

Energy Efficient Multipath Routing in Large Scale Sensor Networks with Multiple Sink Nodes

Yuequan Chen, Edward Chan, Song Han

Department of Computer Science, City University of Hong Kong

Email: cshedchan@cityu.edu.hk

Abstract

Due to the battery resource constraint, it is a critical issue to save energy in wireless sensor networks, particularly in large sensor networks. One possible solution is to deploy multiple sink nodes simultaneously. In this paper, we propose a protocol called MRMS (Multipath Routing in large scale sensor networks with Multiple Sink nodes) which incorporates multiple sink nodes, a new path cost metric for improving path selection, dynamic cluster maintenance and path switching to improve energy efficiency. MRMS is shown to increase the lifetime of sensor nodes substantially compared to other algorithms based on a series of simulation experiments.

1. Introduction

Recent advance in micro-electromechanical system technology has made it possible to develop low-power and low-cost sensors with at a much reduced cost, so that large wireless sensor networks with thousands of tiny sensors are well within the realm of reality. These large sensor networks are able to support many new applications, including habitat monitoring [1] and agricultural monitoring [2]. In such wireless sensor networks (WSN), sensors send data packets to sink nodes through multi-hop wireless links. As the size of the network increases, the sensors near the sink nodes will dissipate energy faster than other sensors as they need to forward a larger number of messages, and prolonging the lifetime of whole network becomes a critical problem. One promising approach is to deploy multiple sink nodes in WSN, since it can decrease the energy consumption of sensors and improve the scalability of the networks.

In this paper, we propose a protocol called MRMS, which stands for “Multipath Routing in wireless sensor networks with Multiple Sink nodes”. MRMS includes three parts: topology discovery, cluster maintenance and path switching. The topology is constructed based on the TopDisc algorithm [3] using our own path cost metric (which is described in a later section). Next we rotate the cluster head within a cluster and change delivery node between clusters to balance energy consumption in the cluster maintenance process. Finally, when some of the sensors in the original primary path have dissipated too much energy, we re-select the primary path to connect to an alternate sink node. Simulation shows that MRMS can improve energy efficiency significantly.

The main contributions in our paper are as follows: First, we introduce a new path cost metric which is based on the distance between two neighbor nodes, hop count to sink node and the residual energy of sensor node. This metric is very useful in path selection and improving energy efficiency. Secondly our scheme uses stateless clusters in which all the ordinary sensors in the cluster maintain only the previous hop and corresponding sink. This means the cluster head does not need to maintain information on its children in its cluster, which simplifies cluster maintenance considerably. Finally, we introduce mechanisms for path switching when the energy of the sensors in original primary path has dropped below a certain level. This allows us to distribute energy consumption more evenly among the sensor nodes in the network. By combining these techniques, we are able to construct a strategy that outperforms existing algorithms, as shown in the simulation experiments that we have carried out.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. A summary of related work is presented in section 2.

Section 3 describes the design of the MRMS protocol in detail. The performance of MRMS is examined in Section 4 and compared with other protocols using simulation. The paper concludes with Section 5 where some possible improvements to MRMS are pointed out.

2. Related work

WSN is an area of much research recently. Since routing is a major issue, a large number of routing protocols such as Direct Diffusion [5] and LEACH [6] have been proposed by researchers [4]. In some of these protocols, cluster-based routing is used to decrease energy consumption, such as in TopDisc [3] and LEACH. However, only a few of these protocols deal explicitly with the multiple sink nodes problem, which is the key focus of our paper. A number of recent papers dealt with the optimal placement of sink nodes in multiple sink sensor networks [10] but do not deal directly with routing issues.

One of the earliest cluster-based routing algorithms is the TopDisc algorithm [3], which is based on the three-color or four color algorithm. TopDisc finds a set of distinguished nodes, using neighborhood information to construct approximate topology of the network. These distinguished nodes logically organize the network in the form of clusters comprised of nodes in their neighborhood. However, TopDisc neither considers the residual energy of sensor networks nor the possibility of path switching.

