

# Choose, not Hoard: Information-to-Model Matching for Artificial Intelligence in O-RAN

Jorge Martín-Pérez\*, Nuria Molner<sup>†§</sup>, Francesco Malandrino<sup>‡</sup>, Carlos Jesús Bernardos\*, Antonio de la Oliva\*, David Gomez-Barquero<sup>†</sup>

<sup>†</sup> iTEAM Research Institute - Universitat Politècnica de València, Spain

\* Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, Spain

<sup>‡</sup> CNR-IEIIT, Torino, Italy

**Abstract**—Open Radio Access Network (O-RAN) is an emerging paradigm, whereby virtualized network infrastructure elements from different vendors communicate via open, standardized interfaces. A key element therein is the RAN Intelligent Controller (RIC), an Artificial Intelligence (AI)-based controller. Traditionally, all data available in the network has been used to train a single AI model to use at the RIC. In this paper we introduce, discuss, and evaluate the creation of *multiple* AI model instances at different RICs, leveraging information from some (or all) locations for their training. This brings about a flexible relationship between gNBs, the AI models used to control them, and the data such models are trained with. Experiments with real-world traces show how using *multiple* AI model instances that *choose* training data from specific locations improve the performance of traditional approaches.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Virtual Radio Access Network (vRAN) is arguably one of the most exciting recent innovations of the networking ecosystem. It is enabled by the Software-Defined Networking (SDN) approach, and allows the functions traditionally performed by base stations (currently gNBs) to be *virtualized* and *split* across multiple network nodes, including newly-introduced entities called Central Units (CUs), Distributed Units (DUs), and Radio Units (RUs). Such a functional split, in turn, allows different decisions to be made at different nodes *and* with different time scales. As an example, RUs can perform real-time radio management, while CUs can adjust higher-level resource allocation over longer time scales.

The different CU, DU, RU units corresponding to different gNBs can now be hosted in edge or cloud servers, sharing their location in some cases and reducing costs for the operators through the remote management of the components thanks to its virtualized nature.

The promising results of vRAN gave rise to initiatives, such as Open Radio Access Network (O-RAN) or Cisco's Open vRAN Ecosystem Group, aiming at creating an open and interoperable RAN ecosystem where open APIs and interfaces can be integrated connecting different vendors components. O-RAN [1] has been so far the vRAN initiative receiving more attention, also thanks to the open-source community created around it.

In addition to the vRAN components, O-RAN introduces a new element called RAN Intelligent Controller (RIC), implementing arbitrary resource allocation and management policies via closed-control loops. Different RICs can run at different time scales, e.g., near-real-time (with latencies of less than 10 ms) and non-real-time (with latencies of several seconds). Owing to their (relatively) relaxed time requirements, non-real-time RICs can leverage Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Machine Learning (ML) for their decisions. RICs can collect from DUs information about the current state of the network, process such data, and instruct RUs accordingly [2]. The importance of AI in O-RAN is such that a dedicated working group [3] has been created to define use cases and which components should host the AI/ML-based intelligence in O-RAN.

AI/ML techniques currently tailored to O-RAN scenarios are the subject of a vast body of research, as detailed in Sec. II, with the majority of works being predicated on the notion that effective AI training requires *hoarding* all existing data from all the sources (black brain in Fig. 1). However,

<sup>§</sup>corresponding author: numolsiu@iteam.upv.es

©20xx IEEE. Personal use of this material is permitted. Permission from IEEE must be obtained for all other uses, in any current or future media, including reprinting/republishing this material for advertising or promotional purposes, creating new collective works, for resale or redistribution to servers or lists, or reuse of any copyrighted component of this work in other works.




Fig. 1. Choosing (solid lines) vs hoarding (dashed lines) data in a scenario with urban (blue), residential (purple) and rural (green) locations. Choosing results in specific model instances for urban+residential (blue/purple brain) and rural (green brain) locations. Hoarding results in a global model instance (black brain).

there are several reasons why this may not always be the best approach. First, transferring data from all RUs to the RIC may incur long delays, hence, decisions may be based upon outdated information. Furthermore, more data means longer training times, which may result in the same issue. Finally, training an AI with data from unrelated locations (e.g., rural and urban areas) may even hurt the performance.

