



Project acronym:	SENDORA	
Project title:	<u>SE</u> nsor <u>N</u> etwork for <u>D</u> ynamic and <u>cO</u> gnitive <u>R</u> adio <u>A</u> ccess	
Project number:	European Commission – 216076	
Call identifier:	FP7-ICT-2007-1.1	
Start date of project:	01/01/2008	Duration: 36 months

Deliverable reference number:	D2.1
Deliverable title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
Version:	4.0
Due date of deliverable:	M24 (December 2009)
Actual submission date:	11 th January 2010
Lead beneficiary:	TEL
Authors:	Ole Grøndalen (TEL, editor), Frode Bøhagen (TEL), Isabelle Tardy (TEL), Vegard Hassel (TEL), Markku Lähteenoja (TEL), Borgar Olsen (TEL), Pål Grønsund (TEL), Aawatif Hayar (EURE), Bertrand Mercier (TCF), Christophe Le Martret (TCF)

Project co-funded by the European Commission within the 7th Framework Programme		
DISSEMINATION LEVEL		
PU	Public	X
PCA	Public with confidential annex	
CO	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including Commission Services)	

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is an updated version of the report D2.1 "Scenario descriptions and system requirements". It is focused on the SENDORA target scenario and has been refined from its 1.0 version delivered in Month 3 and from its 3.0 version delivered in Month 9. Preliminary results of on-going techno-economical study are reported. This study will be continued in 2010 and finally reported in the D2.2 deliverable.

In SENDORA, the target scenario is refined in an iterative process. The first version of the deliverable D2.1 described the process for the selection of the target scenario based on initial assumptions regarding techno-economical parameters and technological performance and constraints. This scenario has been refined during the project based on new results from the business case evaluations and the technical studies conducted in 2009. This version of the document is the final status of the SENDORA system specifications.

The selected target scenario for the SENDORA project is the "nomadic broadband in urban and suburban areas" scenario. In this scenario cognitive radio is used to provide a broadband service to users that are stationary when logged on the network. This scenario is expected to have a very good market potential since it can provide many of the same services as mobile broadband at a lower cost. Cognitive radio is also seen as the best solution for this application, since the system can use the frequency that best fits the radio propagation environment each user experiences. Alternative licensed technologies have to operate in given frequency bands and cannot adapt themselves to the propagation environment in the same way. The capacity of cognitive radio will also be better since the frequency resources available will be larger.

The innovative idea in SENDORA is to combine cognitive radio technology with sensor network technology. A sensor network will be used for monitoring the spectrum usage in an area and will significantly improve the system's ability to detect primary users compared to pure cognitive radio solutions. The sensor network will consist of an externally deployed sensor network and/or sensing capabilities embedded in user terminals. The external sensor network allows guaranteeing that primary users will be detected with a defined probability, regardless of the number of cognitive radios present in the area. Additionally, the embedded sensing in the terminals can enhance the system's performance by providing more local sensing information from the areas where the cognitive radio users are located and will improve sensing as the number of cognitive users grows.

The SENDORA system architecture consists of three parts: a sensing architecture, a communication architecture and a fusion centre. The sensing architecture and communication architecture are connected together logically by a fusion centre. The fusion centre receives the sensing data collected through the sensor network and estimates the spectrum usage situation in the area covered by the sensor network based on this information. The fusion centre also communicates with the communication network providing it with the information it needs to operate cognitively in an optimal way. Depending of the architecture chosen, the fusion centre might also act as the "brain" in the communication network controlling the global behaviour of the cognitive network and the sensor network.

The communication architecture consists of a centralized network of base stations through which the terminals can get Internet access, complemented by terminals communicating directly between each other forming local ad hoc networks.

The SENDORA system will be best suited to provide non real-time services like web browsing and video downloading. Real-time services like telephony and video streaming can be provided occasionally, but the operator will usually not be able to give strict quality guarantees for such services.

It is envisioned that the cognitive radio communication will use frequencies below 6 GHz. It is expected that cognitive radio will only be allowed in some frequency bands within this frequency range initially. Since it is important to have indoor coverage, it is important that the cognitive radios can operate at frequencies below 3 GHz.

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

CONTENTS

Executive Summary	2
Document VERSIONS	4
1 Introduction.....	5
1.1 Sensor Network aided cognitive radio objective.....	5
1.2 Architectures	6
2 Definitions.....	7
3 General ecosystem considerations	9
4 The chosen scenario: Cognitive radio based nomadic broadband in urban and suburban areas	13
4.1 Motivation	13
4.2 Scenario characteristics	13
4.2.1 Deployment strategy	13
4.2.2 User terminals	14
4.2.3 Geographical coverage.....	14
4.2.4 Services and capacities.....	14
4.2.5 Cognitive radio operating frequencies.....	14
4.2.6 Sensors placement, power and communication.....	15
4.2.7 Sensor sensitivity and spectrum release requirements	15
4.2.8 Combination with licensed services	15
4.3 System architecture	15
4.3.1 Communication architecture	16
4.3.2 Sensing architecture	17
4.3.3 Fusion centre	18
4.3.4 Cluster head.....	20
5 System requirements and constraints	23
6 Summary and conclusions.....	27
7 References.....	29
APPENDIX 1: Working assumptions and parameter values	31
APPENDIX 2: Preliminary SENDORA business case	37
Introduction.....	37
Business case definition	37
The idea of the business case	37
Environment and general assumptions.....	37
Spectrum	38
Business case input assumptions.....	38
Revenues	38
CAPEX (Capital expenditures) for the sensors	39
CAPEX for cognitive functionalities	40
CAPEX for new sites	40
OPEX (Operational expenditure).....	41
Business case results	41
Cash flow	41
Sensitivities, critical factors	42
Conclusions from the business case.....	44

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

DOCUMENT VERSIONS

Version	Date	Description, modifications
1.0	28/03/2008	First version
2.0	06/2008	Intermediate version (internal to the consortium) improving the system requirements for the selected scenario
3.0	26/09/2008	Second official delivery. To make the report easier to use as a reference document, it contains only text associated with the selected “Nomadic broadband in urban and suburban areas” scenario.
3.1	14/05/2009	Revision of the version 3.0 document based on the comments from the year 1 periodic review evaluators.
4.0	11/01/2010	Third official delivery. Update of SENDORA architecture, specifications update, techno-economical study preliminary report.

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

1 INTRODUCTION

This report is an updated version of the report D2.1 "Scenario descriptions and system requirements". The content of the current version consists mainly of updated and extended architecture and chosen scenario description, updated lists of system requirements and constraints and an appendix with the final working assumptions and parameter values used in the SENDORA project at M24. An appendix describing an example business case for a SENDORA system has also been included.

The updated information presented in this report is the result of an iterative process where the selected scenario and the corresponding requirements and constraints have been refined as more results from the technical and techno-economical studies have been obtained.

Initially, this document allowed to report the process of selection of the target scenario for the project. The text describing the different candidate scenarios and the selection process in the original version (1.0) has been removed. In this way it is much easier to use the report as a reference to obtain information and avoid misinterpretations about the specifics of the SENDORA system, as only information related to the chosen scenario is included. For information about the candidate scenarios, the selection criteria and the selection process, the reader can refer to the original version (1.0) of the report available on SENDORA project web page (www.sendora.eu).

1.1 SENSOR NETWORK AIDED COGNITIVE RADIO OBJECTIVE

The motivation for developing a Sensor Network aided Cognitive Radio technology is to be able to exploit under-utilized radio spectrum resources.

Indeed, various measurements of spectrum utilization have shown that spectrum is under-utilized, in the sense that the typical duty cycle of spectrum usage at a fixed frequency and at a random geographical location is low. This means that there are many "holes" in the radio spectrum that could be exploited in an opportunistic manner. While this observation stands in some contrast to the general picture of spectrum shortage as can be inferred from official frequency allocation charts, the presence of spectrum holes is understandable given how inefficiently radio resources, and spectrum in particular, are in fact utilized in current systems. Cognitive radios should be able to exploit these spectrum holes by detecting them and using them in an opportunistic way.

Cognitive radio is therefore an emerging concept in wireless access, aimed at significantly improving the way radio spectrum is utilized. The principle of cognitive radio is temporal, spatial and geographic reuse of licensed spectrum. The basic idea is that an unlicensed user can be permitted to use licensed spectrum, provided that it does not interfere with any primary users. The research challenges include devising methods for how such coexistence can be implemented in practice. Indeed, the capability to detect spectrum holes, without interfering with the licensed network currently in use, is the major difficulty faced today by the cognitive radio, even more when fine granularity of allocation in time and frequency is targeted.

The Sensor Network aided Cognitive Radio technology represents a way to solve this issue thanks to the introduction of sensor networks for spectrum sensing and monitoring. This concept is a system approach that involves a set of advanced wireless communications techniques like spectrum sensing, interference management, cognitive radio reconfiguration management, cooperative communications, end-to-end protocol design, cross-layer optimisation and flexible radios design. All these enabling techniques together will form a compound system able to improve the spectrum use in a significant way.

Beyond the technical challenges that have to be addressed to enable efficient sensing and to minimize interferences to primary users, another important aspect which should be considered are the new business models that are expected to emerge from the capabilities provided by cognitive radios. This deliverable reports some initial results from the techno-economical study performed to evaluate the potential of the WSN aided cognitive radio technology developed in SENDORA. This study will be continued in 2010 and finally reported in the D2.2 deliverable.

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

1.2 ARCHITECTURES

The innovative concept developed in SENDORA is the Sensor Network aided Cognitive Radio technology, that utilizes wireless sensor networks to support the coexistence of licensed and unlicensed wireless users in a same area. The general scenario of the Sensor Network aided Cognitive Radio is depicted on Figure 1. In the proposed system, the network of cognitive users, called the secondary network, first communicates with the wireless sensor network. The wireless sensor network monitors the spectrum usage, and is thus aware of the holes that are currently available and can potentially be exploited by the secondary network. This information is provided back to the secondary network. The secondary users are then able to communicate without causing harmful interferences to the licensed network, called the primary network.




