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What is HetNet?

• HetNet could mean a network comprising of different RATs (WiFi, GSM, UMTS/HSPA, LTE, WiMAX)

• In LTE-Advanced term, a HetNet also means a network consisting macrocell, microcell, picocells, RRHs (Remote Radio Heads), femtocells, as well as relay stations.
  – These low-power overlaid Base Stations (BSs) can be either operator deployed or user deployed, and may coexist in the same geographical area, potentially sharing the same spectrum with macrocells.

• This talk focuses on HetNets with different types of access nodes
Why is HetNet important?

• Provide a cost effective roll-out plan with much reduced financial risks for operators.
  – E.g., a green field cable operator can deploy a femto alone network
• Deliver a seamless user experience across outdoor and indoor environments.
• Different RATs (Radio Access Technologies) are designed for different purposes, so are different types of access nodes.
  – One-size-fit-all approach does not work well.
Classification of HetNet access nodes in LTE-A

**TABLE I**

**SPECIFICATION OF DIFFERENT ELEMENTS IN HETNET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of nodes</th>
<th>Transmit Power</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Backhaul</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Macrocell</td>
<td>46 dBm</td>
<td>Few km</td>
<td>S1 interface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picocell</td>
<td>23-30 dBm</td>
<td>&lt;300 m</td>
<td>X2 interface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femtocell</td>
<td>&lt;23 dBm</td>
<td>&lt;50 m</td>
<td>Internet IP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relay</td>
<td>30 dBm</td>
<td>300 m</td>
<td>Wireless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRH</td>
<td>46 dBm</td>
<td>Few km</td>
<td>Fiber</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Technical challenges of HetNets

- **Interference**
- Mobility management and handover
- Self-organization
- Backhauling (4G: peak data rate 1Gbps; B4G > 10 Gbps)
Technical challenges-Interference

- More random
- Dense
- CSG
- Power difference between nodes
- The backhaul network supporting different types of cells may have different bandwidth and delay constraints. E.g., femtocells are unlikely to be connected directly to the core network and thus only limited backhaul signalling for interference coordination is possible.
Source of Interference in HetNets

• **Range expanded users:**
  
  – To address the problems arising due to the power difference between the nodes in HetNets, new cell selection methods that allow user association with cells that provide a weaker DL pilot signal quality are necessary.
  
  – An approach under investigation is that of range expansion, in which an offset is added to the picocell’s (or relay’s) RSS in order to increase its DL coverage footprint. Even though range expansion significantly mitigates cross-tier interference in the UL, this comes at the expense of reducing the DL signal quality of those users in the expanded region.
  
  – Such users may suffer from DL SINRs below 0 dB since they are connected to cells that do not provide the best DL RSS.
Fig. 1 - Dominant DL and UL cross-tier interference scenarios in HetNets
Standardization for HetNet eICIC

• The ICIC methods specified in Rel. 8 and Rel. 9 do not specifically consider HetNet settings and may not be effective for dominant HetNet interference scenarios (Fig. 1).

• In order to address such dominant interference scenarios, enhanced Inter-Cell Interference Coordination (eICIC) techniques were developed for Rel. 10, which can be grouped under three major categories according to:
  – Time-domain techniques.
  – Frequency-domain techniques.
  – Power control techniques.
eICIC – Time Domain Techniques: Subframe alignment

• **Almost Blank Subframes (ABSFs) at femtocells**
  – As shown in Fig. 2(c). In the ABSFs, no control or data signals, but only reference signals are transmitted.

• When there are MUEs in the vicinity of a femtocell, they can be scheduled within the subframes overlapping with the ABSFs of the femtocell, which significantly mitigates cross-tier interference.

• Similar eICIC approach using ABSFs can also be used to mitigate interference problems in **picocells (and relays)** that implement range-expansion.
  – When no interference coordination is used for range-expanded picocell users (Fig. 2(b)), they observe large DL interference from the macrocell. The interference problem can be mitigated **through using ABSFs at the macrocell**, and scheduling range-expanded picocell users within the subframes that are overlapping with the ABSFs of the macrocell.
Fig. 2 - ABSFs for time-domain eICIC for HetNets
eICIC – Frequency Domain Techniques

• In frequency-domain eICIC solutions, control channels and physical signals (i.e., synchronization signals and reference signals) of different cells are scheduled in reduced bandwidths in order to have totally orthogonal transmission of these signals at different cells. While frequency-domain orthogonalization may be achieved in a static manner, it may also be implemented dynamically through victim UE detection.

