

Deterministic Scheduling of Periodic Messages for Low Latency in Cloud RAN

Dominique Barth¹, Maël Guiraud^{1,2}, and Yann Strozecki¹

¹David Laboratory, UVSQ

²Nokia Bell Labs France

Abstract

Cloud-RAN (C-RAN) is an architecture for cellular networks, where processing units, previously attached to antennas, are centralized in data-centers. The main challenge, to fulfill protocol time constraints, is to minimize the latency of the periodic messages sent from the antennas to their processing units and back. We show that statistical multiplexing suffers from high logical latency, due to buffering at nodes to avoid collisions. Hence, we propose to use a *deterministic* scheme for sending periodic messages *without collision* in the network thus saving the latency incurred by buffering.

We give several algorithms to compute such schemes for star routed networks, a common topology where one link is shared by all antennas. First, we show there is a solution without any buffering when the routes are short or the load is small. When the parameters are unconstrained, and buffering is allowed in processing units, we propose the PMLS algorithm adapted from a classical scheduling method. Experimental results show that, even under full load, PMLS finds a deterministic sending scheme with no logical latency most of the time, while using statistical multiplexing adds a very large latency. Using a modification of this algorithm, we obtain very low latency periodic sending schemes which do not disrupt additional random traffic on the network. This article is an extended version of a previous work presented at ICT [1].

1 Introduction

Cloud Radio Access Network or C-RAN, have been proposed as a next generation mobile network architecture to reduce energy consumption [2] and more generally the total cost of ownership. C-RAN is a centralized architecture: each antenna has a Remote Radio Head (RRH) which sends the signal to a BaseBand Unit (BBU) in a data-center¹. The main challenge for this type of architecture is to reach a latency compatible with transport protocols [3]. The latency is measured between the sending of a message by an RRH and the reception of the answer, computed by real-time virtualized network functions of a BBU. For

¹ Others terminologies exist in the literature. The results of this work are fully compatible with any variation of the C-RAN architecture.

example, LTE standards require to process functions like HARQ (Hybrid Automatic Repeat reQuest) in 3ms [4]. In 5G, some services need end-to-end latency as low as 1ms [5, 6]. The specificity of the C-RAN context is not only the latency constraint, but also the periodicity of the data transfer in the *fronthaul network* between RRHs and BBUs: frames need to be emitted and received each millisecond [4]. Our aim is to operate a C-RAN on a low-cost shared switched network. The question we address is the following: is it possible to schedule messages such that they do not collide in the network to avoid latency caused by queuing delays? Eliminating this source of latency leaves us with more time budget for latency due to the physical length of the routes in the network, and thus allows for wider deployment areas.

Let us expose briefly our model: the network topology is modeled by a directed weighted multigraph given by a set of directed paths (routes). A path goes from a node representing the sending of a message by an RRH, to a node representing a BBU and finally to a node representing the reception of the answer by the RRH. Time is discretized and a unit of time or *tic* corresponds to the time needed to transmit a minimal unit of data over the network. To obtain the best possible latency, we want to avoid any buffering in internal nodes of the graph, corresponding to switches of the network. We take advantage of the deterministic nature of the C-RAN messages, called datagrams, i.e. the dates of arrival of the datagrams in the RRHs are known beforehand. In fact, following LTE standard [4], we assume that arrivals of all datagrams are periodic with the same period. We propose to design a *periodic* process to send the messages through the network without collision. By periodic process of period P , we mean that the network at times t and $t + P$ is in the exact same state.

We assume that the route taken by each datagram emitted by some RRH is fixed, and there are no buffering allowed inside the network. Hence, we only have two sets of values that we can choose when building a periodic sending process, called a *periodic assignment*: the time at which each datagram is sent by an RRH in the period, called an *offset*, and the *waiting time* in the BBU before the answer is sent back to the RRH.

When building a periodic assignment, we must take into account the periodicity which makes many scheduling methods unusable. Not only a datagram must not collide with the datagrams sent by the others BBU/RRH in the same period, but also in the other periods. The latency, that is the time between the emission of a datagram and the complete return of its answer, must be minimized. This means that the only buffering we are allowed – the waiting time before sending back the answer – must be small, in particular when the route is long.

In this article, we assume that all RRHs send datagrams with the same periodicity, but are not synchronized. It means that the datagram of each RRH is available at a different time in the period, given by its offset. In current cellular network, the RRHs are synchronized, and simulating our settings would cost a large additional latency, since datagrams should be buffered in their RRHs to honor their offsets. Hence, the model we propose should be seen as a suggestion to design future cellular networks, where emissions of the RRHs are not synchronized. It can already model sensor networks in cars, logistic problems in production lines or multiprocessor systems, where periodic messages (or goods) must be scheduled over a bus (or an assembly line), since we have a better handle on when these messages are generated.

In this article, we focus on *star routed networks*, which represent a simple but common topology, where all RRHs share a single link. We give efficient algorithms for two versions of the problems, called PALL and PAZL, the second one requiring zero waiting time in the BBU. The algorithms are either polynomial or mildly exponential in n , the number of RRHs, and are able to compute periodic sending schemes for star shaped networks with tens of RRHs. The solutions we obtain are extremely good, with no additional latency most of the time, eventhough buffering can only be done in the BBU. For more complex networks and synchronized RRHs, studied in a follow-up work [7], we need to allow buffering at each node to obtain good sending schemes.

Related works

We show in this article that statistical multiplexing, even in a fronthaul network with a small load, does not comply with the latency requirements of C-RAN. Therefore, current solutions [8, 9] use dedicated circuits for the fronthaul. Each end-point (RRH on one side, BBU on the other side) is connected through direct fiber or full optical switches. This architecture is very expensive and hardly scales in the case of a mobile network composed of about 10,000 base stations. The deterministic approach we propose has gained some traction recently: Deterministic Networking is under standardization in IEEE 802.1 TSN group [10], as well at IETF DetNet working group [11]. Several patents on concepts and mechanisms for DetNet have been already published, see for example [12, 13].

The algorithmic problem we focus on may look like wormhole problems [14], but we want to minimize the time lost in buffers and not just to avoid deadlocks. Several graph colorings have been introduced to model similar problems such as the allocation of frequencies [15], bandwidths [16] or routes [14] in a network. Unfortunately, they do not take into account the periodicity of the scheduling and the associated problems are already NP-complete. The only coloring with periodicity is the circular coloring [17] but it is not expressive enough to capture our problem. The problem PALL on a star routed network is very close to a two flow-shop scheduling problem [18] with the additional constraint of periodicity. To our knowledge, all studied periodic scheduling problems are different from PALL that we consider in this article. Either the aim is to minimize the number of processors on which the periodic tasks are scheduled [19, 20] while our problem correspond to a single processor and a constraint similar to makespan minimization. Or, in cyclic scheduling [21], the aim is to minimize the period of a scheduling to maximize the throughput, while our period is fixed.

The train timetabling problem [22] and its restriction, the periodic event scheduling problem [23] are generalizations of our problem. Indeed, they take the period as input and can express the fact that two trains (like two messages) should not cross. However, they are much more general: the trains can vary in size, speed, the network can be more complex than a single track and there are precedence constraints. Hence, the numerous variants of train scheduling problems are very hard to solve (and always NP-hard). Thus, some delay is allowed to make the problems solvable and most of the research done [22] is devising practical algorithms using branch and bound, mixed integer programming, genetic algorithms. . . In the same spirit, complex scheduling problems for time sensitive networks have also been practically solved, using mixed integer programming [24, 25] or an SMT solver [26].

Outline

In Section 2, we propose a model of the fronthaul network and the periodic sending of datagrams along its routes. Then, we introduce the problem **PALL** to formalize the problem of finding a periodic sending of the messages in a network without collision at contention point. We also present the problem **PAZL**, a restriction of **PALL** where no waiting time in the BBU is allowed. We present a simple but very common topology, the star routed network, with a single shared duplex link, that is studied in the rest of the article. In Section 3, we prove that both **PAZL** and **PALL** are **NP-hard** for very restricted classes of graphs, and that their optimization counterparts are hard to approximate. In Section 4, we study the problem **PAZL** and several algorithms are proposed: Polynomial time for small load or small routes, or exponential time in the number of routes, based on a compact representation of optimal solutions. We use these algorithms to provide experimental evidences that **PAZL** can be solved positively when the network is mildly loaded. In Section 5, we propose polynomial time heuristics and an exact **FPT** algorithm for the general **PALL** problem and experimentally show that they work well, even in extremely loaded networks. Finally, in Section 6, we show that our solution largely outperforms stochastic multiplexing, even using a buffering policy taking into account the latency, or in the presence of additional random traffic in the network.

2 Modeling of the Problem

Let $[n]$ denote the interval of n integers $\{0, \dots, n-1\}$.

2.1 Routes and Contention Points

We study a communication network constituted of pairs of vertices between which messages are sent periodically. The routing between each pair of such nodes is given: a **route** is a sequence of vertices (s, c_1, \dots, c_l, t) . A vertex appears only once in a route, that is there is no loop in a route. Each vertex c_i corresponds to a contention point, which is the beginning of a link of the communication network shared by several routes. Hence, all vertices appear in several routes, except s , the first vertex of the route, and t , the last vertex of the route, which are exclusive to the route and represent the source and the target of the message. When modeling a C-RAN network, the first vertex represents the sending of the message by the RRH and the last vertex represents the same RRH that receives the answer, sent back by the BBU.

The set of routes is denoted by \mathcal{R} . A route is interpreted as a directed path in a directed multigraph constituted of all routes, where the sets of arcs of the routes are disjoint. The routes contain no loop nor cycle, since all vertices of a route are different. Thus, the directed multigraph is acyclic. An arc in the multigraph may represent several physical links or nodes of the modeled network, which do not induce contention points.

Each arc (u, v) of a route r is labeled by an integer weight $\omega(r, u)$. It represents the time elapsed between the sending of the message of the route r in u and its reception in v . The **weight of a vertex** u_i in a route $r = (u_0, \dots, u_l)$ is defined by $\lambda(r, u_i) = \sum_{0 \leq j < i} \omega(r, u_j)$. It is the time needed by a message to go




Fig. 1: A routed network, each route is represented by a colored path. Weights on the arcs are omitted.

from the first vertex of the route to u_i . The **length** of the route r is defined by $\lambda(r) = \lambda(r, u_i)$.

On each route, we can buffer the message only in the BBU. Since the BBU does not correspond to a contention point, we identify the BBU with the next contention point in the route. The set of these contention points with possible buffering is denoted by \mathcal{B} . Thus, each route has only one vertex in \mathcal{B} . A **routed network**, which models the telecommunication network, is a triple $N = (\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{B}, \omega)$, see Figure 1 for an example.

2.2 Dynamic of Datagrams Transmissions

In this article, we consider a discretized time. The unit of time is called a **tic**. This is the time needed to send an atomic data in a link of the network. We assume that the speed of the links is the same over all the network. We are developing a prototype of this work based on ethernet base-X [27], using standard values for the parameters of the network: the size of an atomic data is 64 bits, the speed of the links is 10Gbps, hence the duration of a tic is about 5.1 nanoseconds.

In the process we study, a message, called a **datagram**, is sent on each route from the source node. The **size** of a datagram is an integer, denoted by τ , it is the number of tics needed by a node to emit the full datagram through a link. In this paper, we assume that τ is the same for all routes. It is justified by our application to C-RAN, where all source nodes are RRHs sending the same type of datagram. There is no fragmentation: Once a datagram has been emitted, it cannot be fragmented during its travel in the network.

Let $r = (s, \dots, t)$ be a route. In order to avoid contention, it is possible to buffer datagrams in the contention points in \mathcal{B} . An **assignment** A of a routed network $N = (\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{B}, \omega)$ is a function which associates to each route $r \in \mathcal{R}$, the pair of integers $A(r) = (o_r, w_r)$. The value o_r is the **offset**, the time at which the datagram is available in the first vertex of r . The value w_r is the **waiting time**: the datagram is buffered for w_r tics in $u_j \in \mathcal{B} \cap r$, the vertex representing the BBU. The **arrival time** of a datagram in the vertex u_i of r , is the first time at which the datagram sent on r reaches u_i , and is defined by $t(r, u_i) = \lambda(r, u_i) + o_r$ if $i \leq j$ and $t(r, u_i) = \lambda(r, u_i) + o_r + w_r$ otherwise.