Figure 1 General scenario for Sensor Network aided Cognitive Radio

There are two main classes of architectures for the wireless sensor aided cognitive radio implementation. They can be denoted as "Independent sensor network aided cognitive radio architectures" and "Integrated sensor network aided cognitive radio architectures".

In the first case, the sensor network is deployed in an area by an operator and cognitive radio users entering the area can communicate with the sensor network to get information about spectrum usage and/or instructions of how they can use the spectrum.

In the integrated sensor network case there is no independent sensor network: instead, the sensors are integrated in the cognitive radio user terminals. They perform the sensing process and detect in a collaborative manner their own transmission opportunities. In this case, the cognitive network is also the wireless sensor network.

In SENDORA, these two architectures can also be combined into a hybrid architecture. In the hybrid architecture, an independent sensor network is deployed in an area to ensure sufficient knowledge of the spectrum use even when there are few cognitive users present. Then, sensing capabilities are also integrated into the cognitive radio terminals to improve the spectrum sensing with local information delivery as the number of users grows. This kind of architecture is probably the most promising one.

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

2 DEFINITIONS




Figure 2 Spectrum usage in a generic sensor network aided cognitive radio system

Cognitive radio system

A radio system which is aware of its environment and internal state and can make decisions about its radio operating behaviour based on that information and predefined objectives. The environmental information may or may not include location information.

Cognitive radio base station

A base station that is used in a cognitive radio system. It may or may not have its own cognitive capabilities (sensing capabilities or cognitive actuation decision capabilities). If the base station does not have own cognitive capabilities, it will base its decisions on cognitive information from other parts of the network that have cognitive capabilities.

The cognitive network may be an ad hoc network and, in that case, there is no base station: all radio terminals are identical and direct communications between cognitive radio terminals can be set up.

Cognitive radio terminal

A radio terminal that is used in a cognitive radio system. It may or may not have its own cognitive capabilities. If the radio terminal does not have any cognitive capabilities, it will be instructed in how to behave by other parts of the cognitive radio system, e.g. a base station. If the radio terminal has decision capabilities but does not have any sensing capabilities, it will be provided such information by other parts of the cognitive radio system, e.g. a base station.

Fusion centre

A unit in which sensing data is collected and processed to deduce information about spectrum usage in the area covered by the sensors. A sensor network may have zero (in this case, the processing is distributed), one, or several fusion centres.

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

Wireless sensor network

A network of spectrum sensing sensors where the communication to and from the sensor nodes are wireless.

Independent sensor network aided cognitive radio architectures

An independent sensor network aided cognitive radio architecture consists of a sensor network that is deployed in an area to provide a cognitive radio system entering in the area with information about spectrum usage in this area and/or instruct the cognitive radio system on how it shall behave. Physically, the sensors are independent terminals, external to the cognitive radio terminals.

Integrated sensor network aided cognitive radio architectures

An integrated sensor network aided cognitive radio architecture consists of cognitive radio system composed of terminals with integrated sensing capabilities. Terminals are both cognitive terminals and sensors, and all the terminals of cognitive radio system constitute a wireless sensor network.

Nomadic scenarios

In nomadic scenarios the cognitive radio terminals are stationary when they are logged on to the network. The terminals can move when logged off and then log onto the network from a new location later.

Mobile scenarios

Scenarios where the cognitive radio terminals are allowed to move while communicating.

Primary network

A radio network that has been given the rights to use a certain frequency band on a primary basis. Other radio networks might be allowed to use this frequency band only when it is not used by the primary radio network.

Secondary network

A radio network that has been given the rights to use a certain frequency band on a secondary basis. The radio network can use this frequency band only when the primary radio network of this frequency band does not use it. Therefore a secondary network operates in a cognitive way to avoid creating interferences to the primary network, and is also called “cognitive network” in the following.

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

3 GENERAL ECOSYSTEM CONSIDERATIONS

This chapter presents considerations about the roles of different actors in the ecosystems for cognitive radio and related sensor networks, related to the chosen scenario: Nomadic broadband in urban and suburban areas. The deliverable which deals with the ecosystem and business cases (D2.2) is due later in the project (month 28), but ecosystem considerations are an integral part in the scenario definitions and system requirements.

The word “ecosystem” in this context means **business modelling** including the roles of the actors, relations (e.g. partnership) between the actors, cost structures, revenues and money flows between the actors. **Business cases** can be used to quantify the value of different scenarios and options. The figure below shows the main elements in the (telecommunication) business case analysis.




Figure 3 Business case methodology

Net Present Value (NPV), Internal Rate of Return (IRR) and the Payback Period are the most used economic profitability indicators.

At least the following roles can be foreseen in the ecosystem for the sensor network aided cognitive radio in the chosen scenario:

- End user of the communication applications
- Owner of the licence for the radio spectrum
 - Existing mobile and fixed telecommunication operators
 - TV broadcasters
 - Public authorities (police, health care, aviation, etc)
 - Military organisations
- Cognitive radio operator that will utilize a radio spectrum licensed to others
 - As above
 - New operators
- Regulatory body
- Spectrum broker
 - Regulatory body

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

- Owner of the licence for the radio spectrum
- Independent third party
- Owner of the sensor network
- Vendor of equipment
 - Cognitive radio elements
 - Sensor network elements
- System integrator

The requirement for a successful and functional new ecosystem is that the (main) actors have sufficient incentives to be part of that ecosystem. The most important incentive, at least for the commercial actors (private companies) is simple money i.e. the economical results for the company in the short and long term.

To start with, we have defined four different simplified alternatives for the sensor network aided cognitive radio ecosystem for the chosen scenario:

1. One actor uses cognitive radio and sensor network to improve or enhance running business
2. The owner of the radio spectrum sells cognitive spectrum resources to others
3. Spectrum broker is responsible for trade between spectrum owners and cognitive radio operators
4. Cognitive radio is deployed in unlicensed spectrum

One actor uses cognitive radio and sensor network to improve or enhance running business

The owner of the radio spectrum use cognitive radio for better utilization of its own spectrum to provide better service quality or to make new services possible in the same spectrum. For the nomadic broadband in urban and suburban areas, this could be an existing mobile operator that aims to provide nomadic broadband services in addition to its mobile voice and data services in the existing 2G/3G licensed spectrum.

In this alternative the owner of the radio spectrum will implement cognitive radio elements where needed and will also implement and own the related sensor network.

This alternative involves only one actor, so there is no need for agreements with others. If the license was originally limited to specific use or technology, there will probably be a need to renegotiate the license conditions with the regulator.

The business cases for this first ecosystem alternative are probably relative straightforward, i.e. the costs for implementing cognitive functionalities and the sensor network weighted with the economical advantages, like new customers and new revenues from the nomadic services and reduced churn for the mobile services.

The owner of the radio spectrum sells cognitive spectrum resources to others

The owner of the radio spectrum sells a cognitive access to its spectrum to others. The owner of the radio spectrum will implement and operate the sensor network and therefore will have control over interference etc. The cognitive radio operator will implement cognitive radio elements where needed in its own terminals and base stations.

This alternative includes two main actors (seller and buyer) and therefore requires agreements and trust between them. If the spectrum license was originally limited to specific use or technology, there will probably be a need to renegotiate the license conditions with the regulator. In case of conflicts between actors, there may be a need for independent instance to solve these conflicts.

A standardized interface between the cognitive network and the sensor network must be specified.

The business case for the owner of the radio spectrum includes costs for implementing and operating the sensor network weighted with the revenues from selling the spectrum and related sensor information to others.

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

The business case for the cognitive radio operator includes the cost for implementing the cognitive functionalities and for buying the access to the spectrum and sensor information weighted with the revenues from the new customers and services.

Spectrum broker is responsible for trade between spectrum owners and cognitive radio operators

This alternative includes a spectrum broker, which is responsible for “trade” between the radio spectrum owners and the cognitive radio operators. The broker should be the regulatory body or another independent third party to insure fairness in the trade. The broker owns the sensor network and controls the sensor information.

This alternative needs maybe more bureaucracy including agreements and trust between several actors, so it will be more complicated to implement than the previous alternatives.

A standardized interface between the cognitive networks and the sensor network must be specified.

The business case for the broker includes the costs for implementing and operating the sensor network, and revenues from broker provisions.

Cognitive radio in unlicensed spectrum

In this alternative a specific frequency range is not owned by one licensed owner, but all actors can operate there on equal terms. This is similar to the license-exempt usage of spectrum that occurs in the 2.4 GHz band for WLAN systems. The only regulation of the use of this spectrum is related to power levels and interference. This alternative is in line with the idea that the future spectrum regulation should be more flexible with more unlicensed spectrum.

The uncoordinated use of spectrum and free competition between actors means that this alternative is best suited for “best effort” type of services.

All the actors that will use license-exempt bands can utilize cognitive functionalities for improving their services. It is an open question, how sensor networks can be utilized in this alternative. It will need co-ordination and trust between the actors. Also some kind of independent broker functions, like in the previous alternative, may be needed to fully utilize the possibilities given by cognitive radio and sensor networks in this alternative.

A standardized interface between the cognitive networks and the sensor network must be specified.

This last alternative is not the targeted one within SENDORA although the technology developed in the project may help to consider this case in the future.

Combination of the above alternatives

The four ecosystem alternatives presented above are simplified examples. In reality the situation will be more ambiguous and complicated:

- One company can have several roles at the same time, e.g. one company can be a owner in one frequency range and at the same time a cognitive radio operator in the other frequency range
- Two similar operators can trade their frequency resources on equal basis, e.g. competing mobile and nomadic operators can make agreement about trade based on cognitive radio/sensor network to avoid temporary overload.
- Inside the alternatives there is several options, e.g. is the sensor network self owned, outsourced or provided by a broker?
- There will be combinations between the four alternatives.

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

Preliminary SENDORA business case

The assumptions and results of the first SENDORA business case are given in Appendix 2.

