Optimal Planning of Digital Cordless Telecommunication Systems*

Thom Frühwirth

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München (LMU)

Oettingenstrasse 67, D-80538 Munich, Germany

fruehwir@informatik.uni-muenchen.de

Pascal Brisset

Ecole Nationale de l'Aviation Civile (ENAC)

7 Av. Edouard Belin, BP 4005, F-31055 Toulouse Cedex, France

Pascal.Brisset@recherche.enac.fr

Abstract

Digital mobile communications comes to company sites. No cabling is required and the employees can be reached at any time at any place. However, planning of wireless digital networks is quite different from planning traditional wire-based systems. Small, local radio transmitters (senders) have to be installed to provide the wireless devices with signals. The specifics of radio wave propagation at the installation site have to be taken into account.

POPULAR is an advanced industrial prototype that allows to compute the minimal number of senders and their location given a blue-print of the building and information about the materials used for walls and ceilings. It does so by simulating the propagation of radio-waves using ray tracing and by subsequent optimization of the number of senders needed to cover the whole building. Taking advantage of state-of-the-art techniques for programmable application-oriented constraint solving, POPULAR was among the first practical tools that could optimally plan cordless communication systems. In this paper, we introduce the basics of this real-life application and show how easy it is to implement the necessary constraints to solve the problem.

---

1 Introduction

Mobile communication has become literally ubiquitous these days. According to a press release of British Telecommunications Plc (BT) and MCI Communications Corp of September 1996, there are 600 Mill. phones worldwide, 60 Mill. of them mobile (compare this figure to the world's 50 Mill. fax numbers and 40 Mill. email addresses).

With the introduction of the European standard for digital cordless telecommunication (DECT) [ETS92] cordless local area networks are possible. The DECT standard integrates a number of telecommunication services. The wireless services include the Telepoint service (wireless public phones in cities), wireless Local Area Networks (LAN) for data transfer and wireless Private Automatic Branch Exchange (PABX) for in-house communication. The PABX service is the one we are concerned with in this article. PABX enables the installation of Cordless Business Communication Systems (CDBS). PABX systems (fig. 1) have turned out to be a major market which is growing even faster than the wireless communication market in general [Tut90].

Of course, selling such systems is not enough, the service that comes with it makes the difference. A vendor will also plan, install and maintain the system. Especially the planning phase is of importance, since a vendor that can offer to cover a company site with a smaller number of base stations will be ahead of its competition.

The DECT standard allows for a cellular structure of the radio network. A cell is the space that is covered by a single base station (a transmitter). Today, the number and positioning of base stations is estimated by an experienced sales person. The specifics of radio wave propagation at the installation site have to be taken into account. The size of a cell is usually in the tens of meters. For buildings, multi-cellular systems are required, because walls and floors absorb part of the radio signal. To help the sales person, Siemens has compiled a set of guidelines based on typical scenarios. However, a scenario may not always apply and the approach does not work well when it comes to position the base stations.

Computer-aided planning promises to ease some of the difficulties encountered. The idea is: Given a blue-print of the building or company site, together with information about the materials used for walls and floors, compute the minimal number of base stations and their location by simulation and subsequent optimization.

An advanced prototype, POPULAR (Planning of Picocellular Radio), was developed in collaboration with industry and research institutions in Germany: The Siemens Research and Development Department (ZFE), the Siemens Personal Networks Department (PN), the European Computer-Industry Research Center (ECRC) and the Institute of Communication Networks at the Aachen University of Technology.

The authors implemented a protoype version while working at ECRC - nick-

Figure 1: Wireless Private Automatic Branch Exchange (PABX) with Base Stations (BS) and Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN)

named the "phone-demo" - in a few months in the constraint logic programming language ECL^{i}PS^e [MS*95]. The language includes a library for Constraint Handling Rules (CHR) [FrBr95, Fru95], which are a high-level language extension to implement arbitrary constraint systems. The CHR library was essential for a rapid, flexible and efficient implementation of the geometric constraints that appear in this optimization problem. The prototype is part of the demo suite of ECL^{i}PS^e 3.4. Based on this prototype, J.-R. Molwitz from the University of Aachen implemented the tool POPULAR [Mol94] within one man-year while at Siemens.

In the next section, we introduce the physical model of radio wave propagation used in our application. Then we describe the implementation giving details about the constraint solving involved in the optimization. Finally, we conclude the paper with an evaluation of our tool. This work is a companion paper to [FMB96] which does not describe the implementation, but concentrates on the model used and its features (here section 2). For a general survey on constraint logic programming see [JaMa94], for a survey on its applications [Wal96].

2   Modeling Picocellular Radio

Radio wave propagation suffers mainly from the following effects:

- attenuation (weakening) of the signal due to the distance,

- shadowing (absorption) through obstacles,

- multipath propagation due to reflection and diffraction.