Fig. 2: Timeline of a datagram during its travel on a route $r = (s_r, c_1, c_2, t_r)$, with $c_2 \in \mathcal{B}$

Let u_l be the last vertex of the route r , the **transmission time** of the datagram on r is denoted by $TR(r, A)$ and is equal to $\lambda(r) + w_r$ or equivalently $t(r, u_l) - o_r$. This is the total time taken by the process we study: the sending of the datagram from the RRH to the BBU and the return of the answer back to the RRH. We can decompose this time into $\lambda(r)$, the *physical latency* of the process and w_r , the *logical latency*. We define the **transmission time** of an assignment A as the worst transmission time of a route: $TR(A) = \max_{r \in \mathcal{R}} TR(r, A)$. Figure 2 represents the different events happening during the lifetime of a datagram sent on a route r .

2.3 Periodic Emission of Datagrams

In the previous section, we have explained how *one* datagram follows its route. However, the process we model in this article is *periodic*: for each period of P tics, a datagram is sent, from each source node in the network, at its offset. The process is assumed to be infinite, since it must work for an arbitrary number of periods. For a given route, we use the same offset and waiting time in all periods, for simplicity of implementation in real networks and to make our problem more tractable from a theoretical perspective. Hence, at the same time of two different periods, all datagrams are at the same position in the network: the assignments built are themselves periodic of period P . Thus, we only need to consider the behavior of the datagrams on each node of the network during a single period, and to apply the same pattern to every subsequent period. Using a different offset for each route corresponds to sending their datagram at a different time in the period. This matches our hypothesis that the emissions of the RRHs need not to be synchronized but they share a common global clock, useful for coordination of their emissions.

Let A be an assignment of a routed network $N = (\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{B}, \omega)$. Let us denote by $[r, u]_{P, \tau}$, the set of tics used by a datagram on the route r at vertex u in a period P , that is $[r, u]_{P, \tau} = \{t(r, u) + i \bmod P \mid 0 \leq i < \tau\}$. This set of tics depends on A , but A is omitted in the notation, since it is always clear from the context. Let us consider two routes r_1 and r_2 , they have a **collision** at the contention point u if and only if $[r_1, u]_{P, \tau} \cap [r_2, u]_{P, \tau} \neq \emptyset$. The assignment A is said to be **valid** if, for all contention points u and routes r_1 and r_2 containing u , r_1 and r_2 have no collision at u . The validity of an assignment depends on P

the period and τ the size of the datagrams, thus we say that A is a valid (P, τ) -**assignment**. When P and τ are clear from the context, we denote $[r, u]_{P, \tau}$ by $[r, u]$ and say that A is a valid assignment.

The following Figure 3 illustrates two valid periodic assignments for different values of P and τ , but the same network. The three routes are depicted by three different colors. If we let $P = 2$ and $\tau = 1$, then there is a $(2, 1)$ -periodic valid assignment with waiting times zero by taking 0 as offset for each route. However, for the same routed network but $P = 5$ and $\tau = 2$, there is no solution to the problem with waiting times zero. If we allow 1 tic of waiting time for one route, we can build the valid assignment $A'(r_1) = (0, 0)$, $A'(r_2) = (2, 1)$, $A'(r_3) = (0, 0)$.




Fig. 3: A routed network with $A(r_1) = (0, 0)$, $A(r_2) = (0, 0)$, $A(r_3) = (0, 0)$ as a $(2, 1)$ -periodic valid assignment and $A'(r_1) = (0, 0)$, $A'(r_2) = (2, 1)$, $A'(r_3) = (0, 0)$ as a $(5, 2)$ -periodic valid assignment

2.4 Periodic Assignment for Low Latency

The period P , as well as the size of a datagram τ are fixed in our C-RAN settings, but not the buffering policy. Hence, the aim of this article is to find a valid assignment which minimizes the worst latency of the transmissions over the network, that is $TR(A)$. We denote by MINTRA the problem of finding the minimal value of $TR(A)$, for a given period, datagram size and routed network. For simpler hardness proofs and easier reductions, we study the decision version of MINTRA, that we call PALL for **P**eriodic **A**ssignment for **L**ow **L**atency. Each route must respect a time limit called a *deadline*. These limits are encoded in a deadline function d , which maps to each route r an integer such that $TR(r, A)$ must be less than $d(r)$. We define the **margin** of a route r in a routed network N , with a deadline function d as $d(r) - \lambda(r)$. The margin is a bound on the waiting time of a route in a valid assignment.

Periodic Assignment for Low Latency

Input: A routed network N , the integers P, τ and a deadline function d .

Question: Does there exist a (P, τ) -periodic assignment of N such that for all $r \in \mathcal{R}$, $TR(r, A) \leq d(r)$?

In the next subsection, this problem is proved to be NP-hard. In Section 5, we propose heuristics solving the search version of PALL (computing a valid assignment), also denoted by PALL for simplicity. In the definition of PALL, we have chosen to bound the transmission time of each route, in particular we can control the worst case latency. It is justified by our C-RAN application with hard constraints on the latency.

We say that an assignment is **bufferless** when the waiting time of all routes are zero. The assignment can then be seen as a function from the routes to the integers (the value of the offset, the waiting time is omitted). We consider a restricted version of PALL, requiring to find a bufferless assignment. This is equivalent to using the deadline function $d(r) = \lambda(r)$, that is the transmission time must be equal to the size of the route, which implies $w_r = 0$ for all $r \in \mathcal{R}$. This problem is called **Periodic Assignment for Zero Latency** and is denoted by PAZL. Studying PAZL is simpler: in an instance, there is no need to precise \mathcal{B} in the routed network nor the deadline function and a solution is just an offset for each route. Moreover, a solution to PAZL is more efficient when implemented in real telecommunication networks, since we do not need contention buffer at all. A switch taking full advantage of the absence of buffer is presented in [28]. An unusual property of assignments is that given a routed network and a deadline, we may have a (P, τ) -periodic assignment but no (P', τ) -periodic assignment with $P' > P$: the existence of an assignment is not monotone with regard to P .

Proposition 1. *For any odd P , there is a routed network with a $(2, 1)$ -periodic bufferless assignment but no $(P, 1)$ -periodic bufferless assignment.*

Proof. Let us build N , a generalization of the routed network given in Figure 3. Let n be an integer, the vertices of the routes are $v_{i,j}$, v_i^1 and v_i^2 , with $0 \leq i < j < n$. There are n routes denoted by r_i , for $i \in [n]$. The route r_i is equal to $(v_i^1, v_{i,1}, \dots, v_{i,n-1}, v_i^2)$. The weights of the arcs are set so that $\lambda(r_i, v_{i,j}) - \lambda(r_j, v_{i,j}) = P$, where P is an odd number smaller than n . It is always possible by choosing appropriate values for $\omega(r_i, v_{i,j-1})$ and $\omega(r_j, v_{i-1,j})$. In such a graph, there is no (P, τ) -periodic assignment with zero waiting time, since the problem reduces to finding a P -coloring in a complete graph with $n > P$ vertices, the colors being the offsets of the routes.

If we consider a period of 2, for all $i \neq j$, $\lambda(r_i, v_{i,j}) - \lambda(r_j, v_{i,j}) \bmod 2 = 1$, hence two datagrams of same offset and size 1 do not have a collision at $v_{i,j}$. Therefore, the bufferless assignment defined by $A(r_i) = 0$ for all $i \in [n]$ is a valid $(2, 1)$ -periodic assignment of N . \square

The table of Figure 4 summarizes the main notations used in the paper.

Let us introduce a few parameters quantifying the complexity of a routed network. The **contention depth** of a routed network is the size of the longest route (number of arcs) of the network minus one. It is the number of contention points on the route, since the first and the last vertex are private to the route. The **width** of a vertex is the number of routes which contains it, equivalently its indegree and its outdegree. By definition, the first and last vertex of a route are of width 1, while all other vertices are of width at least 2 (otherwise they can be removed). The **contention width** of a routed network is the maximal width of its vertices. Remark that a (P, τ) -periodic assignment of a routed network must satisfy that P/τ is larger or equal to the contention width. Now, let us fix P and τ , for a given vertex of contention width c , we define its **load** as $c\tau/P$. It represents the proportion of the period used by datagrams at this contention point. The load of the routed network is the maximum of the loads of its vertices. A routed network must have a load less or equal to one to admit a valid assignment.

$N = (\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{B}, \omega)$	Routed network
$n = \mathcal{R} $	Number of routes
P	Period
τ	Size of a datagram
$\omega(r, u)$	Weight of the arc (u, v) of r
$\lambda(r, u)$	Length of the route r up to vertex u
$\lambda(r)$	Length of the route r
A	Assignment
$A(r) = (o_r, w_r)$	Offset and waiting time of the route r given by A
$TR(A, r)$	Transmission time of the route r for the assignment A
$TR(A)$	Transmission time of the assignment A
$d(r)$	Deadline of the route r
$t(r, u)$	Transmission time on the route r , up to the vertex u
$[r, u]$	Tics used in the period by the route r at vertex u

Fig. 4: Summary of the notations of the article.

2.5 The Star Routed Network

In this section, we define a family of simple routed networks modeling a Multipoint-to-Multipoint fronthaul (see figure 5), which has been designed for C-RAN [9]. Let $N = (\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{B}, \omega)$ be a routed network, we say it is a **star routed network** if and only if the routes are $\{r_0, \dots, r_{n-1}\}$, r_i is (s_i, c_1, c_2, t_i) and $\mathcal{B} = \{c_2\}$ (datagrams can wait in c_2). Star routed networks have contention depth two but a maximal contention width of n . The load on each of the two contention points is thus $n\tau/P$.

The fronthaul network we model with star routed network has a single shared link, which connects all RRHs at one end and all BBUs at the other end. The links are all *full-duplex*, meaning that the datagrams going from RRHs to BBUs do not interact with those going in the other direction. This property does not need to be enforced in our theoretical modeling, but it matches real fronthaul network and we will use such examples for our experiments.

The two contention points c_1 and c_2 model the beginning of the shared link (used to go from the RRHs to the BBUs) and the other end of the shared link (used in the other direction). The computation in the BBU of an answer to a datagram on the route r takes some time. In the star routed network, this time is encoded in the weight of the arc between c_1 and c_2 in r . The weight $\omega(r, c_1)$ is the time needed to go through the shared link, then to arrive at the BBU, plus the computation time and the time to return to the shared link, see Figure 5.

Star routed network may seem simplistic, but every network in which all routes share an arc and satisfy a coherent routing condition can be modeled by a star routed network. It is common in fronthaul networks, since often all the BBUs are located in the same data-center. In such a situation, we can see the weights of the arcs (c_1, c_2) either as all equals (in that case PAZL is trivial, see Section 5) or different due to the structure of the network inside the data-center and the various hardwares used for the BBUs.

When solving PALL or PAZL on a star routed network, a period, a datagram size and a deadline function are also given. When the period is fixed, we modify




Fig. 5: Left, a physical fronthaul network and right, the star routed network modeling a round trip in the fronthaul network. The computation time in the BBU is given in red.

the deadline function to do several simplifying assumptions on the parameters of the star routed network without loss of generality. We say that a star routed network is **canonical**, for a period P , if the weights of the arcs between c_1 and c_2 are in $[P]$ and the others are equal to zero. Hence, $\lambda(r_i)$, the length of a route is equal to the length of its arc (c_1, c_2) . Moreover, $\lambda(r_0) = 0$. See Figure 6 for an example of the canonical star routed network of Figure 5.

Proposition 2. *Let $I = (N, P, \tau, d)$, with $N = (\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{B}, \omega)$ a star routed network, then there is $I' = (N', P, \tau, d')$, with $N' = (\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{B}, \omega')$ a canonical star routed network, such that:*

$$I \in \text{PALL} \Leftrightarrow I' \in \text{PALL} \text{ and } I \in \text{PAZL} \Leftrightarrow I' \in \text{PAZL}$$

Proof. Let us define ω' and d' from ω and d in such a way that there is a bijection between valid assignments of I and I' , which proves the proposition. In this bijection, the offsets o_i for an assignment of I will be mapped to o'_i , while the waiting times remain the same.

The routed network N' is equal to N except for the weight function ω' . We set the weights of the arcs (s_i, c_1) to zero in N' . We obtain the bijection between valid assignments of I and I' by setting $o'_i + \omega(r_i, s_i) = o_i$ and $d'(r_i) = d(i) - \omega(r_i, s_i)$. The weights $\omega'(r_i, c_2)$ are also set to 0, it does not change the possible collisions for an assignment but it changes the transmission time, hence we set $d'(r_i) = d'(r_i) - \omega(r_i, c_2)$ to preserve the bijection between valid assignments of I and I' .

