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Abstract—Radio access network (RAN) cost savings are expected in future cloud RAN (C-RAN). In contrast to traditional distributed RAN architectures, in C-RAN, remote radio heads (RRHs) from different sites can share baseband processing resources from virtualized baseband unit pools placed in a few central locations (COs). Due to the stringent requirements of the several interfaces needed in C-RAN, optical networks have been proposed to support C-RAN. One of the key elements that needs to be considered are optical transponders. Specifically, sliceable bandwidth-variable transponders (SBVTs) have recently shown many advantages for core optical transport networks. In this paper, we study the connectivity requirements of C-RAN applications and conclude that dynamicity, fine granularity, and elasticity are needed. However, there is no SBVT implementation that supports those requirements, and thus, we propose and assess an SBVT architecture based on dynamic optical arbitrary generation/measurement. We consider different long-term evolution-advanced configurations and study the impact of the centralization level in terms of the capital expense and operating expense. An optimization problem is modeled to decide which COs should be equipped and which equipment, including transponders, needs to be installed. The results show noticeable cost savings from installing the proposed SBVTs compared to installing fixed transponders. Finally, compared to the maximum centralization level, remarkable cost savings are shown when a lower level of centralization is considered.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Radio access technology evolution and centralized radio access network (RAN) architectures [1,2] reveal new paradigms in next-generation mobile networks. The commercial availability of technologies such as long-term evolution (LTE) requiring high-capacity and strict delay constraints for complex coordination schemes among their base stations, and the ever-increasing total cost of ownership (TCO) in mobile networks [including both capital expenditures (CAPEX) and operational expenditures (OPEX)] to satisfy the expected cell site’s demand increment [2,3] motivate research towards centralized RAN architectures. We refer the reader to the studies in [4] and [5] regarding advances in centralized RAN.

Among the main factors contributing to CAPEX increases are the need to deploy more base stations, new building locations, radio frequency (RF) and baseband hardware, and power and cooling equipment acquisition. As for OPEX increases, site rental and power consumption are among the most meaningful contributing factors.

In traditional distributed RAN architectures, RF and baseband processing hardware are co-located in the cell site and are not shared among different sites. In centralized RAN architectures, baseband processing is not only separated from RF processing hardware, i.e., remote radio heads (RRHs), but it is also centralized and can be shared among different sites and even virtualized in baseband unit (BBU) pools [6]. Benefits from sharing BBU pools and statistical multiplexing in non-uniform traffic scenarios have been studied in [2,7].

According to [8], centralized RAN architectures can be implemented in different variations, including BBU clouds. In this paper, we refer to cloud RAN (C-RAN). In C-RAN, virtualized BBU pools running in virtual machines (VMs) are hosted in different central locations and can be flexibly configured, and serve RRHs from various virtualized BBU pools each time. The authors of [9] presented a 3-layered logical structure for C-RAN, taking advantage of computation in a cloud environment.

Because of the stringent requirements of the several interfaces needed in C-RAN and the maturity and evolution of different optical network technologies, optical networks have been proposed to support both the fronthaul network connecting RRHs and BBUs and the backhaul network connecting the BBUs to each other and to their peering point in the mobile core network. For the fronthaul, the authors of [10] proposed the use of wavelength division multiplexing (WDM) technology, and reported a practical implementation with links up to 10 Gb/s interconnecting RRHs and BBUs. For the backhaul, elastic optical networks (EONs), as well as dynamic customer virtual networks (CVNs), can be considered [11].

To interface the optical layer, there are several types of transponders that can be used in both the fronthaul and the backhaul: (i) fixed transponders (FT) that transmit at a fixed bit rate, e.g., 40 Gb/s, (ii) bandwidth-variable transponders (BVTs) that can adapt their bit rate up to a maximum capacity, e.g., 400 Gb/s, and (iii) sliceable...
bandwidth-variable transponders (SBVTs) that can be shared among a number of optical connections.

So far, SBVTs have been proposed for core networks where every slice is used to support large-capacity lightpaths, e.g., 100 Gb/s and above [12,13]. However, SBVTs can be utilized in the metro segment (e.g., to support C-RAN) as long as they can provide finer granularity, e.g., 10–25 Gb/s. Specifically for C-RAN applications, such a fine granularity would allow supporting both the fronthaul and the backhaul networks.

In this paper, we first study in Section II RAN requirements in terms of dynamicity, granularity, and elasticity and the considered architecture model based on LTE. Next, in Section III, we review state-of-the-art SBVTs and conclude that no existing architecture fully supports the requirements for C-RAN applications. Given that, we propose an SBVT architecture based on dynamic optical arbitrary waveform generation and measurement (DOAWG/DOAWM) [14] that perfectly meets the requirements of these applications.

In Section IV, we propose a mixed integer linear programming (MILP) model for dimensioning locations hosting virtualized BBU pools (i.e., central offices, COs) to minimize CAPEX, while taking into account the different interfaces needed. Although the authors of [15] proposed an energy-efficient WDM aggregation network, and formally defined the BBU placement optimization problem as an integer linear programming (ILP) model aiming at optimizing the aggregation network in terms of power, and the authors of [16] recently proposed an ILP model for optimal BBU hotel placement over WDM networks in centralized RAN, few models can be found in the literature considering optical network equipment in C-RAN.