Figure 2 shows an example of the resulting path loss over distance on a logarithmic scale. At $6m$ and $9m$ walls are weakening the signal.


Figure 2: Path loss with additional attenuation at $6m$ and $9m$ due to walls

The COST[1] Subgroup 'Propagation Models' proposed the following path loss model [COS90]:

$$L_P = L_{1m} + 10\,n\,\log_{10} d + \sum_i k_i\,F_i + \sum_j p_j\,W_j \tag{1}$$

where L_P : total path loss in dB,
L_{1m}: path loss in 1 m distance from transmitter,
n : propagation factor,
d : distance between transmitter and receiver,
k_i : number of floors of kind i in the propagation path,
F_i : attenuation factor of one floor of kind i,
p_j : number of walls of kind j in the propagation path,
W_j : attenuation factor of one wall of kind j.

---

[1]European Cooperation in the field Of Scientific and Technical research

The model is based on the power balance of wireless transmission. It combines a distance dependent term with correction factors for extra path loss due to floors and walls of the building in the propagation path.

So far the path loss model does not take reflection and hence multipath effects into account. Even with sufficient receiver sensitivity a radio link could fail due to fading and too many bit errors that result from it. Thus a *fading reserve* (fade margin) is introduced. Furthermore, we also extended the model to take the directional effect of an antenna into account, since antennas do not beam with the same energy in every direction.

3   Planning in POPULAR

Given a blue-print of the building and information about the materials used for walls and ceilings, POPULAR computes the minimal number of senders and their location by simulating the propagation of radio-waves using ray tracing and subsequent optimization of the number of senders needed to cover the whole building.

To get a description of a building one scans in a blue-print. From the scanned image, the walls and ceilings are redrawn. Each wall and ceiling gets its own attenuation factor.

3.1   Simulation of Radio Cells by Ray-Tracing

The characteristics of the building are computed using of test points. Each test point represents a possible receiver position. The test points are placed on a 3-dimensional grid inside the volume that should be covered. At each floor of the building, there is one such layer of test points (fig. 3). For each test point the space where a sender can be put to cover the test point, the "radio-cell", is calculated. If the test grid is sufficiently small (several per squaremeter), we can expect that if two neighbouring test points are covered, the space inbetween - hence the whole building - can also be covered.

Ray tracing simulates the propagation of radio waves through the walls and ceilings of the building. To get to the point of minimal sensitivity (i.e. maximal permissible path loss), each path must be followed through the whole building (fig. 4). The values of antenna attenuation in the direction of the path, the path loss due to the distance and the insertion losses due to intersections of the path with walls and floors are added up to the maximal permissible path loss. The resulting end points are used to describe the hull of the radio cell. We use binary (dichotomy) search to find the threshold location for each ray to speed up the simulation. For each test point, 128 rays are computed in POPULAR.

Note that the radio-cell will usually be a rather odd-shaped object, since the coverage is not a smooth or even differentiable function. The received power at

Figure 3: Grid of test points in a building

a single point may exhibit discontinuities because of tiny changes in the sender
location - for example, a move around the corner can cause an entirely different
pattern of transmitted rays. This is the reason, why the path loss formula cannot
be directly expressed as a constraint and why ray-tracing has to be used. Also
note that the coverage that can be computed is noisy, i.e limited in accuracy,
otherwise we would have to calculate the effect of e.g. every piece of furniture.

In practice, the base stations are installed at the same height at each floor,
on the ceiling or on the walls. This means that on each floor, the possible space
of locations for base stations is on a single plane. This plane is intersected with
the radio cells, reducing them from a polyeder to a series of connected polygons
(one for each floor) (fig. 5).

3.2   Constraint-Based Optimization

For each of the resulting polygons a constraint is set up that there must be (at
least) one location of a sender (geometrically speaking, a point) somewhere in
that space. Then, we try to find locations that are in as many polygons at the
same time as possible. This means that a sender at one of these locations will
cover several test points at once. Thus the possible locations are constrained to
be in the intersections of the polygons covered. In this way, a first solution is
computed. Next, to minimize the number of senders, we use a branch-and-bound
method. It consists in repeatedly searching for a solution with a smaller number
of senders until the minimal number is found.

The result of covering a medieval monastery is shown in figure 6, where four
senders are needed. If more than one sender covers a region, it is attributed to

Figure 4: Path from transmitter intersecting a ceiling and a wall

the sender that provides the strongest signal.

In a first attempt restricted to two dimensions, we approximated a polygon by a single rectangle. The 2-D coordinates are of the form X#Y, rectangles are orthogonal to the coordinate system and are represented by a pair, composed of their left lower and right upper corner coordinates. For each polygon, simply a constraint inside(Sender, Rectangle) is imposed, where Sender refers to a point that must be inside the Rectangle.