We let $\omega'(r_i, c_1) = \omega(r_i, c_1) \bmod P$. Again, it does not change the collisions since computing a possible collision is done modulo P . However, we must change d' to be $d'(r_i) = d'(r_i) - \omega(r_i, c_1) + \omega'(r_i, c_1)$.

Finally, we assume w.l.o.g. that $\omega'(r_0, c_1)$ is the smallest weight among the weights of the arcs (c_1, c_2) . We let $\omega'(r_i, c_1) = \omega'(r_i, c_1) - \omega'(r_0, c_1)$, which implies that $\omega'(r_0, c_1) = 0$. All weights of arcs (c_1, c_2) are changed by the same value, hence collisions are not modified. We change $d'(r_i)$ to $d'(r_i) - \omega'(r_0, c_1)$ for all i so that the constraint on the deadline stay the same. \square

From now on, we may assume that a star routed network is canonical, using Proposition 2. To give a instance of PALL where the routed network is a canonical star routed network, it is enough to give the weights of the arcs (c_1, c_2) for all routes, the period, the datagram size, and d the deadline function. For an instance of PAZL we can also omit d .




Fig. 6: Transformation by the proof of Proposition 2 of the star routed network of Figure 5 to its canonical form, initially with $\tau = 1$, $P = 5$, $d_1 = 30$, $d_2 = 34$, $d_3 = 32$.

3 Hardness of PALL and PAZL

We show in this section that PALL is NP-hard by proving NP-hardness for a restricted version: PAZL with $\tau = 1$. We give two proofs that PAZL is NP-complete. The first proof works even for contention depth two, but not for star routed networks. For contention depth one, the problem is trivial: either the load is less than one and there is a valid bufferless assignment or there is no valid assignment. The second proof works for graphs with contention width 2: the conflicts are locally very simple, but the problem is complex globally nonetheless. Solving PALL is trivial on trees because they can be reduced to one vertex of contention depth one. Thus, it may be interesting to study its complexity on bounded treewidth (or dagwidth) networks, a common property of real networks [29]

Theorem 1. *PAZL is NP-complete on the class of routed networks with contention depth 2.*

Proof. PAZL is in NP since given an offset for each route in an assignment, it is easy to check whether there are collisions, in linear time in the routed network's size.

Let $H = (V, E)$ be an undirected graph and let P be its maximum degree. We consider the problem to determine whether H is arc-colorable with P or $P + 1$ colors. The arc coloring problem is NP-hard [30] and we reduce it to PAZL to prove its NP-hardness. To do that, we define from H a routed network $N = (\mathcal{R}, \omega)$ as follows.

Let us choose an arbitrary total order $<$ on V . For each edge $(u, v) \in E$, if $u < v$, there is a route $s_{u,v}, u, v, t_{u,v}$ in \mathcal{R} . All these arcs are of weight 0. Note that, N is of contention depth 2, as required by the theorem statement.

The existence of a P -coloring of H is equivalent to the existence of a $(P, 1)$ -periodic bufferless assignment of N . Indeed, a P -coloring of H can be seen as a labeling of its edges by the integers in $[P]$. It induces a bijection between P -colorings of H and offsets of the routes of \mathcal{R} , which represent the edges of H . Having no collision on some vertex v implies that all offsets of routes going through v are different, since all arcs are of weight 0. Hence, edges of H incident to v , colored by the offsets of a valid assignment are all of distinct colors. Therefore we have reduced arc coloring to PAZL by a polynomial time transformation which concludes the proof. \square

Remark that we have used weights of zero for all arcs in the proof. It is a further restriction to the class of graphs for which PAZL is NP-hard. We could ask the weights to be strictly positive, another possible restriction which makes more sense in our model, since weights represent the delay of physical links. Then, we can prove NP-completeness using the same proof, by setting all weights to the period P .

We now give a hardness proof for routed networks with contention width two but large contention depth. Note that a vertex of contention depth one does not induce a collision and can be removed from the routed network without loss of generality. The presented reduction can be used to prove an inapproximability result. Let MINPAZL be the following problem: given a routed network and τ , find the minimal period P such that there is a (P, τ) -periodic bufferless assignment (a positive instance of PAZL).

Theorem 2. *If $P \neq NP$, the problem MINPAZL on the classe of routed networks of contention width two cannot be approximated in polynomial time within a factor $n^{1-o(1)}$ where n is the number of routes.*

Proof. We reduce the problem of finding the minimal vertex coloring of a graph to MINPAZL. Let $H = (U, E)$ be a graph, an instance of the problem of finding a minimal vertex coloring. We define the routed network N from H as in Proposition 1.

Let $<$ be an arbitrary total order on U . The vertices of N are in the set $\{v_{u,w} \mid (u,w) \in E\} \cup \{u^1, u^2 \mid u \in U\}$. For each vertex u in H , there is a route r_u in \mathcal{R} , whose first and last vertices are u^1 and u^2 . In between, the route contains all vertices $v_{u,w}$, following the order $<$ on the w . The weights of all arcs is zero. By construction, a contention vertex corresponds to an edge and belongs to exactly two routes representing the vertices of the edge, thus N is of contention width 2. This reduction is illustrated in Figure 7.

The existence of a P -coloring of H is equivalent to the existence of a $(P,1)$ -periodic assignment of N without waiting time: the offset of a route can be identified with the color of the corresponding vertex. Indeed, since all weights are zero, the absence of collision at contention point $v_{u,w}$ is equivalent to the fact that the offsets of r_u and r_w are different and reciprocally.

Therefore, if we can approximate the minimum value of P within some factor such that there is a $(P,1)$ -periodic assignment, we could approximate the minimal number of colors needed to color a graph within the same factor. The proof follows from the hardness of approximability of finding a minimal vertex coloring [31]. \square




Fig. 7: Reduction from vertex coloring to MINPAZL

The previous theorem implies that PAZL is NP-complete on the class of routed networks with contention width two. This also underlines the fact that, for general graphs, the best P such that there is a (P,τ) -periodic assignment may correspond to a very small load. We can build on the reduction of the previous theorem to prove that MINTRA, the problem of minimizing $TR(A)$, is hard to approximate too.

Theorem 3. *If $P \neq NP$, the problem MINTRA, on graphs of contention width two, cannot be approximated in polynomial time within a factor $n^{1-o(1)}$ where n is the number of routes.*

Proof. We reduce the problem of finding the minimal vertex coloring of a graph to MINTRA. Let $H = (U, E)$ be a graph, instance of the problem of finding a minimal vertex coloring. We define the routed network N in two steps.

Let the elements of U be u_0, \dots, u_{n-1} . There are n routes in N , denoted by r_i for $i \in [n]$. In their first part, they go from u_i^0 to u_i^1 , through some vertices in $\{v_{i,j,k}\}_{i,j,k \in [n]}$ that we later define. Moreover, $u_i^1 \in \mathcal{B}$, that is the waiting time is added at u_i^1 . Assume that r_i has offset o_i and r_j has offset o_j and let us fix the datagram size to 1 and the period to n . If r_i and r_j go through some vertex $v_{i,j,k}$, and $\lambda(r_i, v_{i,j,k}) = \lambda(r_j, v_{i,j,k}) + k$, then to avoid a collision, the equation $o_i \neq o_j + k \pmod n$ must be satisfied. If r_i and r_j go through $v_{i,j,k}$ satisfying the previous constraints for all $k \neq l$, it implies $o_i = o_j + l \pmod n$. It is easy to choose the weights of the two arcs going to $v_{i,j,k}$ to realize the previous condition, whatever the choice of weights of the previous arcs of the routes r_i and r_j .

We ensure, using the vertices $v_{i,j,k}$ for $k \neq i - j$, that $o_i = o_j + i - j \pmod n$. It implies that there is some o , such that $o = o_i - i \pmod n$ for all $i \in [n]$. Now, for each route r_i , we set the weight of the arc going to v_i^1 , from the last vertex of the form $v_{i,j,k}$ in r_i , to be $n - i$. With this construction, we have ensured, that the datagram of r_i arrives at v_i^1 at time o modulo n , for all $i \in [n]$.

The second part of the routes, from v_i^1 to v_i^2 is built exactly as in the proof of Theorem 2. Hence, the waiting time in the vertices v_i^1 plays the exact same role as the offset in the graph of Theorem 2: the valid $(n,1)$ -assignments are in bijection with colorings of H , the waiting times corresponding to the colors.

Finally, set the weights of the last arc going to v_i^2 , for all $i \in [n]$, such that, for all $i, j \in [n]^2$, $\lambda(r_i) = \lambda(r_j)$. Since all routes are of the same size, $TR(A)$ is equal to the maximal waiting time of A . Hence, the maximum waiting time is equal to the number of different waiting times required to have a valid assignment. A valid $(n,1)$ -assignment which minimizes $TR(A)$ is in bijection with a minimal proper coloring of H , which proves the theorem. \square

We would like to prove hardness for even more restricted networks, in particular star routed networks. The problem PAZL on star routed networks is similar to the minimization of makespan in a two flow-shop with delays (see Section 5.4), a problem known to be NP-complete [18]. It suggests that PAZL is NP-complete on star routed network, however we have not been able to prove it yet, because the makespan cannot easily be encoded in PAZL. If we relax the definition of routed network by allowing loops, we can model a network with a single half-duplex shared link, that is collisions can happen between datagrams going in both directions. This variant can be shown to be NP-complete by a reduction from the subset sum problem, as it is done for a similar problem of scheduling pair of tasks [32].

4 Finding Bufferless Assignments

In this subsection, we deal with the problem PAZL on a star routed network: we give several simple heuristics and an exact fixed parameter tractable algorithm, in time exponential in the number of routes only. We show in the experiments of Section 4.4, that PAZL can be very often solved positively, in particular for short routes and when the load is moderate. The sensitivity to the load has been studied in details in a follow-up work [33], in which PAZL is solved for higher load using more involved polynomial time algorithms.

4.1 Shortest-Longest policy

We first present a simple policy, which works when the period is large with regard to the lengths of the routes. More generally, it works as soon as the length of the routes modulo the period are close. The algorithm is called **ShortestLongest**: it sends datagrams on the shared link from the route with the shortest arc (c_1, c_2) to the longest. There is no idle time in the contention point c_1 , i.e. a datagram goes through c_1 right after the previous one has left c_1 .

Proposition 3. *Let N be a canonical star routed network, with r the longest route. If $n\tau + \lambda(r) \leq P$ then **ShortestLongest** produces a (P, τ) -periodic bufferless assignment of N in time $O(n \log(n))$.*

Proof. By hypothesis, N is in canonical form, hence $\lambda(r, s_i) = 0$ for all $i \in [n]$. Moreover, $\lambda(r_0) = 0$ and we assume the routes are sorted so that, for all i , $\lambda(r_i) \leq \lambda(r_{i+1})$ (equivalently $\omega(r_i, c_1) \leq \omega(r_{i+1}, c_1)$). We fix P and τ . The algorithm **ShortestLongest** set $o_{r_i} = i\tau$ for all $i \in [n]$. Then, $[r_i, c_1] = \{i\tau, \dots, (i+1)\tau - 1\}$ and since $n\tau < P$, there is no collision on c_1 .

By definition, we have $[r_i, c_2] = \{\lambda(r_i) + i\tau \bmod P, \dots, \lambda(r_i) + (i+1)\tau - 1 \bmod P\}$. By hypothesis, $n\tau + \lambda(r_{n-1}) \leq P$, hence $[c_2, r_i] = \{\lambda(r_i) + i\tau, \dots, \lambda(r_i) + (i+1)\tau - 1\}$. Since $\lambda(r_i) \leq \lambda(r_{i-1})$, we have proven that $[c_2, r_i] \cap [c_2, r_j] = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$. Hence, there is no collision on c_2 and the (P, τ) -assignment built by **ShortestLongest** is valid.

The complexity of the algorithm is dominated by the sorting of the routes in $O(n \log(n))$. \square

If the period is slightly smaller than the bound of Proposition 3, there is a collision of the last route with r_0 on c_1 . Hence, this policy is not useful as a heuristic for longer routes, as confirmed by the experimental results of Section 4.4.

4.2 Greedy Algorithm

We propose a greedy algorithm to build a periodic assignment, which always finds an assignment when the load is less than $1/3$. Therefore, in the rest of the article we are only concerned with load larger than $1/3$. In fact, in a follow-up work [33], we prove that there is always an assignment for load smaller than 0.4 and with high probability for load less than 0.5 . In this article, we present only the simplest greedy method to solve PAZL and focus on its comparison to the previous method and to an exact algorithm we present in the next section.