The proposed SBVT architecture is assessed in Section V. Next, the MILP model is used to compare the FTs and the proposed SBVTs from the CAPEX perspective and to study the impact of the centralization level in C-RAN architectures in representative scenarios supported by optical networks. From the resulting CO design, the impact of the centralization level is also studied from the OPEX perspective regarding network equipment power consumption.

II. RADIO ACCESS NETWORKS

A. Distributed and Centralized RAN

Figure 1 illustrates both distributed and centralized RAN architectures. In distributed RAN, RF and baseband hardware are co-located in the site and are not shared with other sites, whereas in centralized RAN, BBUs from different locations are co-located in the same BBU pool and can be shared between the various RRHs throughout the day.

From the mobile core network perspective, both distributed and centralized architectures require the interconnection of the base stations and their peering point through a backhaul network (e.g., MPLS over an optical network). In addition to backhaul connections transporting user and control data (S1 interface), interconnection among neighboring cells’ base stations may also be required (X2 interface). While latencies of the order of tens of milliseconds are allowed in S1 interfaces, tight coordination schemes between base stations led to maximum delays allowed of the order of hundreds of microseconds for the X2 interface, thus limiting the maximum distance between base stations requiring coordination.

Moreover, compared to distributed RAN, centralized RAN architectures require a fronthaul network aiming at providing connectivity between RRHs and BBUs in remote BBU pools and convey radio interface data. Among the different radio interface protocols, Common Public Radio Interface (CPRI) [17] is widely used. CPRI is a bidirectional protocol, and its bit rate is constant and depends on the cell site configuration. Figure 1 illustrates the logical links supporting CPRI, S1, and X2 interfaces in the centralized approach. In LTE and LTE-advanced (LTE-A) technologies, CPRI requires not only a huge capacity (of the order of Gb/s and tens of Gb/s), but also strict delay constraints (of the order of a few hundred microseconds round-trip time, RTT).

B. C-RAN Architecture Model

In this paper, we consider a reference scenario based on LTE and LTE-A technologies, where a set of geographically distributed RRHs covers certain regions and virtualized BBU pools are hosted in the main COs. In addition, the peering point is located in a core CO, which hosts, among others, the mobility management entity (MME) and the serving gateway (S-GW) functions, which, in turn, could be virtualized according to [6].

To provide the required capacity to support load fluctuations in different areas during the day, some of those RRHs can be activated or deactivated. Let us assume the activation (deactivation) of those RRHs can be done through the corresponding entity in charge of the control and management of the C-RAN. RRHs are connected to end points through fiber links. To support CPRI links, connections from end points to COs can be effectively implemented and dynamically modified, allowing a given RRH to be assigned to different virtualized BBU pools throughout the day. Moreover, to support handover and
tight coordination schemes, among others, coordination among active and neighboring RRH needs to be considered; thus, X2 interfaces between virtualized BBU in remote virtualized BBU pools are required. It is worth noting that, due to the strict delay limitations required in X2 interfaces, not all BBU in virtualized BBU pools in distant COs might be accessible among them. Finally, S1 links toward the core CO (hosting MME and S-GW) also need to be established over the backhaul network; we assume the network is based on MPLS.

Figure 2 depicts an example of the reference scenario, where a set of RRHs corresponding to macro base stations (MBS) covers large areas, and a set of small cells’ RRHs covers smaller areas for capacity management according to the traffic demand fluctuation at different hours. The next section discusses the problem of minimizing CAPEX costs to equip main COs while satisfying demands at any time for all cells; CPRI, S1, and X2 interfaces requirements and limitations, such as capacity and maximum delay constraints, are considered.

Different centralization levels of C-RAN will be studied in this paper, targeted at minimizing CAPEX regarding the cost needed to equip COs. Those centralization levels vary during the day to cope with the load the network needs to serve.

For illustrative purposes, Fig. 3 presents the required connections between COs hosting BBU pools and the core CO hosting both the MME and the S-GW for three representative hours of the day considering two different traffic profiles (business and residential); the connections’ capacities to support S1 interfaces are also shown.

At 4 a.m. (the off-peak period for both business and residential traffic profiles), active RRHs can be served from BBU pools hosted in two COs (COs 1 and 2). However, during the peak business hour, at 12 p.m., additional RRHs corresponding to small cells need to be activated. Interestingly, new BBU pools (hosted in COs 3, 4, and 5) are used to serve all the active RRHs at that time; the connections’ capacity fluctuations between COs 1 and 2 and the core CO are also observed. Similarly, during the residential peak hour, at 9 p.m., the BBU pool in CO 6 is used in addition to BBU pools in COs 1, 2, and 4. However, no RRHs are served from COs 3 and 5, and thus, no connection is required between them and the core CO. Compared to the connections’ capacities at 12 p.m., fluctuations in the required capacity between COs 2 and 4 and the core CO can be observed. As a consequence, C-RAN clearly requires dynamic, elastic, and fine granularity (ranging from 10 to 100 Gb/s) optical connections.

