

Analyzing the behavior of a new Joint Radio Resource Management Strategy

Hermes Irineu Del Monego, José Manuel Oliveira e Manuel Ricardo

Resumo—Este artigo estuda uma nova estratégia de gestão de recursos de rádio em face a dois cenários com diferentes tipos de tráfego. Um cenário considera somente aplicações com tráfego em tempo real, nomeadamente voz e vídeo. No outro cenário, considera-se tráfego em tempo real e não tempo real concorrentemente. A performance desta nova estratégia é comparada com outras duas estratégias bem conhecidas e já encontradas na literatura. Esta comparação foi realizado num contexto onde as redes UMTS e WLAN estão interligadas. Nesta comparação a nova estratégia obteve um baixo número de chamadas bloqueadas para os dois tipos de cenários apresentados.

Palavras-Chave—Renegociação, Realocação, Gestão de recursos, Redes sem fios heterogêneas.

Abstract—This paper studies the performance of a new joint radio resource management strategy in face of two different traffic scenarios. One scenario considers only real-time applications, concretely voice and videostreaming, while the other scenario considers real-time and non-real-time applications running concurrently. The performance analysis is done by comparing the new strategy with two well-known strategies used in scenarios where the UMTS and the WLAN networks are interconnected. In this comparison, the new proposed strategy obtained lower call blocking probabilities for both traffic scenarios.

Keywords—Renegotiation, Reallocation, Resource management, Heterogeneous wireless networks.

I. INTRODUCTION

The concept of fourth generation (4G) networks is characterized by the integration of different heterogeneous networks including celular networks, such as the Universal Mobile Telecommunication System (UMTS), Wireless Local Area Networks (WLANs), usually identified as IEEE 802.11 wireless fidelity (WiFi), and metropolitan wireless access networks, such as WiMAX. The integration of these networks forms one global access network, enabling call transference from one interface to another, seamlessly to the user.

In a context where one telecommunications operator administers different network technologies in the same physical location, a joint and efficient management of those networks resources is desired. This will certainly improve the service offered to the users and, at the same time, will increase the operators' revenue.

This paper proposes a new joint radio resource management (JRRM) strategy for UMTS and WLAN networks, interconnected through the generic interconnection architecture defined by the 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP) [1].

Hermes Irineu Del Monego, INESC Porto, FEUP, Universidade do Porto, UTFPR. José Manuel Oliveira, INESC Porto, FEP, Universidade do Porto. Manuel Ricardo, INESC Porto, FEUP, Universidade do Porto, Portugal. {hmonego,jmo,mricardo}@inescporto.pt

This new strategy, called MTend, bases its behavior in criteria related to user mobility. Additionally, in a scenario of low available resources, the strategy introduces the possibility of renegotiating requests of new calls or reallocating existing calls from one network to another. The performance of the MTend strategy is analyzed in face of two different traffic scenarios where the user is static. One scenario considers only real-time applications, concretely voice and videostreaming, while the other scenario considers real-time and non-real-time applications running concurrently. The performance analysis is done by comparing the new strategy with two well-known strategies used in scenarios where the UMTS and the WLAN networks are interconnected.

In the next section, some important related works are presented. Section III proposes the new strategy for joint management of multi-radio resources, based on user mobility and the renegotiation or reallocation of calls; this section also describes the decision algorithm used to define the interface to which a new call should be allocated. Section IV presents the simulation scenario used to analyze and compare the performance of this new joint radio resource management strategy with two other well-known strategies. Section V analyzes in detail the simulation results. Finally, Section VI presents the main conclusions of this work.

II. RELATED WORK

The joint multi-radio resource management is an well accepted research area in telecommunications. It promotes solutions for the support of Quality of Service (QoS) classes while optimizing the usage of resources.

A strategy based on service classes is proposed in [2], where the authors use two policies: the first policy gives priority to voice calls in GSM EDGE Radio Access Network (GERAN) and interactive traffic in UMTS Terrestrial Radio Access Network (UTRAN); the second inverts the choice. According to the authors, when the mobile stations are close to base station there is no difference between both strategies. In turn, when the distance to the cell increases, more transmission errors may occur due to Wide-Band Code-Division Multiple Access (WCDMA) characteristics, leading to a higher degradation in UTRAN users. In this case, the first policy is the most efficient one.