The idea is to restrict the possible offsets which can be chosen for the routes. It seems counter-intuitive, since it decreases artificially the number of available offsets to schedule new datagrams. However, it allows reducing the number of forbidden offsets for unscheduled datagrams. A **meta-offset** is an offset of value $i\tau$, with i an integer from 0 to P/τ . We call **MetaOffset** the greedy algorithm which works as follows: for each datagram, in the order they are given, it tries all meta-offsets from 0 to P/τ as offset for the assignment until one does not create a collision with the current partial assignment.

Theorem 4. ***MetaOffset** solves PAZL positively on star routed network and load less than $1/3$. The assignment is found in time $O(n^2)$.*




Fig. 8: Times used in the period in c_1 and c_2 , when scheduling the k th route in **MetaOffset**, with a period $P = 3n\tau$

Proof. Let us prove that **MetaOffset** always schedules the n routes when the load is less than $1/3$. Let us assume it has built an assignment for the routes r_0, r_1, \dots, r_{k-1} , using only meta-offsets. The number of meta-offsets is P/τ and already k of them are used, hence to avoid collision in c_1 , we have $P/\tau - k$ choices. We choose an offset among those for the route r_k so that there is no collision in c_2 . Remark that exactly two consecutive meta-offsets can create a collision between r_k and some route r_i with $i < k$ in c_2 , since the datagrams are all of size τ , see Figure 8. Hence, there are at most $2k$ meta-offsets forbidden by collisions in c_2 . In conclusion, there are at least $P/\tau - k - 2k$ possible meta-offsets so that its choice for r_k does not create a collision in c_1 or c_2 . **MetaOffset** terminates and provides a valid bufferless assignment as soon as $P/\tau - 3(n-1) > 0$, which can be rewritten $(n-1)\tau/P > 1/3$: the load is larger than $1/3$.

This algorithm works in time $O(n^2)$, since for the k th route we have to try at most $3k$ meta-offsets before finding a correct one. We can test whether these $3k$ offsets cause a collision in c_2 in time $O(k)$ by maintaining an ordered list of the intervals of tics in the period used by already scheduled routes in c_2 . \square

This algorithm, contrarily to the previous one, may work well, even for loads higher than $1/3$. In fact, experimental data in Section 4.4 suggest that the algorithm finds a solution when the load is less than $1/2$.

4.3 Compact Assignment

In this section, we show how every bufferless assignment can be put into a canonical form. We use that form to design an algorithm solving PAZL in fixed parameter tractable time (FPT), with parameter n the number of routes (for more on parametrized complexity see [34]). This is justified since n is small in practice, from 10 to 20 in our settings, and the other parameters such as P , τ or the weights are large.

Let (\mathcal{R}, ω) be a star routed network and let A be a bufferless (P, τ) -periodic assignment. We say that A is **compact** if there is a route $r_0 \in \mathcal{R}$ such that the following holds: for all subsets $S \subset \mathcal{R}$ with $r_0 \notin S$, the bufferless assignment A' , defined by $A'(r) = A(r) - 1 \pmod{P}$ if $r \in S$ and $A(r)$ otherwise, is not valid. In other words, an assignment is compact if for all routes r but one, $A(r)$ cannot




Fig. 9: Transformation of a bufferless assignment A into a compact assignment A' , following the process of Proposition 4

be reduced by one, that is either in c_1 or in c_2 , there is a route r' using the tics just before r . See Figure 9 for an example of a compact assignment, obtained by the procedure of the next proposition.

Proposition 4. *Let $N = (\mathcal{R}, \omega)$ be a star routed network. If there is a (P, τ) -periodic bufferless assignment of N , then there is a compact (P, τ) -periodic assignment of N .*

Proof. Consider A , a (P, τ) -periodic bufferless assignment of N . We describe an algorithm which builds a sequence $COMP_i$ of sets of routes and a sequence A_i of valid bufferless assignments. For all $i \leq n$, the set $COMP_i$ has cardinal i and satisfies $COMP_{i-1} \subset COMP_i$.

Let r be an arbitrary route of \mathcal{R} and $A_0 = A$, we set $COMP_0 = \emptyset$. For $i = 1$ to n , we choose a route r , denoted by r_i , as follows. Let $A_i = A_{i-1}$. While there is no collision, for all routes $r \in \mathcal{R} \setminus COMP_{i-1}$, let $A_i(r) = A_{i-1}(r) - 1$. Then choose any route r in $\mathcal{R} \setminus COMP_{i-1}$ such that setting $A_i(r) = A_{i-1}(r) - 1$ creates a collision and let $r_i = r$. By construction A_i is a valid bufferless assignment, since it is modified only when no collision is created. We let $COMP_i = COMP_{i-1} \cup \{r_i\}$.

We prove by induction on i , that A_i is compact when restricted to $COMP_i$. We have $|COMP_1| = 1$, hence A_1 is compact over $COMP_1$. Let us consider A_i , by induction hypothesis, since the offsets of routes in $COMP_{i-1}$ are not modified at step i of the algorithm, A is compact when restricted to $COMP_{i-1}$.

Consider $S \subseteq COMP_i$ which does not contain r_0 . If S contains an element of $COMP_{i-1}$, then $S \setminus r_i$ is not empty and by compactness we cannot decrement all offsets of $S \setminus r_i$ without creating a collision. The same property is true for S . If $S = \{r_i\}$, then by construction of r_i by the algorithm, removing one from $A_i(r_i)$ creates a collision. Hence, A_i is compact restricted to $COMP_i$, which proves the induction and the proposition. \square

We now present an algorithm to find a (P, τ) -periodic assignment by trying all compact assignments.

Theorem 5. *PAZL \in FPT over star routed networks when parametrized by the number of routes.*

Proof. Let $N = (\mathcal{R}, \omega)$ be a canonical star routed network and let P be the period and τ the size of a datagram. First, remark that for a given assignment and a route r with offset o_r , by removing o_r to all offsets, we can always assume that $o_r = 0$. By this remark and Proposition 4, we need only to consider all compact assignments with an offset 0 for the route r_0 . We now evaluate the

number of compact assignments and prove that it only depends on n the number of routes to prove the theorem.

We describe a way to build any compact assignment A by determining its offsets one after the other, which gives a bound on their number and an algorithm to generate them all. We fix an arbitrary total order on \mathcal{R} . Let r_0 be the smallest route of \mathcal{R} , its offset is set to 0 and we let $S = \{r_0\}$, $S_1 = \{r_0\}$ and $S_2 = \{r_0\}$. S represent the routes whose offsets are fixed, offsets of unscheduled routes are chosen so that they follow a route of S_1 in c_1 or a route of S_2 in c_2 .

At each step, we add an element to S : let r be the smallest element of S_1 , if it is non empty. Then, select any route $r' \in \mathcal{R} \setminus S$ such that $o_{r'} = o_r + \tau$ does not create collision (by construction $o_{r'} = o_r + \tau - 1$ does create a collision in c_1). Then, we update the sets as follows: $S = S \cup \{r'\}$, $S_1 = S_1 \setminus \{r\} \cup \{r'\}$ and $S_2 = S_2 \cup \{r'\}$. If S_1 is empty, r is smallest element of S_2 , and we set $o_{r'} = o_r + \tau + \omega(r, c_2) - \omega(r', c_2)$. We can also remove r from S_1 (or from S_2 if S_1 is empty) without adding any element to S . Remark that the value of the offset of the route added to S is entirely determined by the values of the offsets of the routes in S .

Now, remark that any compact assignment can be built by this procedure, if the proper choice of element to add is made at each step. Hence, this process generates all compact assignments. We now bound the number of compact assignments it can produce. Remark that, when $|S| = i$, we can add any of the $n - i$ routes in $\mathcal{R} \setminus S$ to S . Hence, the number of sequences of choices of routes to add is $n!$ (but some of these sequences can fail to produce a valid assignment). We have not yet taken into account the steps at which an element is removed from either S_1 or S_2 , without adding something to S . At each step of the algorithm, we can remove an element or not, there are at most $2n$ steps in the algorithm, hence there are at most 4^n sequences of such choices during the algorithm. As a conclusion, there are at most $4^n n!$ compact assignments.

The algorithm to solve PAZL builds every possible compact assignment in the incremental manner described here, and tests at each step whether, in the built partial assignment, there is a collision, which can be done in time linear in the size of N . Therefore PAZL \in FPT. \square

We call the algorithm described in Theorem 5 **Exhaustive Search of Compact Assignments** or **ESCA**. The complexity of ESCA is in $O(4^n n!)$. While a better analysis of the number of compact assignments could improve this bound, the simple star routed networks with all arcs of weights 0 has $(n - 1)!$ compact assignments. Hence, to improve significantly on ESCA, one should find an even more restricted notion of bufferless assignment than compact assignment.

To make ESCA more efficient in practice, we make cuts in the search tree used to explore all compact assignments. Consider a set S of k routes whose offsets have been fixed at some point in the search tree. We consider the times used by these routes in c_1 . It divides the period into $[(a_0, b_0), \dots, (a_{k-1}, b_{k-1})]$ where the intervals (a_i, b_i) are the times not used yet in c_1 . Therefore at most $\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \lfloor (b_i - a_i) / \tau \rfloor$ routes can still send a datagram through c_1 . If this value is less than $n - k$, it is not possible to create a compact assignment by extending the current one on S and we backtrack in the search tree. The same cut is also used for the contention point c_2 . These cuts rely on the fact that the partial

assignment is wasting bandwidth by creating intervals which are not multiples of τ . They significantly speed up **ESCA** on instances of large load, which are also the longest to solve.

4.4 Experimental Evaluation

In this section, the experimental results of the three presented algorithms are compared. Notice that both **MetaOffset** and **ShortestLongest** are polynomial time algorithms but are not always able to find a solution, depending on the load or the size of the routes. On the other hand, **ESCA** finds a solution if it exists, but works in exponential time in n . We compare the performance of the algorithms in two different regimes: routes are either short with regard to τ , or unrestricted.

Experimental Settings The default parameters of all experiments in this article are derived from the C-RAN context: a tic correspond to the sending time of 64 Bytes of data on links of bandwidth 10 Gbps. The datagrams are approximately of size 1 Mbit, which corresponds to 2,500 tics. The number of routes is set to $n = 8$ in most experiments.

All experiments are done on synthetic data generated randomly. We generate the physical fronthaul network represented in Figure 5, by drawing the size of each link according to some distribution which depends on the experiment. Then, the corresponding canonical star routed network is built from the generated fronthaul and the algorithms tested on it.

In the following experiments, we illustrate how well the algorithms work with regards to the load. To change the load, both parameters τ and n are fixed and we modify the period P , which allows for a smooth control of the load and does not impact the execution time of the algorithms.

The code in C is available on the web page of one author² under a copyleft license. The code has been run on a standard 2016 laptop with a 2.2 Ghz Intel Core i7 and the sources are compiled with gcc version 7.3.0. All experiments end in at most a few dozen seconds.

Short Routes We first consider routes which are shorter than τ : a datagram cannot be contained completely in a single arc which is common in our applications. We generate random star routed networks, by drawing uniformly at random the weights of the arcs of the fronthaul network in $[700]$, which corresponds to links of less than 5km between a BBU and an RRH.

In the following experiment, we generate 10,000 random instances of PAZL for load of 1 down to 0.4. We represent, in Figure 10, the percentage of success of each algorithm as a function of the load. We make three experiments with 8, 12 and 16 routes to understand the effect of the number of routes on the quality of our algorithms. A bound on the maximal success rate is given by the exhaustive search which always finds a solution if there is one.

First, we remark that **ESCA** finds a solution even when the load is high. It justifies the idea to look for an assignment without waiting time, in this short routes regime. It seems that increasing the number of routes makes the exhaustive search even more efficient, meaning that the more the routes, the more

² <https://yann-strozecki.github.io/>




Fig. 10: Success rate of the three algorithms solving PAZL, for short routes and 8 routes, 12 routes (bottom left) and 16 routes (bottom right)

instances have a bufferless assignment. Second, remark that **ShortestLongest** is as good as the exhaustive search. While it was expected to be good with short routes (see Proposition 3), it turns out to be optimal for all the random star routed networks we have tried. Therefore, we should use it in practical applications with short routes, instead of the exhaustive search which is much more computationally expensive.

Finally, the greedy algorithm seems to always work when the load is less than $1/2$ and has a good probability to work up to a load of $2/3$, which is twice better than the theoretical bound. The performance of **MetaOffset** seems to depend on the load only and not on the number of routes. There are discontinuities in the probability of success at several loads, which seem to smooth out when the number of routes increases. It can be explained by the fact that **MetaOffset** becomes better when decreasing the load makes the number of available meta-offsets larger. The number of meta-offsets increases when τ is added to the period, which is more frequent when there are more routes.