The constraint solver was implemented using Constraint Handling Rules (CHR) [FrBr95, Fru95], which are our proposal to allow for more flexibility and application-oriented customization of constraint systems. CHR are a declarative language extension especially designed for writing user-defined constraints. CHR are essentially a committed-choice language consisting of multi-headed guarded rules that rewrite constraints into simpler ones until they are solved. The CHR code for the inside constraint is simply:

```
% inside(Sender, LeftLowerCorner - RightUpperCorner)

not_empty @ inside(S,A#B-C#D) ==> A<C,B<D.

intersect @ inside(S,A1#B1-C1#D1),inside(S,A2#B2-C2#D2) <=>
        A is max(A1,A2), B is max(B1,B2),
        C is min(C1,C2), D is min(D1,D2),
        inside(S,A#B-C#D).
```

The first rule (named not_empty) says that the constraint inside(S,A#B-C#D) is only valid if also the condition A<C,B<D is fulfilled, so that the rectangle has a non-

Figure 5: Typical radio coverage areas in a building

empty area. The `intersect` rule says that if a senders location `S` is constrained by two `inside` constraints to be in two rectangles at once, we can replace these two constraints by a single `inside` constraint whose rectangle is computed as the intersection of the two initial rectangles.

To compute a solution, after we have set up all the `inside` constraints, we try to equate as many senders as possible. (This is called the "labeling phase" of the constraint computation). A simple way to do this is the following recursive procedure:

```
equate_senders([]) <=>
equate_senders([S|L]) <=>
        (member(S,L) or true), % equate S with another sender or not
        equate_senders(L).
```

For each sender `S`, the piece of code `(member(S,L) or true)` nondeterministically equates `S` with one of the remaining senders in the lest `L` using `member` or does not do so (`true`). Equating senders causes the `intersect` rule to fire with the constraints associated with the senders. As a result of this labeling procedure, a senders location will be constrained more and more and thus the `intersect` rule will be applied again and again until the rectangle becomes very small and finally empty. Then the `not_empty` rule applies, causes failure and so initiates chronological backtracking that will lead to another choice.

A good heuristic for equating senders takes advantage of the geometric nature of the problem and equates senders from polygons associated with nearby test

Figure 6: Covering a medieval monastery

points first. The result of the optimization is a few senders constrained to be located inside some small rectangle.

It took just 10 minutes to extend this solver so that it works with union of rectangles, that can describe the polygon more accurately, actually to any desired degree of precision. This corresponds to a disjunctive constraint of the form `inside(S,R1) or inside(S,R2) or ... or inside(S,Rn)` which is more compactly implemented as `inside(S,[R1,R2,...,Rn])`. "Geom" stands for "geometrical object".

```
% inside(Sender, GeomList)

intersect @ inside(S, L1), inside(S, L2) <=>
```

```
        intersect_geoms(L1, L2, L3),
        L3 = [_|_],            % at least one geom left
        inside(S, L3).

intersect_geoms(L1, L2, L3) <=>
        setof(Geom, intersect_geom(L1,L2,Geom), L3).

intersect_geom(L1, L2, rect(A#B,C#D)) <=>
        member(rect(A1#B1,C1#D1), L1),
        member(rect(A2#B2,C2#D2), L2),
        A is max(A1,A2), B is max(B1,B2),
        C is min(C1,C2), D is min(D1,D2),
        A<C, B<D. % not empty
```

The above solver can be adapted quickly to work with other geometric objects than rectangles by changing the definition of `intersect_geom/3`. Also, the lifting to 3 dimensions just amounted to adding a third coordinate and code analogous to the one for the other dimensions. The simplicity of the solver does not mean primitiveness or triviality, it rather illustrates the power of CHR, since it would be quite hard to implement the functionality in a hard-wired black-box solver:

Already in the initial non-disjunctive case there are problems: Finite domains are in principle applicable, however coordinates would have to be rounded to integers. Also, we found that for our application the built-in finite domain solver of ECL^{i}PS^e was slightly slower than the CHR implementation. Using linear polynomial constraints would be an overkill and thus inefficient, too. Interval arithmetic as in CLP(BNR) [Ben95] or `Newton` [BMH94] can express the required constraints more adequately - even when we move from rectangles to other geometric objects that are described by non-linear equations. However, the actually used disjunctive geometric constraints would require recasting using auxiliary variables, which is expensive, error-prone and limits the amount of propagation. The cardinality constraint of cc(FD) [HSD95] could be used to express the disjunction. But to the best of our knowledge, a glass-box system combining interval reasoning and cardinality is not available.