Dubois-Ferries and Estrin proposed an algorithm based on Voronoi clusters to handle multiple sink nodes [7]. This Voronoi algorithm designates a sink for each cluster to perform data acquisition from sensors in cluster. Each node keeps a record of its closet sink and of the network distance to that sink. When a message arrives from a sink, the recipient checks if the distance traversed by the packet is less than the current estimate of closet sink distance. If so, the node updates its closet sink and parent entries and resends the message. A node also re-forwards the message if the distance traversed is equal to closest distance and the message came from the closet sink. A drawback of this algorithm is that it does not consider residual energy of sensor node.

A. Das [8] provides an analytical model of multiple sink nodes. However, it also does not also consider path switching or how to handle excessive energy dissipation among the sensors on the original paths. The Two-Tier Data Dissemination (TTDD) scheme [9] provides data delivery to multiple mobile base stations. In TTDD, each data source proactively builds a grid structure that is used to disseminate data to the mobile sinks by assuming that sensor nodes are stationary and location-aware. However, this scheme requires precise position of the sensor nodes, which may be difficult to attain in many cases. It is also designed primarily for mobile sinks, and is not as efficient when the sink nodes are stationary.

3. The MRMS Algorithm

3.1 System Model

In this section we will present the system model used in our work. First we state our major assumptions. We assume there are multiple sink nodes in the wireless sensor networks, each of which has an infinite amount of energy. Every sensor, whose location is randomly distributed, has the same initial energy and radio range. Both the sensor nodes and the sink nodes are stationary. A perfect MAC layer and error-free communication links are assumed, but no communication is possible once the energy of a sensor node has been depleted. A transceiver exhibits first order radio model characteristics in free space i.e. energy spent in transmitting a bit over a distance d is proportional to d^2 .

A wireless sensor networks (WSN) is modeled as a graph $G(V, E)$, as show in Figure 1, where V is the set of all sensor nodes and all sink nodes, E is the set of all links.

$$V = V_{\text{sink}} \cup V_{\text{sensor}}, E = \{(i,j) \mid i,j \in V\}$$




Figure 1. A Sensor Network with Multiple Sink Nodes

Every sensor's initial energy is E_{init} and its residual energy is E_{RE} . The path is defined as $\{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_i, V_j, \dots, S\}$, $V_i, V_j \in V_{sensor}$, $S \in V_{sink}$; the cost is defined as the cost of one link $\langle V_i, V_j \rangle$.

$$Cost_{ij} = \alpha * d^2 + \beta \quad (1)$$

Now we define the path cost as follows:

$$path_cost = \sum cost_{ij} * E_{RE}^\gamma \quad (2)$$

where α is the energy/bit consumed by the transmitter electronics, β is energy/bit consumed by the transmitting and receiving signal operation overhead for amplifying, and d is the distance between two sensor nodes. γ is the coefficient of residual energy and it is a none-zero negative value. From formula (1) and (2), it is clear that the longer the transmitting distance or the larger the overhead, the higher the cost. So the increase in the hop count between the sensor nodes and sink node will increase path cost. In addition, if the residual energy for each sensor decreases, the path cost will also increase. Hence, after a path has been used excessively, the residual energy of the sensors in the path will decrease, driving up the path cost and triggering the path-switching process. The role of the path cost metric in energy-efficient routing will be shown in greater detail in a later section.

3.2 MRMS Overview

There are three phases in MRMS: topology discovery, cluster maintenance and path switching.

MRMS topology discovery is derived from the three-color algorithm used in TopDisc [3], but with a number of significant differences. Firstly, MRMS must save the paths from different sinks, so that when the primary path is not reachable or if the residual energy of the sensors along the path fall below a certain threshold, another path will be selected. Secondly, during the cluster construction, it can construct an optimal or sub-optimal path to any sink node which is based on the path cost metric. Thirdly, the cluster is stateless and each cluster can be considered as a single node.

There are two major processes within cluster maintenance: energy monitoring and cluster reconstruction. The residual energy of the sensors is monitored and when it falls below some threshold, cluster reconstruction is initiated. In cluster reconstruction, if the Cluster Header's (CH) residual energy is below some threshold, it will select new children whose residual energy is the maximum in this cluster to take over. On the other hand, if the delivery node's residual energy is below the threshold, the CH will select a new delivery node whose path cost is the minimum.

The main function of the third phase, path switching, is to switch path to another sink when the primary

path to some sink is not usable any more. After a primary path has been in use for an extended period of time, the energy level of the sensors along this path will dissipate faster than other sensor nodes, and some nodes may run out of energy altogether leaving the path unusable. By switching paths, energy consumption is distributed more equitably.