III. SBVT ARCHITECTURE ENABLING 5G MOBILE NETWORKS

A. SBVT Architectures

As a key component of EONs, SBVTs implement a range of functions, including support of multiple bit rates (e.g., from 10 Gb/s to 1 Tb/s), and dynamically changeable modulation formats and baud rates. To increase the flexibility of EONs, SBVTs include multiple sub-transponders [13]. This capability enables flexibility using two methods: (i) by freely configuring the modulation format of each subcarrier and (ii) by enabling the operation of each subcarrier either as a single-carrier transponder or as part of a larger superchannel through the logical separation of flows with different destinations [12,13].

A few studies conducted on the use of SBVTs show the numerous benefits that can be achieved. The common
conclusion is that thanks to their flexibility, SBVTs have attractive features in terms of programmable rate per destinations, cost reduction when migrating towards high-rate superchannels, and prospects for the integrability of several transponder elements into a single chip [13,18].

At the physical layer, SBVTs can be implemented using coherent optical orthogonal frequency division multiplexing (CO-OFDM), coherent optical WDM (CO-WDM), Nyquist WDM [19], or DOAWG/DOAWM technologies.

The key element inside the SBVT is the optical front end, which is the module distributing different traffic demands over several sub-carriers, which are then grouped into superchannels. The front end contains a set of sub-carrier generation modules. The sub-carrier generation module consists of either an array of independent laser sources (multi-source, as in Nyquist WDM) or a single multi-wavelength source (i.e., a source able to generate several optical carriers from a single laser), as in the cases of CO-WDM or DOAWG/DOAWM. In the former case, all laser sources are independent, i.e., their central frequency can be configured to any value within the C-band and without additional constraints. In the latter case, the frequencies within the multi-wavelength source are not independent, and thus, they have to be contiguous with a spectral separation, typically limited within few tens of gigahertz. However, a multi-wavelength source can be less expensive and guarantees more stability than independent laser sources, hence enabling better sub-carrier spacing when the sliceable capability is not exploited (i.e., all sub-carriers are co-routed and contiguous), in turn guaranteeing higher spectral efficiency [13,18].

Whereas all of the SBVT implementations mentioned above can cope with the requirements for superchannel generation, most of them lack the flexibility to efficiently accommodate fine-granularity connections (e.g., 10 Gb/s). To cope with the dynamic, elastic, and fine-granularity C-RAN scenarios’ connection requirements, it is important that SBVTs be capable of fully exploiting the flexibility of EON networks. This means that, apart from generating superchannels, it is necessary to provide the feature of generating more channels than sub-carriers when the connection requests are as slow as 10 Gb/s (or even slower) to optimize the SBVT capacity utilization.

B. DOAWG-Based SBVT Architecture

The capability of DOAWG to arbitrarily shape a waveform in time and frequency by Fourier synthesis and by a combination of multiple spectral slices makes it possible to implement the SBVT functionality and requirements discussed previously naturally. For instance, Fig. 4 shows a DOAWG-based SBVT generating multiple channels of different bandwidths and modulation formats directed to different destinations.

It should be noted that digital signal processing (DSP) for DOAWG allows the generation of sub-channels as well as superchannels (see Fig. 4) according to the connection requirements. In particular, as shown in Fig. 4 (center and bottom), the number of optical channels is not limited by the number of frequency comb lines, and it is possible to generate a number of optical channels greater than the number of comb lines and spectral slices. This allows for a more efficient and flexible utilization of the SBVT capacity, and avoids the need for grooming finer connections, since it can generate a channel as narrow as requested. This is not possible when using Nyquist WDM or coherent WDM. Finally, it is important to point out that the DOAWG DSP usually applies to subgroups of comb lines and spectral slices, as shown in Fig. 4. This guarantees that it is possible to redo the DSP for some spectral slices without affecting neighbors’ channels (so the reconfiguration can be hitless). Figure 4 shows that the reconfiguration going from four channels in Fig. 4(a) to three channels in Fig. 4(b) and five channels in Fig. 4(c) affects only the first two DOAWG spectral slices.

DOAWG-based SBVT can be implemented using a high-speed field programmable gate array (FPGA) and digital-to-analog converters (DACs), along with other optical front-end components [optical frequency combs (OFCs), modulators, wavelength-selective switches (WSSs)]. The FPGA and DACs form the electric core of the SBVT, which corresponds to the generation of sub- and superchannels. Figure 5(a) shows the schematic diagram of a two-slice SBVT-electric core (SBVT-EC). It maps a high-volume data sequence, like the 400 Gbit/s Cisco client interface, into multiple sub- and superchannels according to the NC&M functions. The NC&M tell the SBVT how many sub-channels need to be provided, and the required baud rate and modulation format for each of them. Once the number of sub-channels and the baud rate/modulation is decided, similar to the conventional sub-carrier multiplexing, the target waveform can be calculated through Tx DSP, which includes symbol mapping, data rate adjusting, filtering, and frequency shifting [20]. The FPGA then sends the time-domain samples of the target waveform to the DACs for waveform generation. Figure 5(b) presents the system diagram for the two-slice SBVT generation. We select two tones from the OFC using a WSS and send them into two I/Q modulators. Two complex outputs (I1/Q1 and I2/Q2)
from the SBVT-EC are utilized to drive the two modulators, forming two phase-coherent spectral slices. The second WSS combines the two slices to create a large-bandwidth superchannel.

