

# A New Objective Function for RPL Based on Combined Metrics in Mobile IoT

Hassar Echoukairi<sup>1\*</sup>, Ali Ouacha<sup>1</sup>, Jawad Oubaha<sup>2</sup> and Mohamed El Ghmary<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Computer Science Department Faculty of Sciences, Mohammed V University in Rabat, Morocco  
Email: a.ouacha@um5r.ac.ma (A.O.); j.oubaha@um5r.ac.ma (J.O.)

<sup>2</sup> Faculty of Science Dhar El Mahraz (FSDM), Sidi Mohamed Ben Abdellah University, Fez, Morocco  
Email: mohamed.elghmary@usmba.ac.ma

\*Correspondence: h.echoukairi@um5r.ac.ma (H.E.)

**Abstract** To satisfy the quality of service requirements for some applications in the Internet of Things (IoT) network with mobile nodes, routing protocols must be adaptable to make better routing decisions. Routing Protocol for Low-power and Lossy Networks (RPL) is one of the routing protocols that support metrics and constraints while building a Destination Oriented Directed Acyclic Graphs (DODAG) using a specific Objective Function (OF). However, RPL metrics that use standard OFs do not guarantee the performance criteria for a specific mobile IoT in terms of received and lost packets, overhead, throughput and power consumption. In this paper, we propose a new version of mrhof based on a combination of metrics such as total energy, the number of neighbors, and expected transmission count (ETX) to evaluate RPL performance in a mobile context. Then, we compare the assessment of this function to existing OFs based on various mobility models (Random Waypoint (RWP), Reference Point Group Mobility (RPGM), Nomadic) and node densities. The results show that this new function is more efficient than the standard OF in terms of packets received and packets lost with Random Waypoint and RPGM models. Regardless of the number of nodes, it also reduces ETX and traffic overhead for all mobility models, as well as convergence time in the Random Waypoint environment. Furthermore, this new function contributes to the improvement of Rtm metric, the enhancement of throughput at low density only in favor of RWP and RPGM models, and an effective power consumption reduction through all densities and mobility models.

**Keywords** internet of things (IoT), routing protocol for LLNs (RPL), objective function (OF), energy, neighbors, ETX, mobility, Contiki.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The Internet of things (IoT) describes the interconnection between physical "objects" from anywhere at any time to exchange data over a network without human interaction. This object can be any system capable of interacting with other objects or systems remotely. The IoT can rely on any network type as long as every device can be individually addressed [1]. For instance, this technology can be used to collect remote data from weather stations to monitor air quality, to

accomplish tasks in home automation to control systems such as door, lock, lights and heaters [2], to remotely monitor agriculture, and to manage energy. One of the promising IoT applications is flood monitoring, where developers have deployed a system based on solar power and fuzzy logic algorithms to extend the lifetime of batteries used in the LoRa network. The developed system enables the collection of reliable and real-time data on a river's water level and dissolved oxygen [3]. In general, the IoT is made up of a number of nodes (devices), including one or more sinks and gateways. It exploits the routing process for sending and receiving data packets from these devices. To enable these devices to communicate over a network, the Internet Engineering Task Force's (IETF) ROLL working group standardized the IPv6 routing protocol for low-power and lossy networks [4]. In low-power and lossy networks (LLN) RPL helps accelerate the creation of networks and the sending of information to a large number of nodes. It is a distance vector protocol that builds DODAG based on link and node metrics. The related DODAG is a tree topology that downstream and upstream routes based on an objective function (OF). RPL usually uses these OFs to allow the selection of parents and the building of the DODAG topology. In this context, two major objective functions: Objective Function Zero (OF0) [5] and Minimum Rank with Hysteresis Objective Function (MRHOF) [6] have been designed. Routing Over Low-Power and Lossy ROLL in order to fulfill the optimization criteria and satisfy the application requirements. Indeed, OF0 selects the ideal parent based on the fewest number of hops, whereas OF1 chooses the optimal route to the sink node using the minimum Expected Transmission Count (ETX). In this case, the routing path of the node is calculated by the number of neighbors available in the network. When a node is fairly closer to the root node or has many children with high quality links that receive and transmit a large number of packets, their battery capacity is quickly depleted. In addition, the IoT network, especially the mobile IoT, will become congested due to an unbalanced load distribution between many nodes. The energy will really be depleted far more rapidly than that of

