

2 Explain flat LTE SAE architecture with a neat diagram. Explain how 3 GPP network evolved towards flat LTE- SAE architecture 10

### **ANS:**

System Architecture Evolution (SAE) is a new network architecture designed to simplify LTE networks and establish a flat architecture similar to other IP based communications networks. SAE uses an eNB and Access Gateway (aGW) and removes the RNC and SGSN from the equivalent 3G network architecture to create a simpler mobile network. This allows the network to be built with an "All-IP" based network architecture. SAE also includes entities to allow full inter-working with other related wireless technology (WCDMA, WiMAX, WLAN, etc.). These entities can specifically manage and permit the non-3GPP technologies to interface directly with the network and be managed from within the same network.



The architecture consists of following modules:

**MME (Mobility Management Entity):** The MME is an important controller node in the LTE network. It is responsible for:

- Idle mode UE (User Equipment) tracking
- Paging procedure such as re-transmissions
- Bearer activation and deactivation process
- S-GW selection for a UE at the initial attach
- Intra-LTE handover with Core Network node relocation
- User authentication with HSS

**SGW (Serving Gateway):** The main function of the Serving Gateway is routing and forwarding of user data packets. It is also responsible for inter-eNB handovers in the U-plane and provides mobility between LTE and other types of networks, such as between 2G/3G and P-GW. The DL data from the UEs in idle state is terminated at the SGW, and arrival of DL data triggers paging for the UE. The SGW keeps context information such as parameters of the IP bearer and routing information, and stores the UE contexts when paging happens. It is also responsible for replicating user traffic for lawful interception.

**PGW (PDN Gateway):** The PDN Gateway is the connecting node between UEs and external networks. It is the entry point of data traffic for UEs. In order to access multiple PDNs, UEs can connect to several PGWs at the same time. The functions of the PGW include:





and cheap receiver equipment.

Reducing the knowledge bit rate and using efficient digital codes can obtain capacity increases.

### **Disadvantages**

- Due to the simultaneous transmission of a large number of frequencies, there is a possibility of inter modulation distortion at the transponder.
- Storage, enhancement of signals is not possible.
- The large bandwidth requirement for transponders.
- Guard bands may waste capacity.
- It requires RF (Radio Frequency) filters to meet stringent adjacent channel rejection specifications. This may increase the cost of the system.
- Network planning is cumbersome and time-critical.
- There is not much flexibility so, need to slowly change already assigned traffic patterns.
- The carrying capacity of traffic is relatively low.

6 Explain briefly about opportunistic scheduling approaches for OFDMA 10

### Maximum Sum Rate Algorithm  $4.4.3$

The objective of the maximum sum rate (MSR) algorithm, as the name indicates, is to The objection rate of all users, given a total transmit power constraint [59]. This maximum is optimal if the goal is to get as much data as possible through the system.  $\frac{100}{100}$  algorithm is that it is likely that a few users that are close to the base station (and hence have excellent channels) will be allocated all the system to the set we will now briefly characterize the SINR, data rate, and power and subcarrier resources that is achieved by the MSR algorithm.

Let  $P_{k,l}$  denote user k's transmit power in subcarrier l. The signal-to-interferenceplus-noise ratio for user k in subcarrier l, denoted as  $SINR_{k,l}$ , can be expressed as

$$
SINR_{k,l} = \frac{P_{k,l}h_{k,l}^2}{\sum_{j=1,j\neq k}^{K} P_{j,l}h_{k,l}^2 + \sigma^2 \frac{B}{L}}.
$$
\n(4.3)

Using the Shannon capacity formula as the throughput measure,<sup>5</sup> the MSR algorithm maximizes the following quantity:

$$
\max_{P_{k,l}} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \sum_{l=1}^{L} \frac{B}{L} \log \left( 1 + \text{SINR}_{k,l} \right)
$$
(4.4)

with the total power constraint

$$
\sum_{k=1}^{K} \sum_{l=1}^{L} P_{k,l} \leq P_{tot}.
$$

The sum capacity is maximized if the total throughput in each subcarrier is maximized. Hence, the max sum capacity optimization problem can be decoupled into  $L$ simpler problems, one for each subcarrier. Further, the sum capacity in subcarrier  $l$ , denoted as  $C_l$ , can be written as

$$
C_l = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \log \left( 1 + \frac{P_{k,l}}{P_{tot,l} - P_{k,l} + \frac{\sigma^2}{h_{k,l}^2} \frac{B}{L}} \right),\tag{4.5}
$$

where  $P_{tot,l} - P_{k,l}$  denotes other users' interference to user k in subcarrier l. It is easy to show that  $C_l$  is maximized when all available power  $P_{tot,l}$  is assigned to just the single user with the largest channel gain in subcarrier  $l$ . This result agrees with intuition: give