IV. C-RAN CAPEX MINIMIZATION PROBLEM

Once the DOAWG-based SBVT has demonstrated its feasibility and applicability to C-RAN scenarios, let us focus on the C-RAN CAPEX minimization (CRAM) problem for dimensioning CO locations to minimize CAPEX. In line with other network CAPEX minimization problems (e.g., see [21]), the CRAM problem assumes a known capacity will be provided.

A. Problem Statement

The CRAM problem can be formally stated as follows: Given:

- A set of geographically distributed RRHs $H$, with $N(h)$ representing the subset of RRHs neighboring RRH $h$; i.e., near RRHs operating at the same frequency band and requiring X2 interface links between them to interconnect their respective BBUs, and with $H(t)$ representing the subset of $H$ with the RRHs to be activated at time $t$.
- The tuple $(\alpha_h, \beta_h, \gamma_h)$ representing the required capacity by RRH $h$ for CPRI, S1, and X2 interfaces, respectively, in the case where it is active. Since the required capacity is constant and depends on the configuration, it can be precomputed in advance.
- A set $V$ of VMs’ configurations with capabilities for BBU pool virtualization; each VM configuration $v$ is defined by its cost $\xi_v$, and the number of BBUs it can virtualize $\lambda_v$; let us assume that one BBU can serve one RRH.
- A set of transponders $P$, each transponder $p$ consists of a set of DSP modules $D(p)$, where the capacity of each module is $\sigma_p$, and its cost is $\kappa_p$; since gray or colored transponders may be considered to support different interfaces, the parameters $\sigma_{p,\text{CPRI}}$, $\sigma_{p,\text{S1}}$, and $\sigma_{p,\text{X2}}$ indicate if $p$ can support CPRI, S1, or X2 interface links, respectively.

- A set of line cards $C$; each line card $c$ can support one type of transponder, and it is defined by its cost $\kappa_c$ and the number of ports to plug in transponders $\eta_c$.
- A set of MPLS equipment $E$; each switch $e$ is defined by its cost $\kappa_e$, its switching capacity $\sigma_e$, and the number of available slots $\rho_e$ to plug in line cards; the parameter $\eta_e$ represents if equipment $e$ can support card $c$.
- A set $O$ of the main COs; each main CO can be equipped with a predefined configuration of VMs and with an MPLS switch.
- $O(h)$ represents the subset of main COs that can be reached by RRH $h$ without exceeding the delay imposed by the CPRI requirements.
- $U(o)$ accounts for the subset of main COs that can be reached from the main CO $o$ without violating the X2 delay constraints.
- A core CO with functions for MME and S-GW, along with others.

Objective: minimize the cost of the VMs’ configurations, MPLS equipment, line cards, and transponders to install in each main CO.

B. Mathematical Model

The following sets and parameters have been defined:

- $H$ Set of RRHs.
- $O$ Set of main COs.
- $V$ Set of VMs’ configurations that can be equipped in main COs.
- $E$ Set of MPLS equipment that can be equipped in main COs.
- $T$ Set of hours.
- $P$ Set of transponders.
- $D(p)$ Set of DSP modules of transponder $p$.
- $C$ Set of line card types.
- $H(t)$ Subset of $H$ with RRHs active at time $t$.
- $N(h)$ Subset of $H$ with RRHs neighboring $h$.
- $O(h)$ Subset of $O$ with main COs that can be accessed by RRH $h$ without exceeding the CPRI delay constraint.
- $U(o)$ Subset of $O$ with main COs that can be reached from main CO $o$ without exceeding the X2 delay constraint.
- $\lambda_v$ Number of VMs in VMs’s configuration $v$.
- $\alpha_h$ Capacity required in CPRI link by RRH $h$ in the case of being active.
- $\beta_h$ Capacity required in S1 interface link by RRH $h$ in the case of being active.
- $\gamma_h$ Capacity required in X2 interface link by RRH $h$ in the case of being active.
- $\sigma_p$ Capacity of DSP module of transponder $p$.
- $\kappa_c$ Capacity of line card of transponder $p$.
- $\eta_c$ if transponder $p$ can support CPRI links.
- $\eta_{\text{S1}}$ if transponder $p$ can support S1 interface links.
- $\eta_{\text{X2}}$ if transponder $p$ can support X2 interface links.
- $\xi_{\text{CPRI}}$ Number of ports in line card type $c$ to support transponder $p$.
- $\xi_{\text{S1}}$, $\xi_{\text{X2}}$, $\xi_{\text{CPRI}}$ if line card type $c$ does not support transponder $p$. 
\[\sigma_e\] Available capacity in equipment \(e\).
\[\rho_e\] Number of available slots in equipment \(e\).
\(\eta_{ec}\) 1 if equipment \(e\) can support line card type \(c\); 0 otherwise.
\(\kappa_v\) Cost of VM configuration \(v\).
\(\kappa_p\) Cost of transponder \(p\).
\(\kappa_c\) Cost of line card type \(c\).
\(\kappa_e\) Cost of equipment \(e\).