Manuscript received October 8, 2022; revised November 27, 2022; accepted January 23, 2023.

other nodes. Also, if the congested node is the bottleneck node, the problem is even more detrimental [8]. However, RPL is designed for static IoT and does not support device mobility. Moreover, it suffers from load imbalance, especially when there is a non-uniform distribution of in large scale devices [9]. As a result, the network's quality of service is impacted in terms of overhead, throughput, convergence time and power consumption. As can be seen, these issues pose major challenges to the IoT networks. Therefore, the innovation of this research is to solve the issues encountered in RPL during load balancing and mobility of IoT devices by proposing a new objective function based on MRHOF that takes into account total energy consumption, the number of neighbors, and link ETX. To show the improvement that RPL-TotEg-Neighbors provides, we compare it to the standard MRHOF and OF0 that use the ETX link metric with the total Energy consumption and the hop count respectively.

The remaining part of this paper is structured as follows: the second section provides an overview of the most recent research on RPL improvement, function objectives, and problem statement. Section III describes the process of RPL in Contiki and presents our new approach for assessing QoS in a mobile context with various densities. Section IV presents the analysis and results of the new Objective Function and compares them to the other standard functions through simulations. Finally, Section V concludes the paper with some perspectives for future work.

## II. RELATED WORKS

The challenge that the internet of things confronts is finding the best technique for communication between objects that guarantees better performance while consuming less energy. These objects have limited power resources and are frequently linked by radio links of varying quality. As a result, academia and industry collaborated to develop the 6LoWPAN technique, which connects these low power objects to the IP world (IPv6) over IEEE 802.15.4 links [10]. To that end, several communication protocols have been developed, including MQTT [11], CoAP (Constrained Application Protocol) and RPL [12, 13]. Many studies have been carried out to evaluate and improve the RPL protocol under various network conditions, including energy efficiency, quality of service, load balancing congestion and mobility. Provided the inequity nature of RPL and the negative impacts of these imbalanced networks on IoT routing, the author of [14] presented a review study for increased energy efficiency and performance in a more load balanced network. Specifically, the authors in [15] presented a comprehensive survey of RPL that focused on an existing objective function and a set of metrics; they also demonstrated the distinction between the use of single and composite metrics as well as the weight of each on parent choice and network performance. Lastly, this study discusses the advantages and the weaknesses of each method studied. The authors of [16] presented an RPL protocol instantiation that employs residual energy as one

of the routing metrics in the objective function. The deployment uses a well known battery theoretical model for predicting the node lifetime for routing at runtime. The results show that this approach improves energy consumption distribution and network life time, but it does not account for the combined metrics energy and ETX. The authors of [17] presented ALABAMO, a model that uses a new objective function for RPL to balance packets forwarded by neighbor nodes. The results show that the proposal can reduce node energy consumption while increasing network lifetime. However, this approach does not consider its impact on other network metrics such as delay. On the other hand, the number of hops used in multi-hop routing increases the amount of information collected, which decreases power consumption and reliability. To address this congestion issue, various approaches such as control resources, traffic control, and hybrid schemes have been proposed [18, 19]. Another enhancement of RPL called RPEZ [20] is designed based on an efficient objective function that uses three combined metrics: node residual energy, delay, and ETX to make routing decisions at the time using the fuzzy logic process. This technique selects the neighbor with the best quality value as the preferred parent to path data to the root node. The optimized objective function RPEZ achieves 7% higher PDR, 8% lower Latency and consumes 8% lower power than MRHOF and OF0. However, this protocol is designed for strained conditions with data rates of 10p/min, 100 node density, and a single sink node. It does not consider load balancing in a medium that supports mobility. Unlike these works, which focus on RPL, its improvements, and load balancing, the following research concentrated on mobility in RPL, its methods, and related issues.

