chosen, but all networking settings remain the same for all simulations. We vary the percentage of ZigBee end devices from 0% to 50% in order to observe the response of ZigBee mesh routing to increasing percentages of ZigBee end devices.

Because end devices do not participate in ZigBee Mesh routing, when the total number of devices is fixed, increasing the percentage of end devices effectively decreases the number, and hence density, of ZigBee Mesh routing capable devices in the network. This forces all devices to have fewer choices in potential end-to-end paths, and thus may end up using paths



(a)



(b)


Fig. 2. For network with 20% mobile nodes, ZigBee router and end device acting as mobile sender, sending to a stationary destination. (a) depicts the packet delivery ratio achieved with ZigBee router acting as sender. (b) depicts the packet delivery ratio achieved with ZigBee end device acting as sender.

at lower qualities and/or more susceptible to path breakages. Reflected in Figs 2 and 3, all curves of the delivery ratio in ZigBee Mesh routing share the same trend of going lower as the percentage of end devices grows.


Compared with the cases where a ZigBee end device acts as an end host of the path (either sender or receiver), having a router as the end host tends to show a better performance. This is obvious since the router directly participates in the ZigBee Mesh routing, while an end device must always associate itself with a router and changes its own address every time it switches to a new router. When a path is broken, the router can usually reestablish the path faster. Note that the delivery ratio in the case where an end device acts as the receiver is particularly low. This is due to the fact that when the end-to-end path becomes broken, the receiver suffers the aforementioned overhead of router reassociation and address acquiring, as in other cases. In the meantime, the sender has to rediscover the receiver, now with a new address, using application layer recovery mechanisms, further degrading the performance. As expected, AODV assumes all devices as routing capable, therefore changing the percentage of end devices has no impact on the data delivery ratio.

B. Varying Heterogeneity in Highly Mobile ZigBee Network

Following the same methodology, we now study the performance of ZigBee Mesh routing when more devices are mobile.



(a)



(b)

Fig. 3. For network with 20% mobile nodes, ZigBee router and end device acting as mobile receiver, receiving from a stationary sender. (a) depicts the packet delivery ratio achieved with ZigBee router as receiver. (b) depicts the packet delivery ratio achieved with ZigBee end device as receiver.


Specifically, we increase the percentage of mobile nodes from 20% to 50%, all moving at 1m/s under the random waypoint model. All other settings remain the same.

Similar to Figs 2 and 3, Figs 4 and 5 show that as the percentage of end devices increases, the number of routing capable devices in ZigBee Mesh routing decreases, so does the delivery ratio. Moreover, a larger percentage of mobile devices tends to increase the chance of path breakages, so the absolute delivery ratios are lower, seen in both AODV and ZigBee Mesh routing mechanisms.


IV. CONCLUSIONS

Routing in a ZigBee network is not exactly the same as in a MANET. In particular, while Full Function Devices (FFD) can serve as network coordinators or network routers, Reduced Function Devices (RFD) can only associate and communicate with FFDs in a ZigBee network. Therefore, different from traditional MANET routing algorithms, which only take into account node mobility to figure out a best route to a given destination, node heterogeneity plays an important role in ZigBee network routing.

In this paper, we study the impact of network heterogeneity on ZigBee mesh routing. Particularly, we are interested to find out how different mixtures of mobile ZigBee routers and mobile ZigBee end devices influence the performance of ZigBee mesh routing. We performed extensive evaluation using




(a)




(b)

Fig. 4. For network with 50% mobile nodes, ZigBee router and end device acting as mobile sender, sending to a stationary destination. (a) depicts the packet delivery ratio achieved with ZigBee router acting as sender. (b) depicts the packet delivery ratio achieved with ZigBee end device acting as sender.



(a)



(b)

Fig. 5. For network with 50% mobile nodes, ZigBee router and end device acting as mobile receiver, receiving from a stationary sender. (a) depicts the packet delivery ratio achieved with ZigBee router as receiver. (b) depicts the packet delivery ratio achieved with ZigBee end device as receiver.

NS-2 simulator, with our own ZigBee implementation. The results indicate that the ZigBee mesh routing algorithm exhibits significant performance difference when the network is highly heterogeneous. Routing performance in ZigBee network does degrade when the network comprises of an increasing number of ZigBee end devices. Moreover, the delivery ratio worsens when there are more instances of mobility in the network (in highly mobile scenarios). Moreover, comparing to AODV routing results, we do see significant difference in routing performance when network nodes are not assumed to be equally capable. We also reveal that the ZigBee end devices tend to perform worse than ZigBee routers in both sending and receiving packets, since the end devices incur much overhead in associating with new parents when there is network mobility. On the other hand, ZigBee routers typically suffer less packet loss when there are intensive amounts of mobility in the ZigBee network, yet the additional service overhead of ZigBee (such as association with children devices) still degrades the performance of ZigBee routers in almost all scenarios.

REFERENCES

- [1] Z. Alliance, "Zigbee specification v1.0," June 2005.
- [2] —, "Zigbee alliance." [Online]. Available: <http://www.zigbee.org/>
- [3] C. Perkins and E. Royer, "Ad hoc on-demand distance vector routing," in *2nd IEEE Workshop on Mobile Computing Systems and Applications*, 1999, pp. 90–100.
- [4] D. B. Johnson and D. A. Maltz, *Dynamic Source Routing in Ad Hoc Wireless Networks*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1996, vol. 353, ch. 5, pp. 153–181.
- [5] P. Jacquet, P. Muhlethaler, A. Qayyum, A. Laouiti, L. Viennot, and T. Clausen, "Optimized link state routing protocol (olsr)," RFC 3626, October 2003.
- [6] I. Chakeres, E. Belding-Royer, and C. Perkins, "Dynamic manet on-demand routing protocol (dymo)," Internet Draft, draft-ietf-manet-dymo-03.txt, October 2005.
- [7] V. Park and S. Corson, "Temporally-ordered routing algorithm (tora) version 1," Internet Draft, draft-ietf-manet-tora-spec-03.txt, June 2001.
- [8] Z. J. Haas, M. R. Pearlman, and P. Samar, "The zone routing protocol (zrp) for ad hoc networks," Internet Draft, draft-ietf-manet-zone-zrp-04.txt, July 2002.
- [9] B. N. Karp and H. T. Kung, "Gpsr: Greedy perimeter stateless routing for wireless networks," in *ACM Mobicom*, August 2000, pp. 243–254.
- [10] I. 802.15.4, "Ieee 802.15.4 : Mac and phy specifications for lr-wpan," <http://www.ieee802.org/15/pub/TG4.html>, 2003.
- [11] A. A. O. A. L. Hester, Y. Huang, "neuronetform: A self-organizing wireless sensor network," in *11th IEEE ICCCN Conference*, October 2002.
- [12] X. Hong, K. Xu, and M. Gerla, "Scalable routing protocols for mobile ad hoc networks," *IEEE Network Magazine*, pp. 11–21, July-Aug 2002.
- [13] C. E. P. Samir R. Das and E. M. Royer, "Performance comparison of two on-demand routing protocols for ad hoc networks," in *IEEE Conference on Computer Communications (INFOCOM)*, March 2000.
- [14] E. M. Royer and C. E. Perkins, "An implementation study of the aodv routing protocol," in *IEEE Wireless Communications and Networking Conference*, 2000.
- [15] J. Zheng and M. J. Lee, *A Comprehensive Performance Study of IEEE 802.15.4*, 2004.
- [16] J.-Y. L. B. Santashil PalChaudhuri and M. Vojnovic, "Perfect simulations for random trip mobility models," in *38th Annual Simulation Symposium*, April 2005.