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

4 THE CHOSEN SCENARIO: COGNITIVE RADIO BASED NOMADIC BROADBAND IN URBAN AND SUBURBAN AREAS

4.1 MOTIVATION

Mobile broadband is becoming a very important service for both operators and users and it will be very important for operators to be able to offer good and cost-effective wireless broadband services. The mobility feature will only be required for a small percentage of the users since the users will usually be stationary when using the mobile broadband services. This opens up the possibility to use a nomadic broadband network, which will be simpler and more cost-effective than mobile broadband networks, to complement actual mobile broadband networks.

To use a nomadic broadband network can be an attractive solution for both operators with and without their own mobile network. For an operator with a mobile broadband network, a cognitive nomadic broadband network can be used to off-load the mobile network by transferring parts of the traffic to the nomadic network. An operator with a mobile network without broadband capabilities (e.g. a 2G network) can use the nomadic network to offer wireless broadband to its customers.

A nomadic broadband service can also be an interesting service in its own. In this case the users either settle for a nomadic service or combine this service with mobile services (e.g. a 2G or 3G service).

Cognitive radio based nomadic broadband networks can be a very interesting opportunity for operators since they can offer both high bit rates and low costs. But since it is difficult to give strict quality of service guarantees with cognitive radio, the solution is better suited for non real-time services like broadband internet access than for real-time services like telephony and video streaming. Cognitive radio based nomadic broadband services should therefore mainly target non real-time services, with the possibility of offering real time services if the spectrum (and other) conditions allow it.

Cognitive radio has the advantage that different frequency bands can be used depending on the user needs and the situation the user is in. For example, in the case where the cognitive network uses base stations, if the cognitive user has line of sight to a base station and is equipped with a directional antenna the user can use high frequency bands to obtain a very high capacity link. The same user can use frequencies below 1 GHz to get Internet access when located in the basement of buildings or in rural areas. Generally, cognitive radio gives the opportunity to use part or parts of a large frequency band that best fits the user's communication needs. If several parts of the spectrum are used, the transmissions in the different frequency bands might be bonded to give a virtual high capacity channel. This characteristic of cognitive radio makes it possible to offer a type of service that it is not possible to offer with licensed radio systems which have strictly defined bandwidths and operation limited to a certain (narrow) frequency band.

4.2 SCENARIO CHARACTERISTICS

4.2.1 Deployment strategy

It is likely that an operator will start with deployment of hot-zones. A hot-zone is a small area where the capacity demand is high. It is larger than a Wi-Fi hot-spot, and cognitive radio deployments in hot-zones will be complementary to Wi-Fi hot-spot(s) in the same area.

Initial hot-zone deployments are expected to be the preferred solution for both 2G and 3G operators wanting to complement or off-load their licensed network and for green-field operators. Later the hot-zones will be extended to cover large parts of cities and eventually whole cities with suburbs. It is therefore important that the sensor network is extensible to larger areas and scalable to handle an increasing number of customers. Finally, the network can be extended to give blanket coverage over a large area.

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

4.2.2 User terminals

Typical user terminals for nomadic usage are expected to be the laptops, Ultra-Mobile PCs, PDAs and smartphones. The antenna(s) can either be integrated (e.g. into the laptop lid) or be external. An external antenna can be everything from a unit that can be put on the table beside a laptop to larger antennas with better directivity. A large antenna can for example be used to obtain a high capacity backhaul link for a Wi-Fi access point that is temporarily put up when arranging a meeting at a location where no internet connection is available.

4.2.3 Geographical coverage

It is expected that an operator will typically start with local coverage in hot-spots or hot-zones covering areas ranging from a few hundred to a few kilometres in diameter. The coverage will later be extended to cover larger areas.

The cognitive radio network must give indoor coverage since the users will often be indoor when needing broadband services.

4.2.4 Services and capacities

The network will mainly provide non-real time services like web browsing and video downloading. Real-time services like telephony can be provided occasionally, but the operator will probably not be able to give strict quality guarantees for such services.

The bandwidth requirements will increase the coming years, and an increase of about 50% each year is not unrealistic [Cherry].

The bit rates offered to customers should at least be the same as offered by other mobile technologies like WiMAX and LTE in order to be able to offer the services foreseen. With this in mind a reasonable requirement could be that in urban and suburban areas the capacity offered to the users should be at least 5 Mbit/s downlink and 1.3 Mbit/s uplink in 2010 and increase to about 11.3 Mbit/s downlink and 2.9 Mbit/s uplink in 2012.

There is also a trend that the capacity required will be more symmetric in the uplink and downlink. Hence, the capacity requirements might increase faster for the uplink than for the downlink.

4.2.5 Cognitive radio operating frequencies

The operating frequency range will initially be parts of the frequency range below 3 GHz increasing to 6 GHz or more later as the capacity requirements increase. The cost of sensors that can scan and user terminals that can operate over such a large frequency range will be high initially due to relatively modest production volumes and modest number of users. It is therefore expected that cognitive radios in the beginning will be designed to operate in one or more specific frequency bands rather than over the whole frequency range.

As the number of users grows there will be a larger demand for capacity and it will be necessary to extend the operating frequency range of the cognitive radios. This will be possible as the production volumes increase and the technology becomes more mature.

This approach will also match the situation of different regulatory constraints in some frequency bands. Since it is difficult for regulators to allow cognitive radio operation in frequency bands where the existing frequency licenses give the licensee exclusive rights to use the frequency band, cognitive radio will only be allowed after the existing licenses expire and the possibilities for cognitive radio operation can be included in the license conditions. Since the licenses expire at different times in different frequency bands, this kind of cognitive radio operation will initially only be allowed in certain parts of the frequency band below 6 GHz.

Some licensees might also allow cognitive radio operation in their frequency bands (if allowed by the regulator), e.g. to improve their own usage of the spectrum or to trade spectrum with other operators. Also in these cases the cognitive radio operation will be confined to certain frequency bands.

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

4.2.6 Sensors placement, power and communication

The cognitive radio system will include a sensor network consisting of independent sensors nodes and/or sensing capabilities integrated into the user terminals. Independent sensor nodes can communicate either through a wired or wireless backhaul network. Integrated sensing will be communicated via radio.

Wireless sensors may communicate in an unlicensed band, in a (narrow) licensed band or use cognitive radio communication. Since it is important to pass information about detected primary users quickly and reliably, a licensed band would be best but it is uncertain whether such a band will be available. In any case, it shall be as narrow as possible, in order that regulation bodies accept to allocate such a band.

In densely populated areas, it will probably be possible to place fixed sensors so that they can be powered from the mains. The sensing functions integrated into user terminals will be powered from batteries.

4.2.7 Sensor sensitivity and spectrum release requirements

The regulatory requirements will determine how fast a primary user must be detected. The corresponding requirements will probably be different from one frequency band to another.

Even if the primary user detection time requirement is relatively relaxed, the requirements on the sensors can be very tough. In densely populated areas there will usually be a large number of cognitive radio users utilizing different parts of a large frequency band. The sensor network has to monitor the entire spectrum used by cognitive radio terminals to detect primary users within the required time limits.

4.2.8 Combination with licensed services

Due to the difficulties of providing real-time services with cognitive radio, it is a good idea to combine cognitive radio with one or more licensed radio technology in order to support all types of services.

Cognitive radio based nomadic usage can be a good complement for operators with 2G licenses. Their users can then be provided with a broadband service via cognitive radio. This service will only give a nomadic service, but the user will usually be stationary when needing broadband Internet access.

Cognitive radio based nomadic broadband networks could be combined with traditional broadband wireless services like UMTS/HSPA or WiMAX. In this case the user terminal could choose to switch to cognitive radio when the licensed system is not able to provide the service required, e.g. with respect to bit rate or coverage. The switch could also be initiated by the operator (assumed to own both the primary and cognitive radio networks) to off-load the licensed network by re-allocating users that do not need the distinctive functionalities of the licensed network (e.g. the mobility) to the cognitive system. Since the cost of acquiring new spectrum for licensed mobile broadband services is very high or even not possible at all, off-loading traffic by a cognitive radio network can be a very attractive alternative from an economical point of view.

Likewise, the user (or the operator) could switch from cognitive radio to the licensed technology when the cognitive radio system is not able to provide the user with the services he needs. Typically, this will be real-time services with strict QoS requirements.

It is also possible to have a system where the users at any time are connected to both the cognitive radio system and the licensed mobile system, and in which each packet is routed to the network that is best suited at that time.

4.3 SYSTEM ARCHITECTURE

The *sensor network aided cognitive radio* system architecture that is considered to bring cognitive nomadic broadband access is illustrated in

Figure 5. Both the sensing architecture and the communication architecture are represented in this figure. The sensing architecture is based on a fixed deployed sensor network with additional sensing capabilities at user

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

terminal level (hybrid architecture). The communication architecture takes advantage of this sensing architecture to communicate in a cognitive way.

The sensing architecture and communication architecture can be functionally connected together by a fusion centre as illustrated in Figure 4. The fusion centre collects sensing information from the sensor network and estimates the spectrum usage situation in the area covered by the sensor network based on this information. The fusion centre also communicates with the communication network providing it with the information it needs to operate cognitively in an optimal way. The corresponding interfaces will be defined in the project, in task WP44. The fusion centre might also act as the “brain” in the communication network controlling the behaviour of the secondary cognitive network, as well as the behaviour of the sensor network (referred to as the 'cognitive actuation' function and studied in the WP4 of the project).




Figure 4 SENDORA general system architecture

4.3.1 Communication architecture

Figure 5, the terminals in the architecture are marked with C, A and S according to their functional capabilities and H if they are locally cluster heads:

Centralized access (C)	The terminal has the properties needed to communicate with the base stations
Ad hoc (A)	The terminal has the properties required to establish and be part of an ad hoc network.
Sensing (S)	The terminal has sensing capabilities.
Cluster Head (H)	The terminal is the Cluster Head of a local ad hoc network

The communication architecture consists of a centralized network of base stations through which the terminals can get Internet access, complemented by terminals communicating directly with each other forming local ad hoc networks.