Laamaziet al [21] evaluated the performance of RPL in static and mobile environments using two mobility models: Random Waypoint Mobility Model (RWP) and Random Walk Mobility Model (RWK). Simulation results reveal that the type of mobility has a direct impact on packet loss to its destination. In [22, 23], Saadet al. introduce a strategic plan for mobile sinks in 6LoWPAN wireless sensor networks where each node evaluates its weight according to three metrics: number of hops, residual energy and number of neighboring nodes. The sinks move towards the node with highest weight. The findings show that this strategy just takes into account the network's lifetime by balancing energy consumption; it is also restricted to specific applications. [23, 24], Korbi et al. have proposed an enhanced version of RPL called ME-RPL (Mobility Enhanced RPL) that includes the mobility status of node in the control message. This approach allows the static node with the lowest rank to be selected as the preferred parent. MRPL provides high PDR and improves route stability, but neglects the rule in control messages and does not incorporate any routing metrics in the parent selection process. [23, 25], the authors proposed an extension of RPL called CoRPL based on corona mechanism that allows the localization of mobile nodes. The evaluation is carried out in a mobile environment composed of fixed DODAG and mobile

nodes with low speeds up to 4 m/s. RPL achieves less packet loss ratio, shorter end-to-end delay, and consumes less energy than the standard RPL. Nevertheless, it does not discuss hybrid network with various mobility models. Another solution [26] for improving network routing quality has been proposed, which consists of using the Means approach while exploiting the free time slot of the dead node in favor of the cluster head during cluster formation [27, 28]. In order to address all these issues related to load balancing and quality of service for dense mobile nodes with non-uniform distribution, we focused on enhancing one of the RPL's components, specifically the objective function rplrhof, which uses combined metrics, total energy consumption, the number of neighbors and ETX as a criterion for selecting the best path.

in the DODAG's construction sends DAO message (RPLinstanceID, K, D, Flags, Reserved, DAO Sequence) to announce its address in order to establish a downward route according to W K H R S H U D Finally, once the RPL DAO unicast message, a DAO parent sends a DAO acknowledgement [31, 32]. In this context, RPL builds a logical topology using these three control messages as well as a set of metrics and constraints provided by a specific Objective Function This help in the translation of metrics such as ETX, energy and the number of neighbors into ranks, which are then employed by the ICMPv6 class of update\_energytotal(), update\_numberNeighbors() select and optimize routes in the RPL instance. The corresponding DODAG construction process for our proposed RPL is depicted in Fig.1 below.

### III. RPL PROCESS IN CONTIKI AND METHODOLOGY OF PROPOSED OBJECTIVE FUNCTION

#### A. RPL process in Contiki

The Contiki operating system supports both standard protocols and new IoT enabling protocols such as uIP, 6LoWPAN, CoAP, RPL, and others. This system is also controlled and analyzed by a simulator. RPL routing modules and their files are provided in a separate directory "contiki/core/net/rpl" in this system. The related directory contains logically separated files according to the functions they provide, such as rpl-dag.c for DAG formation, rpl-icmp6.c for ICMP message packaging, and so on [29]. Regarding routing, ContikiOS applies RPL, which organizes a topology as a Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG) that is subdivided into one or more DODAG. DODAG information is conveyed via control (packets) ICMPv6 messages called DODAG Information Object (DIO), DODAG Information Solicitation (DIS) and DODAG Destination Advertisement Object (DAO).

In order to identify and maintain RPL topology, the following parameters are used:

- RPLinstanceID is a unique identifier within a network. It identifies the sender relationship to an RPL instance.
- DODAG Version Number is the numeric value that the root continuously increments to identify the current DODAG Version.
- DODAG ID is the identification of a DODAG.
- Rank specifies the node's individual position with respect to the DODAG root

To start the DODAG system at first the root node broadcasts to its neighboring nodes the DIO message containing information: RPL instanceID, versionNumber, rank, G, MOP, Prf, DTSN, Flags, Reserved, energytotal, number of neighbors, dio\_input() and dio\_output() Second, the neighbor node that receives the DIO message, calculates its rank and advertises the graph with supplementary DIOs. If another neighbor node does not want to wait for the DIO message, it can send a DIS message that contains Flags, Reserved, dis\_input() and dis\_output(), which initiates the DIO transfer and resets the Trickle timer. Third, the node that wants to participate




Figure 1. DODAG construction with rpl-TotEg-Neighbors [1, 33].