**bigM** Large positive constant.

**Decision variables:**

- \(x_{oc}\) Binary. 1 if CO \(o\) is equipped with a VM configuration \(v\); 0 otherwise.
- \(y_{oe}\) Binary. 1 if CO \(o\) is equipped with equipment \(e\); 0 otherwise.
- \(l_{oc}\) Integer. Number of cards of type \(c\) to equip in \(o\).
- \(a_{op}\) Integer. Number of transponders \(p\) in CO \(o\).
- \(z_{hot}\) Binary. 1 if RRH \(h\) is assigned to CO \(o\) at time \(t\); 0 otherwise.
- \(w_{hoe}t\) Integer. Number of X2 interface links required between COs \(o\) and \(o'\) by RRH \(h\) at time \(t\).
- \(r_{hotp}\) Binary. 1 if DSP module \(\delta\) in transponder \(p\) is used in main CO \(o\) to support CPRI links at time \(t\) for RRH \(h\); 0 otherwise.
- \(q_{hotp}\) Binary. 1 if transponder \(p\) is equipped in main CO \(o\) to support CPRI links at time \(t\) for RRH \(h\); 0 otherwise.
- \(m_{opt}\) Integer. Number of transponders \(p\) to equip in main CO \(o\) to support S1 interface links at time \(t\).
- \(n_{oc}tp\) Integer. Number of transponders \(p\) to equip in CO \(o\) to support X2 interface links at time \(t\) to reach CO \(o'\).

The problem can be formulated as follows:

**Objective function** [Eq. (1)]

\[
\text{Minimize} \sum_{o \in O} \sum_{v \in V} \kappa_v \cdot x_{ov} + \sum_{o \in O} \sum_{c \in C} \kappa_c \cdot y_{oe} + \sum_{o \in O} \sum_{p \in P} \kappa_p \cdot a_{op},
\]

subject to:

\[
\sum_{o \in O} z_{hot} = 1 \quad \forall \, t \in T, h \in H(t).
\]

\[
\sum_{v \in V} y_{oe} \cdot x_{ov} \geq \sum_{h \in H(t)} z_{hot} \quad \forall \, t \in T, o \in O.
\]

\[
\sum_{v \in V} x_{ov} \leq 1 \quad \forall \, o \in O.
\]

\[
w_{hoe}t \geq \sum_{h \in H_n(h)} z_{hoe} - (1 - z_{hot}) \cdot \text{bigM} \quad \forall \, t \in T, h \in H(t), o \in O(h), o' \in U(o).
\]

\[
\sum_{o \in O(U(o))} z_{hoe} \leq (1 - z_{hot}) \cdot \text{bigM} \quad \forall \, t \in T, h \in H(t), o \in O.
\]

**Constraints**

\[
\sum_{p \in P} y_{oe} \cdot r_{hotp} \geq \alpha_h \cdot z_{hot} \quad \forall \, t \in T, h \in H(t), o \in O(h).
\]

\[
\sum_{o \in O(\pi)} \sum_{p \in P(\pi)} r_{hotp} = 1 \quad \forall \, t \in T, h \in H(t).
\]

\[
q_{hotp} \cdot |D(p)| \geq \sum_{p \in P} r_{hotp} \quad \forall \, t \in T, h \in H(t), o \in O(h), p \in P.
\]

\[
\sum_{p \in P} |D(p)| \cdot x_{S1} \cdot m_{opt} \geq \sum_{h \in H} i_h \cdot z_{hot} \quad \forall \, t \in T, o \in O,
\]

\[
\sum_{o \in O} y_{oe} = \sum_{v \in V} \chi_v \quad \forall \, o \in O.
\]

\[
\sum_{o \in O} y_{oe} \cdot l_{oc} \geq a_{op} \quad \forall \, o \in O, p \in P.
\]

\[
\sum_{o \in O} \rho_e \cdot y_{oe} \geq \sum_{c \in C} \chi_c \quad \forall \, o \in O.
\]

\[
\sum_{o \in O} \sigma_e \cdot y_{oe} \geq \sum_{p \in P} \alpha_p \cdot a_{op} \quad \forall \, o \in O.
\]

\[
l_{oc} \leq \rho_e \cdot \eta_{ec} + (1 - y_{oe}) \cdot \text{bigM} \quad \forall \, o \in O, e \in E, c \in C.
\]

The first set of constraints deal with the assignment of RRHs to the main COs. Equation (2) ensures that RRHs are assigned to one and only one accessible main CO each time they are active. Equation (3) guarantees that the VM configuration selected in each main CO has enough VMs to satisfy BBU virtualization for the RRHs assigned to it, while Eq. (4) makes sure one VM configuration is assigned to a main CO at the most.