A centralized solution is an efficient way of implementing Internet access with predictable service (coverage, throughput, delay, etc.). Centralizing the intelligence and the sophisticated hardware also makes the use of low cost terminals possible.

Ad hoc communication between terminals located close to each other allows data to be transferred at higher bit rates and with less power than if the communication had to be transferred via base stations. Moreover, as terminals are close to each other, spectral opportunities will be higher in terms of capacity. In addition, thanks to ad hoc communication, the range and coverage of the secondary network can be extended by allowing terminals that are not able to access the centralized network directly to get access through nearby terminals with centralized access.

At any given time, some terminals will communicate with the centralized network and some will be part of local ad hoc networks forming what might be conceived as the *centralized part* and *ad hoc parts* of the network. It must however be noted that the centralized network and ad hoc network parts change all the time as terminals change from ad hoc communication to centralized communication or vice versa.

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

Some terminals have the capability to communicate with the centralized network and directly with other terminals at the same time. Such terminals can connect the local ad hoc networks to the centralized network, thereby providing the local ad hoc network with Internet access. This may be the role of the Cluster Head terminal.

The centralized part of the network will always make use of the fusion centre for sensing information collection and possibly for decision procedures, while the ad hoc part of the network may interact with the fusion centre as well but can also perform its own and independent distributed sensing and decision processes. In that case, the fusion centre shall nevertheless be informed of the decisions taken to be globally aware of the spectrum occupancy in the area.




Figure 5 Cognitive radio based nomadic broadband system architecture.

4.3.2 Sensing architecture

The sensing architecture consists of a fixed network of sensors complemented with sensing capabilities integrated in some of the terminals.

The reason for having a fixed network of sensors is that it is difficult to base the operation of a cognitive radio network solely on information from sensing integrated in the user terminals. The number and positions of the terminals will indeed be random variables and sometimes the sensor network formed by the terminals will not be able to detect primary users with the required confidence. By deploying a fixed and dedicated network of sensors

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

where the number and location of the sensors are carefully chosen, a certain primary user detection confidence can be guaranteed.

A fixed deployed sensor network also has the advantage that the sensors can communicate with each other and eventually with one or several fusion centre(s) through a wired backbone network and that the sensors can be powered from the mains.

On the other hand, sensing integrated into the terminals will be co-located with the cognitive radios and hence be capable of providing accurate local information. By using this information in addition to information from a fixed deployed sensor network, the cognitive radio network can be controlled in a much better way. Primary users in close proximity to the user, which are the ones that will experience the most serious interference from the cognitive radio terminal, will be detected much faster by the integrated sensor than by the deployed external sensor network.

The integrated sensing can also be much simpler than the deployed sensors, for example only monitoring the frequency band that is actually used by its associated cognitive radio terminal.

The fixed sensor network can probably be smaller (e.g. fewer sensors) if it is combined with integrated sensing in the terminals than if the spectrum sensing had to be solely based on the deployed sensor network. This gives reduced costs for the operator and a certain sharing of the sensor network costs between the operator and the users.

Based on the discussion above, different types of sensor nodes can be foreseen:

- Class 1: Nodes with high processing power, powered from the mains and connected to a wired backhaul network.
- Class 2: Same as class 1 but not connected to a wired backhaul network, i.e. they must use radio for sensing information communication.
- Class 3: Nodes with low processing power, battery powered and use radio for sensing information communication. Sensor nodes integrated into user terminals will usually belong to this class.

Information from the sensors in the fixed sensor network and from sensing integrated in terminals connected to the centralized network is collected in one or more fusion centres. The fusion centre(s) use(s) this information to deduce the spectrum usage and send(s) this information to the base stations. Then the base stations use this information when allocating transmission opportunities to the terminals. Alternatively, the fusion centre(s) can allocate the transmission opportunities to the terminals itself.

4.3.3 Fusion centre

The fusion centre functionally connects the sensor network and the communication network.

The fusion centre acts as an aggregation point (partial aggregation may also be performed locally by the sensors of the sensor network while collecting sensing information towards the fusion centre) for the data from the sensors in the sensor network. Based on the sensor data received, the fusion centre estimates the spectrum usage in the geographical area covered by the sensor network.

The sensors can either send sensing information to the fusion centre unsolicited or the fusion centre can poll the sensor network for sensing information. In the latter case a sensor will send a message to the fusion centre when it connects to the sensor network with information about its sensing capabilities and, if it is known, its position. The fusion centre will then respond with a message telling the sensor whether to sense or not and possibly instruct the sensor on how to sense e.g. which frequency range to sense, which primary system(s) to look for, the sensing policy etc. During operation the fusion centre can give new instructions to the individual sensors. In this way the fusion centre gets the sensor data it needs in order to utilize the sensor network optimally at all times.

The sensors integrated in terminals operating in ad hoc mode can ask the fusion centre(s) for information about the spectrum usage in the area they are located. They can also operate without interactions with the fusion centre in a distributed manner, but the fusion centre must always be informed about the ad hoc network's spectrum usage.

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

With respect to the communication network, the fusion centre can act as a source of information about the spectrum usage in the area and/or as an entity performing some level of control of the communication network. If the fusion centre only acts as an information source, the base stations allocate transmission opportunities to the terminals based on spectrum usage information they get from the fusion centre. The level of control that a fusion centre can have on the communication network range from simple control like instructing the communication network to use specific frequency ranges to detailed control of specific parts of the communication network like controlling behaviour of individual terminals.

The 'cognitive actuation' function will decide the frequency and bandwidth to be used by cognitive radio terminals but will also decide, in a refined architecture, some other parameters (like for example the Modulation and Coding Scheme (MCS), the retransmission scheme, etc.) to optimise the spectrum use. The corresponding decisions may be taken at different levels of the system architecture (at Fusion Centre level, Base Stations level, Ad hoc Cluster Heads level or cognitive terminals level). For instance, it can be more optimal to select frequencies at a high level of hierarchy (typically at Fusion Centre level) while it can be more optimal to select MCS at a link level (typically at Base Stations level). Therefore, the 'cognitive actuation' function implementation may be distributed on the system architecture.

A cognitive radio network might have more than one fusion centre which will communicate with each other and share information about the spectrum situation in their areas and the network's own usage of spectrum resources. In the following, we define the generic interface of a fusion centre:




Figure 6 Fusion centre inputs and outputs

Fusion centre inputs

- **Information requested from third party databases**
Some examples are:
 - Information from the regulator's databases about frequencies where cognitive radio operation is allowed and which primary system can operate in different frequency bands
 - Information about spectrum usage from primary system operators databases
 - Information about available spectrum from spectrum broker databases
 - Information from other cognitive radio operators' databases about their spectrum usage
- **Information pushed from third parties**
Some examples are:
 - Information sent from the regulator containing updated information about regulatory issues or instructing a specific behaviour of the cognitive system
 - Information from a primary system operator informing about time/frequency slots that is made available for cognitive spectrum usage

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

- Information from a spectrum broker about which frequencies can be used for cognitive radio operation during a certain time interval
- Information from other cognitive radio operators about their presence in the area and their spectrum usage
- **Information from the sensor network**
Sensor information from the fixed sensor networks and from sensing integrated in the terminals.
- **Requests for information from local ad hoc networks**
Local ad hoc networks can request information about the spectrum usage situation in the area they are located.
- **Information from other fusion centres**
This includes both sensing information and information about their own spectrum usage.
- **Information from base stations about own spectrum use**
This input will only exist if the allocation of the transmission opportunities is performed by the base stations and not by the fusion centre itself.

Fusion centre outputs

- **Instructions and requests to sensors**
The fusion centre can send instructions to the individual sensors (both fixed and integrated in terminals) in the sensor network about which frequency they shall sense, which primary system they shall look for, the sensing strategy etc. In this way the fusion centre can optimize the use of the available sensor network.
- **Information and instructions to base stations**
The fusion centre sends information about the spectrum usage to the base stations in the cognitive radio communication network. It can also send instructions to the base stations and in this way perform some level of control of the behaviour of the communication network.
- **Information about own usage of the spectrum**
This information can be sent to different parties, e.g. to the operator who owns the spectrum (as a basis for later payment), to other cognitive radio operators or to a spectrum broker.
- **Information to other fusion centres**
A cognitive radio network can have several fusion centres which may share sensing information and information about the system's own spectrum usage.
- **Information and instructions to local ad hoc networks**
The fusion centre can send information to local ad hoc networks about the spectrum usage in the area they are located. It might also send instructions to the ad hoc network about how it should behave, e.g. which frequency range to use. The scheduling of the traffic within the ad hoc network is however done locally within the ad hoc network, for example by the cluster head node in a clustered ad hoc network.
- **Information and instructions to individual terminals**
The fusion centre sends information about the spectrum usage to individual terminals in the cognitive radio communication network. It can also send instructions to individual terminals and in this way perform some level of control of the behaviour of the terminals.

4.3.4 Cluster head

In the local ad-hoc networks, one of the terminals is appointed as the Cluster Head (CH). The cluster head has a similar role in the local ad hoc network as the fusion centre has in the SENDORA network as a whole. Information from the sensing taking place in the local ad hoc network terminals (i.e. in the terminals with sensing capability) is collected by the CH. The CH uses this information to decide on how the available

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

spectrum should be allocated to terminals in the local ad hoc network and instructs the ad hoc network terminals on which frequency/time slots they can use.

It should be noted that the CH is not an autonomous unit in the SENDORA network, but rather handles a functional part of the Fusion Centre (FC). The FC must either allocate a set of available frequencies to the CH which the CH can then allocate to individual terminals locally, or the CH must ask the FC for acceptance to use a particular set of frequencies locally. The FC can also instruct the CH to behave in a particular way, e.g. to stop all local transmissions in a particular frequency band when a primary user using this band is detected somewhere else in the network.