In this paper, we introduce, discuss, and evaluate the benefits of *choosing* which data is used to train an AI model in O-RAN. Specifically, we propose to create *multiple* model instances running at different RICs, and to train them by *choosing* the most appropriate data, even if it does not come from locations under their control, as exemplified in Fig. 1. By doing so, we reap the twofold benefit of (i) getting *better* learning, as only relevant information is used, and (ii) get *faster* learning, as having to move less information across the network results in shorter network delays and, usually, in cost savings [4].

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we discuss state-of-the-art AI/ML in O-RAN scenarios, highlighting how most approaches seek to leverage all existing data to train a single AI model. In Sec. III, we use a real-world scenario to compare the *choosing* and *hoarding* approaches in AI training. Motivated by our experimental findings, in Sec. IV we discuss in detail how the choosing approach tackles many of the major issues of AI in O-RAN scenarios. Finally, Sec. V discusses open research issues, and Sec. VI concludes the paper.

## II. EXISTING AI/ML SOLUTIONS FOR O-RAN

As mentioned in Sec. I, one of the core principles of O-RAN is to make networks intelligent and self-manageable [1], [5]. AI/ML is one of the key enabling technologies, with popular approaches including Reinforcement Learning (RL) [6], Deep Learning (DL) [7], and Federated Learning (FL) [8].

One common application of AI in vRAN networks is to improve the usage of computational and networking resources, as done in [9] and [10], which relies for this purpose on unsupervised and supervised DL techniques, respectively. Other works, use intelligence-powered optimization techniques for the semi-automated management of cellular networks integrated in real testbed environments [11].

In the O-RAN WG2 [3], AI is leveraged for traffic steering to trigger handovers to neighboring cells that are predicted to provide better performance to the terminal. Bounded processing latency is a significant problem when deciding how and where to apply intelligence. Swift decision making by RICs has received significant attention; as an example, [2] trains and validates models offline in the non real-time RIC, and then deploys them in the near real-time RIC to perform online decisions. The choice of the network node where the training and inference happen has a significant impact on training times and the network delays, hence, such a decision is critical.

A related problem concerns how to learn from data located in different nodes, for which there are two different approaches, namely, centralized and distributed. Centralized learning requires to train one single model at one single server, that can be either in the edge or in the cloud. In this case, all the data is gathered at the server where the model is trained. This approach is considered in works such as [10], [12], [13] and [14], which use AI to make network management decisions aimed at reducing end-to-end latency. The opposite approach is to train one model in a distributed fashion, at multiple cloud and edge servers. In this case, each server performs one epoch of the learning process with local data and exchange the partial results with the rest of the training servers to include this information in the subsequent individual epochs, as in FL [8]. FL aims at creating a single, global model by averaging the local models of the different learning nodes. The advantage of this training is that, network latency

tends to be lower as data is collected from close-by sources; furthermore, distributed approaches tend to preserve the privacy of the data. Works such as [15] and [4] follow this distributed approach.

Considering all the analyzed literature, we can observe a strong tendency to use *all* available data to obtain *one* single generic model – trained in either a centralized or a distributed manner. The option of creating *multiple* instances of the model, that can fit data of different nature, is as of yet unexplored. Accordingly, in Sec. III next we leverage real-world cellular traces to verify our intuition that creating multiple model instances and *choosing* the data they are trained upon may beat the traditional approach of *hoarding* all data to train a single model instance.

### III. CHOOSING AND HOARDING IN A REAL-WORLD SCENARIO

In this section we evaluate the effect of creating multiple AI models and flexibly *choosing* the data they are trained over. Specifically, we compare the extreme approaches of (i) training *multiple* model instances, each controlling one RU, and training them by *choosing* data from a single RU (e.g., green brain in Fig. 1), and (ii) *hoarding* training data from all RUs (e.g., black brain in Fig. 1) and training a single model instance. We further assess how both approaches are affected by lowering the quantity of available data.