Equation (5) allows accounting for the number of X2 interface links between main COs \(o\) and \(o'\) that are required for RRH \(h\) at time \(t\). This inequality actually sets a lower bound on \(w_{hoe}t\) if and only if RRH \(h\) is assigned to the main CO \(o\) at time \(t\). Equation (6) guarantees that if RRH \(h\) is assigned to main CO \(o\), the neighboring RRHs are not
assigned to COs that cannot be accessed from the main CO \( o \) to guarantee that the X2 interface links would not exceed the delay constraint.

Equations (7)–(13) are in charge of selecting the proper transponder configuration for each interface link. Specifically, Eqs. (7)–(9) guarantee that transponder \( p \) selected for the CPRI link of active RRH \( h \) at \( t \) has enough capacity and that one and only one DSP module is selected. Equation (10) ensures that the capacity of the transponders selected in the main CO \( o \) for the S1 interface links is enough to satisfy the total S1 interfaces’ capacity required in \( o \) at each time. Similarly, Eq. (11) ensures that the capacity of the transponders selected for the X2 interface links between the main COs is enough to satisfy the required capacity for the X2 interfaces in \( o \) every time. Equation (12) ensures that the same transponders’ configuration is selected for the X2 interfaces between the main COs \( o \) and \( o’ \). Equation (13) accounts for the number of transponders of each type to equip the main CO \( o \) to guarantee the required connections at any time.

Finally, Eqs. (14)–(18) deal with the MPLS equipment at the main COs. Equation (14) ensures that a main CO is equipped only if it is active. Equation (15) guarantees that the cards used to equip each main CO can support the selected transponders. Equations (16) and (17) guarantee that the switching equipment selected has enough slots and capacity, respectively. Finally, Eq. (18) ensures that if MPLS equipment \( e \) is assigned to the main CO \( o \), and it does not support line card \( c \), that line card is not equipped in \( o \).

Considering the particular case where the exact number of main COs to equip is given, the parameter \( \Phi \) representing the number of main COs to equip is defined and the model is extended with the following constraints:

\[
\sum_{o \in O} \sum_{h \in H(t)} z_{oht} \geq \sum_{o \in O} y_{oc} \quad \forall o \in O, \tag{19}
\]

\[
\sum_{c \in C} y_{oc} = \Phi. \tag{20}
\]

Equation (19) ensures that only the main COs that host BBUs assigned to active RRHs at some time are equipped, whereas Eq. (20) ensures that \( \Phi \) main COs are equipped.

The amounts of variables and constraints approximate to \(| O | \cdot (| V | + | E | + | C | + | T | \cdot | P | \cdot (| H | + | O |)) \) and \(| T | \cdot | O |^2 \cdot (| P | + | H |) \), respectively. Note that the amount of COs and RRHs highly impacts the size of problem instances. The instances generated in this paper could be solved to optimality in reasonable solving times (hours). Nonetheless, in case the size of the instances prevent them from being solved to optimality, additional methods based on column generation [22] or randomized meta-heuristics [23] could be developed.

V. RESULTS

In this section, we first focus on the assessment of the proposed DOAWG-based SBVT. Next, we apply the MILP model presented in the previous section to study CAPEX from installing FTs or SBVTs and from different centralization levels. Finally, OPEX is also studied.

A. DOAWG-Based SBVT Assessment

To demonstrate the DOAWG-based SBVT described in Section III.B, we implemented the system described in Fig. 5(b). Figure 6 shows the two sub-carriers generated from one single laser with a 100 kHz linewidth to transmit three channels with a QPSK modulation format.

We select two tones from the OFCs using WSSs and send them into two different I/Q modulators driven by the DACs with the target spectra shown in Figs. 6(a) and 6(b). Figure 6(c) shows the spectrum after combination. The two tones are set to be 25 GHz apart. Channel 1 and channel 3 both carry 12 GBAud 2\(^{15}\)–1 PRBS signals and are shaped by a Nyquist filter with a roll-off factor of 1/24, and both occupy a bandwidth of 12.5 GHz. The center channel 2 is a 24 GBAud 2\(^{15}\)–1 PRBS signal with a 25 GHz bandwidth shaped by the same Nyquist filter. For the receiver DSP, a 13-tap finite impulse response (FIR) based on the constant modulus algorithm (CMA) [24] equalizes the linear distortion of the received waveform and adaptively updates the tap coefficients. Then, a 2-stage carrier frequency and phase recovery algorithm locks down the frequency offset and the phase noise of the received waveform [25].

Figure 7 shows the constellation at a 20 dB optical signal-to-noise ratio (OSNR) after the CMA and carrier phase recovery. Finally, we show the bit error ratio (BER) versus the OSNR using 393,204 symbols. Figure 8 shows the theoretical BER curves for 12 and 24 GBAud and the BER results for the three different channels. We observe a \( \sim 0.2 \) dB OSNR penalty at \( 10^{-3} \) BER, which is mainly due to the distortions from the sinusoidal transfer function of the I/Q modulators and the laser phase noise.

Finally, let us show the SBVT’s ability to change its configuration. Figure 9 shows calculated target waveforms for two scenarios where the SBVT is configured to generate four and three sub-channels/superchannels with different baud rates, and modulation formats using low-speed electronic and optoelectronic devices (25 GS/s DACs and...
Fig. 8. BER versus OSNR at 0.1 dB bandwidth resolution for theoretical curves at 12 and 24 Gbaud and channels 1, 2, and 3.