#### B. Methodology of proposed Objective Function

In most RPL implementations, the MRHOF objective function uses the ETX metric to measure the path with minimal cost. When DODAGs are formed, nodes tend to choose parents with the best link quality and the minimum root hops. It is found that this objective function leads to the construction of topologies with unbalanced load traffic in the bottleneck nodes, especially the nodes of the first hop, i.e. from the root. Additionally, nodes closer to the root or having many children with high quality links will receive and forward a large number of packets, causing congestion and quickly draining their battery [34]. However, this objective function is designed using RPL metrics and constraints, which do not guarantee performance criteria in a dense mobile IoT network. To resolve these imbalance issues, notably in a mobile environment, we propose a new MRHOF objective function that takes into account energy consumption, the number of neighbors of the nodes, and ETX links.

The proposed objective function process is illustrated as follows:

- 1) First, a logical topology of the mobile IoT network is built, with a sink (root) node fixed in the center of the simulation surface.
- 2) Root node initiates and broadcasts the DIO message to its neighboring nodes

- 3) When the nearest node (N) receives this DIO message, it can decide whether or not to join the DODAG. The DIO packet contains information such as node rank, Mode of Operation (MOP): storing mode and non-storing mode, Objective Function and other metrics.
- 4) Each node recognizes these neighbors based on the DIO messages regularly received from them, which include ranking information, ETX, energy consumed and the number of neighbors where:
  - Node's rank is determined by the hop distance between the node and the sink node
  - ETX is a dynamic metric focused on a node's lowest number of successful transmissions [35, 36]. It's calculated using the formula shown in Eq. (1) below:

$$ETX = \frac{1}{d_f * d_r} \quad (1)$$

where:

$d_f$ : is IRUZDUG GHOL calculated from the probability computation of the received packet at the neighboring node.  
 $d_r$ : is UHYHUVH GHOL calculated from the probability of an acknowledgement (ACK) packet at the receiver.

- 5) If it is a DIO message for the first time, it is added to the list of candidate parents. In this case, the OF is used to calculate the rank and the DIO message multicasted to the other nodes.
- 6) Otherwise, the current parent (PN) node will be changed to the lower rank based on the combined metrics using the following formula [34]:

$$Rank(N) = Rank(PN) + ETX(N, PN) + \alpha \cdot \frac{1}{NEIGHBORS(PN)} \times \frac{1}{AverageEnergy} \times ENERGY(PN) \quad (2)$$

where:

Rank(N) is Rank of node  
 Rank(PN) is Rank of parent node  
 ETX(N, PN) is value from node N to parent node PN  
 NEIGHBORS(PN) is number of neighbors of the parent node PN  
 $\alpha$  is coefficient that controls the weight given to the number of neighbors. It's fixed to 2.  
 $\beta$  is corresponds to the weight attributed to ENERGY (PN), it's fixed to 3  
 $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  should be higher than 1 to have a discernible effect on the parent node selection. Otherwise, Neighbors and ENERGY would have a smaller effect than ETX.  
 AverageEnergy: Average energy of nodes.  
 ENERGY(PN): Total Energy consumed by the parent node PN, it's measured by the following equation:

$$ENERGY(mj) = Transmit \times 19.5 \text{ mA} + Listen \times 21.5 \text{ mA} + CPU_{time} \times 1.8 \text{ mA} + LPM \times 0.0545 \times \left(\frac{3V}{32768}\right) \quad (3)$$

where:

LPM is a power consumption parameter that measures the amount of power used while sleeping.  
 CPU is a power parameter that specifies the node processing level.

- Radio listen and transmit are node communication parameters (transmit and receive)
- 7) The parent node will be replaced by the best alternative node if the following condition is met:  
 $Rank(PBest) < Rank(PN)$   
 This node will be selected to be the preferred parent.
  - 8) The node enhances its position and computes its own rank.
  - 9) Following the parent node selection process, data will be multicast to neighboring nodes.