In order to draw reliable conclusions, grounded in reality, we leverage a dataset [2] that emulates a 5G network in a real-world urban scenario near the Rome Colosseum. The scenario includes 4 RUs operating at 0.98 and 1.02 GHz in the downlink and uplink, using a channel bandwidth of 3 MHz. Up to 40 User Equipments (UEs) communicate with the RUs to send and receive traffic of three network slices: enhanced Mobile Broadband (eMBB), Machine Type Communication (MTC), and Ultra Reliable Low Latency Communication (URLLC). Each network slice is allocated a Resource Block Group (RBG) to use, and every RU has the same number of UEs transmitting at each slice. Traffic of different slices is generated according to different processes, namely, eMBB UEs transmit at constant bitrates, while MTC and URLLC UEs have Poissonian traffic.

Every RU uses the O-RAN O1 interface to report UEs' uplink (UL) and downlink (DL) metrics, such as Modulation Coding Scheme (MCS),

granted Physical Resource Blocks (PRBs), buffer size, power multiplier.

Given such information, the RIC's goal is to predict the performance (more specifically, the bitrate) experienced by each user. To this end, we follow the lead of [2] and use a feed-forward (FF) neural network (NN), with a first hidden layer of 30 ReLU-activated neurons, followed by a second hidden layer of 30 neurons that feed their output to a sigmoid activation unit. The input layer is fed with the DL MCS and buffer size, the sum of granted and requested PRBs, and the UE network slice. All inputs are transformed via  $L_2$  normalization, and the network slice is fed to the NN using one-hot encoding. The training stage aims to minimize the Mean Absolute Percentage Error (MAPE) of the bitrate inference, using the Adam optimizer with a learning rate of  $10^{-6}$  over 100 epochs. Moreover, during the training stage, 20% of the dataset is left out for later validation. We implemented the FF NN using PyTorch 1.10.0+cu102 on an Intel Xeon CPU E5-2670 @2.60GHz.

We focus on RU<sub>4</sub>, and compare the performance of five setups: one where data from all RSUs is *hoarded* at RU<sub>4</sub>, and four more when RU<sub>4</sub>'s model instance is only trained with data from a specific RSU. For each setup, we assess the performance resulting from changing the quantity of training data (Sec. III-A) and maximum training time (Sec. III-B). We further check how learning quality translates into the performance of a specific application, namely, a quality predictor xApp that estimates if an MTC UE will have available bandwidth (Sec. III-C).

#### A. Impact of the quantity of training data

Fig. 2 shows how an increasing amount of training data (x-axis) impacts the prediction quality, quantified through the MAPE (y-axis) of *multiple* NN instances (lines) when they infer the DL bitrate of UEs at RU<sub>4</sub>. As mentioned above, four NN instances *choose* training data from a single RU (blue lines in Fig. 2), and a fifth NN instance *hoards* training data from all RUs (black line). Additionally, Fig. 2 illustrates what is the best instance choice (yellow) as we increase the data samples.

The results in Fig. 2 show that the MAPE has a monotonic decrease as the *multiple* NN instances use more data. NN instances that *choose* training




Fig. 2. NN accuracy as a function of the quantity of available training data, when the objective is to infer the DL bitrate of an UE at  $RU_4$ . NN instances *choose* training data from one RU (blue lines), or *hoard* training data from all RUs (black).

data from a single RU have up to 350K data samples, while the NN instance that *hoards* data from all RUs has up to 1400K samples – see Fig. 2 break in the x-axis. However, *hoarding* more training data from all RUs only reduces the MAPE from 1.92% to 1.75% when data increases from 350K to 1400K samples, respectively. This makes the reduction of the MAPE negligible as the 0.17% decrease translates into reducing the inference error only by 2 Bytes in the URLLC slice. This suggests that a NN instance that *chooses* training data from a single RU may yield similar performance to *hoarding* data from all the RUs, while carrying substantially less data around the network.

In general, we can observe that below 350K training samples it is better to use the NN instance *choosing* training data from  $RU_4$  (1.85% MAPE) than the NN instance *hoarding* data from all RUs (1.90% MAPE). This highlights how, in this case, it is beneficial to *choose* data from a single RU unless data is extremely plentiful – and, again, such plenty does come with an associated overhead.