Now we will discuss each of these phases in greater detail.

3.3 Details of the MRMS Algorithm

3.3.1 MRMS Topology Discovery Algorithm

MRMS topology discovery is partially based on the three color algorithm used in TopDisc [3], which is derived from the simple greedy log (n)-approximation algorithm for finding the set cover. At the end of the TopDisc topology discovery process, the sensor network is divided into n clusters and each cluster is represented by one node, which is called the cluster head. The cluster head is able to reach all the sensor nodes in the cluster directly because they are all within its communication range. Each cluster head knows its sink, but they can not communication with each other directly. Instead, a *delivery* node (the grey node) acts as an intermediary which delivers messages between each pair of head node.

In the MRMS topology discovery mechanism, unlike TopDisc, the cluster is stateless because the cluster head will not maintain any children. Instead every sensor will note its previous hop and corresponding sink in its routing table (Figure 2); this approach reduces the complexity of cluster reconstruction described in the next section. Thus each cluster can be considered a virtual node as far as the topology is concerned. A sensor node may keep information for more than one cluster heads and sinks in the routing table, as it can keep track of different paths from different sink nodes. However only one of these paths can be designated the *primary* path in the table, and this is the path with the minimum path cost, hence ensuring the topology will be an energy efficient one. The pseudo code in Table 1 provides details of the topology discovery process.



(a) Sensor and sink nodes before topology discovery (b) Sensor and sink nodes after topology discovery

Figure 2. Cluster construction with multiple sink nodes

MRMS Topology Discovery

/*WHITE: Undiscovered node

*BLACK: Cluster Head node

*GREY: Discovered by one black node

*/

1. If node is sink Then

Topology discovery is finished and return;

```

2. If node is sensor and it is still WHITE
    If previous node color is BLACK Then
        Change the node's color to GREY;
         $\text{minPathCost} \leftarrow \text{path\_cost}_{\text{old}} + \text{cost}_{ij} * E_{RE}^{\gamma}$ 
        Save the previous node as the route to its cluster head.
        Broadcast the topology discovery message again with some delay; where the delay is inversely
        proportional to the distance which between itself and the previous node.
    If previous node color is GREY Then
        Delay some time, with the delay inversely proportional to the distance which between itself and
        the previous node.
        After delay, if node is still WHITE, change its color to BLACK
        Mark this node as cluster head,
         $\text{hopCount} \leftarrow \text{hopCount} + 1$ ; /* note each cluster is considered one hop count here */
         $\text{minPathCost} \leftarrow \text{path\_cost}_{\text{old}} + \text{cost}_{ij} * E_{RE}^{\gamma}$ 
        Save the corresponding information as its primary path in its route table;
        Broadcast the topology discovery message again
    Else if ((node color is GREY and its previous node is BLACK) OR (node color is BLACK))
        AND (new sink is not in RouteTable) Then
            If  $\text{path\_cost}_{\text{old}} + \text{cost}_{ij} * E_{RE}^{\gamma} < \text{minPathCost}$  Then
                 $\text{minPathCost} \leftarrow \text{path\_cost}_{\text{old}} + \text{cost}_{ij} * E_{RE}^{\gamma}$ 
                Change the primary path to the new sink; save the original path as its alternative path
                Broadcast the new topology discovery request again
            Else
                Discard the topology discovery request.

```

Table 1. The MRMS Topology Discovery Algorithm

3.3.2 MRMS Cluster Maintenance

As explained in a previous section, MRMS cluster maintenance includes two parts: energy monitoring and cluster reconstruction. Energy monitoring in MRMS is relatively straight-forward. A cluster header will check its energy periodically. If the sensor's residual energy is below some threshold, it will invoke the cluster reconstruction process. A special case is that of a delivery node, in which case it needs to inform its child cluster head to change its delivery node as well.

In cluster reconstruction, when the residual energy of the cluster head (CH) is below some threshold, it will broadcast the SELECT_NEW_CH message to its neighbors, as shown in Figure 3(a). Any sensor that receives this message will check its routing table and reports its residual energy to the CH if the previous hop in its primary path is the current CH. After combining all incoming information, the current CH will select the child with the maximum residual energy as the new CH and pass control to the new CH, as shown in Figure 3(b). The new CH will probe new delivery node based on the path cost, and broadcast the NEW_CH to all its children in its cluster, as shown in Figure 3(c). If a sensor node is the delivery node of some cluster head and its residual energy is below some threshold, it will notify these cluster heads to change their delivery nodes, as shown in Figure 4. Detailed pseudo-code is shown in Table 2.