#### IV. SIMULATION AND CONFIGURATION

In order to access our approach, we use the Cooja simulator running on small devices [37]. It supports some implementations such as: MSPSim that is the most used software package emulator of the MSP430 series microprocessor and sensors, multiple platforms equipped with low ROM and RAM like (SkyMote/TelosB Wisemote, ESB, «), multiple radio API, both IPv4 and IPv6 stack shared by all processes and others [37-39]. Furthermore, it includes all the tools and compilers required for Contiki development and debugging. For these reasons, we chose 2.7 as the version to implement our rpl-TotEg-Neighbors approach under the OS Ubuntu. The main objective of our approach is to improve one of the RPL's components, specifically the objective function mrhof, in terms of received and lost packets, throughput, overhead, ETX, Rtmrhc, convergence time and power consumption for the IoT networks. However, in order to do this, we have selected a random distribution with varying density in the range [10, 45] under different mobility models. In addition, the BonnMotion simulator is applied to create the mobility pattern trajectories [40]. However, the BonnMotion output must be converted using a built application called WiseML [40]. The additional setup parameters for this simulation are shown in Table I and Table II. The tools collectview, awk scripts, and the pcap file are used to generate the performance measures. Finally, the obtained results are plotted in figures using the Gnuplot software.

TABLE I. COOJA PARAMETERS SETUP

Parameter	Value
Operating System/Simulator	Contiki OS 2.7Cooja
Radio Medium model	Unit Disk Graph Medium (UDGM): Distance Loss
Random Seed	123,456
Aera	100x 100 meters
Sink Position	(50,50)
Number of nodes (motes)	15, 25, 35, 45
Topology	Point-to-multipoint, Multipoint-to-multipoint
Simulation time	600000 ms
Transport protocol	UDP
Objective functions	rpl-mrhof, rpl-of0, rpl-TotEg-Neighbors
Application program	Examples/ipv6/rplcollect
MAC Layer	IEEE 802.14.5
Duty Cycle	ContikiMAC
Transmit and received ratio	TX=100%, RX=100%
Transmission range	50 m
Speed	No limit speed

Mobility Model	RWP, RPGM, Nomadic
TABLE II. BONNMOTION PARAMETERS SETUP	
Parameter	Value
X; Y area	100 m
Minimum speed	0
Maximum speed	100 m/s
Simulation Duration	1200 sec
Minimum pause time	0
Maximum pause time	20 s

We estimated an average for several runs for each test to validate our simulations. In this simulation, the proposed objective function  $rpl-TotEg-Neighbors$  is compared to the current functions  $rpl-mrhof$  and  $rpl-of0$  in terms of average received and lost packets, throughput, average control traffic overhead, average ETX, average  $Rtmetric$ , average convergence time, and average power consumption. The simulation metrics used serve as proof of network performance requirements that require upgrading for excellent efficiency.

### V. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

To investigate the impact of the chosen metrics on both protocol and network behavior, we consider various scenarios for optimizing packet delivery and selecting the best routes while consuming the lowest amount of power. For the evaluation of our  $rpl-TotEg-Neighbors$  in this paper, we focus on the performance metrics described below.

#### A. Average Received and Lost Packets

In this scenario, we have increased the number of nodes and moved all nodes except the sink to three mobility models: RWP, RPGM, and Nomadic. As shown in Fig. 2.1, as the network size increases, our proposed objective function  $rpl-TotEg-Neighbors$  records a high number of received packets and a low number of lost packets when compared to the  $mrhof$  and  $of0$  functions in a Random Waypoint environment. In Fig. 2.2, we see the same behavior of our approach as before in terms of receiving packets and very low packet loss when compared to  $mrhof$  and  $rpl-of0$  in the mobile RPGM. In Fig. 2.3 and in a nomadic environment, we show that our approach provides significant improvements over other objective functions only for lost packets. When compared to  $rpl-mrhof$  and  $rpl-of0$ , our approach records more packets received and fewer packets lost in Random Waypoint and RPGM environments than Nomadic, implying that these mobility models may be better for RPL than others. We conclude that the  $rpl-TotEg-Neighbors$  function, when applied to a variable density network during RWP and RPGM mobility, is more reliable than the standard  $mrhof$  and  $of0$  functions.




Figure 2.1. Average received and lost packets vs number of nodes for Random WayPoint Model (RWP)




Figure 2.2. Average received and lost packets vs Number of nodes for RPGM Model




Figure 2.3. Average received and lost packets vs number of nodes for Nomadic Model




Figure3. Average routing metric vs number of nodes for mobility models

B. Average ETX and Rtm metric

This section presents the average Expected Transmission Count (ETX) and Routing Metric (Rtm metric) evaluation results for the three objective functions (rpl-TotEg-Neighbors, rpl-mrhof and rpl-of0) based on node density and the three mobility models (RWP, RPGM, and Nomadic). Except for the sink node, the following figures show the ETX and Rtm metric values of all nodes. These values are assigned by the application using the rpl collect protocol. In Fig.3, our proposed function provides better average routing metric than other standard functions for all densities in all mobile scenarios. The Rtm metric value can be calculated by using the best neighbor's previous Rtm metric value, which is also determined by the ETX value. A lower ETX value denotes a better neighbor. As a result, Rtm metric is better, and the protocol seemed to be more reliable.

