



HAL
open science

TCRA: A Time-based Channel Reservation Scheme for Handover requests in LEO satellite Systems

Lila Boukhatem, André-Luc Beylot, Dominique Gaïti, Guy Pujolle

► To cite this version:

Lila Boukhatem, André-Luc Beylot, Dominique Gaïti, Guy Pujolle. TCRA: A Time-based Channel Reservation Scheme for Handover requests in LEO satellite Systems. *International Journal of Satellite Communications and Networking*, 2003, 21 (3), pp.227-240. 10.1002/sat.739 . hal-01151234

HAL Id: hal-01151234

<https://hal.science/hal-01151234>

Submitted on 5 Oct 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

TCRA: a time-based channel reservation scheme for handover requests in LEO satellite systems

L. Boukhatem¹, A. L. Beylot², D. Gäiti^{1,3} and G. Pujolle^{1,†,*}

¹*Laboratoire LIP 6, Université de Paris 6-4, Place Jussieu 75252 Paris Cedex, France*

²*ENSEEIH, IRIT/TeSA-2, rue C. Camichel-BP 7122, 31071 Toulouse Cedex 7, France*

³*Laboratoire LM2S, Université de Technologie de Troyes-BP. 2060, 10010 Troyes Cedex, France*

In this paper, we propose a time-based channel reservation algorithm (TCRA) suitable for handover and call admission control procedures in future mobile satellite systems. These systems are characterized by a high rate of handover attempts which can degrade significantly their performance. Therefore, we propose TCRA, a scheme which guarantees a null handover failure probability by using a channel reservation strategy in the cells to be crossed by the user. The performance of TCRA has been compared to the guaranteed handover (GH) scheme. The TCRA reservation method has the advantage of a better channel utilization by locking the resources only for their expected time of use. A mathematical model has been developed for both schemes, and its results have been validated through simulations.

1. INTRODUCTION

The mobile telecommunication market knows a never-predicted growth. Some mobile service operators are expanding their networks and others are studying new solutions based on satellite links supporting either narrow or large band services. Some of the proposed solutions are based on geostationary (GEO) satellites equipped with simple on-board processing and switching facilities; other ones propose the use of low and medium Earth orbit satellites (LEO, MEO). The non-GEO satellite systems have the ability to provide large coverage areas and constitute an ideal solution for the support of multicast applications [1–3]. However, these systems are characterized by a dynamic network topology which leads, at a user level, to a high number of handover attempts. This problem should be alleviated by implementing new call admission and handover control techniques for a better QoS performance.

Several approaches for handover prioritization proposed in terrestrial cellular systems have been studied for mobile satellite networks. These approaches include the guard channel scheme [4], handover queueing [5, 6], and connection admission control algorithms [7–9].

*Correspondence to: G. Pujolle, Laboratoire LIP 6, Université de Paris 6 - 4, Place Jussieu 75252 Paris Cedex, France.

†E-mail: guy.pujolle@lip6.fr

Our proposed time-based channel reservation algorithm (TCRA) scheme exploits the fact that the relative motion of the users (either fixed or mobile) is predictable. Therefore, TCRA anticipates the user motion and reserves resources accordingly. It estimates the residence time of the user in each cell to be crossed and reserves a resource during the corresponding residence time interval.

The remaining of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the handover issue in the special context of satellite constellations. We also present a brief description of the guaranteed handover (GH) scheme [10, 11] and highlight its main drawbacks. Section 3 describes the TCRA scheme in details and shows how TCRA improves the GH performance. An analytical approach is developed in Section 4 to derive the performance of TCRA and GH algorithms. Simulation experiments, contained in Section 5, are derived to validate the results obtained analytically. Finally, we report the conclusions in Section 6.

2. HANDOVER PROBLEM IN A LEO SATELLITE CONTEXT

In future LEO satellite systems, the footprint of each satellite contains circular adjacent cells corresponding to the satellite spot-beams.

Depending on a coverage concept, two kinds of mobile satellite constellation systems can be defined: satellite-fixed cells (SFC) and earth-fixed cells (EFC) systems. This paper only focuses on SFC systems.