with the largest channel gain in subcarrier  $\iota$ . This results is sometimes as  $\iota$  and  $\iota$  and each channel to the user with the best gain in that encounting according test referred as a "greedy" optimization. The optimal power allocation proceeds according to  $r_{\text{eff}}$  and  $r_{\text{eff}}$  and  $r_{\text{eff}}$  and  $r_{\text{eff}}$  and each channel to the user with the optimal power anotazically for the multiple to  $\frac{1}{n}$  as a "greedy" optimization. The optimal power realistically for the multiple to  $\frac{1}{n}$   $\frac{1}{n}$  and  $\frac{1}{n}$  as a "greedy" op as a "greedy" optimization. 114, 16] or more real earn capacity is readily  $det_{c_{T_{f_{i}}\mid_{\tilde{r}_{i}}\in\{r_{i}\}\cup\{r_{i}}}}$  with QAM, "mercury waterfilling" [34]. The total sum capacity is readily  $det_{c_{T_{f_{i}}\mid_{\tilde{r}_{i}}\in\{r_{i}\}\cup$ 

# **Maximum Fairness Algorithm**

**4.4.4 Maximum Fairness Algority of the MSR** algorithm, in a cellular and the total throughput is maximized by the MSR algorithm, in a cellular statement of  $\frac{1}{100}$  and  $\frac{1}{100}$  and  $\frac{1}{100}$  and  $\frac{1}{100}$  and Although the total throughput is maximized by any by several orders of  $m_{\rm{a}}$   $\frac{d}{dt}$   $\frac{d}{dt}$  tem like LTE where the path loss attenuation will vary by several orders of  $m_{\rm{a}}$   $\frac{d}{dt}$ ,  $\frac{d}{dt}$  tem like LTE tem like LTE where the path loss attenuation will be extremely underserved by an MSR-based  $\frac{m_{\text{ap}}}{m_{\text{ap}}}\frac{m_{\text{ap}}}{m_{\text{ap}}}\frac{m_{\text{ap}}}{m_{\text{ap}}}\frac{m_{\text{ap}}}{m_{\text{ap}}}\frac{m_{\text{ap}}}{m_{\text{ap}}}\frac{m_{\text{ap}}}{m_{\text{ap}}}\frac{m_{\text{ap}}}{m_{\text{ap}}}\frac{$ between users, some users will be extremely<br>procedure. At the alternate extreme, the maximum fairness algorithm [41]  $\lim_{\delta t \to 0} \frac{1}{\sin \delta t}$ <br>http://www.php.that.the minimum user's data rate is maximum procedure. At the alternate extreme, the maximum user's data rate is  $\frac{1}{2}$  aims to  $a_{ij}$  and  $b_{ij}$  cate the subcarriers and power such that the *minimum* user's data rates of all users, hence the subcarriers and pow cate the subcarriers and power such that the data rates of all users, hence the  $_{\text{the}}$   $_{\text{the}}$   $_{\text{the}}$   $_{\text{the}}$   $_{\text{the}}$ "Maximum Fairness."

Iaximum Fairness."<br>The maximum fairness algorithm can be referred to as a  $\textit{Max-Min}_{\text{problem, singlet}}$ The maximum fairness algorithm can be the optimum subcarrier and power allocation goal is to maximize the minimum data rate. The optimum subcarrier and power allocation goal is to maximize the minimum data rate. Than in the MSR case because the objection<br>is considerably more difficult to determine than in the MSR case because the objective is considerably more difficult to determine the (NP-hard) to simultaneously find the function is not concave. It is particularly difficult (NP-hard) to simultaneously find the function is not concave. It is particularly and the complexity suboptimal  $\frac{1}{a|g_b|}$  optimum subcarrier and power allocation. Therefore, low-complexity suboptimal  $\frac{1}{a|g_b|}$ optimum subcarrier and power anotation and power allocation are done separately. A common approach is to assume initially that equal power is allocated to each

subcarrier, and then to iteratively assign each available subcarrier to a low-rate use with the best channel on it [41,54]. Once this generally suboptimal subcarrier allocation is completed, an optimum (waterfilling) power allocation can be performed. It is typical for this suboptimal approximation to be very close to the performance obtained with an exhaustive search for the best joint subcarrier-power allocation, both in terms of the fairness achieved and the total throughput.