Long routes We now want to understand the performance of these algorithms when the size of the routes is unbounded. In this experiment we fix the number of routes to 8 and the weights of the arcs of the fronthaul network are drawn following a uniform distribution in $[P]$. We represent in Figure 11 the percentage of success of each algorithm, for load from 1 down to 0.4.

In this regime, the performances of **ShortestLongest** are abysmal because




Fig. 11: Success rate for 8 routes over 10,000 random instances

it depends on the difference of size between the longest and the smallest route, which is large here. Algorithm **MetaOffset** has a performance not far from the short routes regime, which is expected since it does not directly depends on the size of the route.

When the load is larger than 0.5, the **ESCA** finds more solutions than **MetaOffset** which justifies its use. However, for load larger than 0.8 there are instances for which there are no solutions to PAZL. It means that with long routes and high load, looking for a bufferless assignment is far too restrictive. This justifies the design of algorithms for the general PALL problem, which we present in the next section. We will test them on 8 long routes and a load between 1 and 0.8, parameters for which, as shown here, there are not always a bufferless assignment.

The computation time of **ESCA** is bounded by $O(4^n n!)$ as shown in Theorem 5, but it can be much better in practice, either because it finds a solutions quickly or because a large part of the tree of compact assignments is pruned during the algorithm. We study the evolution of the running time of the algorithm when n grows in the following experiment. The weights of the arcs are drawn following a uniform distribution in $[P]$ and the load is set to 0.95. The table of Figure 12 shows the time before **ESCA** ends, for 8 to 16 routes, averaged on 100 random star routed networks. This shows that for less than 20 routes, which corresponds to all current topologies, the algorithm is efficient enough, but we should improve it further to work on more routes.

n	8	10	12	14	16
Time (s)	6.10^{-5}	8.10^{-4}	2.10^{-2}	0.4	11

Fig. 12: Running time of **ESCA**, averaged over 100 random instances

5 Solving PALL on Star Routed Networks

In this section, we consider the more general PALL problem on star routed networks. The datagrams are allowed to wait in the BBUs to yield more possible assignments. Hence, we allow the process time of a route to be greater than the length of the route, but it must be bounded by its deadline.

5.1 Simple Star Routed Networks

Often in real networks, the length of the routes are not arbitrary and we may exploit that to solve PALL easily. For instance all the weights on the arcs (c_1, c_2) are the same if all the BBUs are in the same data-center and all datagrams require the same time to be processed in the BBUs. Finding an assignment in that case is trivial: send all datagrams so that they follow each other without gaps in c_1 . In the corresponding canonical routed network, one can set $o_i = i\tau$. Since all arcs (c_1, c_2) are of weight zero in this case, the interval of time used in c_2 are the same as for c_1 and there is no collision in c_2 .

Another possible assumption would be that all deadlines are larger than the longest route. It may happens when, in the network we model, all RRHs are at almost the same distance to the shared link.

Proposition 5. *Let $N = (\mathcal{R}, \omega)$ be a canonical star routed network with n routes, let $P \geq n\tau$ and let d be a deadline function. Let r_{n-1} be the longest route, and assume that for all $r \in \mathcal{R}$, $d(r) \geq \lambda(r_{n-1})$. Then, there is a (P, τ) -periodic assignment for N and d and it can be built in time $O(n)$.*

Proof. The idea is to set the waiting times of all routes so their datagrams behave exactly as the datagram of r_{n-1} . The offset of the route r_i is set to $i\tau$, which ensures that there is no collision in c_1 as soon as $P \geq n\tau$. The waiting time of the route r_i is $w_i = \lambda(r_{n-1}) - \lambda(r_i)$.

The time at which the datagrams of r_i arrives in c_2 is $t(r_i, c_2) = w_i + i\tau + \lambda(r_i)$. Substituting w_i by its value, we obtain $t(r_i, c_2) = i\tau + \lambda(r_{n-1})$. Hence, there is no collision in c_2 . We denote by A the defined assignment. By definition of the transmission time, we have $TR(r_i, A) = w_i + \lambda(r_i) = \lambda(r_{n-1})$. By hypothesis, $d(r_i) \geq \lambda(r_{n-1})$, which proves that the assignment respect the deadlines.

Finally, the complexity is in $O(n)$ since we have to find the maximum of the length of the n routes and the computation of each w_i is done by a constant number of arithmetic operations. \square

5.2 Two Stages Approach

We may decompose an algorithm solving PALL on a star routed network in two parts: first set all the offsets of routes so that there is no collision in c_1 and then knowing this information find waiting times so that there is no collision in c_2 while respecting the deadlines.

First, we give several heuristics to choose the offsets, which are experimentally evaluated in Section 5.6. For all presented algorithms, we assume that the star routed network is given in canonical form. We send the datagrams through c_1 in a compact way (no gap between datagrams). It means that for n routes,

denoted by r_0, \dots, r_{n-1} , the offsets are $o_i = \sigma(i) \times \tau$, for some permutation $\sigma \in \Sigma_n$. We consider the following orders σ :

- Decreasing Margin (DM): Decreasing order on the margin of the routes.
- Increasing Margin (IM): Increasing order on the margin of the routes.
- Decreasing Arc Weight (DA): Decreasing order on the weight of the arcs (c_1, c_2) .
- Increasing Arc Weight (IA): Increasing order on the weight of the arcs (c_1, c_2) . This sending order yields a (P, τ) periodic assignment in which the waiting times are zero, if the period is large enough (see Proposition 3).

We also propose to fix the offsets of the routes according to some random order. If we pack the datagrams as previously, we call Random Order (RO), the heuristic of choosing an order uniformly at random. We may also allow some time between two consecutive datagrams in c_1 . The order of the routes in c_1 is still random and we consider two variations. Either the time between two datagrams in c_1 is random and we call this heuristic Random Order and Random Spacing (RORS) or the time between two consecutive datagrams is always the same and we call this heuristic Random Order and Balanced Spacing (ROBS).

We call **Waiting Time Assignment** or WTA the problem PALL where the offsets of the routes are also given as input. A solution to WTA is a valid assignment such that the offsets coincide with those given in the instance.

In the rest of the section we study different methods to solve WTA either by polynomial time heuristics or by an FPT algorithm. The methods to solve WTA are then combined with the heuristics we have described to fix the offsets of the routes, which yields an algorithm solving PALL.

5.3 Greedy Scheduling of Waiting Times

We now solve the problem WTA, we are given a canonical routed network, a deadline function and an offset for each route. The **release time** of a route is defined as the first time its datagram can go through c_2 : for a route r with offset o_r , it is $\lambda(r, c_2) + o_r$, it is the same as the arrival time in c_1 , $t(r, c_1)$, but it is fixed in an instance of WTA.

The first algorithm we propose to solve WTA is a greedy algorithm which sets the waiting times in a greedy way, by prioritizing the routes with the earliest deadline to best satisfy the constraints on the process time. Since the network is in canonical form, $\omega(r, t_r) = 0$ for all routes r , thus choosing the earliest deadline is equivalent to choosing the route with the smallest margin.

We call the algorithm **GreedyDeadline**, and it works as follows. Set $t = 0$ and $U = \mathcal{R}$. While there is a route in U , find $s \geq t$ the smallest time for which there is $r \in U$ with a release time lower or equal to s . If there are several routes in U with a release time lower or equal to s , then r with the smallest deadline is selected and set $w_r = s - \lambda(r, c_2)$, $t = s + \tau$ and $U = U \setminus \{r\}$.

This algorithm does not take into account the periodicity, which may create collisions. Let r_0 be the first route selected by the algorithm, then $t_0 = t(r_0, c_2)$ is the first time at which a datagram go through c_2 . Then, if all routes r are




Fig. 13: A run of **GreedyDeadline** with $P = 20, \tau = 4$.

such that $t(r, c_2) \leq t_0 + P - \tau$, then by construction, there is no collision on the central arc. However, if a route r has $t(r, c_2)$ larger than $t_0 + P - \tau$, since we consider everything modulo P to determine collision, it may collide with another route. Therefore we correct **GreedyDeadline** by this simple modification: $s \geq t$ is the smallest time for which there is $r \in U$ with a release time lower or equal to s such that there is no collision if a datagram goes through c_2 at time s . This rule guarantees that if **GreedyDeadline** succeeds to set all waiting times, it finds a solution to WTA, as illustrated in Figure 13. However, it can fail to find the value s at some point because the constraint on collisions cannot be satisfied. In that case **GreedyDeadline** stops without finding a solution.

The complexity of **GreedyDeadline** is in $O(n \log(n))$, using the proper data structures. The set of routes \mathcal{R} must be maintained in a binary heap to be able to find the one with smallest deadline in time $O(\log(n))$. To deal with the possible collisions, one maintains a list of the intervals of time during which a datagram can go through c_2 . When the waiting time of a route is fixed, an interval is split into at most two intervals in constant time. During the whole algorithm, each element of this list is used at most twice either when doing an insertion or when looking for the next free interval. Hence, the time needed to maintain the list is in $O(n)$.

5.4 Earliest Deadline Scheduling

The problem WTA is the same as a classical earliest deadline scheduling problem, if we forget the periodicity. Given a set of jobs with *release times* and *deadlines*, schedule all jobs on a single processor, that is choose the time at which they are computed, so that no two jobs are scheduled at the same time. A job is always scheduled after its release time and it must be dealt with before its deadline. Let us call n the number of jobs, the problem can be solved in time $O(n^2 \log(n))$ [35] when all jobs have the same running time and it gives a solution which minimizes the time at which the last job is scheduled. On the other hand, if the running times are different the problem is NP-complete [36]. The polynomial time algorithm which solves this scheduling problem is similar to **GreedyDeadline**. However, when it fails because a job finishes after its dead-

line, it changes the schedule of the last jobs to find a possible schedule for the problematic job. The change in the scheduling is so that the algorithm cannot fail on the same job a second time except if there is no solution, which proves that the algorithm is in polynomial time. Note that there are other algorithms to solve the same problem [37, 38], the second one being in $O(n \log(n))$ only, but it should not be faster on our small instances.

The problem WTA is the same as this scheduling problem but adding constraints arising from the periodicity. The jobs are the routes, the size of a datagram is the running time of a job, the release time and the deadline are the same in both models, because the star routed network is canonical. Let us call **Minimal Latency Scheduling**, denoted by **MLS**, the algorithm which transforms an instance of WTA into one of the described scheduling problem to solve it in time $O(n^2 \log(n))$ using the algorithm of [35].

Recall that $t(r, c_2)$ is the time at which the datagram of r goes through c_2 . Let us denote by t_{min} and t_{max} the smallest and largest value of $t(r_i, c_2)$ for all $i \in [n]$. When **MLS** finds an assignment A , it always satisfies $PT(r) \leq d(r)$ for all r . Moreover, by construction **MLS** schedules the datagrams without collision if we forget about the periodicity (each route send only one datagram). Let us assume that $t_{max} - t_{min} \leq P - \tau$, then all datagrams go through c_2 during a interval of time less than P . Hence, when we compute potential collisions modulo P , all the relative positions of the datagrams stay the same which implies there is no collision. However, if $t_{max} - t_{min} > P - \tau$, then computing $t(r_i, c_2)$ modulo P for all i may show some collision. Since the scheduling algorithm minimizes t_{max} , it tends to find small values for $t_{max} - t_{min}$ and **PMLS** may succeed in finding a valid assignment (as shown in Section 5.6), but not for all instances.

We now present a variant of the previous algorithm, that we call **Periodic Minimal Latency Scheduling**, denoted by **PMLS**. The aim is to deal with the periodicity, by modifying the instance without changing the assignments, so that the chance of finding a solution with $t_{max} - t_{min} \leq P - \tau$ are larger. Remark that if an instance has a valid assignment, we can guarantee that one route has a waiting time zero in some valid assignment.