Figure 3. Intra-Cluster Reconstruction




Figure 4. Changing Delivery Node in Cluster Reconstruction

3.3.3 MRMS Path Switching

As discussed in a previous section, when the path to the original sink has been used for an extended period of time, there is a need to switch to another sink. There is a problem in determining the suitable sink, however, is that the value of the path cost is not always current. Although it is possible to have use a periodical update approach to refresh the path cost, this technique is expensive and quite unnecessary since switching to a different sink does not occur frequently for stationary sensors. In MRMS, we use an event-based approach where path switching is triggered when during the cluster reconstruction process it is discovered that the current path is no longer the best path.

Cluster Reconstruction

1. When the energy of the current CH has dropped below a certain threshold, the current CH broadcasts a message to poll the residual energy level of all its children. When a sensor receives this message, it will report the current residual energy to its CH.
2. The current CH selects the child with the maximum residual energy as the new CH; the new CH changes the radio range to $2R$ and broadcasts probing the new delivery node message to all neighbors
3. The sensor node receives the probing message, it will do the following.
If its sink node is the same as that of the original cluster and $\text{hopCount} < \text{hopCount of original cluster}$
Then
 Report its current battery residual energy and its path cost to original sink.
4. After the new CH receives the reply information,
If $\text{path_cost}_{\text{old}} + \text{cost}_{ij} * E_{RE}^{\gamma} < \text{minPathCost}$ Then
 $\text{minPathCost} \leftarrow \text{path_cost}_{\text{old}} + \text{cost}_{ij} * E_{RE}^{\gamma}$
 Change the primary path to corresponding information
If all new calculated $\text{path_cost}_{\text{new}}$ is larger than $\eta * \text{path_cost}_{\text{old}}$ Then
 Initiate path-switching by sending a new probing message to probe the path to another sink /*
 this will be described in section 5.3 */
5. After the new CH broadcast has selected the new delivery node in its primary path, it will broadcast the new information to all children in the old cluster.
6. All of children in old cluster change its previous hop to the NEW CH in its primary path.

Table 2 Cluster Reconstruction

We will now describe the details of path switching in MRMS, using Figure 5 to illustrate the process. In the original path, because the sensor nodes which are near the sink node consume energy more rapidly than the sensor nodes which are far away from the sink node, these nodes close to the sink will invoke cluster-reconstruction. For example, in Figure 5, sensor A will probably see many of its upstream nodes invoke cluster reconstruction first. Since the path cost in the primary path will be updated whenever cluster reconstruction occurs, there is no need for sensor A to do anything explicitly to refresh the path cost in the primary path ({CH->A-->S1} in Figure 5.a).

However, if in due time the cluster containing A undergoes cluster reconstruction, then there is a possibility that a new primary path will be chosen. The first task is to determine whether there is a need to refresh the path cost to the alternate path, which has not been updated for quite a while. The approach we have adopted is for the source CH to send a probe message to confirm another sink only if the path cost in the original primary path exceeds the path cost in the alternate path by a certain threshold η . The value of this threshold is dependent on the hop count of the CH to the sink, since the larger the hop count, the further away it is from the sink and the larger the interval between cluster reconstruction – and hence the more outdated the path cost of the alternate path is likely to be. Figure 5b shows the CH sending a probing message to sink S_3 after the above condition has been met. After S_3 has received the probing message, it will compare current path cost ($\text{path_cost}_{\text{CH->S3}}$) to the original one ($\text{path_cost}_{\text{CH->S1}}$). If the current path cost is larger than some threshold, the sink node will send fresh message to all sensor nodes in this path, and if the new calculated path cost in the new sink is less than the path cost of the original primary path, which is the case in Figure 5b, then source CH will switch to the new sink node, otherwise S_3 will simply return its later path cost to the CH. Either way, the path cost will be broadcast by the CH to all its children in the cluster, and each child sensor node will update its routing table entries accordingly. In case the CH does not receive a reply from S_3 , then topology discovery will be invoked again.