Furthermore, as shown in Fig.4, our rpl-TotEg-Neighbors function outperforms other functions in terms of average ETX in RPGM and Nomadic mobile scenarios for all densities. To conclude, these results show that the new improvement of the standard mrhof has a direct influence that can reduce ETX and improve Rtm metric according to the number of nodes and mobility models.




Figure4. Average ETX vs number of nodes for mobility models

C. Average Convergence Time

Multiple control messages are exchanged across the network during the DODAG's construction and until the topology is accomplished in the RPL protocol. For this, the convergence time measures the time taken between the first DIO sent and the last DIO that joined the DAG. To ensure better network stability, this metric needs to be as minimal as possible [41]. Fig.5 depicts the average convergence time of the standard RPL (mrhof, of0) and rpl-TotEg-Neighbors based on the number of nodes and three mobility models RWP, RPGM, and Nomadic. In this context, we notice that the new improvement provides a slower convergence time than the standard RPL ones (mrhof and of0) in Random Waypoint for all densities.




Figure5. Average convergence time vs number of nodes for mobility models

D. Average Control Traffic Overhead

Control traffic overhead is the total sum of control messages (Internet Control Message Protocol version 6) such as DIO, DIS and DAO generated in RPL in order to setup and maintain the network. This traffic occurs when nodes report discovering routes and sending error messages, which leads to network congestion. In this scenario, the flow of control messages should be reduced because any accumulated traffic would exhaust the network resources in LLN [42]. Fig.6 presents the average RPL control traffic messages (DIO, DIS, DAO) for all mobility models (RWP, RPGM, and Nomadic) with a random network topology and different densities using rpl-mrhof, rpl-of0, and rpl-TotEg-Neighbors. As a result, under all mobility models and densities, the improved function outperforms the standard OF mrhof in route calculation, whereas of0 requires more control messages due to collisions and retransmissions.

E. Throughput

This metric is measured by counting the number of data packets successfully delivered in a given period of time. This metric's traffic can be injected into the network with the same quantity from any of the source nodes. To be considered better, the value of this metric should be significantly high for an IoT network. Throughput is

affected by the network's traffic workload [43]. It is also calculated using the following formula:

$$\text{Throughput} = \frac{\text{Number of delivered packets} \times \text{size} \times 8 \text{ (bit)}}{\text{Total duration of simulation (s)}}$$

Fig. 7 depicts the throughput analysis of the proposed objective function *rpl-TotEg-Neighbors* versus *rpl-mr* and *rpl-of0* under various mobility models. It is also worth mentioning that *rpl-TotEg-Neighbors* has slightly better throughput than *rpl-mr* in this test for low node densities and in Random Waypoint and Nomadic mobile environments. In these mobile conditions (RWP and RPGM), *rpl-TotEg-Neighbors* solves the congestion problem by using the new metric that combines the total energy and the number of neighbors of the nodes. The results show that the proposed function successfully provides more delivered packets than the current functions for any low density and any type of mobility. In this case, we can confirm that our proposed method avoids the collision problem.




Figure 6. Average Control Traffic Overhead vs number of nodes for mobility models




Figure 7. Throughput vs number of nodes for mobility models

F. Average Power Consumption

Energy consumption is one of the most significant challenges of any IoT and it is crucial to evaluate it over a mobile and dense IoT network running RPL. This metric's performance is determined by the power consumed by nodes to collect and transfer packets between any source and its preferred parent. The average power consumption is the average sum of the node states in terms of CPU, LPM, Tx, and Rx consumed power. To illustrate this point, Fig. 8 compares the proposed function to the standards OF (*mrhof* and *of0*) with various mobility models and densities for average power consumption. As shown in this figure, *rpl-TotEg-Neighbors* provides better performances with all mobility models (RWP, RPGM, nomadic) in terms of power consumption than with the standard *mrhof* for all densities. However, the *of0* consumes more power than the other cases because it does not use any routing metrics to choose its data path, whereas the new function *rpl-TotEg-Neighbors* selects a path based on the minimum total power consumption and the number of nearest neighbors. So average power consumption for *rpl-TotEg-Neighbors* is smaller. Therefore, the objective of our new improvement is achieved.