Figure 7 shows the functional architecture of a local ad hoc network.




Figure 7 Local ad hoc network architecture

The CH that plays the role of interface between the local ad hoc network and the centralised network (and which may also be the gateway for broadband access provision to the ad hoc network) is one of the terminals of the local ad hoc network. If this terminal is switched off or has low batteries, then another terminal shall be elected. This CH election is classical in ad hoc topologies. Then the new CH handles the roles of the previous CH terminal.

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

5 SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS AND CONSTRAINTS

This section gives the requirements and constraints which are crucial for the design of the SENDORA sensor network aided cognitive radio system.

In addition to the requirements and constraints given in this section, there are also several parameter values and assumptions that the different WPs need but which are not crucial for the system concept. These working parameter values and assumptions need to be coordinated across the SENDORA project, and are given in the appendix.

The selected scenario is cognitive radio based nomadic broadband in urban and suburban areas with a hybrid architecture. Hybrid architecture means that there will both be deployed an external independent sensor network and sensing integrated in the user terminals.

REQUIREMENTS AND CONSTRAINTS RELATED TO THE COGNITIVE COMMUNICATION NETWORK

As described in Section 4.3, at any time the network can be divided into a centralized access part and local ad hoc network parts. The requirements below may be different for the two parts of the network. If that is the case, it will be explicitly stated.

1. Usage model

Nomadic, i.e. the terminals are stationary when they are communicating with the network but the users can move between sessions.

2. Network topology

The network will at any time consist of two parts:

- a. a centralized access network with dedicated base stations. In this case all wireless broadband communication is directly between the terminal and the base station. The base station has a connection both to the fusion centre and the Internet. These connections are typically wired.
- b. local ad hoc networks where all cognitive terminals are equivalent and organize themselves in a network. One (or several) cognitive terminal(s) can also be connected to the centralized access network and play the role of gateway for the other terminals to communicate with the centralized network part (e.g. for Internet access)

The topologies for the two parts of the network are specified in 4.3.

3. Terminal types

The terminal types will be laptops, Ultra-Mobile PCs, PDAs and smartphones. The main focus in SENDORA is on laptops and ultra-mobile PCs. Furthermore, three functionalities are identified for the terminals:

- Cognitive centralized communication (requirements described in this section)
- Cognitive ad hoc communication (requirements described in this section)
- Sensing (requirements described in next section)

A terminal may have one or more of these functionalities as described in Section 4.3.

4. Capacity for each user

The capacity experienced must be sufficient to be conceived as broadband by the users. The capacity requirements are expected to increase by about 50% each year.

- a. For the centralized part of the network, the requirement for 2010 is 5 Mbit/s for downloading and 1.3 Mbit/s for uploading of data. It is also expected that there will be greater symmetry between uplink and downlink capacities in the future.
- b. For the ad hoc parts of the network, a few Mbit/s is assumed in both directions, i.e. receiving and transmitting.

5. Services and QoS

The main services will be Internet access and other services without real-time constraints. Real-time services might be offered on a best effort basis. The system may offer some kind of QoS guarantees to

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

the users, e.g. minimum average bitrate measured over a relatively long period.

6. **Operating frequency range**

The operating frequency range will initially be parts of the frequency range below 3 GHz increasing to 6 GHz or more later as the capacity requirements increase. In most cases it is expected that only parts of this spectrum range will be allowed for cognitive radio usage in a given country or area. In addition, there will probably be different constraints related to cognitive operation in different frequency bands.

7. **Coverage**

Outdoor and indoor coverage is required.

- a. For the centralized part of the network, it is likely that an operator will start with deployment of hot spots or hot zones. Then the hot spots/zones will be extended to cover large parts of cities or finally whole cities with suburbs later. It is therefore important that the sensor network is extensible to larger areas and scalable to handle an increasing number of customers. Finally, the network can be extended into rural areas to give blanket coverage or at least coverage along the main roads and in villages.
- b. In the ad hoc parts of the network, the coverage shall be lower (maximum a few hundred meters) as the ad hoc network will provide connectivity to a more restricted area of the system.

8. **Available power**

Most terminals will be battery operated. The cognitive radio should not empty the battery faster than conventional technologies like Wi-Fi. It should however be taken into account that battery technology can improve significantly in the coming years.

9. **Dynamic power control**

The cognitive user terminals must have dynamic power control.

10. **User terminal and base station range**

- a. The centralized part of the network should be designed for a typical base station separation of 1 km.
- b. The ad hoc parts of the network should be designed with a typical maximum distance between the nodes of a few hundred meters.

11. **Resource allocation**

The transmission opportunities are allocated based on sensing information from the sensor network and other information (e.g. from the primary network or from other database). The cognitive radio terminals might be instructed to use a particular set of transmission parameters (e.g. modulation, FEC scheme, transmission power, etc.).

In the centralized part of the network the transmission opportunities are allocated by the base stations or by the fusion centre. In the ad hoc parts of the network more distributed resource allocation algorithms will be considered.

REQUIREMENTS AND CONSTRAINTS RELATED TO THE SENSOR NETWORK

1. **Mobility**

The sensors in the external sensor network will be fixed and their placement will usually be the result of careful planning by the entity that deploys the sensor network. The sensing in the user terminals may communicate with external sensors or base stations even when the terminal moves. But there are no handover functionalities involved, the sensing information is just communicated to other sensors or base stations that are able to pick up the corresponding transmissions of the terminals as they pass by.

2. **Topology for sensor network communication**

WP6 in cooperation with WP5 is currently proposing and studying topologies for the sensor network communication.

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

3. **Power for the sensors**

The external sensor network can be assumed to be powered from the mains, while the terminals with integrated sensing will be powered from batteries.

4. **Geographical layout and planning of the external sensor network**

The geographic layout must at least encompass the area covered by the cognitive nomadic broadband network. WP6 has produced outcomes regarding the sensor network dimensioning that allows the optimal placement of the external sensors.

The coverage of the sensor network shall be large enough to cover the area of cognitive operation. In particular, it shall be extensible and scalable as well.

5. **Frequencies for communication between the sensors**

In order to guarantee the availability of the sensing information and decisions, it will be assumed that the wireless sensors can use a narrow licensed band for communication. No specific bandwidth will be assumed for this communication, but it is important that this sensor network communication must be spectrum efficient.

In addition it will be assumed that the sensor network can use cognitive radio communication for capacity extension to transmit signalling information.

6. **Minimum probability of detection**

The probability for the sensor network to detect a primary user within its coverage area is at least 0.95.

7. **Scalability of the fusion centre**

The fusion centre must scale with the number of customers served, so that the coverage area of the network can be extended e.g. from a hot-zone to a whole city in a cost efficient manner.

CONSTRAINTS RELATED TO THE PRIMARY NETWORK

1. **Primary technologies**

The cognitive radio based nomadic broadband network will operate over a large frequency band which encompasses several frequency bands, each associated with a specific primary technology. The frequency bands and their associated primary technology might vary from country to country, or even from area to area. In SENDORA, the primary technologies that will be targeted are Wi-Fi, UMTS (including HSPA), LTE and DTT.

CAPACITY OF THE DEMONSTRATION PLATFORM

This section provides some general characteristics of the demonstration platform, especially of its RF part. The objective of the demonstration is to prove the sensor network aided cognitive radio concept and in particular the feasibility of the targeted scenario. The hardware constraints of the RF part shall therefore be taken into account for the design of the enabling techniques to be integrated in the demonstrator.

The main objective of the RF platform is to show that a highly reconfigurable RF transceiver is possible with existing available components. Hence, the targeted prototype is very ambitious in term of frequency bands, since the objective is to address from 200 MHz to 7.5 GHz, with a maximum bandwidth of 20 MHz. Hence, we will be able to receive and transmit almost all the existing commercial Radio Access Technologies. Concerning the transmitted power, the target is comparable to existing GSM terminals (+21 dBm). On the receiver side, the objective is to have a noise figure from 8 to 12 dB, depending on the frequency band. Since SENDORA is also considering Multiple Antenna Processing, the RF equipment will include up to 4 antennas and 4 RF chains. Finally, the key features of the targeted prototype are the following:

- It will integrate advanced re-sampling functionalities
- It will allow to communicate at the same time in different bands and different waveforms

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

- The board by default is Time Division Duplex based. It means that we use the same frequency band for Rx and Tx on one chain, and that a switch is used at the front end. In other words, one can only either transmit or receive. In order to implement a Frequency Division Duplex system, one has to use 2 chains, one for the uplink, and one for the downlink.

The overall RF board is composed of 3 parts:

- TX ANALOG PART
- LO DRIVES PART
- RX ANALOG PART

Each part has a control interface that comes from the digital mother board. More over, TX and RX parts have an I/Q signal interface to the mother board, for AD/DA conversion. OL part feed the 2 other parts in term of Local Oscillators for modulation/demodulation and frequency conversion.

A. Local oscillators

Since we address a very wide frequency band, the local oscillator generation is a key feature of the RF transceiver. The LO generation is based on a wide band frequency synthesizer (1.9 to 4.1 GHz) and a frequency doubler. Hence the LO range is from 3.8 GHz to 8.2 GHz. The drawback of this solution is that the frequency step is quite large, but it can be compensated digitally on the base band signals.

B. Transmitter section

The base band signal (zero IF) is in I/Q format, and fed to a quasi direct modulator. The chosen component allows one to generate a signal directly from base band to a frequency range from 4 to 8 GHz. The modulated signal is then filtered and amplified. Afterwards, a switch is used to separate low and high frequencies, if the signal shall be transmitted between 4 to 7.5 GHz

C. Receiver section

This part is certainly the most complex one, due to the very wide addressed frequency band (from 400 MHz to 7.5 GHz). As explained in section V, the LNA is a critical part, since the performance of existing wide band LNAs are not yet adequate (relatively high noise figure, non constant gain vs. frequency). Hence, the overall frequency band is divided (by a switch) into 2 sub-bands, one from 400 MHz to 2 GHz, and another one from 2 GHz to 7.5 GHz. After the LNA stage, the signal is filtered and the frequency bands are again spitted in 2 sub bands. It gives us 4 sub-bands:

- 400 MHz to 1.2 GHz
- 1.2 GHz to 2 GHz
- 2 GHz to 4 GHz
- 4 GHz to 7.5 GHz.