Figure 5. Path switching in different sink node

4. Performance Evaluation and Simulation Result

To evaluate the performance of the MRMS Algorithm, we have implemented it in *GloMoSim* [11] which is based on *Parsec*[12]. In our simulation, we assume the energy model is based on first order radio model in free space, that is, the energy dissipation is:

$$e^T(d) = (\alpha * d^2 + \beta) * r$$

where α , β are real numbers. α is the energy consumed at the output transmitter antenna for transmitting one meter, β is the overhead energy representing the sum of the receiver, sensing and computation energy which is independent of the distance d ; r is the number of bits transmitted.

In our simulation, the sensor network consists of 250 nodes which are distributed randomly over a planar square region of 100m by 100m. There are up to 3 sink nodes, with positions (33.33, 33.33), (66.67, 33.33), (50.00, 66.67). The initial battery capacity of the sensors is set as 0.5J, α is set to 0.1 nJ/bit/m² and β set to 50 nJ/bit [6]. There are ten hotspots generating events, which are detectable by sensors within 10 m. Arrival rate of the events is based on a Poisson distribution model with an arrival rate of 0.5 packet per second. The data packet size is 2000 bits and all control packets size is assumed to be 100 bits. We set up the simulation time to range from 10 to 150 minutes for evaluating the performance of the various protocols.

4.1 Performance Criteria

The main objective of our simulation is to evaluate the energy efficiency and the lifetime of sensor networks. However, researchers have proposed different definitions of lifetime. In our experiments, we use the following metrics.

- Time to first node failures: This metric indicate the duration for which the sensor network is fully functional i.e. no sensor failure due to battery outage.
- Number of dead nodes: We measure the number of dead nodes as time goes on; this metric provides an indication of the expected lifetime and the reliability of sensor networks.
- Mean Energy Consumption of one packet: the metric indicates the energy consumption of transmitting a packet to sink successfully.
- Average hop count to sink: This metric is useful since the larger the number of hops a packet has to traverse before it reaches the sink, the higher the aggregate energy consumption.
- Packet delivery ratio: this metric is defined as a ratio of the number of received packets at the sink to the number of packets transmitted by the source sensors. The higher the delivery ratio, the higher the reliability of the network. Uneven energy consumption in the network will lead to premature failure of sensors and reduced reliability, hence the packet delivery ratio is also a good indirect measure of the lifetime of the network.

4.2 Experiments and result analysis

In this section we discuss the performance of MRMS with the Voronoi Algorithm [7], TopDisc Algorithm and Direct Flooding algorithm. The Direct Flooding algorithm is a simplistic algorithm used as a base case; in its topology discovery phase the sink node simply floods its information to its neighbor sensor nodes without any optimization. After receiving the topology discovery request, the sensor nodes broadcast it again directly without any attempt to optimize the process. Similarly there is no optimization for sending packets to sink nodes. A single sink is used for Direct Flooding.

From Figure 6, we see that MRMS outperforms other protocols significantly, with MRMS close to doubling or tripling the time to first sensor node failure in some cases. In Direct Flooding, the first node dies quicker than the other protocols, because all packets are sent to only one sink and there is no cluster reconstruction and path switching. The TopDisc Algorithm uses clustering to decrease energy consumption which can improve the lifetime of sensor nodes and the Voronoi Algorithm uses the multiple sink nodes which improve the load-balance of data which is sent to sink nodes. However, MRMS by combining multiple sink nodes, cluster reconstruction and path switching, can best balance sensor energy consumption and prolong the duration for sensor network which is fully functional.

From Figure 7, it can be seen once again that MRMS decreases the number of dead nodes significantly, indicating that MRMS is indeed more energy-efficient than the other algorithms. The same conclusion can be reached by looking at Figure 9, which displays the average hop count to sink node for the various algorithms. The effect of using multiple sink nodes is seen clearly in this experiment, as both MRMS and Voronoi Algorithm decrease the hop counts by 1.5-2 hops compared to the Direct Flooding and the TopDisc algorithm. This result is quite obvious since multiple sink nodes will decrease the average distance from the sensor nodes to sink node and hence the hop count will drop accordingly.