Figure 8. Average Power Consumption vs number of nodes for mobility models

G. Discussion

RPL's design is based on the objective function. This means that any change to the RPL specification's core can maintain the primary basis of its parameters while improving its performance. For this reason, we have proposed a new objective function (*rpl-TotEg-Neighbors*) which uses combined metrics (ETX, total energy and number of neighbors) according to different mobility models and various densities. Our solution is compared with the standards *mrhof* and *of0*. The new function outperforms the current *mrhof* function under certain conditions. It reduces traffic overhead and expected transmission for all mobility models, which helps avoid collisions. It also improves routing metrics and the packets delivery, minimizes convergence time and reduces power consumption for any type of mobility and for a low density.



power and lossy networks Computer Communications, vol. 104, no. 17, 2017, pp. 17-33

[31] A. Oliveira and T. Vazão, "Low-power and lossy networks under mobility: A survey" Computer Networks, 2015.

[32] P. O. Kamgueu, E. Nataf, and T. D. Ndie, "Survey on RPL enhancements A focus on topology, security and mobility" Computer Communications, 2018

[33] C. Cobarza, J. Montavont, and T. Noel, "Analysis and performance evaluation of RPL under mobility" in Proc. 2014 IEEE Symposium on Computers and Communications (ISCC), Madeira, Portugal, 23-26 June 2014; pp. 6

[34] E. B. Aissa and S. H. Asmaa, "Proposition et evaluation de performances d'une nouvelle fonction objective d'équilibrage de charge dans l'internet des objets" Université Saad Dahleb Blida, Mémoire de Master, 2018

[35] J. Ko, J. Eriksson, N. Tsiftes, S. Dawson-Haggerty, A. Terzis, A. Dunkels, "DQGLX & XOOHU" & RQWLNL53/ Together

[36] H. Lamaazi, N. Benamar, M. I. Imaduddin and A. J. Jara, "3HUIRUPDQFH DVVHVPHQWRIWKHURXWLQJSURWRFROIRUORZSRZHUDQG lossy QHWZRUP" Proc. 2015 International Conference on, Marrakech, 2015

[37] C. Community Contiki: The Open Source OS for the Internet of Things [Online]. Available: <http://www.contiki-os.org/index.html>

[38] M. O. Farooq and T. X. Q. "2S Hybrid Multihop Wireless sensor networks A survey," Sensors, 2011, pp.5900-5930.

[39] K. Roussel, Y.Q. Song, and 2 = H Q G U Dcoo for WSN simulations Some new uses and limits, in Proc. 2016 International Conference on Embedded Wireless Systems and Network, pp.319-324, 2016.

[40] 1 \$ V F K H Q E U X F N 3 \$ P R E L O L W a n a l y s i s W Q R D L R J H C Osnabruck, Germany, 2013

[41] N. Pradeska, W. W. Najib, and S. S. Kusumawardani, "3 H U I R U P D Q F H analysis of objective function MRHOF and OF0 in routing protocol RPL IPV6 over low power wireless personal area networks / R : 3 \$ 1 in Proc. 2016 8th Int. Conf. Inf. Technol. Electr. Eng. Empower. Technol. Better Future, 2016, pp. 16.

[42] ; / L X = 6 K H Q J & < L Q ) \$ O L D Q G ' 5 R J analysis of routing protocol for low power and lossy networks (RPL) in large scale networks IEEE Internet Things, vol. 4, no. 6, pp. 2172-2185, 2017.

[43] S. A. Jyothi, A. Singla, P. B. Godfrey and A. Kolla, "Measuring DQGLX and Understanding Throughput of network topologies, Proc. SC16: International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking pp. 761-772, 2016

Copyright © 2023 by the authors. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License BY-NC-ND 4.0, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided that the article is properly cited, the use is non commercial and no modifications or adaptations are made.