Two other strategies commonly used in this context are the load balancing (Lbal) and the coverage area (CovAr) strategies, which will be used for comparison with the strategy proposed in this paper. The Lbal strategy is characterized by directing calls to the interface with lowest load, maintaining the interfaces balanced [2], [3], [4].

The CovAr strategy directs calls preferentially to the interface associated to smaller area cell. For example, in hotspots the calls are directed firstly to the WLAN network until it saturates, and then to the UMTS network [3].

III. JRRM BASED ON USER MOBILITY, AND CALL RENEGOTIATION AND REALLOCATION

The multi-radio resource management strategy proposed in this paper, called MTend, aims to maximize the use of the radio resources, while satisfying the QoS requirements posed by the applications.

Fig. 1 represents the structure of the decision algorithm used for the joint management of interconnected UMTS and WLAN radio resources under the control of the same operator. When a new call request arrives, the algorithm decides to which interface it should be directed, based on the call characteristics and resources available. In a scenario where both networks have resources available, the strategy is based on the Mobility Tendency of the users, differentiating applications according to their tendency for mobility. For example, voice calls are inherently mobile, since the probability of a user receiving or starting a call in movement is relatively high. Thus, this strategy gives priority to mobile applications in the UMTS network, in order to avoid vertical handoffs between different network technologies. Applications usually used in static contexts (e.g., web browsing and videostreaming) are accepted preferentially in the WLAN network.




Fig. 1. Joint multi-radio resource management algorithm

In scenarios of insufficient resources, our strategy proposes two complementary mechanisms. The first mechanism consists of renegotiating the resources requested by the new call; the second mechanism considers the possibility of reallocating an accepted call from one network to the other, enabling resources to be freed in the congested network. The renegotiation and reallocation mechanisms require the monitoring of each access network so that their level of congestion can be evaluated.

The renegotiation mechanism consists of two renegotiation tries. In a case where the first try does not succeed, the system enables the application to reduce again the resources requested. Table I contains the renegotiation parameters for the applications used in our study.

The following paragraphs formalize the MTend strategy decision algorithm. The network interface selected to serve the

TABLE I
APPLICATION BIT RATES AND THEIR RENEGOTIATION ALTERNATIVES

Application	Mean bit rate (kbit/s)		
	1 st Request	1 st Renegotiation	2 nd Renegotiation
Voice	24	12	8
Videostreaming	128	64	32
WWW	128	64	32
FTP	128	64	32

new call is chosen according to Eq. (1), where $tend$ represents the decision tendency. The indicator function 1_y is 1 if the event y is true, else it is zero. P_{UMTS} and P_{WLAN} are the eligibility degrees given to an arriving session, respectively to be transported over the UMTS and WLAN interfaces, as shown in Table II.

$$tend = P_{UMTS} * \mathbf{1}_{\eta_{UMTS} \geq \Delta_{\eta r}} - P_{WLAN} * \mathbf{1}_{Bw_{WLAN} \geq r} \quad (1)$$

TABLE II
UMTS AND WLAN ELIGIBILITY DEGREES ACCORDING TO THE USER MOBILITY CRITERION

Application	Eligibility Degree	
	P_{UMTS}	P_{WLAN}
Voice	2	1
Videostreaming	1	2
WWW	1	2
FTP	1	2

The η_{UMTS} and Bw_{WLAN} variables are, respectively, the available UMTS load factor and the available bandwidth in the WLAN interface. In UMTS, the load factor estimates the amount of supported traffic per base station site; in [5], the authors describe the mechanism to obtain the available UMTS load factor. The available bandwidth in the WLAN interface is obtained by monitoring the channel occupation ratio, as described in [6]. $\Delta_{\eta r}$ is the UMTS load factor associated to a new call and it is obtained also as described in [5]. r is the WLAN mean bit rate requested by the new call.

