

I. system for
implementing internet
of things, since



I.

Contiki has been the go-to operating system for implementing Internet of Things, since its inception in the year 2002, because it is an open source operating system which is lightweight and mature. It allows rapid prototyping and easy shift between different hardware platforms. This OS is preferred mainly because the developer need not design the underlying operating system for the internet-connected devices. Using this platform, almost any device can be connected to the internet even when the device is placed underground or in an enclosed space. The inventor of Contiki has managed to fit an entire operating system, including a graphical user interface, networking software and web browser into less than 30 kilobytes of space, which makes it easier to run on small, low-powered chips. Devices with limited memory, power, processing power and communication bandwidth can be run using Contiki. The Contiki system includes a network simulator called Cooja, which simulates networks of Contiki motes (sensors). Contiki provides IPv6 networking for relaying datagrams across network boundaries.

It contains the Routing Protocol for Low power and Lossy Networks (RPL), an Internet Protocol (IP) optimized for wireless sensor networks. Contiki is implemented in the C language and can be ported to a number of micro controllers such as MSP430, Atmel AVR, Arduino, CC2430, etc. The applications are implemented using Constrained Application Protocol (CoAP) which is an application layer protocol that provides power efficient operation through low radio duty cycling mechanism. CoAP adopts patterns from HTTP but unlike the latter, CoAP uses UDP.

<https://assignbuster.com/i-system-for-implementing-internet-of-things-since/>

II. COMPARISON OF TOPOLOGIES The remote sensors (motes) can be arranged in a number of topologies according to the required application. The mote type determines the type of sensor hardware and which Contiki applications are to be simulated. In the case of Smart City concept, the major concern would be power consumption and the transmission-reception delay. To determine the topology in which power consumption is minimum, motes were placed in different topologies with different transmission ranges and payload. The three major topologies are linear, ellipse and random. In this example, IPv6 routing with RPL is considered.

Therefore, arpl-border-router with three clients and servers are simulated using Cooja simulator. Figure 1. shows the various topologies Figure 1a.

Linear topology 1a. Linear

1b.

Ellipse

1c. Random To evaluate the power

consumption, Tmote Sky mote was used in different topologies and the following graph (Figure 2.

) was obtained from the average power values of each topology. From Figure 2. it is inferred that power consumed during transmission and reception between motes is less in random topology. Figure 2.

Power for various topologies Transmission range of the various motes also affect the amount of power consumed. Therefore, we increase the transmission as well as interference ranges of the motes to examine the power consumption. From figure 3. it can be observed that for various transmission ranges, the motes in random topology has consumed less power

over its counterparts. Figure 3. Range Vs Power Then next concern is the amount of data, ie.

, payload, sent by the servers during transmission of signals. Figure 4. plots the power consumed by the nodes with increasing payload. It can be seen that for random topology, the power consumed decreases drastically with increase in payload. Therefore, random topology can be used even when large amount of server data has to be transmitted. Figure 4. Payload variation The payload also affects the end-to-end delay of the nodes.

Hence, an experiment is conducted by increasing the payload and determining the corresponding power changes. From figure 5, it can be inferred that as the payload increases, transmission-reception delay also increases. When the topologies are compared, linear topology has been found to have lesser delay. Figure 5. Payload Vs Delay From all the above comparisons, it can be observed that random topology can be used for practical applications.