Recall that $t(r, c_1)$ is the release time of r . Algorithm **PMLS** runs, for each route $r \in \mathcal{R}$, the algorithm **MLS** on an instance defined as follows. Subtract $t(r, c_1)$ to all the release times and deadlines of the routes, to obtain an equivalent problem. Therefore, $t(r, c_1)$ is zero in the instance we build and the waiting time w_r is set to zero. Hence the datagram of r goes through c_2 at time 0 and $t_{min} = 0$. Then, as in Proposition 2, the instance is modified so that all release times are in $[P - \tau]$. Each release time $t(r_i, c_1)$ is replaced by $t(r_i, c_1) \bmod P$ and $d(r_i) = d(r_i) - (t(r_i, c_1) - t(r_i, c_1) \bmod P)$. Furthermore, if the release time of a route r is between $P - \tau$ and P , we set it to 0 and $d(r) = d(r) - P$. The deadline of each route is set to the minimum of its deadline and $P - \tau$. Hence, if **MLS** finds a solution for such a modified instance, we have by construction of the instance $t_{max} \leq P - \tau$. Since $t_{min} = 0$, the assignment is valid. Algorithm **PMLS** returns the first assignment it finds when running **MLS** for some $r \in \mathcal{R}$.

The instance of WTA we have defined in this transformation is equivalent to the original instance, except we have fixed the waiting time of r to be zero. If there is some valid assignment, then at least one route has waiting time zero, then if **MLS** finds an assignment then **PMLS** also finds one. Algorithm **MLS** is used at most n times, thus the complexity of **PMLS** is in $O(n^3 \log(n))$. Note that **PMLS** is a heuristic and may fail to find a solution even if it exists. It is the case when,

for the n modified instances, there is no solution with times $t(r_i, c_2)$ using an interval of time less than P in c_2 .

5.5 FPT algorithms for WTA and PALL

As a warm-up, we give a simple FPT algorithm for WTA which is practical, and then we build on it to give a more complicated FPT algorithm for PALL. Unfortunately, the dependency on n the number of routes in the second algorithm is yet too large to be useful in practice.

Theorem 6. *WTA \in FPT over star routed networks when parametrized by the number of routes.*

Proof. Consider an instance of WTA, which is given as a release time and a deadline for each route. We show that we can build a set of instances such that one of these instances has a valid assignment if and only if the original instance has a valid assignment.

As for PMLS, for each route r , we consider the instance where r has release time and waiting time zero ($t(r, c_1) = w_r = 0$). The release times and deadlines of all routes are modified so that all release times are less than P as in the transformation described for PMLS. If there is an assignment such that $t_{max} < P - \tau$, then the periodicity does not come into play for this assignment and the algorithm MLS will find the assignment as explained in Section 5.4.

Now, remark that if there is a valid assignment for an instance with the properties just stated, then there is a valid assignment satisfying for all i , $t(r_i, c_2) \leq 2P - \tau$. Indeed, if there is a i such that $t(r_i, c_2) \geq 2P$ in a periodic assignment, then we have $w_i = t(r_i, c_2) - \lambda(r_i, c_2) \geq P$. Hence, we can set $w_i = w_i - P \geq 0$ and we still have a valid assignment. Moreover, for all $r_i \neq r$, it is not possible that $2P - \tau < \lambda(r_i, c_2) \leq 2P$, since it would imply a collision between r and r_i .

From an instance I , with the properties of the first paragraph, we define a new instance I' whose valid assignments are a subset of the ones of I . Moreover, one of the valid assignments of I' satisfies that, for all $i \in [n]$, $t(r_i, c_2) \leq P - \tau$ and is thus found by MLS. Let us now consider A a valid assignment of I , we can assume that, for all $i \in [n]$, $t(r_i, c_2) \leq 2P - \tau$. Let S be the set of routes r_i such that $P - \tau < t(r_i, c_2) \leq 2P - \tau$. The instance I' is defined by changing, for all route $r \in S$, $t(r, c_1)$ and $d(r)$ to $t(r, c_1) - P$ and $d(r) - P$. Then, by construction A is also a valid assignment of I' . Assignment A as a solution of I' , satisfies $t(r_i, c_2) \leq P - \tau$ for all $i \in [n]$.

The FTP algorithm is the following: for each route r build a modified instance as in PMLS. Then, for each subset S of routes, remove P to the release time and to the deadline of each route in S and run MLS on the instance so modified. If there is a valid assignment, then we have proved that there is some S , such that the instance built from S has a valid assignment with $t(r_i, c_2) \leq P - \tau$ for all $i \in [n]$. Hence, MLS finds a valid assignment for this instance. \square

The algorithm of Theorem 6 has a complexity of $O(2^n n^3 \log(n))$. If we consider some valid assignment, the routes r with $t(r, c_2) > P$, must satisfy $t(r, c_2) > P + \tau$ to avoid collision with the first route. Hence, the deadline of these routes must be larger than $P + \tau$. These routes are exactly those that must be put in S , hence we can enumerate only the subsets of routes with a

deadline larger than $P + \tau$. In practice, only k routes have a deadline larger than $P + \tau$ with $k \ll n$, and we need only to consider 2^k subsets. Let us call this algorithm **All Subsets PMLS**, and let us denote it by **ASPMLS**.

Theorem 7. $\text{PALL} \in \text{FPT}$ over star routed networks when parameterized by the number of routes.

Proof. Consider a star routed network, instance of **PALL** with a valid assignment. We characterize such a valid assignment by a set of necessary and sufficient linear equations and inequations it must satisfy. These conditions are expressed on the values $t(r, c_1)$ and $t(r, c_2)$ and setting those value is equivalent to setting the offsets and the waiting times, that is choosing an assignment.

First, we assume the star routed network is canonical. Hence, there is a valid assignment A , such that for all routes $r \in \mathcal{R}$, $0 \leq t(r, c_1) < P - \tau$ and $0 \leq t(r, c_2) < 2P - \tau$. By definition $t(r, c_2) = t(r, c_1) + \omega(r, c_2) + w_r$. Since a waiting time is non-negative, we have $t(r, c_2) \leq t(r, c_1) + \omega(r, c_2)$. Now, let S be the set defined as in Theorem 6, of the routes r such that $P - \tau < t(r, c_2) \leq 2P - \tau$. We want to guarantee that for $r \in \mathcal{R}$, $t(r, c_2) \in [P - \tau]$. To do that, we replace the inequation $t(r, c_2) \leq t(r, c_1) + \omega(r, c_2)$ by $t(r, c_2) \leq t(r, c_1) + \omega(r, c_2) - P$ and $d(r)$ by $d(r) - P$ for all $r \in S$. Remark that the presented linear constraints now depend on S , which itself depends on A .

Let σ and σ' be two permutations of Σ_n such that σ is the order of the routes r_0, \dots, r_{n-1} according to the value $t(r, c_1)$ and σ' according to the value $t(r, c_2)$. Since all $t(r, c_1)$ and $t(r, c_2)$ are in $[P - \tau]$, we have $t(r, c_1) = t(r, c_1) \bmod P$ and $t(r, c_2) = t(r, c_2) \bmod P$. Hence, we can express the constraints on the absence of collision between routes by adding the following equations to the ones of the previous paragraph:

- for all $i < n - 1$, $t(r_{\sigma_i}, c_1) \leq r_{\sigma_{i+1}, c_1} + \tau$ (no collision in c_1)
- for all $i < n - 1$, $t(r_{\sigma'_i}, c_2) \leq r_{\sigma'_{i+1}, c_2} + \tau$ (no collision in c_2)
- for all $i < n$, $t(r_i, c_2) < d(r_i)$ (deadline respected)

Consider now the system of inequations $E_{S, \sigma, \sigma'}$ we have built from A . The values $t(r, c_1)$ and $t(r, c_2)$ given by A satisfy the system by construction. Moreover, any solution to these equations yields a valid assignment, because the equations guarantee that there is no collision, that the offsets and the waiting times are non-negative and that all routes meet their deadlines. However, a solution of $E_{S, \sigma, \sigma'}$ may be rational, while offsets and waiting times must be integers. We use the following simple fact: $x + e_1 \leq y + e_2$ implies $\lceil x \rceil + e_1 < \lceil y \rceil + e_2$ when e_1 and e_2 are integers. Since all equations of $E_{S, \sigma, \sigma'}$ have this form, if we take the upper floor of the components of a solution, it is still a solution of $E_{S, \sigma, \sigma'}$ with integer values. As a consequence, any solution to $E_{S, \sigma, \sigma'}$ yields a valid assignment of the original instance of **PALL**.

The algorithm to solve **PALL** is the following. Build $E_{S, \sigma, \sigma'}$ for all triples (S, σ, σ') . Then, solve each linear system, and if it admits a solution, convert it back into a valid assignment of the instance of **PALL** by rounding. There are 2^n sets S and $n!$ orders σ . Thus, $2^n(n!)^2$ systems with $2n$ variables and a bitsize of the same order as the original instance are solved at most. Since solving each system can be done in polynomial time in the size of the instance, it proves that the algorithm is **FPT** in n . Moreover, it always finds a valid assignment if there

is one, since we have shown that from a valid assignment, we can find (S, σ, σ') for which the values associated to A satisfy $E_{S, \sigma, \sigma'}$. \square

5.6 Experimental Evaluation

Evaluating the Necessary Margin We set the number of routes to 8 to make comparisons with the results of Section 4.4 easier. We draw uniformly the weights of the arcs of the fronthaul network in $[P]$. We use *the same deadline* for all routes, which is the most common constraint, when modeling a C-RAN problem: all RRHs have the same latency constraint and all BBUs take the same time to process the answer.

We define the **margin** of an instance as the margin of the longest route of the routed network. Since all routes have the same deadline, it is the difference between the length of the longest route and the deadline. Note that the margin is defined before making the network canonical, since this operation makes the deadlines all different, and thus breaks the semantic of the margin. The margin represents the *logical latency* which can be used by the communication process, without taking into account the physical length of the network, since it cannot be changed. For a given star routed network, it is equivalent to set the margin or all the deadlines to the length of the longest route plus the margin. However, to compare different star routed networks with different length of routes, the margin is more relevant than the deadline. Hence, in our experiments, we consider margins from 0 to 3,000 tics to understand how much logical latency is needed to find an assignment. We look at two different regimes, a medium load of 0.8 and a high load of 0.95. Considering smaller load is not relevant since we can solve the problem using bufferless assignments, as shown in Section 4.4.

We first try to understand what is the best choice of heuristics for the first stage of the algorithm. The first stage is followed in this experiment by **GreedyDeadline**, the simplest algorithm to solve WTA. In Figure 14, the success rate of all possible first stage heuristics to solve PALL is given, function of the margin of the instances. The success rate is an average computed over 10,000 random star routed networks.




Fig. 14: Success rate of different sending orders, left 0.8 load, right 0.95 load.

According to our experiments, policy IA, that is sending the datagrams on increasing order on the length of the arcs (c_1, c_2) , does not work well. It corresponds to the policy of Proposition 3 which we already know to be bad for PAZL when the routes are long as in this experiment. Sending in decreasing order

on the margin of the routes (DM) or on the length of the arcs (c_1, c_2) (DA) work better and it seems that DA is better than DM, especially in a loaded network.

Remark that sending the datagrams using a random order does not perform well, but better than IM and IA, which shows that the latters are a poor choice for the first stage of our algorithm. The interest of using a random order is that we can draw many of them. In Figure 15 the same experiment is made for the three heuristics choosing an order at random, but we now draw 1,000 different random orders and solve each induced WTA instance using **GreedyDeadline**. The algorithm is considered to succeed as soon as a valid assignment is found for one order. Each random order drawn is used for RO, RORS and ROBS to make the comparison fairer.




Fig. 15: Success rate of different sending orders with the random orders generated 1000 times, left 0.8 load, right 0.95 load.

First remark that our algorithms find assignments with margin 0 for many instances with 0.95 of load and long routes which was not possible when only looking for bufferless assignments (see Section 4.4). It justifies the interest of studying PALL and not only PAZL.

Using many random orders is much better than DA, the best policy using one specific order. With a load of 0.95, a solution is found with margin 0 most of the time. The three random order policies have similar performances, but RORS has slightly better success rate than the two others ones, under high load and small margin. Hence, in the following experiments, we always draw 1,000 random orders using the policy RORS to set the offsets of the assignments.

We now compare the performances of the four different algorithms used in the second stage to set the waiting times. Since **GreedyDeadline** already finds assignments with margin 0 under mild loads, it is more interesting to focus on the behavior of the algorithms under high load. In Figure 16, we represent the success rate of the four algorithms with regards to the margin, computed over 10,000 random star routed networks generated with the same parameters as previously.

The **MLS** algorithm performs poorly, worst than **GreedyDeadline**, **PMLS** and **ASPMLS**, which shows that *taking into account the periodicity* is fundamental. Algorithm **GreedyDeadline** is close to 100% success rate for margins larger than 1,500 while **PMLS** and **ASPMLS** algorithms find a solution for more than 99% of the random instances, even *with a margin 0*. In other words, for very high load and no margin, there are very few instances for which we do not find an assignment. With a margin of 300, which corresponds to about $15\mu s$ of




Fig. 16: Success rate of four algorithms solving PALL, 0.95 load

additional delay with the chosen parameters, we always find a solution.