IV. SIMULATION SCENARIO

In order to demonstrate and evaluate the joint radio resource management strategy proposed in this paper, we considered a simulation scenario corresponding to an hotspot located in a shopping center. We adopted simulation scenarios where the number of users varies from 1 to 1000 and, in the busy hour, each user is involved, in average, in 6 calls, each with an average duration of 120s, where the incoming calls follow a Poisson process.

The simulation system was implemented in Network Simulator 3 (NS-3) [7], being the UMTS interface developed as a statistical module, based in [5], [8]. NS-3 already implements the IEEE 802.11 multi-rate standard (i.e., 6 Mbps to 54 Mbps) [9], [6]. Voice and videostreaming applications are modeled as constant bit rate (CBR) and variable bit rate (VBR) traffic, respectively, transported using UDP. WWW and FTP are modeled using the On-Off traffic source implemented in NS-3. The WWW application alternates between the On and

the Off states, while FTP is modeled as constantly On, considering files sufficiently large to occupy a 120s session. WWW and FTP traffic is transported using TCP. We assumed that the UMTS network supports applications with QoS requirements, while the WLAN network does not integrate any mechanism for QoS support.

V. RESULTS ANALYSIS

In this section we present and discuss the results obtained through the simulation of three joint multi-radio resource management strategies using the scenario described in Section IV. The objective is to compare the behavior of the strategy presented in this paper, identified as Mobility Tendency (MTend), with two other strategies, namely the Load Balancing (LBal) strategy and the strategy based in the Coverage Area (CovAr).

We separate the analysis in two different scenarios. The first scenario only considers real-time applications, concretely voice and videostreaming, while the second scenario considers real-time and non-real-time applications running concurrently.

The parameter used to compare the three strategies is the call blocking probability (CBP). This probability is given by

$$CBP(\%) = \left[1 - \frac{C_{accept}}{C_{off}} \right] \times 100,$$

where C_{accept} is the number of application calls accepted, and C_{off} is the total number of calls offered to the system.

A. Real-Time Traffic Scenario

To analyze the behavior of the three joint radio resource management strategies in the presence of real-time traffic, we considered scenarios using voice and videostreaming traffic parameterized according to Table I [10], [11]. We assumed that 50% of the calls are voice calls and the other 50% are videostreaming calls, i.e., only the two first applications from Table II were considered in these simulations.

Fig. 2 (a) shows the average values and the 95% confidence intervals of the call blocking probability for all strategies. These strategies present very high probabilities for a number of users above 600, reaching a call blocking probability of almost 100% between 900 and 1000 users. The MTend strategy presents a performance better than the other two, having a call blocking probability always below the other two strategies until the number of users reaches 500.

The box inside Fig. 2 (a) shows the performance of the resource management strategies for scenarios with a reduced number of users, from 1 to 40. The MTend strategy still has a better performance than the other two strategies in those scenarios, obtaining call blocking probabilities under 2% for a number of users less than 20.

The most interesting analysis should be done for low call blocking probabilities, under 20%, which are the values considered by an operator for a real service provisioning scenario. Fixing a call blocking probability, the gain obtained with the MTend strategy comparing with the concurrent strategy S is given by Eq. (2), where $Users_S$ represents the number of users using the operator's networks with the strategy S .

$$G_{MTend_S}^{CBP} = \frac{|Users_{MTend} - Users_S|}{Users_{MTend}} \quad (2)$$

Considering the call renegotiation mechanism active, for example, for a call blocking probability of 2%, the gain of $G_{MTend_{LBal}}^{2\%} = 6\%$, while for the CovAr strategy, the gain is $G_{MTend_{CovAr}}^{2\%} = 35\%$. It means that the operator supports 6% to 35% more users with the MTend strategy than with the other two resource management strategies, for the given call blocking probability.

Fig. 2 (b) shows the average values and the same confidence intervals for call blocking probability, now assuming that the three strategies integrate the same renegotiation mechanism described in Section III.