This approach is used to decrease the amount off outer band interference (one has to keep in mind that basically all existing RATs are received at the antenna level, sometimes with huge level of signal). After this part, the architecture uses basically the same principle as for the transmitter section. We up convert the signal into a frequency range of 4 to 7.5 GHz and the signal is converted into base band thanks to an I/Q MMIC mixer. The base band signal is finally filtered and amplified.

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

6 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This report is the final version of the report D2.1 "Scenario descriptions and system requirements" focused on the SENDORA target scenario. In the original version of the report the main goal was to define the target scenario that will be the basis for the system that will be developed in the SENDORA project.

Another goal for this final version of the report was that it should be easy to use it as a reference for information about the chosen scenario, its architecture and the system requirements and constraints.

The content of the current version consists mainly of final descriptions of the chosen scenario and of the associated architecture and chosen scenario description, updated lists of system requirements and constraints and an appendix with a snapshot of the working assumptions and parameter values used in the SENDORA project at the time of writing.

The updated information presented in this report is the result of an iterative process where the selected scenario and the corresponding requirements and constraints have been refined as more results from the technical and techno-economical studies were obtained.

The report also includes initial results of the techno-economical study. This study is still on-going and will be reported in details in deliverable D2.2.

The innovative idea in SENDORA is to combine cognitive radio technology with sensor network technology. A sensor network will be used for monitoring the spectrum usage in an area and will significantly improve the system's ability to detect primary users compared to pure cognitive radio solutions.

The sensor network will consist of both an externally deployed sensor network and sensing capability in user terminals. The external sensor network will make it possible to guarantee that primary users will be detected with a certain high probability while the sensing in the terminals will enhance the system's performance by providing more detailed sensing information from the areas where the cognitive radio users are located.

The SENDORA system architecture consists of three parts: a sensing architecture, a communication architecture and a fusion centre. The sensing architecture and communication architecture are connected together by a fusion centre. The fusion centre collects sensor data from the sensor network and estimates the spectrum usage situation in the area covered by the sensor network based on this information. The fusion centre also communicates with the communication network providing it with the information it needs to operate cognitively in an optimal way. The fusion centre might also perform some level of control on the communication network, e.g. giving instructions on frequency ranges the communication network can use or even controlling behaviour of each individual terminal.

The communication architecture consists of a centralized network of base stations through which the terminals can get Internet access, complemented by terminals communicating directly with each other forming local ad hoc networks. A centralized solution is an efficient way of implementing Internet access with predictable service (coverage, throughput, delay, etc.). Centralizing the intelligence and the sophisticated hardware also makes the use of low cost terminals possible.

Ad hoc communication between terminals located close to each other allows data to be transferred at higher bit rates and with less power than if the communication had to be transferred via base stations. This reduces the interference generated by the cognitive radios and increases the system capacity. In addition, the range and coverage of the network can be extended by allowing terminals that are not able to access the centralized network directly to get access through nearby terminals with centralized access.

The SENDORA system will be best suited to provide non real-time services like web browsing and video downloading. Real-time services like telephony and video streaming can be provided occasionally, but the operator will not be able to give strict quality guarantees for such services.

It is assumed that the SENDORA system will utilize frequencies below 6 GHz, but that cognitive radio will only be allowed in some frequency bands within this frequency range initially. Since it is important to have indoor coverage, it is important that the cognitive radios can operate at frequencies below 3 GHz.

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

Based on the selected target scenario, requirements and constraints have been specified for the cognitive radios, the sensor network and the primary technologies to be considered.

Finally, the report contains an appendix listing assumptions and parameter values that are used in the SENDORA project but which are not crucial for the system concept. The purpose of these tables is to ensure that the same parameters and assumptions are used by all partners and working groups in the project. This makes it easier to compare and combine results achieved by different partners and working groups. This version of the document presents the final status of these tables.

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

7 REFERENCES

- [Cherry] Steven Cherry, "Edholm's law of bandwidth", IEEE Spectrum July 2004, pp. 58-60.
- [Baum] D.S. Baum, J. Hansen, G. Del Galdo, M. Milojevic, J.Salo and P. Kyösti, "*An interim channel model for beyond-3G systems – Extending the 3GPP spatial channel model (SCM)*", in Proc. of IEEE VTC 2005 Spring, Stockholm 2005, pp. 3132-3136.

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

APPENDIX 1: WORKING ASSUMPTIONS AND PARAMETER VALUES

Note: the tables in this appendix contain assumptions and parameter values that are used in the SENDORA project but which are not crucial for the system concept. The purpose of these tables is to ensure that the same parameters and assumptions are used by all partners and working groups in the project. This makes it easier to compare and combine results achieved by different partners and working groups.

Assumptions and parameters that are crucial to the system concept are given in chapter 5 “System requirements and constraints”.

Table 1: SENSOR NETWORK RELATED PARAMETERS						
Parameter name	Description	Value	Justification/motivation	Proposer (WP)	WPs using the parameter	Comments
Pd	An individual sensor’s minimum probability for detecting a primary user	0.95	Initial assumption.	WP2	WP3	Finally, the value for Pd has to be set to satisfy the required minimum probability of detection for the sensor network as a whole (ref. D2.1 v4.0 chapter 5).
Pf	An individual sensor’s maximum probability of false alarm	0.05	Initial assumption.	WP2	WP3	
Primary system channel model	The channel model with corresponding propagation parameters for each primary system	SCME (3GPP Spatial Channel Model Extended)[Baum]	In deliverable D5.4	WP3	WP3, WP4, WP5	Well documented Matlab codes are available on the 3GPP web site. This channel model will be considered in the scope of D5.4
fres	Resolution of frequency scan	200 kHz	Initial assumption	WP3	WP3	
Tuse	Time for which a secondary user can use the primary resource, once it gets it	Will be specified for each type of primary system later in the study		WP3	WP3, WP4	
Pprim	A priori probabilities of the primary users being present	Will be specified for each type of primary system later in the study		WP3	WP3, WP4	

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

Table 2: SENSOR NETWORK RELATED ASSUMPTIONS

Assumption name	Assumption	Justification/ motivation	Proposer (WP)	WPs using the assumption	Comments
Sensing policy	Emphasis is on highly reliable detection of primary users, less on detecting secondary users. Initially, the preference is to identify the channels which are less used. Only one secondary system is considered, the coexistence of secondary systems is not considered.	The objective is to use the spectrum in an opportunistic manner	WP2	WP3, WP4	There are a lot of challenges in connection with detection of and co-existence with other cognitive radio systems in the same area. SENDORA will not be able to study these issues, and will focus only on coexistence with primary users.
A priori knowledge	The primary systems that operate in a certain frequency range in a given area can be assumed to be known by the fusion centre.	Initial assumption	WP2	WP3, WP4	
Sensor statistics	Initially it is assumed that the sensor statistics that are sent to the fusion centre are log-likelihood ratios (LLRs).		WP3	WP3, WP5	
WSN waveform	The waveform of the sensor network to convey the sensed information can be an OFDM, CDMA or spread spectrum based waveform		WP2	WP5, WP6, WP7	The project will assess which waveform is the best. The demonstrator will use an OFDM waveform.
Licensed frequency band	It is assumed that the sensor network operator has been allocated (i.e. been given a license for) a 10 kHz wide frequency band.	Need to guarantee the transmission of signaling messages related to the cognitive process	WP2	WP4, WP5	This do not preclude that the sensor network communicates at much higher bit rates using cognitive radio in other frequency bands. The narrow frequency band is required for the setup of the WSN and to guarantee the release of the spectrum when a primary communication is detected.
Sensor radios	The sensors will not transmit and receive data at the same time			WP3, WP4	
Interface to the communication network	Specification of a standard interface between the communication network and the sensor network must be established (even more when different actors are involved, e.g. if the sensor network is owned by a spectrum broker).		WP2	WP4, WP6	Interface defined in WP4. Interface that may be potentially brought to standardization.

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

Table 2: SENSOR NETWORK RELATED ASSUMPTIONS

Assumption name	Assumption	Justification/ motivation	Proposer (WP)	WPs using the assumption	Comments
Sensor antennas	It will be assumed that the sensor nodes may use multiple antennas. Sensors integrated in terminals will use maximum 4 antennas while the fixed sensor nodes might use more than 4 antennas.	Assumption for the definition of sensing strategies		WP3, WP4, WP5	
Capacity and QoS for sensor communication	The required capacity for communication of sensor information depends on the amount of information that has to be transferred and QoS requirements (e.g. latency) for different types of sensor information. WP3 and WP4 jointly assess the required sensor communication capacity and QoS requirements.			WP5, WP6	
Sensor node processing power	The processing power of a battery operated sensor node will be assumed to be at least the same as the processing power of a mobile phone today.			WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6	
Sensor node communication capabilities	If the sensor nodes use cognitive radio for communication it is assumed that they cannot transmit and receive at the same time.			WP3, WP4	
Link between global sensing and local sensing	Figure 5 shows a potential link between the global sensing and the local sensing.		WP2	WP3, WP4	
Exit strategy	A node stops its transmission in the bandwidth if a primary user has been detected locally in order to release the spectrum quickly, and then it informs the Fusion Centre through the sensor network.		WP3 WP2	WP4	

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

Table 3: PRIMARY SYSTEM RELATED PARAMETERS AND ASSUMPTIONS

Parameter name	Description	Value	Justification/ motivation	Proposer (WP)	WPs using the parameter	Comments
Primary systems	The primary systems that the sensor network must be able to detect	Wi-Fi, UMTS/HSPA, LTE and DTT		WP2	WP3, WP4	
Interference constraints	The interference constraints for each primary system	See sub-table 3-1	See sub-table 3-1	WP2	WP3, WP4	
Interaction with cognitive radio system	Interaction between the cognitive radio network and primary technology networks	There might be information exchange between the cognitive radio network and the primary technology network, e.g. information about the location of primary technology users.			WP4	