• For instance, victim MUEs can be determined by the macro eNBs by utilizing the measurement reports of the MUEs, and their identity may be signaled by the macro eNB to the home eNB(s) through the backhaul. Alternatively, victim MUEs may also be sensed by the home eNBs.
eICIC – Power Control Techniques

• Apply different power control techniques at femtocells.
  – While reducing the radiated power at a femtocell also reduces the total throughput of femtocell users, it may significantly improve the performance of victim MUEs.

• Let $P_{\text{max}}$ and $P_{\text{min}}$ denote the maximum and minimum home eNB transmit powers, respectively, $P_M$ denotes the received power from the strongest co-channel macro eNB at a home eNB, $\alpha$ and $\beta$ denote two scalar power control variables.

• Then, four different DL power control approaches at femtocells can be listed as follows (all values are in dBm) :

HetNet eICIC – Power Control Techniques

1) Strongest macro eNB received power at a home eNB: The femtocell transmission power can be written as
   \[ P_{tx} = \max \left( \min(\alpha P_M + \beta, P_{max}), P_{min} \right) \].

2) Path loss between a home eNB and MUE: The home eNB transmission power can be set as
   \[ P_{tx} = \text{med}(P_M + P_{ofst}, P_{max}, P_{min}) \], where the power offset is defined by
   \[ P_{ofst} = \text{med}(P_{ipl}, P_{ofst-max}, P_{ofst-min}) \], with \( P_{ipl} \) denoting a power offset value that captures the indoor path loss and the penetration loss between home eNB and the nearest MUE, and \( P_{ofst-max} \) and \( P_{ofst-min} \) denote the minimum and maximum values of \( P_{ofst} \), respectively.

3) Objective SINR of HUE: In this approach, the received SINRs of home eNB users (HUEs) are restricted to a target value and transmit power at a femtocell is
HetNet eICIC – Power Control Techniques

reduced appropriately to achieve this target SINR using the following expression: \( P_{tx} = \max(P_{min}, \min(PL + P_{rec,HUE}, P_{max})) \), where \( P_{rec,HUE} = 10 \log_{10} \left( 10^{I/10} + 10^{N_0/10} \right) + \text{SINR}_{tar} \), with \( I \) being the interference detected by the served UE, \( N_0 \) is the background noise power, \( \text{SINR}_{tar} \) is the target SINR for the HUE, and \( PL \) is the path loss estimate between the home eNB and the HUE.

4) **Objective SINR of MUE:** The goal of this approach is to guarantee a minimum SINR at the MUEs, and the home eNB transmit power is given by \( P_{tx} = \max(\min(\alpha P_{\text{SINR}} + \beta, P_{max}), P_{min}) \), where \( P_{\text{SINR}} \) is the SINR of the MUE considering only the nearest femtocell interference.
Fig. 3 - Simulation set up

![Simulation Diagram with Picocells and Femtocells]

- Picocell
- Femtocells

Distance (m) vs Distance (m) with Power (dBm) range from -50 to -100.
Simulation set up

• The scenario is a residential area of size 300m × 300m in Luton (UK), containing 400 houses of which 63 were selected to host a CSG femtocell
  – Assuming 3 operators with equal customer share, this corresponds to an approximate 50% femto penetration.

• The scenario is also covered by one macrocell located 200m south and 200m east from the scenario’s center, and one picocell deployed at the macrocell edge.

• Both macrocell and picocell operate in open access.

• Eight VoIP mobile users move along predefined paths according to a pedestrian model of mean speed 1.1m/s.
Simulation set up

• The picocell and the femtocells are fully loaded and therefore utilize all subcarriers.

• The cell power is uniformly distributed between subcarriers, and a pedestrian user carrying a VoIP service is considered to fall in outage if it cannot receive control data (i.e., user SINR is smaller than $-4$ dB for a time interval of 200ms).
Macrocell - Femtocell Interaction

• Fig. 4 illustrates the SINR of a pedestrian user when passing by the front door of two different houses hosting a femtocell.

• It can be seen that when no action is taken at the femtocells (no eICIC), the SINR of the pedestrian user significantly falls due to the cross-tier interference, thus resulting in UE outage.

• On the other hand, when eICIC is applied, the MUE SINR recovers and outages vanish.
  – In this case, an eICIC action is triggered by the macrocell in the femtocells when MUEs report low signal quality using channel quality indicators, i.e., user SINR smaller than -3 dB.
Fig. 4 SINR versus time of a victim MUE when passing close to two houses hosting a CSG femtocell.
Macrocell - Femtocell Interaction

• The \textit{ABSF eICIC time} method provides the best MUE protection since those subframes overlapping with the ABSFs of femtocells are not interfered. The different eICIC power methods result in distinct levels of signal quality protection for the victim MUE.