Comparing Fig. 2 (a) with 2 (b), becomes clear that the CovAr strategy increases its performance when it uses the renegotiation mechanism; this occurs because of the succeeded renegotiation of calls, mainly in scenarios where the number of users is low (between 100 and 400). Even though, the MTend strategy presents a performance better than the other two, until the number of users reaches 600. This is due mainly to the use of the reallocation mechanism implemented in the MTend strategy, which takes advantage of the resources available at both interfaces. In this case, the reallocation of calls from the congested network to the other network occurs. Above the 600 users, the call inter-arrive interval becomes small and the reallocation mechanism acts more frequently to maintain the networks balanced, what increases the number of blocked calls. Table III summarizes the gain obtained in real-time traffic scenarios with the MTend strategy in comparison with the other two strategies, considering call blocking probabilities varying from 2% to 10%.

TABLE III
GAIN OF MTEND STRATEGY IN RESPECT TO LBAL AND COVAR
FOR REAL-TIME TRAFFIC

CBP(%)	$G_{MTend_S}^{CBP} (\%)$			
	Without Renegotiation		With Renegotiation	
	S=LBal	S=CovAr	S=LBal	S=CovAr
2	8	56	6	35
5	12	33	7	26
10	14	30	9	29

B. Real-Time with Non-Real-Time Traffic Scenario

For the scenario with real-time and non-real-time traffic the simulations considered all the four applications presented in Table I, where the average number of calls made by each user per hour is given as: voice and videostreaming 2 calls, whereas www and FTP users make 1 calls per hour.

Fig. 3 shows the average values and the 95% confidence intervals of the call blocking probability for the three strategies obtained with the introduction of TCP traffic (WWW and FTP), in addition to the real-time traffic (voice and videostreaming). In Fig. 3 (a) the strategies do not integrate the call renegotiation mechanism, while in Fig. 3 (b) this mechanism is integrated in all the three strategies.




Fig. 2. Call blocking probability for real-time traffic, without (a) and with (b) call renegotiation




Fig. 3. Call blocking probability for real-time and non-real-time traffic, without (a) and with (b) call renegotiation

Comparing Fig. 3 (a) with Fig. 3 (b), we conclude that the call renegotiation mechanism increases the performance of all the strategies, although not for the same number of users. However, the call renegotiation mechanism benefits are not so relevant as observed with real-time traffic, in Fig. 2, which means that with TCP traffic the call renegotiation mechanism were less used by the strategies.

Comparing Fig. 3 with Fig. 2, we should stress two aspects. The first aspect has to do with the behavior of the call blocking probability when the number of users increases. In the presence of TCP traffic, the call blocking probability increases much more gradually than when only real-time traffic is present, where this probability increases rapidly between 100 and 500 users. The reason for the gradual increase of call blocking probability in the real-time and non-real-time traffic scenarios is related with the higher diversity of applications competing for the same resources. In this scenario the number of videostreaming calls decreases, which explains the lower call blocking probabilities, even for higher number of users.

The other relevant aspect is associated with the call blocking probability for a low number of users. Comparing the boxes inside Figs. 2 and 3, it can be observed that for the real-time and non-real-time traffic scenario the call blocking probability starts to grow right at the beginning of the graphic, while in real-time traffic scenario this probability remains constantly low until 50 users. However, the MTend strategy outperforms the other two strategies, even for this number of users.

Table IV summarizes the gain obtained in real-time and non-real-time traffic scenarios with the MTend strategy in comparison with the other two strategies, considering call blocking probabilities varying from 2% to 10%. By comparing Table IV with Table III, we can observe that the gains presented by MTend strategy over the other strategies increase for the real-time and non-real-time traffic scenario; that is, the gains in this scenario, which supports also WWW and FTP applications, are higher than in the real-time traffic scenario, where only voice and videostreaming applications were used.