25 GHz IQMs. A comprehensive theory and experimental demonstration of the SBVT generation can be found in [26].

B. CAPEX and OPEX Studies

Once the DOAWG-based SBVT has been assessed, let us focus on studying the resulting CAPEX and OPEX from different centralization levels. For evaluation purposes, we consider a scenario where 49 RRHs, e.g., representing MBSs, are geographically distributed, covering an area of about 500 km². The outmost cells cover regions where the traffic load varies according to the business load profile, and the central ones vary according to a residential profile similar to that described in [2], e.g., representing an urban area surrounded by industrial zones. Figure 10(a) depicts the reference scenario. To guarantee delay constraints in such a scenario, sets $O(h)$ and $U(o)$ in the MILP model are defined based on distances among locations.

In addition, a set of RRHs, e.g., corresponding to small cells, is also geographically distributed for capacity management, resulting in a scenario with 195 RRHs. It is worth highlighting that not all of them will be active simultaneously since the traffic profiles vary differently throughout the day. Nonetheless, the MBSs’ RRHs are always considered active to guarantee coverage even in off-peak hours, whereas the small cells’ RRHs are progressively activated (deactivated) as the load increases (decreases). Figure 10(b) illustrates the number of active small cells per MBS required for the two profiles against the hour of the day. A set of main COs that can be selected to host virtualized BBU pools is considered. Their location is illustrated in Fig. 10(a). We target a maximum 150 μs RTT between RRHs and BBUs and, as a consequence, no single main CO can be accessed by all RRHs in the evaluated scenarios. One sector is considered in each cell.

CAPEX is studied from the network equipment perspective (MPLS switches, line cards, and transponders to equip the main COs) considering two different types of transponders (FTs and the proposed SBVTs) and four different centralization levels. The network equipment’s cost is based on the cost model in [27], while a multiplicative cost is used for the SBVTs [28]. The virtualized BBU pools’ cost is not considered, since a computer’s cost is much lower than those of the transponders and switches. The MILP model described in the previous section was implemented, and several instances were solved using CPLEX.

For the CAPEX studies, we firstly consider different configurations based on the previously described scenario and solve problem instances for peak hours.

Aiming at comparing CAPEX when using FTs and SBVTs, the graphs in Fig. 11 present the cost (in terms of cost units, where 1 cost unit is the cost of a 10 Gb/s transponder, [27]) against the network load of installing 10 and 40 Gb/s FTs and 400 Gb/s and 1 Tb/s SBVTs in the switches. As shown, the total cost is dominated by the cost of the transponders, where the cost savings obtained are around 35% and 50% from installing the 400 Gb/s and 1 Tb/s SBVTs, respectively, with respect to the cost of installing FTs. In addition, there are savings coming from the smaller size of the installed MPLS switches as a result of the reduction in the number of slots that are needed when SBVTs are considered. This is especially noticeable in the case of adopting 400 Gb/s SBVTs.

Aiming at studying CAPEX for different centralization levels, let us now consider different peak and off-peak hours. We assume two different LTE-A 4 × 4 multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) [29] configurations: (i) 40 MHz, requiring the CPRI links’ capacity to be close to 10 Gb/s and the S1 and X2 links’ capacities to be about 600 and 230 Mb/s, respectively, and (ii) 100 MHz, requiring the CPRI links’ capacity to be close to 25 Gb/s and the S1 and X2 links’ capacities to be about 1.5 Gb/s and 550 Mb/s, respectively [30].

Figure 12 shows the network equipment cost evolution against the number of main COs to equip for peak hours in business (12 h) and residential areas (22 h), and for LTE-A 4 × 4 MIMO 40 MHz [Figs. 12(a) and 12(b)] and
LTE-A $4 \times 4$ MIMO 100 MHz [Figs. 12(c) and 12(d)] configurations. The maximum centralization level requires two main COs, since this is the minimum number of COs required to support all RRHs without exceeding the delay constraints. Indeed, for the 40 MHz configuration [Figs. 12(a) and 12(b)], equipping the same two COs at any time with the cheapest equipment configuration results in the minimum cost solution.

Interestingly, as soon as the CPRI links’ capacity increases [Figs. 12(c) and 12(d)], e.g., due to a configuration upgrade from 40 to 100 MHz, the number of main COs to equip at the minimum cost moves away from the fully centralized solution at peak hours. The results for off-peak hours showed that the fully centralized case, 2 COs, satisfies the demand at that time and at the minimum cost. As can be seen in Figs. 12(c) and 12(d), equipping more than 7 and 4 COs at the corresponding peak hours increases the cost.

Considering the 100 MHz configuration and aiming at dimensioning our scenario, we restricted the set of COs that can be selected to 7 main COs, corresponding to the ones that need to be equipped to satisfy demand at peak hours and that can be selected to satisfy demand at any time. The problem was solved for each hour separately, and the minimum cost solutions obtained were saved. Then, each main CO was dimensioned with the minimum equipment necessary to satisfy demand at any hour. Although the proposed mathematical model can solve the problem considering all hours of day simultaneously, splitting the problem into different instances per hour allows for solving it in reasonable times while obtaining good enough solutions, as will be seen in the next paragraphs. The results showed that by equipping the seven main COs with the smallest MPLS switches, demand is satisfied at any time. More specifically, the required equipment to be installed resulted in 2867.6 cost units in terms of CAPEX.