In the EFC coverage, satellites are able to steer their antennas in such a way that each beam maintains the coverage of a given earth-fixed cell during a given time duration [10]. The SFC coverage means that the cells described on the earth surface by each satellite beam are fixed to the spacecraft and move relatively to the earth surface. Consequently, and given that LEO satellites travel at a high velocity (5–9 km/s), both the earth rotation and mobile users motion become negligible. Therefore, in this kind of systems, mobile and fixed users are treated in the same way as regards to the handover procedure. Besides, the number of handovers is function of both the satellite speed and the size of the cells corresponding to the spotbeams (in this study, we only focus on predictable handovers which are introduced by satellite motion and not those which result from shadowing, fading, and blocking effects). This number becomes very important especially in LEO satellite networks, leading to a real need of special CAC techniques and sophisticated handover management schemes.

To address this handover problem, a guaranteed handover scheme (GH) has been proposed in References [10, 11]. This scheme guarantees to GH users (prioritized users) the success of all their handovers. In the following section, we give a brief description of the scheme and highlight its main drawbacks.

2.1. *Guaranteed handover scheme (GH)*

The GH scheme has been proposed to hold the handover issue in LEO satellite systems supporting a SFC coverage. Two kinds of users are defined, prioritized users known as GH users and the other ones, called regular users, which do not benefit from the reservation strategy, and are not protected against handover fails.

The GH scheme tries to reserve a channel in the cell next to the one the user is entering. If such a channel is available it is locked, otherwise, a reservation request is sent waiting for a free

channel. As the reservation is issued one cell before the user performs his handover, the success of this handover is guaranteed under the assumption that all the cells dispose of the same channel capacity C and also that the queued reservations have priority over both new calls (either GH or regular) and handed over calls of regular users. Concerning the case of a new generated call, it can be admitted in the system only if simultaneously two channels are idle in the first two cells (the source cell and the first transit cell). If ever one or both channels are not available, the call is blocked at setup.

The channel reservation used in this scheme is called channel locking mechanism. This strategy is in some manner very conservative and selfish, since a locked channel cannot be used by another user except the owner, even if the owner is not using it and is still far enough from the cell. To illustrate such a scenario, let us assume that an active GH user is performing his handover from cell $(i - 1)$ to cell (i) . At the same time, this GH user will lock a channel belonging to cell $(i + 1)$ to guarantee the success of his handover to this cell. This channel will be locked during all the time necessary for the user GH to cross cell (i) . Due to this ‘early’ locking mechanism, a new generated call in cell (i) cannot be admitted (we assume that all the channels are used or locked in this cell) even if this user will leave cell (i) before the GH user arrives.

Consequently, this conservative locking strategy introduces a bad channel resource utilization when performing unnecessarily new calls blocking. It also results in an excessive prioritization of GH users which is achieved at the expense of a higher blocking probability of new call arrivals.

2.2. Other proposals

Other solutions have been proposed to deal with the handover issue in a LEO satellite environment [7, 9, 12]. The authors of Reference [12], for example, have proposed a reservation mechanism based on GH scheme and called ECL (Elastic Channel Locking scheme). This mechanism gives a flexible way to control quality of service (in terms of new call and handover blocking probabilities) by adjusting the time to send out channel reservation requests. This sending time is delayed when compared with GH. In ECL, the locking reservation request is sent when the user is T_a time away from its entering point in the next cell. The time T_a is decided by the QoS requirements for handover failure probability. This proposition improves the GH performance but does no longer guarantee the null handover probability.

Our aim in this paper is to propose a new solution, based on GH scheme, able to reduce the blocking probabilities while ensuring a null handover probability for the prioritized traffic.

3. TIME-BASED CHANNEL RESERVATION ALGORITHM (TCRA) DESCRIPTION

The time-based channel reservation algorithm (TCRA) is proposed to improve the GH performance and to provide a better resource utilization of the communication system. In this scheme, the channels are locked only for their expected time of use. In other words, TCRA locks a channel only in the cell next to the one the user is entering (thus there is no need to know the call finishing instant). The reservations are performed progressively with the cells movement. This methodology allows to perform more accurate reservations in order to increase the number of admitted users in the system and to enhance the satisfaction degree of the users waiting for admission. Finally, it is worth stressing that this strategy can be achieved thanks to the deterministic and predictable satellite motion.