TABLE IV
GAIN OF MTEND STRATEGY IN RESPECT TO LBAL AND COVAR FOR REAL-TIME AND NON-REAL-TIME TRAFFIC

CBP (%)	$G_{MTend_S}^{CBP}$ (%)			
	Without Renegotiation		With Renegotiation	
	S=LBal	S=CovAr	S=LBal	S=CovAr
2	10	60	67	50
5	22	45	50	38
10	36	33	52	42

C. Call Renegotiation

Although the renegotiation mechanism is one of the MTend's features, we decided to apply it also to the other two strategies, for comparing its impact in each strategy's performance. Figures 4 and 5 presents the number of call

renegotiation tries for the three strategies, normalized to the number of incoming calls. This number is bigger for the CovAr strategy, mainly due to the big number of blocked calls in that strategy observed when the renegotiation mechanism is switched off. Thus, the CovAr increases the number of call renegotiations to obtain a better global performance. Figures 4 and 5 enables also to conclude that the number of first renegotiation tries (Figure 4) is bigger for the three strategies than the number of second renegotiation tries (Figure 5). From this analysis, we can conclude that the renegotiation mechanism is an important contribution for the better use of both networks resources, helping to decrease the call blocking probability.




Fig. 4. Percentage of first renegotiation tries




Fig. 5. Percentage of second renegotiation tries

D. Call Reallocation

Figure 6 presents the number of reallocation calls in both interfaces, normalized to the number of incoming calls in each interface. When the number of users is small, there is no need to reallocate calls since both networks have available resources to accept the incoming calls. One can see that the number of reallocation calls in the UMTS interface increases with the increase of the number of users until this reaches 500, while in WLAN the number of reallocation calls decreases along the simulations. This analysis clearly shows that the WLAN interface becomes congested much more earlier than the UMTS interface leaving few space for reallocation calls, while UMTS enables reallocations even for high number of users.




Fig. 6. Percentage of reallocation calls

VI. CONCLUSION

This paper analyzes the impact of real and non-real time traffic on joint radio resource management, presenting a performance analysis of three JRRM strategies for locations simultaneously covered by UMTS and WLAN networks. This analysis compares the behavior of two well-known strategies in this context, one based on the coverage area and the other based on load balancing, with a new strategy proposed by the authors, the MTend strategy.

The simulation results presented in the paper show that the MTend strategy has a performance which is globally better than the two other strategies used for comparison, either in the presence of real-time traffic or in the presence of real-time and non-real-time traffic. Besides accepting more calls, the MTend strategy guaranties a better QoS support for the applications. This strategy tends also to decrease the number of handoffs between the UMTS and the WLAN interfaces, giving priority to voice calls in the UMTS interface.

REFERENCES

- [1] 3GPP, "Mobility Between 3GPP-Wireless Local Area Network (WLAN) Interworking and 3GPP Systems (Release 8)," Services and System Aspects Group, TS-23.327 v.8.2.0, December 2008.
- [2] R. Agustí, "Radio Resource Management in Beyond 3G Systems," in *IEEE Mediterranean Electrotechnical Conference (MELECON 2006)*, 2006, pp. 569–574.
- [3] S. Ramirez, M. Genoves, M. Navarro, R. Skehill, and S. McGrath, "Evaluation of Policy-Based Admission Control Algorithms for a Joint Radio Resource Management Environment," in *IEEE Mediterranean Electrotechnical Conference (MELECON 2006)*, 2006, pp. 599–603.
- [4] A. Tolli, P. Hakalin, and H. Holma, "Performance Evaluation of Common Radio Resource Management (CRRM)," in *IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC 2002)*, 2002, pp. 3429–3433.
- [5] H. Holma and A. Toskala, *WCDMA For UMTS - HSPA Evolution and LTE*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2007.
- [6] H. Zhai, X. Chen, and Y. Fang, "How Well can the IEEE 802.11 Wireless LAN Support Quality of Service?" *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 4, no. 6, pp. 3084–3094, 2005.
- [7] NS-3, "Network Simulator 3." [Online]. Available: <http://www.nsnam.org>
- [8] J. Pérez-Romero, O. Sallent, and R. Agustí, *Radio Resource Management Strategies in UMTS*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2005.
- [9] G. Bianchi, "Performance Analysis of the IEEE 802.11 Distributed Coordination Function," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 535–547, March 2000.
- [10] 3GPP, "Improvement of RRM across RNS and RNS/BSS (Release 5)," Radio Access Network Group, TR-25.881 v.5.0.0, December 2001.
- [11] P. T.-G. D. Staehle, K. Leibnitz, "Source Traffic Modeling of Wireless Applications," University of Wurzburg, Research Report 261, June 2000.