• The behavior of these eICIC techniques depends on their nature and tuning, but there is always a tradeoff between the performance of both victim MUE and aggressing femtocell.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>elCIC methods</th>
<th>Number of macro-pico HOs</th>
<th>Number of PUE outages</th>
<th>Number of MUE outages</th>
<th>Average elCIC TP gain at a femto [Mbps]</th>
<th>Average sum TP of pedestrian users [kbps]</th>
<th>Average sum TP of femtocell tier [Mbps]</th>
<th>elCIC actions femto-10 min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no elCIC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>73.32 (100%)</td>
<td>156.03</td>
<td>3974.25</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elCIC time</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2158.82</td>
<td>2990.50</td>
<td>14.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elCIC power 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.02 (15.03%)</td>
<td>1937.26</td>
<td>3153.88</td>
<td>14.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha = 1, \beta = 60$dB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46.49 (63.41%)</td>
<td>1139.20</td>
<td>3725.88</td>
<td>56.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elCIC power 1*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34.49 (47.03%)</td>
<td>1499.30</td>
<td>3558.75</td>
<td>20.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha = 1, \beta = 75$dB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22.55 (30.75%)</td>
<td>1626.61</td>
<td>3333.75</td>
<td>17.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elCIC power 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.74 (46.02%)</td>
<td>1281.21</td>
<td>3520.75</td>
<td>47.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elCIC power 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.74 (66.05%)</td>
<td>1183.35</td>
<td>3751.13</td>
<td>39.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{SINR}_{\text{FUE}}^{\text{tar}} = 0$dB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elCIC power 3*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{SINR}_{\text{FUE}}^{\text{tar}} = 5$dB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elCIC power 4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{SINR}_{\text{MUE}}^{\text{tar}} = 5$dB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
System Level Femtocell Simulation

- Example: Feasibility of OFDMA WiMAX Femtocells
  - Traffic, mobility and user repartition.
  - Computation of interference matrix.
  - Optimization method for frequency planning.
  - Computation of user data rates.
  - Test of different allocation/density/access method scenarios.
Sub-channel allocation strategies

- Same Channel (Worst Case)
- Random
  - Without knowledge of the macrocell sub-channels
  - Taking into account the macrocell sub-channels
- FRS 1X1X3 (1 BS *1 Cell * 3 Frequencies)
- Optimization method
  - Only femto
  - Femto and macro
**DFP (Dynamic Frequency Planning)**

- **Minimization Problem and Constraints**

The problem is to:

\[
\min \sum_{i \in N} \sum_{j \in N} \sum_{k \in NF} \frac{W_{ij}}{D_i \cdot D_j} y_{i,j,k}
\]

subject to:

\[
\sum_{k=0}^{NF} x_{i,k} = D_i \quad \forall i, k
\]

\[
y_{i,j,k} \geq x_{i,k} + x_{j,k} - 1 \quad \forall i, j, k
\]

\[
y_{i,j,k} \geq 0 \quad \forall i, j, k
\]

\[
x_{i,k} \in \{0,1\} \quad \forall i, k
\]

- \(N\) number of sectors, \(\{1, \ldots n_i, \ldots N\}\)
- \(NF\) number of subchannels, \(\{1, \ldots f_k, \ldots NF\}\)
- \(D_i\) requested subchannels by the \(i\)-sector
- \(W_{i,j}\) interference restriction between the \(i\)-sector and the \(j\)-sector

\(x_{i,k}\) is defined as:

\[
x_{i,k} = \begin{cases} 
0, & \text{the } i\text{-sector is not using the } k\text{-frequency} \\
1, & \text{the } i\text{-sector is using the } k\text{-frequency}
\end{cases}
\]
### Sub-channel allocation strategies results [3]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>method</th>
<th>Cost function</th>
<th>Throughput kbps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same channel</td>
<td>2256.0</td>
<td>3168.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlucky random</td>
<td>607.9</td>
<td>4752.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucky random</td>
<td>325.7</td>
<td>5702.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRS 1X3X1</td>
<td>143.5</td>
<td>5913.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optim femto</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>6336.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optim femto &amp; macro</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>6652.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Femto Deployment in a UK Residential Area (1/5)

Typical Scenario in Luton, UK - Pico cell coverage

- Pico cell + Femto cell co-deployment
  - Pico cell for outdoor coverage
  - Femto cell for indoor coverage
Femto Deployment in a UK Residential Area (2/5)