3.1. Basic assumptions and user mobility model

In this study, we are interested in two different QoS parameters: new call blocking and handover call dropping probabilities. We propose the following model which allows to derive these two performance parameters.

As said in the previous section, due to the high satellite velocity, the mobile user motion and the earth rotation speed are neglected. Therefore, user motion is straight and opposite to the satellite velocity vector. The system coverage geometry is illustrated in Figure 1. Satellite spot-beams describe on the earth surface overlapping adjacent cells. Each cell is modelled as a rectangular area bounded by the segments joining intersection points of adjacent circular cells belonging to the same street of coverage. The side of each rectangular cell is referred to as the constant R . Let us assume that the entire bandwidth resource of each cell is divided into a fixed number of channels. Let C be this channel capacity.

3.2. Algorithm description

In this scheme, the aim is to compute time intervals necessary for a user to cross each cell belonging to the set of visited cells. One has to note that these time intervals are computed progressively: at each handover instant TCRA evaluates the expected crossing time of the user in the cell next to the one it is entering. These time intervals are used to reserve, in each of the considered cells, a channel which will be available during the corresponding crossing time duration. To implement such a method, each satellite should register, for each channel, all time periods where the channel is locked.

The proposed algorithm consists of three different phases:

Phase 1: Call admission. At call set-up time T_{setup} , a channel reservation request is sent to the first two cells to be visited by the user: the source cell C_0 , where the call was originated, and the first transit cell C_1 .

Let T_i be the expected residence time of a user in a given cell C_i . In the source cell, T_0 is a variable uniformly distributed between 0 and R , whereas in transit cells, T_i (for $i > 0$) has a constant value T_{max} equal to (R/V_{sps}) , where V_{sps} is the sub-satellite point speed.

In this study, we assume that users locations can be determined, with a sufficient accuracy, since it is expected that either mobile or fixed terminals to be used in these systems would integrate positioning facilities such as global positioning system (GPS) receivers (otherwise, an other version of TCRA has been proposed in a previous work, the reader can refer to Reference [13]).

At this step, the exact user location in the source cell is evaluated by the network, and the value of T_0 is derived.




Figure 1. User mobility model.

Given this value, a reservation request is sent to cells C_0 and C_1 to reserve in each a channel for, respectively, the time intervals:

$$[T_{\text{setup}}, T_{\text{setup}} + T_0 + \delta t]$$

and

$$[T_{\text{setup}} + T_0 - \delta t, T_{\text{setup}} + T_0 + T_{\text{max}} + \delta t]$$

where δt is used to allow for a given error margin ($\delta t > 0$). If both requests are satisfied, the call is accepted, otherwise it is rejected.

This call admission procedure, when reserving in the first two cells, limits the number of admitted new calls in the system so that they do not cause a handover failure to any call in progress and also do not experience any handover failure. Therefore, if no blocking occurs at call setup, no handover failure is expected in the future since that the users relative geographical position remains the same, and only a time-lag will occur. Of course, this condition is verified under the assumption of a similar cell shape and also a similar capacity in terms of bandwidth (resources).

In other words, to simplify the proposed model, we have translated it into a one-dimensional problem by considering the transit time intervals of the users in each cell. Therefore, we only have to verify that the number of overlapping time intervals does not exceed the cell capacity C . This condition is necessary and sufficient to affirm that, at each instant, when considering the worst case where all the users are still active, there will not be more than C users under the same satellite beam coverage.

Phase 2: At each handover instant. When a given user performs a handover from cell C_i to cell C_{i+1} at time T_{HOi} , the system can anticipate the future handover instant and thus reserve a channel in the upcoming cell C_{i+2} for the time interval

$$[T_{HOi}, T_{HOi} + T_{\text{max}} + \delta t].$$

Phase 3: Call termination. When a user terminates its call in a cell C_i , it releases the current used channel and sends a reservation cancellation request to cell C_{i+1} .