### B. Impact of the maximum training time

In the following, we use all the available data and limit the maximum training time to a value between 10 and 1000 seconds, reporting the resulting MAPE. Fig. 3 shows how increasing the maximum training time (x-axis) impacts the MAPE (y-axis) of *multiple* NN instances (lines) when they infer the DL bitrate of UEs at  $RU_4$ . As in Sec. III-A, four NN instances *choose* training data from a single RU (blue lines), and a fifth NN instance *hoards* training data from




Fig. 3. NN accuracy when it uses more/less training time to infer the DL bitrate of an UE at  $RU_4$ . NN instances *choose* training data from one RU (blue lines), or *hoard* training data from all RUs (black).

all RUs (black line). Again, Fig. 3 also illustrates what is the best instance choice (yellow line).

When the maximum training time is below 550 s, Fig. 3 shows that it is better to use a NN instance that *hoards* training data from all RUs (black line). Hence, if network transfer times are negligible it is better to *hoard* with *heterogeneous* training data from all RUs: with more data available, learning progresses more within each epoch, and we require fewer epochs to reach the desired learning quality. However, if the maximum training time is between 550 sec and 800 sec, it is better to use a NN instance *choosing* training data from  $RU_4$  given its lower MAPE – see Fig. 3 zoom. In case the maximum training time is above 800 sec, the accuracy of the NN instances are essentially the same, no matter whether they *choose* data from a single RU or *hoard* data from all RUs.

From Fig. 3 we can say that depending on the targeted training time, might be beneficial to *hoard* the NN instance with *heterogeneous* data from all RUs. Note, however, that Fig. 3 only reports the maximum training time and not network transfer delay, which increases with more data and/or data from faraway locations [4]. Therefore, *choosing* training data from a single RU leads to longer training time than *hoarding* data from all RUs; however, the latter entails longer network latencies, which shall be weighted against the shorter training time. Indeed, Fig. 3 only deals with the *training* time, i.e., the combined duration of all learning epochs; it neglects the network delay incurred by carrying all the required data to the node performing the learning. Such a delay grows, in general, with




Fig. 4. Accuracy of a quality predictor xApp as a function of the quantity of training data. The xApp uses NN instances that *choose* training data from one RU (blue lines) or *hoard* training data from all RUs (black line).

the quantity of training data to use, hence, *choosing* training data from a single RU may be an attractive option in scenarios where transferring data across the network incurs higher delays and/or costs.

### C. Quality predictor xApp

We now take the NN instances trained in Sec. III-B, and use them inside a quality predictor xApp that checks if an MTC UE will have available bandwidth when it connects to RU<sub>4</sub>. The quality predictor xApp is fed with O-RAN data coming from RUs through the E2 interface, and provides near real-time estimations of the DL that UEs will experience.

To assess the quality predictor performance we resort to the accuracy metric, which tells the percentage of true positives and negatives, i.e., the percentage of UEs that before connecting to RU<sub>4</sub> were successfully classified as having non-zero/zero DL bitrate, respectively. Fig. 4 illustrates the xApp accuracy (y-axis) when the quantity of training data increases (x-axis) in the already-mentioned *choose* and *hoard* cases. Again, Fig. 4 illustrates the best instance choice (yellow line) as we increase the training data samples. Fig. 4 shows that it is better for the xApp to use a NN instance that *hoards* training data from all the RUs. Specifically, the xApp achieves its best accuracy 94.81% when it uses the NN instance that *hoards* 175K data samples from all the RUs, for it achieves a smaller accuracy 93% when it uses a NN instance that *chooses* training data from a single RU.

Interestingly, Fig. 4 also shows that RU<sub>3</sub> is the best choice when we have about 250K and 300K training samples. This is because of the homogeneity of dataset [2], hence, information about events happening under RU<sub>3</sub> is useful to predict the connection quality of UEs attaching to RU<sub>4</sub>.