Sub-table 3-1: Primary system related parameters – Interference constraints

Parameter	Wi-Fi	UMTS/HSPA	LTE	DTT
Maximum response time	100 ms	10 ms/2 ms (TTI length)	0.5 ms (one resource block)	2 s (same as 802.22 requirements)
Detection threshold	-82 dBm over 5 MHz	-117.3 dBm over 5 MHz (10% of thermal noise)	-121.2 dBm over 200 kHz (same as thermal noise)	-116 dBm over 6 MHz (same as 802.22 requirements)
Acceptable level of interference	< -76 dBm over 20 MHz (from Wi-Fi standard)	< -117.3 dBm over 5 MHz	< -121.2 dBm over 200 kHz	< -116 dBm over 6 MHz
Maximum outage probability	0.001	1.39e-6 (10 TTIs every hour)	1.39e-6 (10 TTIs every hour)	3.5e-4 (30 sec per 24 h)
Maximum transmitted power	20 dBm (ISM requirements)	43 dBm	43 dBm	43 dBm
Signal bandwidth	5 MHz (one channel)	5 MHz (one carrier)	180 kHz (one resource block)	6 MHz (one TV channel)

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

Table 4: COMMUNICATION NETWORK RELATED PARAMETERS

Parameter name	Description	Value	Justification/motivation	Proposer (WP)	WPs using the parameter	Comments
Nusers	Number of users that must be served simultaneously	10	<p>a. For the centralized part of the network at least 10 simultaneous users should be supported for initial deployments. Later the system must be able to support a significantly higher number of simultaneous users per base station.</p> <p>b. In the ad hoc parts of the network, 10 simultaneous users should be supported.</p>	WP2	WP4, WP5, WP6	The maximum number of cognitive users that must be served will depend on the required outage probability that will guarantee the QoS of the primary system. WP3 and WP4 studies provide some indications about this.
Channel model	The channel model for the communication network	The propagation environment is urban and suburban non line-of-sight (i.e. with reflections mainly from buildings), both indoor and outdoor. The following channel models will be used: Cost-Hata (path-loss), log-normal (shadowing), Rayleigh (fast fading).	See deliverable D4.1	WP2	WP4	This channel model will be considered in the scope of D4.1

Table 5: COMMUNICATION NETWORK RELATED ASSUMPTIONS

Assumption name	Assumption	Justification/motivation	Proposer (WP)	WPs using the assumption	Comments
Location information	It will be assumed that 50% of the user terminals have an integrated GPS (or Galileo) receiver. Note however that GPS information will not be available indoor.		WP2	WP4	
Communication network waveform	The waveform of the cognitive network to convey the user communications can be an OFDM based waveform	Coherence with demo	WP2	WP5, WP6, WP7	
Interface to the sensor network	Specification of a standard interface between the communication network and the sensor network must be established.			WP4, WP6	This interface is considered in the scope of WP44 task

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

Table 5: COMMUNICATION NETWORK RELATED ASSUMPTIONS

Assumption name	Assumption	Justification/motivation	Proposer (WP)	WPs using the assumption	Comments
Accountability and enforcement	It is assumed that the SENDORA network has mechanisms that ensure proper accountability and enforcement in relation to interference infringements. However, the development and specification of such functionalities are outside the scope of the SENDORA project.		WP2		

APPENDIX 2: PRELIMINARY SENDORA BUSINESS CASE

INTRODUCTION

This appendix shows the results of the first business case calculation in the SENDORA project. The main deliverable for business case and ecosystem considerations will be D2.2 “Business case and ecosystem evaluations” in M28 (April 2010). It was however decided to include preliminary business case results in this last revision of deliverable D2.1 in M24 (December 2009) due to the recommendation from the Technical Review (March 2009): *“In the second year of the project, specific attention needs to be paid to commercialisation of the approach and corresponding business models. Some activities to involve potential users, operators and vendors should be planned.”*

The commercial wide scale application of the SENDORA technologies will be quite far in the future. This has a natural consequence that all SENDORA business case calculations are based on uncertain inputs and therefore one should avoid drawing strong and definite conclusions based on the results.

The goal of this first preliminary business case is to give an indication, if it is possible to make profitable business based on SENDORA concept, and secondly to identify the critical aspects influencing the profitability. This business case calculation will be improved and enhanced in the deliverable D2.2 that will also include new and different business case calculations (see possibilities of roles and business models in chapter 3 of the main part of this report).

BUSINESS CASE DEFINITION

The idea of the business case

The main idea behind this first business case is that several mobile, fixed and TV network owners (spectrum owners) will establish a **joint venture** and this joint venture will get right to use the “unused” (in space and in time) spectrum resources of all those operators in a cognitive way based on the SENDORA concept. So we can call the business case: **“Spectrum sharing based on the SENDORA concept”**.

This joint venture will build a sensor network and it will provide **cognitive nomadic broadband services** in the “unused” spectrum. The business case is calculated from the point of view of this joint venture i.e. the mother companies establish the joint venture and hope to get the invested money back by receiving dividends from the joint venture. The success criteria could be for example that the pay-back period (time, when accumulated cash flow turns positive) is less than five years.

Environment and general assumptions

The business case is calculated for a hypothetical European city with 1 million inhabitants and with an area of 400 km² (20 km * 20 km). All calculations will be made for this city, but can with some effort be scaled up and down for larger and smaller cities.

The studied city is assumed to have a well developed telecommunication market. This means a high penetration of both mobile (voice, data and broadband) and fixed telecommunication services and also TV services. A working competition environment with several network owners and service providers is assumed.

The commercial realization of SENDORA technologies lies some years ahead. To allow for this, the study period is assumed to be from 2015 to 2020. The traditional cash flow analysis will be used to get an indication of the profitability. Due to large uncertainties the cash flow analysis must be enhanced with sensitivity analysis. Discount rate for present value calculations is set to 10%.

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

The basis for this business case calculation is the SENDORA scenario description from the main part of this report:

- Nomadic broadband in urban and suburban areas
- Mostly non-real time services (best effort)
- Sensing architecture: both externally deployed sensing (fixed sensors) and embedded sensing in the terminals (integrated sensors)
- Communication architecture: in this first calculation only centralized communication network (communication via base stations)

Spectrum

The table below shows an example of the total frequency resources available for the joint venture (without specifying from which mother company they are coming). These numbers are included only to indicate what frequency resources can be available for such a joint venture; the numbers are not used in the business case calculations.

Frequency band	Size of the frequency band available for joint venture	Primary system
470-790 MHz	Some parts of 320 MHz	DTT
900 MHz	20 MHz	LTE (today GSM)
1800 MHz	60 MHz	LTE (today GSM)
2,1 GHz	60 MHz	UMTS
2,6 GHz	90 MHz	LTE
3,5 GHz	20 MHz	WiMAX

Table 1 Example of total frequency resources that can be available for the joint venture

This means that the cognitive operation and sensing is assumed to cover a spectrum area from about **500 MHz to 3,6 GHz**.

SENDORA spectrum trading (selling or buying of cognitive access to frequency spectrum) is not included in this first calculation. The joint venture will **get free access to all frequency resources** without paying anything.

Spectrum allocation is in this case based only on sensor information, not on a database lookup.

BUSINESS CASE INPUT ASSUMPTIONS

This section presents the input parameter assumptions used in this first calculation. They will be improved in the later versions based on received comments and other new information.

Revenues

The joint venture will provide nomadic broadband for the inhabitants and businesses in the studied city. It will do it with competition from several other providers. It is assumed that the joint venture will catch 10 000 nomadic broadband users in the first year growing to 100 000 users in the last year (2020), as shown in the table below. The well known S-curve is used to model the subscriber adoption per year.

YEAR	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
# of users	10 000	19 306	34 269	54 757	78 044	100 000

Table 2 Number of nomadic broadband users for the joint venture (end of year)

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

The average revenue per user (ARPU) per month is assumed to be 20 Euro in 2015 decreasing gradually to 18,1 Euro in 2020. This is on the lower edge compared to the most of the advanced mobile and nomadic broadband offers in Western Europe today. It is impossible to be sure what will be the general ARPU level at year 2015 and onwards. This is however a parameter that is independent of SENDORA technologies, so no sensitivity analysis is done for this parameter.

In reality there are important dependencies, like price elasticity between the mobile/nomadic broadband services from the other operators and the nomadic broadband services from the joint venture (i.e. if one operator increase its tariffs, it will get less users because of competition). These aspects are complicated and not taken into account here.

CAPEX (Capital expenditures) for the sensors

The joint venture will establish a sensor network based on **fixed sensors** covering gradually the total area of the studied city. In addition it is assumed that 50% of the terminals belonging to the customers of the joint venture have an **integrated sensor**.

Assumptions for the fixed sensor network:

- Required density of fixed sensors: 100 sensors per km²
- Price for the fixed sensor: 40 Euro (2015) decreasing to 23,6 Euro (2020)
- Installation of the fixed sensor: 25 Euro (2015) decreasing to 22,6 Euro (2020)
- These values are average values including on unspecified combination of Class 1, 2 and 3 sensors (see section 4.3.2).
- The CAPEX for fixed sensor network can possibly be shared with other player using also the same sensing information; if this is the case, the above CAPEX is reflecting the share of the CAPEX for the joint venture
- Roll-out:
 - 2015: the most dense area of the city, 100 km²
 - 2017: 150 km²
 - 2018: 150 km²

Assumptions for the integrated sensors:

- 50% of the cognitive terminals have an integrated sensor (Class 3)
- Price for an integrated sensor: 20 Euro (2015) decreasing to 11,8 Euro (2020)

The present calculation **does not include a dependency or correlation between the numbers of fixed and integrated sensors**. How to economically optimize the use of fixed and integrated sensors is one of the crucial aspects in SENDORA. Such considerations will be included later, when more information is available from the co-operation between WP2 and the technical WPs about the sensing and interference requirements.