The example shown in Figure 2 illustrates the existing difference between TCRA and GH schemes. In this scenario user U arrives in the system at time T_0 . Each cell disposes of two channels ($C = 2$) and the parameter δt is assumed to have a null value. The figure shows for TCRA scheme channel reservation times in the three cells. We can easily note that, in GH case, user U is unable to access the system since users u_1 and u_2 have locked both channels of cell C_1 (even if they are not yet really used). On the other hand, in TCRA case, user U is accepted in the system since it can use channel 1 belonging to cell C_1 before user u_1 takes possession of it.

3.3. Hexagonal cells shape

In this study, we have modelled satellite spotbeams using a rectangular form. Of course, this choice has the advantage of simplifying calculations (by allowing the same cell crossing time for all users), nevertheless it requires a certain degree of overlapping between cells. Other forms can be used to model cellular networks. The most often used ones are hexagonal cells. This shape is very close to the real cellular form and needs less overlapping than for rectangular cells.

Our TCRA scheme can be extended to support a hexagonal cells model [14]. Indeed, when considering such a shape, the cell crossing time is not similar for all users, it depends on the position of the user in the cell. Therefore, we proposed a new version for TCRA which defines




Figure 2. Example illustrating the difference between GH and TCRA blocking conditions.

three different regions in a cell and, depending on the relative location of the user, reserves resources in a given set of cells and for the appropriate crossing time. For more details, the reader can refer to Reference [14].

4. ANALYTICAL EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSED SCHEME

4.1. Presentation of the method

In order to show the influence of the proposed mechanism on the performance of the system, an approximate analytical model has been performed in the case where only prioritized users P are considered. An analytical model has also been developed for guaranteed handover scheme. The model with rectangular cells is considered.

Classical traffic assumptions are considered. New calls are assumed to arrive according to a Poisson process with parameter λ_{nc} . Uniform traffic is considered: all the cells are assumed to offer the same new traffic intensity; the residence time T_0 of a user in its original cell is assumed to be uniformly distributed between 0 and T_{max} . In the following cells, this time will be equal to T_{max} . Call durations, T_c , are assumed to be exponentially distributed with a parameter μ . Consequently, a new call will be taken into account in its originating cell during a time T_{nc} which is the minimum between T_c and T_0 . In the following cells, due to the memoryless property of the exponential distribution, this residence time T_{ho} is the minimum between T_c and T_{max} .

$$\begin{cases} T_{nc} = \inf(T_c, T_0) \\ T_{ho} = \inf(T_c, T_{max}) \end{cases}$$




Figure 3. Derivation of the blocking probability.

The expectation of these r.v. can easily be derived:

$$E[T_{nc}] = \frac{1}{\mu} - \frac{1 - e^{-\mu T_{max}}}{\mu^2 T_{max}}, \quad E[T_{ho}] = \frac{1 - e^{-\mu T_{max}}}{\mu}$$

The call admission control can be expressed as follows (parameter δt is neglected as in Reference [11]). Let $N_t(y)$ denote the number of users at time t with an abscissa between y and $(y + R)$. This area covers a part of two consecutive cells (see Figure 3). If a given user arrives at time t with an initial abscissa x , $0 \leq x \leq R$, this new call will be accepted iff

$$\forall y, \quad x - R \leq y \leq x, \quad N_t(y) < C \quad (1)$$

This formula obviously concerns cell C_0 , C_{-1} and C_1 .

In the case where only prioritized traffic is considered, GH algorithm can be described as follows. A new call will be accepted if less than C channels are occupied or locked in cell C_0 and C_1 . As each active user in cell C_{-1} (resp. C_0) has locked a channel in cell C_0 (resp. C_1), the CAC condition leads to

$$(N_t(-R) + N_t(0) < C) \quad \text{and} \quad (N_t(0) + N_t(R) < C) \quad (2)$$

(2) implies

$$\forall y, \quad -R \leq y \leq R, \quad N_t(y) < C \quad (3)$$

As this condition includes the previous one, GH is more restrictive than TCRA. Both solutions lead to a handover dropping probability equal to 0, but TCRA improves the performance for new calls.

An exact model of the whole system is quite complicated to be derived because it is necessary to know the number of in-progress calls in each cell and their relative positions. Consequently, an approximate model has been developed. Classical approximations are proposed. The handover arrival process is approximated by a Poisson process with parameter λ_{ho} which parameter has to be computed. In the model, the users are also supposed to be uniformly distributed over all the cell. An isolation method is proposed which consists on considering independence between the cells [11].