Typical Scenario in Luton, UK - pico cell + femto cell

- Strong signal leakage to outdoor from femto cell
  - Ping-pong effect for outdoor users
  - Decreased signal quality
- Needs to be mitigated to prevent interference

![Diagram showing signal leakage and coverage areas](image-url)
Confine signal within indoor to minimize signal leakage
  - Reduce Tx power of HNB/HeNB
  - Adjust antenna orientation
Femto Deployment in a UK Residential Area (4/5)

*Typical Scenario in Luton, UK - Interference optimization*

- 3D display with three cuts
Femto Deployment in a UK Residential Area (5/5)

Typical Scenario in Luton, UK - Interference optimization

- 3D display inside a room.
Some of our early work on femtocells

- All the above papers attracted a large number of citations
- …… our other work (joint channel, power and MCS allocation, distributed approach, decoupling of DL and UL in HetNet, eICIC in HetNet)
CWiND simulation platform
**iBuildNet® - Main Features**

### 3D Building Modeling
- Auto recognition of *floor plan* in CAD files
- Auto recognition of different kinds of *walls*
- Auto recognition of *doors and windows*
- Auto recognition of *columns*
- Ability to add *floor, ceiling, and other objects*
- Built-in *apartment, lift models etc*

### 3D DAS Design
- Passive/Active/Hybrid DAS design
- Repeaters, base stations as signal source
- Rich device database
- Femto/WiFi deployment
- Automatic antenna placement*

### 3D Wireless system evaluation
- Built-in accurate 3D propagation models
- Match most of typical building materials
- Tradeoff between accuracy and efficiency
- Cross-floor signal propagation
- Verification of prop. model with measurements
- Coverage prediction for different services
- Handover prediction and planning

### Joint Indoor + outdoor HetNet P&O
- Hybrid Indoor/outdoor DAS planning & optimisation
- Campus wide joint indoor-outdoor HetNet planning & optimisation (P&O)
- High-rising building interference control & optimisation
- Indoor signal leakage mitigation
- Signal evaluation of Outdoor basestations

### Multi-System and Multi-band
- WLAN
- GSM
- WCDMA
- TD-SCDMA
- CDMA 2000
- WiMAX
- LTE-FDD
- TD-LTE
- LTE-Advanced
Conclusions

• HetNets have the potential to significantly boost network performance, benefiting from transmitter-to-receiver distance reduction and enabling better spatial reuse of the spectrum.

• In this talk, the major advantages of HetNets, as well as their technical challenges are discussed.

• Particular attention has been given to the avoidance of cross-tier interference due to its crucial role in proper operation of multi-tier networks.

• Furthermore, the main eICIC techniques currently under discussion in 3GPP have been evaluated through realistic system-level simulations.
Conclusions

• Dense femto cell deployment is studied, automatic channel allocation based on reducing the overall system interference can significantly improve throughput.

• A tool to study HetNet is illustrated in a femto/pico scenarios, by adjusting femto Tx power and antena orientation, interference can be significantly reduced.

• The tool opens many opportunities to study HetNets in indoor-outdoor scenarios.
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Coverage of a macrocell
Coverage of femtocells
Coverage of one femtocell
Technical challenges - SON

• **Self-configuration**: where newly deployed cells are automatically configured by downloaded software before entering into the operational state.

• **Self-healing**: where cells can automatically perform failure recovery or execute compensation mechanisms whenever failures occur.

• **Self-optimization**: where cells constantly monitor the network status and optimize their settings to improve coverage and reduce interference.

• **Self-planning**
Technical challenges - SON

• Without SON, HetNet can’t work well.

• Self-organized HetNet is challenging task due to the following reasons:
  – Various type of coexisting cells
  – The increasing number of network parameters that need to be considered.
  – The random, uneven and time-varying nature of user arrivals and their resulting traffic load.

• SON is key to all types of access nodes, small cells highlight its importance.
Technical challenges - backhaul

• High data rates: e.g., 4G has 1Gbps peak data rate
• Complex topology of the various type of coexisting cells.
• Possible backhaul solutions
  – Some cells may have dedicated interfaces to the core network.
  – Some cells may form a cluster to aggregate and forward the traffic to the core.
  – Some other cells may rely on relays as an alternative interface.
• The backhaul solution is likely to be a mixture of both wireless and wired backhaul technologies.
  – To start with, LTE outdoor cells can use wireless backhaul
  – FTTx will be important when the network evolves
Technical challenges-handover

- In HetNets, due to the large number of small cells and the different types of backhaul links available for each type of cell, handover becomes a challenge.
- The probability of handover failure increases the probability of user outage.