#### **Proportional Rate Constraints Algorithm** 4.4.5

A weakness of the Maximum Fairness algorithm is that the rate distribution among users is not flexible. Further, the total throughput is largely limited by the user with the worst SINR, as most of the resources are allocated to that user, which is clearly suboptimal. In a wireless broadband network, it is likely that different users require application-specific data rates that vary substantially. A generalization of the Maximum Fairness algorithmis the Proportional Rate Constraints (PRC) algorithm, whose objective is to maximize the sum throughput, with the additional constraint that each user's data rate is proportional to a set of pre-determined system parameters  $\{\beta_k\}_{k=1}^K$ . Mathematically, the proportional data rate's constraint can be expressed as

$$
\frac{R_1}{\beta_1} = \frac{R_2}{\beta_2} = \dots = \frac{R_K}{\beta_K} \tag{4.6}
$$

where each user's achieved data rate  $R_k$  is

$$
R_k = \sum_{l=1}^{L} \frac{\rho_{k,l} B}{L} \log_2 \left( 1 + \frac{P_{k,l} h_{k,l}^2}{\sigma^2 \frac{B}{L}} \right), \tag{4.7}
$$

and  $\rho_{k,l}^{k,l}$  can only be the value of either 1 or 0, indicating whether subcarrier l is used<br>and  $\rho_{k,l}^{k,l}$  or not. Clearly, this is the same setup as the Maximum Feiner l is used<br>and user. The advantage is that  $\rho$ and  $\rho_{k,l}^{k,l}$  can only clearly, this is the same setup as the Maximum Fairness algorithm if  $h^{y}$  is that any arbitrary data rates algorithm if  $\frac{1}{2}$  and  $\frac{1}{2}$  for each user. The advantage is that any arbitrary data rates can be achieved by  $\int_{0}^{\infty}$  ying the  $\beta_k$  values. The PRC optimization problem is also generally very difficult to solve directly, since the both continuous variables  $P_{k,l}$  and binary variables to solve directly, since The PRC openinuous variables  $P_{k,l}$  and binary very difficult to solve directly, since the maximum Fairness case, the prudent approach the feasible set is  $\mu$  involves both extra Maximum Fairness case, the prudent approach is to separate the set is a near-optimal cut is to separate the and convex. As you allocation, and to settle for a near-optimal subcarrier and power allocation that can be achieved with manageable complexity. The subcarrier and power subcarrier and power separate the subcarrier and power allocation that can be achieved with manageable complexity. The near optimal subcarrier and power allocation and outlined in [45,46] and a low-complexity implementation

## **Proportional Fairness Scheduling** 4.4.6

The three algorithms we have discussed thus far attempt to *instantaneously* achieve an The three and as the total sum throughput (MSR algorithm), maximum fairness (equal objective among all users), or pre-set proportional retains), maximum fairness (equal objective such as among all users), or pre-set proportional rates for each user. Alternatively, data rates tor each user. Alternatively, one could attempt to achieve such objectives over time, which provides significant adone could devibility to the scheduling algorithms. In this case, in addition to throughput and fairness, a third element enters the tradeoff, which is *latency*. In an extreme case of latency tolerance, the scheduler could simply just wait for the user to get close to the base station before transmitting. In fact, the MSR algorithm achieves both fairness and maximum throughput if the users are assumed to have the same average channels in the long term (on the order of minutes, hours, or more), and there is no constraint with regard to latency. Since latencies even on the order of seconds are generally unacreptable, scheduling algorithms that balance latency and throughput and achieve some degree of fairness are needed. The most popular framework for this type of scheduling is Proportional Fairness (PF) scheduling [49, 50, 52].

The PF scheduler is designed to take advantage of multiuser diversity, while maintaining comparable long-term throughput for all users. Let  $R_k(t)$  denote the instantaneous data rate that user k can achieve at time t, and  $T_k(t)$  be the average throughput for user  $k$  up to time slot  $t$ . The Proportional Fairness scheduler selects the user, denoted as  $k^*$ , with the highest  $R_k(t)/T_k(t)$  for transmission. In the long-term, this is equivalent to selecting the user with the highest instantaneous rate relative to its mean rate. The average throughput  $T_k(t)$  for all users is then updated according to

$$
T_k(t+1) = \begin{cases} \left(1 - \frac{1}{t_c}\right) T_k(t) + \frac{1}{t_c} R_k(t) & k = k^* \\ \left(1 - \frac{1}{t_c}\right) T_k(t) & k \neq k^*. \end{cases} \tag{4.8}
$$

Since the Proportional Fairness scheduler selects the user with the largest instantaneous data rate relative to its average throughput, "bad" channels for each user are unlikely to be selected. On the other hand, users that have been consistently underserved receive scheduling priority, which promotes fairness. The parameter  $t_c$  controls the latency of the system. If  $t_c$  is large, then the latency increases, with the benefit of higher sum throughput. If  $t_c$  is small, the latency decreases since the average throughput values change more quickly, at the expense of some throughput. The Proportional

$$
\frac{1}{\text{max}}
$$

$$
T_k(t+1) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{t_c}\right) T_k(t) + \frac{1}{t_c} \sum_{n \in \Omega_k(t)} R_k(t, n) \tag{4.9}
$$

for  $k=1,2,\ldots,K.$  Other weighted adaptations and evolutions of PF scheduling of OFDMA are certainly possible.  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}}$  and