Under those approximations, a cell is modelled by a multiclass M/G/C/C queue with reservation. A first class corresponds to the actual number i of ‘new calls’ (i.e. those initiated in the current cell) and a second class to the number j of ‘handover calls’ (i.e. those initiated in a previous one). Let p_k be the new call blocking probability when k resources are occupied by a new call or a handover. The accepted new call arrival rate is then equal to $\lambda_{nc}(1 - p_k)$. We used the numerical solution of the steady state distribution of the corresponding multiclass M/M/C/C

queue with reservation [15] with respective service rates:

$$\mu_{\text{nc}} = \frac{1}{E[T_{\text{nc}}]}, \quad \mu_{\text{ho}} = \frac{1}{E[T_{\text{ho}}]}$$

Let $\pi_{i,j}$ denote the steady state probability of state (i, j) and Π_k the marginal probability of having k occupied resources. The same approach has been adopted to analyse both GH and TCRA mechanisms. The main difference comes from the derivation of p_k .

4.2. Blocking probabilities for TCRA mechanism

Given the uniform position of the users and the uniform arrivals of users within a cell, p_k can be derived as follows (we only consider the steady state values). Let Y denote the initial offset of a new call arrival, and V the actual configuration when a new call arrives:

$$p_k = \frac{1}{R} \int_{x=0}^R \sum_{l,m=0}^C \Pr[\text{New Call blocked} \mid V] \Pi_l \Pi_m dx$$

with

$$V = \{Y = x, N_t(-R) = l, N_t(+R) = m, N_t(0) = k\}$$

(in configuration V , there are k users in cell C_0 , l in cell C_{-1} and m in cell C_1).

This blocking probability depends on the number of users within the area $[x - R, x + R]$ (see Figure 3). When a user arrives he finds a configuration which satisfies condition (1). It is necessary to determine among all the possible users positioning configurations those which are not blocking for the arrival of the new call. Computation details are presented in Appendix A.

The numerical solution of the Markov chain corresponding to the multiclass M/M/C/C queue with reservation leads then to the derivation of the new call blocking probability $P_{\text{b,nc}}$, PASTA property can be applied:

$$P_{\text{b,nc}} = \sum_{k=0}^c \Pi_k p_k$$

The handover rate $\lambda_{\text{ho},i}$ in cell i can then be derived. Let τ_{nc} (resp. τ_{ho}) the probability for an accepted new call (resp. a handover) to experience a handover (resp. a new handover).

$$\tau_{\text{nc}} = \frac{1 - e^{-\mu T_{\text{max}}}}{\mu T_{\text{max}}}, \quad \tau_{\text{ho}} = e^{-\mu T_{\text{max}}}$$

Due to the memoryless property of the call duration, $\lambda_{\text{ho},i}$ can be expressed as a function of the input rates in cell $(i - 1)$.

$$\lambda_{\text{ho},i} = \lambda_{\text{nc},i-1}(1 - P_{\text{b,nc}})\tau_{\text{nc}} + \lambda_{\text{ho},i-1}\tau_{\text{ho}}$$

Since the traffic is assumed to be symmetric, it leads to

$$\lambda_{\text{ho}} = \frac{\lambda_{\text{nc}}(1 - P_{\text{b,nc}})\tau_{\text{nc}}}{1 - \tau_{\text{ho}}}$$

A recursive approach is then necessary to derive the blocking probability and the handover rate. The first iteration starts by neglecting the new call blocking probability

$$\lambda_{\text{ho}}^0 = \frac{\lambda_{\text{nc}}\tau_{\text{nc}}}{1 - \tau_{\text{ho}}}$$

The iterative method is stopped when the relative difference between the blocking probability values computed in two subsequent steps is below a threshold ε .

4.3. Blocking probabilities for GH mechanism

The derivation of the blocking probabilities p_k is easier to determine for GH mechanism using (2). If a new arriving call finds k customers in the current cell, he will be accepted if there is less than $C - k$ in cell $i - 1$ and in cell $i + 1$. Using the same independence approximations as in the previous paragraph, the blocking probabilities p_k can be written as follows:

$$1 - p_k = \sum_{l=0}^{C-k-1} \sum_{m=0}^{C-k-1} \Pi_l \Pi_m$$

which is simply equal to

$$1 - p_k = \left(\sum_{m=0}^{C-k-1} \Pi_m \right)^2$$

The derivation of the performance criteria can be obtained using the previous method.

5. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

The performance evaluation of both TCRA and GH schemes has been investigated through analytical and simulation results. Extensive simulation experiments have been carried out to validate the proposed analytical approach. The tests presented are aimed to show the behaviour of the proposed strategy TCRA, and to highlight its advantages with respect to guaranteed handover scheme.

In particular, we have considered that the simulated cellular network is a grid of 36 square shaped cells folded onto itself. Each cell corresponds to a beam of the satellite. The users are assumed to cross the cellular network with a constant relative velocity orthogonal to the side of the spotbeams. The model considers two classes of users, prioritized users noted P (which benefit from reservation strategies), and non-prioritized users called NP users. Moreover, a fixed channel allocation (FCA) technique has been used for the allocation of satellite channels to beams (cells). We describe, in the following, the main parameter values used in the simulated scenario:

- New call arrivals in a given cell are assumed to be Poisson processes, with a channel holding time exponentially distributed.
- The communication's lifetime of the users is exponentially distributed.
- The number of available channels per beam is 20.
- V_{sps} and R are fixed, respectively, to 25.000 km/h and 250 km.

The model allows to generate new call and handover blocking probabilities of each type of users ($P_{\text{nc}-i}$ and $P_{\text{ho}-i}$, where $i \in \{P, \text{NP}\}$).

The simulation has been divided in two parts. In the first part, we have considered only one type of users, all of them are prioritized users P (the proportion of P users is set to 100% of the total user population). The mean call duration is fixed to 180 s. We are interested in comparing analytical and simulation results of both GH and TCRA schemes in terms of $P_{\text{nc}-P}$. In the

second part of simulations, we have taken into account both P and NP users. The proportion of P users is set to 30% of the total user population and the mean call duration is fixed to 180 s for NP users and 300 s for P users.

5.1. Part A

Intuitively, as TCRA tries to reserve the resources for only the expected time of their use, it yields to a shorter locking duration. Hence, the resources are more available for new arriving users which have a greater chance to be admitted in the system.

With GH scheme, the resources are locked before their effective use, so they reside in the locked state for longer time and block entry of more new calls increasing the blocking probability.

These tendencies are verified in Figure 4. The illustrated curves show the analytic and simulation results for TCRA and GH schemes in terms of the new call blocking probability. The handover dropping probability is not plotted in the figure since it shows a null value with both schemes.

Firstly, we can easily note the good agreement between the results derived by the analytical method for both schemes and those obtained by simulations. The slight difference is exclusively due to the approximations of the analysis when assuming a Poisson distribution for handover requests.

Changing traffic intensity by increasing λ_{nc} , the call blocking probability increases accordingly using both schemes. However, results show clearly that TCRA reduces significantly this blocking probability with respect to the GH scheme especially when dealing with low traffic loads. We can also remark that the reduction obtained by TCRA is about a mean factor of 100 for the traffic range under examination.

5.2. Part B

In order to achieve a more complete performance comparison between TCRA and GH, we launched a second set of experiments where we considered the presence of non-prioritized users.




Figure 4. Call blocking probabilities for TCRA and GH schemes.




Figure 5. Handover dropping probabilities of each type of users.




Figure 6. Call blocking probabilities of each type of users.

Figure 5 plots the handover dropping probability shown by NP users (P_{ho-NP}) and the global handover failure probability P_{ho} both as a function of the traffic load. The handover dropping probability relative to type P users is not drawn for both GH and TCRA schemes since that it shows a null value.

We can easily note, from the figure, that TCRA allows a significant reduction of P_{ho-NP} probability (and thus of the global dropping probability) when compared to the results shown by the GH scheme. This improvement is due to the fact that TCRA allows P users to lock the channels for a shorter time period than it is achieved in the GH scheme. This allows NP users to have a higher chance to achieve successfully their handovers.