It turns out that the performances of PMLS and ASPMLS are almost identical. Even with a load of 1 and a margin of 0, we have to draw 100,000 random instances before finding one which can be solved by ASPMLS and not by PMLS. Since ASPMLS is of exponential complexity in n , it may not be relevant to use it within the parameters of this experiment. To verify that, we present the computing time of PMLS and ASPMLS for different instance sizes. To stress the algorithms, we set the margin to 0 and the load to 0.95. The table of Figure 17 shows the computation times of PMLS and ASPMLS, averaged on 1,000 instances. Recall that both PMLS and ASPMLS use the same first stage which produces 1000 instances of WTA, using the policy RORS.

# routes	8	12	16	20	24
ASPMLS (ms)	1.88	5.98	47.75	209.2	1815
PMLS (ms)	0.07	0.08	0.09	0.10	0.12
Ratio	27	78	523	2122	14882

Fig. 17: Computation time for PMLS and ASPMLS function of the number of routes

The complexity of both these algorithm depends on the number of routes. As shown in Figure 17, the time complexity of PMLS seems linear on *average*, while its theoretical worst case complexity is cubic. ASPMLS scales exponentially with the number of routes as expected. Both algorithms are usable for instances of 20 routes, but for 40 routes or more ASPMLS becomes too slow. Since ASPMLS almost never finds a solution when PMLS does not and is much slower, one should prefer to use PMLS.

When evaluating the computing time of our method, we should take into account how many random orders are drawn. In previous experiments, we have drawn 1,000 random orders which may be 1,000 time slower than using a single fixed order. There is a trade-off between the number of random orders and the

success rate. We investigate the success rate of our algorithms with regards to the number of random orders drawn, a load of 0.95 and a margin 0. The table of Figure 18 presents the success rate for different numbers of sending orders, averaged over 10,000 instances, for **GreedyDeadline**, **PMLS** and **ASPMLS**.

# orders	1	10	100	1,000	10^4	10^5
GreedyDeadline	0.55	6.05	35.44	77.43	90.1	92.4
PMLS	82.04	98.84	99.71	99.80	99.83	99.83
ASPMLS	91.33	99.17	99.72	99.80	99.83	99.83

Fig. 18: Success rates function of the number of random orders drawn in the first stage of the three algorithms

First, observe that the better the algorithm to solve WTA is, the less random orders it needs in stage one to achieve its best success rate. In particular, **ASPMLS** has better results than **PMLS** for less than 1,000 random orders, but not beyond. This further justifies our choice to draw 1,000 random orders, to obtain the best success rate within the smallest time.

The number of different orders is $7! = 5,040$ since we have 8 routes and the solutions are invariant up to a circular permutation of the order. Hence, for 8 routes it is possible to test every possible order. However the computation time of this exhaustive method scales badly with n . The fact that **PMLS** and **ASPMLS** have already high success rates for 10 random orders hints that even for a larger number of routes, drawing 1000 random orders is sufficient to obtain good assignments.

Harder Topologies Previous experiments use instances with weights of arcs uniformly drawn in a large interval. However, it is quite natural to consider that most routes are of roughly the same length or can be arranged in two groups of similar lengths, when the fronthaul network involves one or two data-centers.

By Proposition 5, there is an assignment with margin equal to the maximum difference between the sizes of the routes. Hence, if all routes have almost the same size, the needed margin is small. If the routes are drawn uniformly in a large interval, then the expected difference between the longest route and the second longest route is large. This difference can be seen as a free waiting time for most routes, hence we expect to need little margin in this regime too. As a consequence, the harder instances should be for routes with length drawn in an interval of moderate size compared to the period.

Figure 19 shows the probability of success of **PMLS** over 10,000 instances as a function of the margin. In the left experiment the length of arcs are drawn in $[0, I]$, where I goes from 0 to 6400. As expected the success rate decreases when the size of the interval increases, until $I = 1600$, and then increases again. In the most difficult settings, only 78% of the instances can be solved with margin 0, and we need a margin of 1,900 to ensure that **PMLS** always finds a solution. Results for **ASPMLS** are not shown, since they are the same as for **PMLS**, even on these hard instances.

We do the same experiment at the right of the figure, except that the weights of arcs of half of the routes is drawn in $[I]$ and the length of the other half is drawn in $[P/2, P/2 + I]$. The situation is the same as for the previous experiment




Fig. 19: Success rate of PMLS, with length of arcs drawn either in $[I]$ (left) or in $[I]$ or $[P/2, P/2 + I]$ (right).

but with better success rates, hence the case of two data centers seems simpler to deal with in practice.

6 Deterministic Assignments vs Statistical Multiplexing

6.1 Performance of Statistical Multiplexing

Now that we have designed and tuned PMLS to solve PALL efficiently, we compare its performances against the actual way to manage the messages in a network: *statistical multiplexing*, with a FIFO buffer in each node of the network to resolve collisions. For statistical multiplexing, the time at which the datagrams are sent in the network is not managed by the user as in our approach, thus we assume the offsets of each route is fixed to some random value, and they stay the same over time. We consider a second policy to manage buffers called **CriticalDeadline**. In a buffer with several datagrams, this policy sends the one with the smallest remaining margin, which is the time it can wait before missing its deadline.

We have implemented a statistical multiplexing simulator, to evaluate the performance of these two policies and to compare them to finding assignments with small margin by solving PALL. For statistical multiplexing, both contention points have a buffer. The process is not periodic: even if the offset of a route is the same each period, it is possible that some datagram do not arrive at the same time in a contention point in two consecutive periods because of buffering. Therefore we must measure the process time of each route over several periods if we want to compute the maximum latency of the network. We choose to simulate it for 1,000 periods but we have observed that the process time usually stabilizes in less than 10 periods. The **margin**, for statistical multiplexing, is defined as the maximum process time, computed as explained, minus the size of the longest route of the star routed network.

In Figure 20, we represent the probability of success of statistical multiplexing and PMLS for different margins. The success rates are computed from 10,000 star routed networks for each margin. On the left part of Figure 20, the arcs of the network are uniformly drawn in $[P]$, while on the right part, the arcs of the network are uniformly drawn in $[1600]$ (the hardest settings of the previous section). The other parameters of the experiences are the same as previously




Fig. 20: Probability of success of statistical multiplexing and PMLS for several margins on random topologies when the size of the routes are distributed either on P (left) or on a small range of values (right).

and the load is 0.95.

The experiment shows that statistical multiplexing does not ensure a minimal latency. For random topologies, the latency is extremely high when using FIFO (6538 tics in average), with a margin of about 10,000 for the worst 30% of instances, which corresponds to half the period (0.5ms). Even when the messages are managed with **CriticalDeadline**, 20% of the instances have a margin of more than 4,000 (2838 tics in average) while PMLS finds an assignment with 0 margin 99% of the time!

For hard topologies (right figure), the average margin of statistical multiplexing (9052 tics for FIFO, 6574 tics for **CriticalDeadline**) is worst than for random topologies. The worst case of **CriticalDeadline** remains the same ($\simeq 16500$ tics) while the worst case of FIFO fall from 30828 tics for random topologies to 19105 tics on hard topologies. The settings are stressful for PMLS, and we find an assignment with margin 0 in only 78% of the instances, and it needs a margin of 2,000 tics to be sure to find an assignment. However, PMLS still vastly outperforms the statistical multiplexing both for the average margin and for the worst margin.

Even under a light load of 0.4, for which we can always find bufferless assignment, statistical multiplexing has a very high average margin (1290 tics for FIFO and 1052 tics for **CriticalDeadline**) and worst case margin (10963 tics for FIFO and 6938 tics for **CriticalDeadline**).

For each 1,000 tics of latency we save from the periodic process, we are able to lengthen the routes of 10km, which has a huge economical impact. We feel that it strongly justifies the use of a deterministic sending scheme for latency critical applications such as our C-RAN motivating problem.

6.2 Periodic Assignment and Random Traffic

The algorithms proposed in this paper are designed to manage deterministic periodic flows in dedicated networks. In this section, the objective is to determine the effect of adding in the network non-deterministic flows (internet traffic, best-effort) managed by statistical multiplexing.

The algorithms solving PALL are not designed to take into account additional best-effort traffic. In particular, they often build very compact assignments,




Fig. 21: A (P, τ') -assignment interpreted as a (P, τ) -assignment

with all datagrams following one another in a contention vertex, which is bad for the latency of best-efforts datagrams trying to go through the same contention point. Thus, we propose an adaptation of any algorithm solving PALL, to find assignments where the unused tics are as evenly spaced as possible in the period. Such assignments minimize the maximal latency of any random datagram trying to go through the contention points. A similar approach, to decrease the latency of best-effort datagrams while scheduling C-RAN datagrams on an optical ring, can be found in [39].

6.2.1 Spaced Assignments

Most algorithms for PALL, when determining the waiting times, send datagrams as early as possible and thus create long sequences of datagrams in c_2 , without free tics between them. We propose to modify any algorithm solving PALL on an instance with datagram size τ as follows: compute a (P, τ') assignment using the algorithm, for the largest possible $\tau' \geq \tau$.

Lemma 8. *Let $I' = (N, P, \tau', d)$ be an instance of PALL, for which there is an assignment, and let $\tau \leq \tau'$, then there is also an assignment for $I = (N, P, \tau, d)$.*

Proof. Let A be the assignment of I' , the absence of collision is the absence of intersection between intervals $[r_i, c_1]_{P, \tau'}$ (and $[r_i, c_2]_{P, \tau'}$). If we consider A as an assignment of I , then the intervals are $[r_i, c_1]_{P, \tau}$ and are strictly included in $[r_i, c_1]_{P, \tau'}$, hence they do not have intersections either. \square

Lemma 8 gives a way to obtain a solution of the original instance from the instance with a larger message size as illustrated in Figure 21, with the additional property that all datagrams are separated by at least $\tau' - \tau$ free tics in each contention point. We are interested in finding the maximal τ' for which there is an assignment. Since the property of having an assignment is monotonous with regards to τ' , we can do so by a dichotomous search on τ .

We call SPMLS, for Spaced PMLS, the adaptation of PMLS which finds an assignment for the largest possible τ by dichotomous search on τ . We experimentally investigate how large can be τ' so that SPMLS finds a (P, τ') -assignment. In Figure 22, we represent the probability to find a (P, τ') -assignment function of τ' . The star routed networks are generated as in Section 5.6, with 8 routes and length of the arcs drawn in $[P]$. The network has a load of 0.6 of C-RAN traffic, hence the period is set to 33,333 for $\tau = 2500$. The network is less loaded with C-RAN traffic than in the previous sections because it will also support non deterministic traffic, incurring an additional load.

For more than 80% of the instances, there is an assignment for the maximal size of a datagram $\tau' = \frac{P}{n} = 4166$. This means that SPMLS perfectly balances




Fig. 22: Probability of finding a (P, τ') -assignment over 10,000 instances

the free tics in the period. In the worst case, a solution with $\tau' = 3925$ is found, which still yields $3925 - 2500 = 1425$ unused tics between datagrams. Hence, we expect SPMLS to work well in conjunction with random traffic. The excellent performance of PMLS when the load is high explains this result and further justifies the work we have done to solve PALL efficiently under high load rather than just requiring mild load in applications.

6.2.2 Performance Evaluation

We evaluate in this section different ways to manage both statistical and deterministic traffics together in the same network.

Best-effort datagrams generation Let us denote best-effort by BE. The BE traffic is generated as follows. The size of a BE datagram is small in practice, and set to 50 tics in our experiments. We generate 0.2 of average load of BE traffic in our experiment, to obtain a total load of 0.8. The BE datagrams do not make a round trip in the network as the C-RAN datagrams, they go through a single contention point. We simulate that, by generating 0.2 of average load of BE datagrams for each of the two contention points c_1 and c_2 . The **latency** of a BE datagram is defined as the time it must wait before going through its contention points.

On each contention point, the generation is split in two exponential distributions which give the time before the next arrival of datagrams. The first one models background traffic, it has an average load of 0.15 and generates one BE datagram every 333 tics on average. The second models a burst of BE datagrams, it has an average load of 0.5 and generates *ten* BE datagrams every 10,000 tics on average.