From Figure 8, it can be seen that MRMS decreases the energy consumption considerably compared with the Voronoi algorithm, TopDisc algorithm and Direct Flooding. As simulation time increases, the average energy consumption for one packet in MRMS and the other algorithms remain relatively stable. There are actually several factors at work. As time goes on, with some of the original best paths no longer available, more and more of the outlying sensors becomes unreachable meaning that the remaining sensors tend to be closer to the sink nodes. This can be seen in Figure 9 and Figure 10 where the hop count and distance decreases with time for most algorithms. MRMS, however, behaves a bit differently in that its average distance to sink does not decrease much over time, meaning that it is still able to keep some of the outlying sensors alive (and hence the higher average distance). Despite the longer actual distance from the sinks (which greatly affects the energy consumption of the packet), MRMS still maintains the best average energy consumption per packet, which is a tribute to the cluster maintenance and path switching mechanisms. Figure 11 confirms that MRMS outperforms significantly the other three algorithms significantly based on the packet delivery ratio, indicating the MRMS is indeed more energy efficient and reliable, since most of the packets are actually able to reach the final destination, unlike the other algorithms.

5. Conclusion and Future Work

In this paper, we proposed the MRMS algorithm which includes topology discovery, cluster maintenance and path switching. Since MRMS uses multiple sink nodes, cluster maintenance and path switching which can distribute the energy consumption in sensor networks more evenly, it enjoys significant improvement in key metrics compared to other approaches. We plan on exploring the effect of a lossy MAC layer on the MRMS, as well as how to construct node-disjoint multipaths for multiple sink nodes.




Figure 6. Time to First Node Failure




Figure 7. Number of Dead Nodes




Figure 8. Average Energy Consumption for packet




Figure 9. Average Hop Count vs Time




Figure 10 Average Distance to Sink vs Time




Figure 11. Packet Delivery Ratio

Reference

- [1] A. Mainwaring, J. Polastre, R. Szewczyk, D. Culler, and J. Anderson, "Wireless sensor networks for habitat monitoring," Proc. 1st ACM Int'l Workshop on Wireless Sensor Networks and Applications, 2002.
- [2] J. Burrell, T. Brooke, and R. Beckwith, "Vineyard computing: sensor networks in agricultural production," IEEE Pervasive Computing, Vol. 3, Issue. 1, 2004.

- [3] B. Deb, S. Bhatnagar, and B. Nath, "A topology discovery algorithm for sensor networks with applications to network management," Proc. IEEE CAS Workshop on wireless communication and networking, Pasadena, USA, Sept., 2002.
- [4] J.N. Al-Karaki and A.E. Kamal, "Routing Techniques in wireless sensor networks: A survey," IEEE Wireless Communication, Vol. 11, Issue 6, Dec. 2004.
- [5] C. Intanagonwiwat, R. Govindan, and D. Estrin, "Directed Diffusion: a Scalable and Robust Communication Paradigm for Sensor Networks," Proc. ACM Mobicom 2000, Boston, MA, 2000.
- [6] W. Heizelman, A. Chandrakasan and H. Balakrishnan, "Energy-efficient communication Protocol for wireless microsensor networks", Proc. 33rd International Conference on System Sciences, January 2000.
- [7] H. Dubois-Ferries and D. Estrin, "Efficient and Practical Query Scoping in Sensor networks," Tech Rep. 2004-39, CENS/UCLA Tech Report, 2004.
- [8] A. Das and D. Dutta, "Data Acquisition in Multiple Sink Sensor Networks," Proc. 2nd International Conference on Embedded Sensor Systems, 2004.
- [9] F. Ye, H. Luo, J. Cheng, S. Lu and L. Zhang, "A two-tier Data Dissemination Model for large Scale Wireless Sensor networks," Proc. ACM Mobicom 2002, Sept. 2002.
- [10] E.I. Oyman and C. Ersoy, "Multiple Sink Network Design Problem in Large Scale Wireless Sensor Networks," Proc. International Conference on Communication, June 2004.
- [11] GloMoSim: A Scalable Simulation Environment for Wireless and Wired Network Systems. UCLA Parallel Computing Laboratory and Wireless Adaptive Mobility Laboratory.
- [12] R. Bagrodia, R. Meyer, M. Takai, Y. Chen, X. Zeng, J. Martin and H.Y. Song, "PARSEC: A Parallel Simulation Environment for Complex Systems," IEEE Computer, vol. 31, no. 10, October 1998.