Similarly, we dimensioned the same configuration scenario considering the fully centralized approach, where only 2 COs can be equipped, and a theoretical fully distributed approach, where 49 main COs are equipped, each to serve a single MBS’s RRH and its small cells’ RRHs. From the results, the fully centralized approach required a huge capacity switch (6.72 Tb/s and 48 slots) and a small one (2.24 Tb/s and 16 slots), whereas the fully distributed required 49 of the smallest switches (1.40 Tb/s and 10 slots). The CAPEX value obtained for the fully centralized approach was 3518.4 cost units, whereas for the fully distributed one, it was 4694.9 cost units. The solution obtained when 7 COs were equipped represents CAPEX savings as high as 16% and 39% compared to the scenarios where 2 and 49 COs were equipped, respectively.

Focusing on the main COs to equip hour by hour, Fig. 13 illustrates that during off-peak hours, only two COs need to be equipped, whereas for peak hours, more main COs need to be equipped. An elastic use of CO network equipment is envisioned.

For completeness, we also study the impact of the centralization level, taking into account the power consumption of the equipment throughout the day.

In line with [31], we assume that the power consumption of the switches can be approximated as the summation of the consumption of the basic node, the slot cards, and the port cards. In addition, we consider a fixed component of power consumption in MPLS switches related to the basic node and its slot power requirements, and a variable contribution from the line cards and transponders in use, assuming they only consume power when they are in use.
Figure 14 represents the power consumption of the transponders [Fig. 14(a)] and total power consumption considering all the equipment in all the main COs [Fig. 14(b)] against hours in the day. As expected, since the fully centralized approach is the one requiring the lowest number of transponders to be equipped, their contribution to the power consumption is also the lowest. On the contrary, the distributed approach is the one requiring more transponders, since each main CO requires the necessary equipment not only for the CPRI interfaces, but also for the X2 and S1 interfaces. The solution requiring 7 COs to be equipped results in a slight increment of 5% in terms of the transponders’ power consumption compared to the centralized approach and savings near 37% in relation to the distributed one. Notwithstanding, the contribution of the switches and line cards to the power consumption needs to be considered to evaluate the OPEX.

As described in the CAPEX study, because of the equipment selection for CAPEX minimization, the centralized approach requires a huge-capacity switch plus a small one, and the distributed approach requires 49 units of the smallest switches. For the centralized approach, it is clear that the high-power consumption of the large switch will impact the total power consumption, even though the lowest number of transponders is required. As shown in Fig. 14(b), the centralization level requiring 7 COs presents a lower total power consumption than the fully centralized approach; savings close to 7% are observed. Values for the fully distributed approach are not depicted in Fig. 14(b), since computing only the fixed contribution from the 49 smallest switches is as high as 270 kWh (49 × 5.51 kWh). The 7 COs solution shows savings close to 82% compared to the fully distributed approach.

Finally, as shown in Fig. 14(a), it is clear that for any of the approaches considered, the equipment usage follows curves along hours in the day, similar to the traffic load figures shown in Fig. 10.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

The connectivity requirements for C-RAN scenarios were studied in terms of dynamicity, elasticity, and granularity. Although different SBVT implementations have been proposed, none fulfill the C-RAN requirements regarding fine spectrum granularity. Hence, DOAWG as a candidate for implementing SBVTs was introduced, since it enables flexibility in the temporal and spectral domains by combining multiple spectral slices and generating optical channels with sub-wavelength granularity as well as superchannels. The sliceability is not limited by the number of combs, making DOAWG-based SBVT exceptionally flexible and adaptable to any type of optical channel. In particular, DOAWG's fine-granularity capability was shown by generating optical channels of 6.25 and 12.5 GHz in a single comb line.

To perform CAPEX and OPEX studies, and assuming that C-RAN is supported by optical networks, the CRAM problem for C-RAN CAPEX minimization has been presented and formally defined using an MILP model. The mathematical model was implemented and problem instances considering different centralization levels and LTE-A configurations were solved using CPLEX.

The results showed that remarkable cost savings can be obtained when installing the proposed SBVTs compared to installing fixed transponders.

Next, the impact of the centralization level in optical-network-supported C-RAN was studied. The results showed that, in the evaluated scenarios, although the maximum centralization level results in the minimum CAPEX solution for certain LTE-A configurations, as soon as higher capacities are required in different LTE-A interfaces (e.g., due to a configuration upgrade), lower levels of centralization result in CAPEX savings up to 18% compared to the fully centralized approach. Savings as high as 39% were observed compared to a fully distributed approach.

For completeness, OPEX was also studied from the solutions obtained after solving the CRAM problem. OPEX savings near 7% and up to 82% were shown for the solution requiring a low level of centralization compared to the fully centralized and fully distributed approaches, respectively.
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