Sensing of WCDMA (i.e. UMTS) primary signals can be a problem, because WCDMA spectrum is always "busy". We assume however that the joint venture has knowledge about the WCDMA codes used by the primary operator. Therefore WCMA sensing is not assumed to have influence on the complexity and price of the sensors.

In addition to the sensors, there is a need for (a) fusion centre(s). The assumptions for the fusion centre are:

- One fusion centre for the studied city
- Installed at first year (2015)
- Price: 150 000 Euro
- Installation cost: 10 000 Euro

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

CAPEX for cognitive functionalities

The joint venture will provide nomadic broadband services in the city area. It will start in the densest areas of the city at year 2015 and will later (after year 2018) cover the whole city. The number of customers for the joint venture is gradually increasing during the years. To be able to provide cognitive nomadic broadband services it is necessary to have new type of terminals and new hardware and software in the base stations.

Terminals must be multi-radio terminals (operating on different bands in the spectrum area 0,5-3,6 GHz). In the timeframe before year 2015 there will probably be significant terminal development towards multi-radio terminals with software defined functionalities (some advanced studies are already on-going in that direction, including in Future Networks FP7 projects like SACRA). Therefore we have assumed that **cognitive functionalities in the terminals is a part of the normal terminal development**, and costs for that are taken care of by the users when they are purchasing terminals i.e. they represent no CAPEX for the joint venture.

The assumptions for cognitive functionalities (hardware or software or both) in the base stations are:

- Number of base station sites where the joint venture is operating:
 - 2015: 50
 - 2016: 175
 - 2017: 250
 - 2018: 350
 - 2019: 400
 - 2020: 450
- CAPEX for cognitive functionalities in the base station sites:
 - 1 000 Euro (2015) decreasing to 590 Euro (2020)

Detailed radio and capacity planning will be further performed for the present calculation. The number of base station sites and the associated CAPEX are only uncertain estimates.

The sensor network operated by the joint venture uses a narrow frequency band (e.g. 10 kHz wide) as a fall-back for transmission of critical sensor information. It is assumed that this frequency band is used from a license owned by one of the operators in the joint venture, and therefore no license fee is included in the CAPEX calculations.

CAPEX for new sites

One of the most important cost elements in the mobile communication business is the CAPEX for establishing new sites (cabinets, masts, power connection, antennas etc) for the base stations. This CAPEX can be avoided by site sharing or co-location i.e. using existing sites also for new technologies.

The original idea was that the joint venture could use the existing sites from the mother companies only paying a site rental and not needing to establish a significant number of new sites. This raised a crucial question:

- Can the new cognitive systems function optimally when they are co-located with the “old” systems in the same base station sites ?

An answer to this question must be based on further work in the technical WPs. The following assumptions are made to avoid interference problems due to co-location of primary and secondary base stations:

- The joint venture can select optimally from a wide variety of base station sites from a wide spectrum range (500 MHz to 3,6 GHz)
 - DTT transmitter locations
 - Mobile base station locations; operating in several frequency bands
 - WiMAX base station locations
- The planning rule must be that the cognitive system will not use the same frequency band as the co-located primary system and that sufficiently wide guard bands are used to avoid interference.

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

In the present calculation the share of new sites is set to 0%, but it is implemented a possibility to make sensitivity analysis for this parameter with a CAPEX of 60 000 Euro (no decrease with time) for a new site. Not surprisingly, a moderate share of new sites makes the business case unprofitable (see below), so the aspect of co-location definitely needs more work and clarifications for the later business cases.

OPEX (Operational expenditure)

OPEX is here the periodic operating costs for the joint venture when it is doing nomadic broadband business. In this first business calculation OPEX is divided in 4 components:

1. General OPEX
 - 10 Euro (2015) per customer per month decreasing to 6,9 Euro (2020)
 - This OPEX component reflects the general efficiency of the new operator (joint venture) and covers e.g. customer acquisition (sales and marketing) costs and general operation of the company
 - It is highly uncertain and difficult to benchmark, but is independent from the SENDORA concept and is therefore not subject for sensitivity analysis later
2. OPEX for the fixed sensor network
 - 7 Euro (2015) per fixed sensor per month decreasing to 6,3 Euro (2020)
 - This OPEX component covers the power supply cost and (hopefully seldom) maintenance visits
 - Critical parameter due to the high number of sensors; subject to sensitivity analysis
 - The OPEX for fixed sensor network can possibly be shared with other player using also the same sensing information; if this is the case, the above OPEX is reflecting the share of the OPEX for the joint venture
3. OPEX for the maintenance of the cognitive base stations
 - 250 Euro (2015) per base station site per month decreasing to 226 Euro (2020)
4. Site rental
 - 350 Euro (2015) per base station site per month (no decrease with time)

BUSINESS CASE RESULTS

Combining costs (CAPEX and OPEX) with revenues gives yearly cash flows and from cash flows the standard profitability indicators, like NPV (Net Present Value), IRR (Internal Rate of Return) and pay-back period, can be extracted.

SENDORA is an innovative and long term project. This means that many basic assumptions in the business case calculations will remain (very) uncertain for a long time. The results will not give definite answers, but indications to evaluate if it is possible to make business utilizing the SENDORA concept.

Cash flow

The accumulated cash flow for the first preliminary SENDORA business case calculation is shown in the figure below. This is accumulated cash flow for the “Base case” using the input assumptions documented in the earlier sections of this appendix.

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010




Figure 8 Accumulated cash flow for the Sendora business

NPV for this case is 1,9 million Euro (study period 2015-2020), IRR is 24 % and the pay-pack period is in the range of 5 years.

The accumulated cash flow and the associated economical results are quite similar to many others telecommunication infrastructure projects. That means that it will be tough and long-term business case, where the operator (joint venture) must be patient and have financial strength (long term financing) to wait a longer period for the return on investment.

The input assumptions for this kind of future oriented business case are uncertain. There are many aspects, which are independent of the SENDORA concept, but have crucial influence on the profitability. Examples of these are the operational efficiency of the joint venture (influencing OPEX) and the competition situations (influencing ARPU and number of customers). We do not evaluate these aspects further, but concentrate on aspects where the SENDORA concept has crucial influence.

Sensitivities, critical factors

Sensitivity analysis is done here by changing the value of one (critical) input parameter and showing how the economical results are changing. All other input parameters are as in the "Base case". NPV is used as the indicator of profitability.

Density of fixed sensors

Fixed sensors per km ²	NPV Million Euro	
50	7,70	Base case
100	1,91	
117	0	
150	-3,88	

Table 3 NPV sensitivity of the density of fixed sensors

The density of the fixed sensor is definitely one very important SENDORA related parameter, because the number of fixed sensors must be sufficiently high to get reliable sensing and so it will have significant influence on the CAPEX and especially on the OPEX.

Price of the fixed sensor

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

Fixed sensor price NPV
Euro (2015) Million Euro

20	2,47	Base case
40	1,91	
60	1,34	
108	0	
150	-1,20	

Table 4 NPV sensitivity of the price of fixed sensor price

The influence of the price of a fixed sensor is not so significant, because it is a one-time investment.

Fixed sensor OPEX

OPEX per sensor NPV
Euro/month (2015) Million Euro

5,0	4,66	Base case
7,0	1,91	
8,4	0	
10,0	-2,22	
15,0	-9,10	

Table 5 NPV sensitivity of the fixed sensor OPEX

This is sensitive and at the same time uncertain parameter. The fixed sensor network planning (density, trade-off between CAPEX and OPEX e.g. high CAPEX for fixed sensor can mean robustness and lower OPEX requirements) and optimization with integrated sensors must be one of the focus areas for the further SENDORA work.

Need for new site infrastructure

Share of new sites NPV
% Million Euro

0 %	1,91	Base case
5 %	0,69	
8 %	0	
10 %	-0,34	
20 %	-2,48	
50 %	-9,12	

Table 6 NPV sensitivity of the share of new cognitive radio base station sites

Quite a moderate need for new site establishment means unprofitable business under our present assumptions. So the SENDORA project must try to find solutions which allow the co-location between primary and secondary systems as much as technically possible.

Project:	SENDORA	Deliv. ref.:	D2.1
EC contract:	216076	Deliv. title:	Scenario descriptions and system requirements
		Deliv. version:	4.0
		Submission date:	11 th January 2010

CONCLUSIONS FROM THE BUSINESS CASE

This first SENDORA business case calculation is based on uncertain inputs and therefore one should avoid drawing strong and definite conclusions based on the results.

This business case is probably one of the best possible cases for SENDORA, because it is based on the “joint venture” concept. The joint venture has free access to frequency resources of the mother companies, knowledge of the WCDMA codes used and good possibilities for co-location.

One very general conclusion from the present calculation is that it does not seem impossible to make profitable (long term) business by using the SENDORA concept.

The main value of this business case calculation is to identify, what are the critical SENDORA aspects influencing the profitability, so that the technical WPs can focus on them. The most critical (SENDORA) aspects influencing the profitability are:

- Sensor density
- Sensor OPEX
- New sites should be avoided

Further business case work in SENDORA (often with tight co-operation with technical WPs):

- Sensor planning
 - Dependency fixed/integrated
 - Different classes of fixed sensors
- Cognitive network planning
 - Number of base stations
 - Frequency plan to avoid the need for new sites, guard bands, DL/UL
- Better version of the present business case
- New business cases (e.g. for a broker)
- Spectrum trading

To organize the business case study analysis, cooperation work has already been launched: a working group composed of technical WPs representatives has reviewed this initial analysis through several conference calls and meetings in H2-2009. Some specific topics have been identified as crucial, like the WSN dimensioning (WP6) for which valuable inputs have already been brought to refine the study.