Statistical multiplexing policy We test several policies to deal with all traffics using statistical multiplexing. The BE traffic is managed using **FIFO**, and we propose two policies to deal with C-RAN. First, all datagrams, BE or C-RAN,




Fig. 23: Cumulative distribution of the latency of BE datagrams for several network management schemes

are stored in the same buffer and dealt with the **FIFO** policy regardless of their type. We call this policy **FIFO**.

In order to minimize the latency of C-RAN traffic, we can store the two types of datagrams in two different buffers, managed each with **FIFO**, but we prioritize the C-RAN datagrams which are always sent first. It can be technically implemented using TSN 802.1Qbu [11], that allows to define priority class in the traffic to schedule first the traffic with the highest priority, here the C-RAN traffic. We call this policy **FramePreemption**.

We also consider the case of C-RAN traffic scheduled by **PMLS** or **SPMLS**. Then, we need to forbid the transit of a BE datagram which collides with a C-RAN datagram. Thus, in each contention point, we reserve 50 tics (the size of a BE datagram) before the arrival of a C-RAN message. Observe that it wastes some resources and thus slightly decreases the maximal throughput and may worsen the latency of BE datagrams.

Figure 23 shows the cumulative distribution of the logical latency of BE datagrams, that is the probability that a BE datagram has a latency less than some value. The distribution is computed over 1000 random instances, and for each the traffic is simulated for ten periods.

If we compare **FIFO** and **FramePreemption**, we see that the latency of BE datagrams is better (1977 tics on average) with **FIFO**. It is expected, since in **FramePreemption** the C-RAN datagrams are prioritized and thus the latency of the BE datagrams is strictly worse, 3256 tics on average. However, this is a trade-off with the margin of the C-RAN datagrams, which is strictly better for **FramePreemption**: 1919 tics on average versus 5265 tics for **FIFO**.

Using a deterministic approach for C-RAN with **PMLS**, the trade-off is even stronger: the C-RAN margin is down to 0, but the BE traffic is more impacted, at latency of 4909 tics on average. This can be explained by both reservation of tics to deal with the periodic sending scheme and the long sequences of C-RAN

datagrams without free time in contention points.

Using **SPMLS**, the C-RAN traffic is smoothed over the period, in order to regularly leave some free tics for BE traffic. By construction, we still have C-RAN margin of 0 but it improves the latency of BE datagrams to 949 tics on average, which is even better than with **FIFO**.

This result shows that managing deterministic traffic deterministically is also good for the other sources of traffic on the network. We have already observed such a phenomenon in [39], a similar problem on an optical ring.

7 Conclusion

In this article, we proposed two kinds of deterministic sending schemes to establish low latency periodic communication between BBUs and RRHs in a star routed network. The first method uses no buffering and has no latency overhead. It works when the routes are short (using algorithm **ShortestLongest**) or when the load is less than 0.8 (using algorithm **ESCA**). When the load is higher, buffering is allowed in the BBUs and we propose the algorithm **PMLS** which finds a deterministic communication scheme with almost no additional logical latency. Our deterministic approach is vastly superior to the classical statistical multiplexing for all loads of the network, even when sources of random traffic are present. Indeed, even with an oversized network (small load), the latency of statistical multiplexing is an order of magnitude larger than what is expected, while our solution requires zero logical latency for most instances in the harshest settings. This emphasizes that *deterministic sources* of traffic are always best *dealt with deterministically*.

There are still several challenge to tackle so that our work can be easily used in a real fronthaul network for C-RAN. From a theoritical perspective, we need to prove that PAZL and PALL are NP-hard on star routed networks. Then, we should design a better FPT algorithm for PALL on star routed networks, as efficient as the one for PAZL. This would help us understand if any performance is lost by using **PMLS** as a heuristic in practice. Then, we must generalize our study of the PALL problem to other common fronthaul topologies, such as caterpillars, trees, cycles or bounded treewidth graphs. Some elements on cycle topologies are given in [39] and on routed networks of bounded contention depth, for synchronized RRHs in [7].

Several variations of our model are relevant to capture more use cases than C-RAN. We may consider routes periodically emitting datagrams of *different sizes* to represent different payload transmitted in the network. In that case, we cannot rely on **PMLS** since the corresponding non periodic scheduling problem is already NP-hard. We could also allow for links of different speeds in the fronthaul network, but we must then model the interface between links more precisely, which is tedious but could be solved using scheduling over several parallel machines using [40]. Instead of minimizing the worst transmission time, we may want to minimize the average transmission time. This objective is linear, and it makes the size of the route irrelevant to the objective. Hence, it should be *easier* to solve, for intance using linear programming. We could allow preemption, that is the datagrams may be cut into pieces, which would certainly change the complexity of the problem and help with the latency. Instead of computing periodic sending schemes, we could try to organize communications

with pseudo-periodic schemes (periodic over several periods). Finally, the routes may not be fixed but computed from the network to minimize $TR(A)$, which makes the problem even more difficult to solve (certainly Π_2 -complete instead of NP-complete).

Acknowledgments We thank Olivier Marcé and Brice Leclerc who have introduced us to the problem, from a practical perspective. We also thank Christian Cadéré and David Auger for friendly discussions on the subject and insightful remarks. This work has been partially supported by the french ANR project N-GREEN.

References

- [1] D. Barth, M. Guiraud, B. Leclerc, O. Marce, and Y. Strobecki, “Deterministic scheduling of periodic messages for cloud RAN,” in *2018 25th International Conference on Telecommunications (ICT) (ICT 2018)*, (Saint Malo, France), June 2018.
- [2] C. Mobile, “C-RAN: the road towards green RAN,” *White Paper, ver.*, vol. 2, 2011.
- [3] T.-S. N. T. G. of IEEE 802.1, “Time-sensitive networks for fronthaul,” July 2016. IEEE P802.1/D0.4.
- [4] Y. Bouguen, E. Hardouin, A. Maloberti, and F.-X. Wolff, *LTE et les réseaux 4G*. Editions Eyrolles, 2012.
- [5] 3GPP, *3rd Generation Partnership Project; Technical Specification Group Services and System Aspects; Service requirements for the 5G system*. Stage 1 (Release 16).
- [6] F. Boccardi, R. W. Heath, A. Lozano, T. L. Marzetta, and P. Popovski, “Five disruptive technology directions for 5G,” *IEEE Communications Magazine*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 74–80, 2014.
- [7] D. Barth, M. Guiraud, B. Leclerc, O. Marcé, and Y. Strobecki, “Scheduling synchronized periodic messages on a meshed network.” 2020.
- [8] A. Pizzinat, P. Chanclou, F. Saliou, and T. Diallo, “Things you should know about fronthaul,” *Journal of Lightwave Technology*, vol. 33, no. 5, pp. 1077–1083, 2015.
- [9] Z. Tayq, L. A. Neto, B. Le Guyader, A. De Lannoy, M. Chouaref, C. Aupetit-Berthelemot, M. N. Anjanappa, S. Nguyen, K. Chowdhury, and P. Chanclou, “Real time demonstration of the transport of ethernet fronthaul based on vran in optical access networks,” in *Optical Fiber Communications Conference and Exhibition (OFC), 2017*, pp. 1–3, IEEE, 2017.
- [10] N. Finn and P. Thubert, “Deterministic Networking Architecture,” Internet-Draft draft-finn-detnet-architecture-08, Internet Engineering Task Force, 2016. Work in Progress.

- [11] “Time-sensitive networking task group.” <http://www.ieee802.org/1/pages/tsn.html>. Accessed: 2016-09-22.
- [12] W. Howe, “Time-scheduled and time-reservation packet switching,” Mar. 17 2005. US Patent App. 10/947,487.
- [13] B. Leclerc and O. Marcé, “Transmission of coherent data flow within packet-switched network,” June 15 2016. EP Patent App. EP20,140,307,006.
- [14] R. J. Cole, B. M. Maggs, and R. K. Sitaraman, “On the benefit of supporting virtual channels in wormhole routers,” in *Proceedings of the eighth annual ACM symposium on Parallel algorithms and architectures*, pp. 131–141, ACM, 1996.
- [15] R. Borndörfer, A. Eisenblätter, M. Grötschel, and A. Martin, “Frequency assignment in cellular phone networks,” *Annals of Operations Research*, vol. 76, pp. 73–93, 1998.
- [16] T. Erlebach and K. Jansen, “The complexity of path coloring and call scheduling,” *Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 255, no. 1, pp. 33–50, 2001.
- [17] B. Zhou, “Multiple circular colouring as a model for scheduling,” 2013.
- [18] W. Yu, H. Hoogeveen, and J. K. Lenstra, “Minimizing makespan in a two-machine flow shop with delays and unit-time operations is np-hard,” *Journal of Scheduling*, vol. 7, no. 5, pp. 333–348, 2004.
- [19] J. Korst, E. Aarts, J. K. Lenstra, and J. Wessels, “Periodic multiprocessor scheduling,” in *PARLE’91 Parallel Architectures and Languages Europe*, pp. 166–178, Springer, 1991.
- [20] C. Hanen and A. Munier, *Cyclic scheduling on parallel processors: an overview*. Université de Paris-Sud, Centre d’Orsay, Laboratoire de Recherche en Informatique, 1993.
- [21] E. Levner, V. Kats, D. A. L. de Pablo, and T. E. Cheng, “Complexity of cyclic scheduling problems: A state-of-the-art survey,” *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, vol. 59, no. 2, pp. 352–361, 2010.
- [22] R. M. Lusby, J. Larsen, M. Ehrgott, and D. Ryan, “Railway track allocation: models and methods,” *OR spectrum*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 843–883, 2011.
- [23] P. Serafini and W. Ukovich, “A mathematical model for periodic scheduling problems,” *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 550–581, 1989.
- [24] N. G. Nayak, F. Dürr, and K. Rothermel, “Incremental flow scheduling and routing in time-sensitive software-defined networks,” *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, vol. 14, no. 5, pp. 2066–2075, 2017.
- [25] W. Steiner, S. S. Craciunas, and R. S. Oliver, “Traffic planning for time-sensitive communication,” *IEEE Communications Standards Magazine*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 42–47, 2018.

- [26] A. C. T. dos Santos, B. Schneider, and V. Nigam, “Tsnsched: Automated schedule generation for time sensitive networking,” in *2019 Formal Methods in Computer Aided Design (FMCAD)*, pp. 69–77, IEEE, 2019.
- [27] “IEEE 802.3 10 gb/s.”
- [28] M. Guiraud, “Deterministic scheduling of periodic datagrams for low latency in 5g and beyond,” 2021.
- [29] F. De Montgolfier, M. Soto, and L. Viennot, “Treewidth and hyperbolicity of the internet,” in *Network Computing and Applications (NCA), 2011 10th IEEE International Symposium on*, pp. 25–32, IEEE, 2011.
- [30] I. Holyer, “The np-completeness of edge-coloring,” *SIAM Journal on computing*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 718–720, 1981.
- [31] D. Zuckerman, “Linear degree extractors and the inapproximability of max clique and chromatic number,” in *Proceedings of the thirty-eighth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pp. 681–690, ACM, 2006.
- [32] A. J. Orman and C. N. Potts, “On the complexity of coupled-task scheduling,” *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, vol. 72, no. 1-2, pp. 141–154, 1997.
- [33] M. Guiraud and Y. Strozecki, “Scheduling periodic messages on a shared link.” 2020.
- [34] R. G. Downey and M. R. Fellows, *Parameterized complexity*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [35] B. Simons, “A fast algorithm for single processor scheduling,” in *Foundations of Computer Science, 1978., 19th Annual Symposium on*, pp. 246–252, IEEE, 1978.
- [36] J. K. Lenstra, A. R. Kan, and P. Brucker, “Complexity of machine scheduling problems,” *Annals of discrete mathematics*, vol. 1, pp. 343–362, 1977.
- [37] J. Carlier, “Problème à une machine dans le cas où les tâches ont des durées égales,” tech. rep., Tech. Report, Institut de Programmation, Université de Paris VI, Paris, France, 1979.
- [38] M. R. Garey, D. S. Johnson, B. B. Simons, and R. E. Tarjan, “Scheduling unit-time tasks with arbitrary release times and deadlines,” *SIAM Journal on Computing*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 256–269, 1981.
- [39] D. Barth, M. Guiraud, and Y. Strozecki, “Deterministic contention management for low latency cloud RAN over an optical ring,” in *Optical Network Design and Modeling - 23rd IFIP WG 6.10 International Conference, ONDM 2019*, vol. 11616 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pp. 479–491, Springer, 2019.
- [40] B. B. Simons and M. K. Warmuth, “A fast algorithm for multiprocessor scheduling of unit-length jobs,” *SIAM Journal on Computing*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 690–710, 1989.