4 Evaluation and Conclusions

While we worked on POPULAR, without knowing from each other, the WISE tool [FGK*95] was developed with exactly the same functionality. WISE is written in about 7500 lines of C++. For optimization WISE uses an adaptation of the Nelder-Mead direct search method that optimizes the percentage of the building covered. A recent paper [StEp96] uses the Nelder-Mead method for continuous space and Hopfield Neural Networks for a modelling in discrete space. The authors shortly mention a tool called IWNDT which is programmed in C.

POPULAR is a state-of-the-art tool. For a typical office building, an optimal placement is found by POPULAR within a few minutes. This is impressive since everything (including ray tracing and a graphical user interface) was implemented in a CLP language. The CLP code is just about 4000 lines with more than half of it for graphics and user interface. The overall quality of the placements produced is comparable to that of a human expert. The precision of the placements is within 0.7 meters. It is influenced by the underlying path loss model with its the fading reserve, the number of rays used in the simulation and the approximation of radio cells by unions of rectangles.

While the simulation phase has linear complexity in the number of test points, the optimization phase has a theoretical exponential complexity. Our practical experience shows, however, that the actual complexity is much lower. Ray tracing is fast by limiting the number of rays to 128 and by using binary (dichotomy) search for the threshold of each ray. The labeling benefits from heuristics that take the geometric nature of the problem into account. The average run-time on a SUN SPARCStation 10 was almost linear in the number of walls and test points, with about $25ms$ per wall and per test point. In a big building, this number may reach several thousands, resulting in computation times of about a minute and placing up to 25 base stations.

The necessary constraints were expressed and implemented with ease in CHR. Simplicity, flexibility, efficiency and rapid prototyping were the advantages of using CHR: The application was extended from rectangles to unions of rectangles, from 2-D to 3-D. Also, restricting allowed senders locations to walls or near ceilings or to aisles for ease of installation and maintenance was just a matter of constraining the sender positions to the union of the allowed spaces.

References

[Ben95] F. Benhamou. Interval constraint logic programming. In A. Podelski, editor, Constraint Programming: Basics and Trends. LNCS 910, March 1995.

[BMH94] F. Benhamou, D. MacAllester, and P. Van Hentenryck. CLP(Intervals) Revisited, In ILPS'94. MIT Press, 1994.

[COS90] COST 231 'Propagation Models' Subgroup. *Building Penetration Losses*. COST 231 TD (90) 116, Darmstadt, December 1990.

[ETS92] ETS 300 175-1:1992. *Radio Equipment And Systems (RES); Digital European Cordless Telecommunications (DECT); Common Interface; Part 1: Overview*. European Telecommunications Standards Institute, October 1992.

[FGK*95] S. J. Fortune, D. M. Gay, B. W. Kernighan et al., WISE Design of Indoor Wireless Systems, IEEE Computational Science and Engineering, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 58-68, Spring, 1995.

[FMB96] T. Frühwirth, J.-R. Molwitz and P. Brisset, Planning Cordless Business Communication Systems, IEEE Expert Magazine, Special Track on Intelligent Telecommunications, February 1996.

[FrBr95] T. Frühwirth and P. Brisset, Chapter on Constraint Handling Rules, in ECLiPSe 3.5.1 Extensions User Manual, ECRC Munich, Germany, December 1995.

[Fru95] T. Frühwirth, *Constraint Handling Rules*, Chapter in Constraint Programming: Basics and Trends (A. Podelski, Ed.), Springer LNCS 910, pp. 90ff, March 1995.

[HSD95] P. Van Hentenryck, Vijay A. Saraswat, and Y. Deville, Constraint processing in cc(fd), In A. Podelski, editor, Constraint Programming : Basics and Trends. Springer Verlag, LNCS 910, 1995.

[JaMa94] J. Jaffar and M. J. Maher, Constraint Logic Programming: A Survey, Journal of Logic Programming, 1994:19,20:503-581.

[Mol94] J.-R. Molwitz, *Entwicklung eines Werkzeugs zur Planung picozellularer Funknetze für die drahtlose Kommunikation*, Master Thesis, in German, University of Technology, Aachen, Germany, June 1994.

[MS*95] M. Meier, J. Schimpf et al., ECLiPSe 3.5.1 User Manual, ECRC Munich, Germany, December 1995.

[StEp96] D. Stamatelos and A. Ephremides, Spectral Efficiency and Optimal Base Placement for Indoor Wireless Networks, IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communicatrions, Vol. 14, No.4, May 1996.

[Tut90] W. H. W. Tuttlebee (Ed.). *Cordless Telecommunications in Europe.* Springer Verlag London Limited, 1990.

[Wal96] M. Wallace, Survey: Practical Applications of Constraint Programming, Constraints Journal, Vol.1, No.1, 1996.