In terms of new call blocking probability (see Figure 6), and as it was expected, the TCRA scheme gives better performance than the GH scheme since that TCRA estimates more accurately the channel holding times. Therefore, the amount of admitted traffic is maximized

and the system resources are utilized most efficiently. Furthermore, one can note that, in the GH scheme, the call set-up blocking probability for P users is twice that of NP users. Indeed, unlike NP, P users are blocked at set-up if both the two first cells (and not only one) have no idle channels.

6. CONCLUSIONS

This paper proposes a new time-based channel reservation scheme called TCRA for handover control and management in LEO mobile satellite systems, especially those supporting a satellite-fixed cell coverage. TCRA is based on the feature that, in LEO systems, the users mobility and trajectory are predictable. It guarantees to users a null handover failure probability during all their communication lifetime. It has the advantage to reserve channel resources for users only the expected time duration where they are supposed to be under the coverage of the considered beam. An analytical model has been developed for both TCRA and the guaranteed handover (GH) scheme. The results obtained analytically and by simulation point out that TCRA can achieve a better channel utilization than GH. The new call blocking probabilities have been reduced significantly leading to a higher satisfaction degree of the whole potential user population.

APPENDIX A

A possible configuration for TCRA scheme corresponds to a configuration which satisfies the following conditions:

$$\forall y, \quad x - R \leq y \leq 0, \quad N_i(y) < C \quad (\text{A1})$$

which corresponds to the fact that the C nearest users in areas 1, 2 and 3 are distributed over an area larger than R . And in a symmetric way for areas 2, 3 and 4, we obtain:

$$\forall y, \quad 0 \leq y \leq x, \quad N_i(y) < C \quad (\text{A2})$$

When a new user arrives, he finds one of the possible configurations. He will be accepted if conditions (A1) and (A2) are still satisfied. If we analyse areas 1, 2 and 3, one can easily find that the distance between all the users in area 1 and area 2 is less than R . Let i , j and k be the number of users in areas 1, 2 and 3, respectively. Let us try to position i users in area 1 and k users in area 3 and determine the suitable configurations. A uniform distribution of the users in the different areas at arrivals instants is assumed. As areas 1 and 3 have the same size, they can be overlaid and we can try to place on a X-axis the various users (this corresponds to a translation of the customers of area 3 for example by a distance R). We consider the customer L on the left of area 1 (selected among i customers). All the other customers of area 1 are at a distance on the X-axis smaller than R from customer L , just as all the customers of area 2. We call margin the number of customers in area 3 which can be placed at a distance lower than R from customer L . This margin K is equal to $C - i - j$. If the margin is null, customer L is immediately placed; this increases by 1 the margin for the second customer to be placed. If the margin is negative, the configuration is not possible. If it is positive one can indifferently choose a customer in area 1 (the margin increases) or in area 3 (the margin decreases). Let $\phi(K, i, j)$ denote the number of

possible configurations, $\phi(K, i, j)$ can be recursively computed.

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(K, i, j) &= i\phi(K + 1, i - 1, j) + j\phi(K - 1, i, j - 1) \\ K \geq 0, \quad i > 0, \quad j > 0\end{aligned}$$

The bounds are obtained as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(-1, i, j) &= 0 \quad \text{if } i > 0 \text{ or } j > 0 \\ \phi(-1, 0, 0) &= 1 \\ \phi(K, i, j) &= (i + j)! \quad K \leq j\end{aligned}$$

We consider a user who arrives with an initial X -co-ordinate x in the current cell and which finds k users there. Among these k users, k' have a X -co-ordinate smaller than x and are in area 2, $k - k'$ are thus in area 3. Let l be the number of users in the cell on the left. Among these l customers, l' are in zone 1. In the same way, let m be the number of users in the cell of right-hand side and m' those which are in the area 4. The probability Φ that the user is accepted in such a situation (independent of x), corresponds to all the possible configurations where an initial margin lower by 1 is still appropriate. Consequently,

$$\Phi = \frac{\phi(C - k + k' - l' - 1, l', k')}{\phi(C - k + k' - l', l', k')} \frac{\phi(C - k - 1, k - k', m')}{\phi(C - k, k - k', m')}$$

Assuming a uniform distribution of the users in the various cells, the distribution of the customers in the different zones is done with a probability G : where

$$G = \binom{k}{k'} \binom{l}{l'} \binom{m}{m'} \left(1 - \frac{x}{R}\right)^I \left(\frac{x}{R}\right)^J$$

with $I = (l' + m - m' + k - k')$ and $J = (l - l' + m' + k')$

By making the sum on the various possible states and while balancing by the marginal probabilities of the numbers of customers in the close cells, one obtains the following expression for p_k :

$$1 - p_k = \sum_{l=0}^C \sum_{m=0}^C \Pi_l \Pi_m \sum_{l'=0}^l \sum_{m'=0}^m \sum_{k'=0}^k \Phi \int_{x=0}^R \frac{G}{R} dx \quad (\text{A3})$$

As,

$$\frac{1}{R} \int_{x=0}^R \left(1 - \frac{x}{R}\right)^n \left(\frac{x}{R}\right)^p dx = \frac{n! p!}{(n + p + 1)!}$$

Equation (A3) may be simplified as follows:

$$\int_{x=0}^R \frac{G}{R} dx = \binom{k}{k'} \binom{l}{l'} \binom{m}{m'} \frac{I! J!}{(I + J + 1)!} \quad (\text{A4})$$

It finally leads to the derivation of the parameters p_k .

REFERENCES

1. Ananasso F, Priscoli FD. Satellite systems for personal communication networks. *Wireless Networks* 1998; **4**: 155-165.

2. Gavish B. LEO/MEO systems—global mobile communication systems. *Telecommunication Systems* 1997; **8**:99–141.
3. Lutz E. Issues in satellite personal communication systems. *Wireless Networks* 1998; **4**:109–124.
4. Ruiz G, Doumi TL, Gardiner JG. Teletraffic analysis and simulation of mobile satellite systems. *Proceedings of IEEE VTC'96* 1996; 252–256.
5. Del Re E, Fantacci R, Giambene G. Efficient dynamic channel allocation techniques with handover queuing for mobile satellite networks. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications* 1995; **SAC-13**(2):397–405.
6. Del Re E, Fantacci R, Giambene G. Handover queuing strategies with dynamic and fixed channel allocation techniques in low earth orbit mobile satellite systems. *IEEE Transactions on Communications* 1999; **COM-47**(1): 89–102.
7. Kalyanasundaram S, Edwin KP, Shroff NB. An efficient scheme to reduce handoff dropping in LEO satellite systems. *Proceedings of the 17th IEEE Colloquium on Reliable Distributed Systems* 1998; 431–436.
8. Mertzanis I, Tafazolli R, Evans BG. Connection admission control strategy and routing considerations in multimedia (Non-GEO) satellite networks. *Proceedings of IEEE VTC'97* 1997; 431–435.
9. Uzunalioglu H, Evans JW, Gowens J. A connection admission control algorithm for low earth orbit satellite networks. *Proceedings of IEEE ICC'99* 1999; **2**:1074–1078.
10. Restrepo Mejia J. Comparative analysis of low earth orbit satellite constellations (satellite-fixed and earth-fixed cells) for fixed and mobile users. *Ph.D. thesis*, ENST Telecom Paris, 1997.
11. Maral G, Restrepo J, Del Re E, Fantacci R, Giambene G. Performance analysis for a guaranteed handover service in an LEO constellation with a satellite-fixed system. *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology* 1998; **VT-47**(4):1200–1214.
12. Yi X, Ding QL, KO C. An elastic scheme for LEO satellite mobile communication systems. *Proceedings of IEEE GLOBECOM2000*, San Francisco, November 2000.
13. Boukhatem L, Gaïti D, Pujolle G. A channel reservation algorithm for the handover issue in LEO satellite systems based on a “satellite-fixed cell” coverage. *Proceedings of IEEE VTC'01*, Greece, April 2001.
14. Boukhatem L. Le Handover dans les Constellations de Satellites LEO. *Ph.D. thesis*. University of Paris 6, December 2001.
15. Ritter M. (COST242), Multi-rate models for dimensioning and performance evaluation of multiservice networks, COST 242 interim Report, Tran-Gia P (ed.), 1994. <http://www-info3.informatik.uni-wuerzburg.de/CONF/RITTER/interim.ps.gz>