As in Sec. III-B, the accuracy does not increase after a certain amount of training data; specifically, the xApp accuracy does not improve after 200K samples – see Fig. 4. For example, when the xApp uses the NN instance that *hoards* training data from all RUs (black line), its accuracy drops down to a 92.32% with 305K samples. This highlights the relevance of not only *choosing* or *hoarding* the RUs used in the training stage, but also deciding the fraction of data used at the training stage.

It is important to highlight that the dataset we used for our findings is remarkably *homogeneous*, i.e., it considers every RU receiving the same amount of traffic at every slice; in these conditions, the *hoarding* strategy is most likely to perform well. None the less, *hoarding* data from all RUs in the training stage did not always result in the best learning or application performance. This highlights the potential of *choosing* the training data, as such approach achieves similar (if not better) performance than *hoarding* data in a scenario where traffic patterns are homogeneous across RUs. Hence, scenarios with data diversity across RUs will benefit even more from *choosing* RU data, for it allows to create *multiple* model instances that fit the traffic peculiarities of each RU. We now widen our focus, and discuss how our findings fit into the wider problem of information-to-model matching for AI in O-RAN.

## IV. WHY CHOOSING WORKS: BETWEEN NETWORKING AND LEARNING

The high-level ambition of this paper is to shift the focus from *how* to best combine all available data within one model instance to finding the best *matching* between data, model instances, and gNBs. Such a shift is motivated by three main factors, related to networking, ML, or both.

Our numerical results show that deviating from the standard approach of creating a single model instance using all the available data, can offer significant performance advantages; in other words, *choosing works* better than *hoarding*. We now switch our



focus towards *why* choosing works, and remark how it helps to address three of the main issues affecting learning in O-RAN scenarios.

The first issue concerns the networking side of O-RAN and stems from the large cost of ML training. Whether such training is performed in a centralized or distributed manner, it always requires moving significant quantities of information – data, gradients, models... – around the network. The ML training process will compete for bandwidth and computational resources with user-plane traffic, and potentially impact the performance of the latter. It follows that reducing the quantity of data that ML models are trained upon, if it can be done without jeopardizing the quality of the resulting decisions, is a very appealing prospect.

The second issue is related to the ML side, more specifically, the relationship between the quantity of available data, the learning performance, and the training time. Theoretical and experimental results concur that the time taken by each training epoch grows *linearly* with the quantity of used data, while the learning quality improves more slowly, typically, according to a square-root law [4]. It follows that, while more data does translate into better learning, prolonged training times may not be worth it in time-constrained scenarios.

The networking and ML sides combine in the third issue, namely, the extent to which it is beneficial to learn from *heterogeneous* data. Indeed, different RUs may operate in very different conditions, e.g., rural/residential/urban areas, possibly with different traffic patterns and user mobility. An

ML model instance can learn from heterogeneous data, but that requires more complex models, which in turn have longer training times. The issue is so significant that some recent works on FL envision dropping nodes with overly-heterogeneous data from the training process.

Choosing – more accurately, *being able* to choose – addresses the concerns above in three main ways:

- allowing the creation of *multiple* model instances;
- each model instance can leverage information from some (or all) locations for its training;
- locations can use any model instance for their decisions, including those not trained using local information.

Fig. 5(right) represents a possible decision made where data is chosen and not hoarded: data from the two urban (blue) RUs is combined in one model instance, which both RUs then leverage. Data from the residential (red) and rural (green) RUs is kept separate and used for two different model instances; furthermore, the red+green model instance also uses data from the rural RU. Compared with Fig. 5(left), summarizing the state-of-the-art approach, we are creating more model instances, training each of them with a smaller quantity of data, and choosing how to *match* data and model instances.

Importantly, the one in Fig. 5(left) is *also* a possible decision. Indeed, being able to choose does not prevent falling back to creating a single model instance – leveraging all information – whenever the scenario and conditions warrant it.

## V. OPEN ISSUES

The greater flexibility afforded by being able to choose model instances and data comes at a cost in terms of new decisions and additional factors to consider when making them; this, in turn, opens up new exciting avenues for future research.

A first, major topic is represented by the relationship between learning quality and network overhead. Traditionally, it is assumed that achieving a high learning quality requires more data, which entails more network overhead. However, our results suggests that, in many scenarios, it is possible to achieve both, i.e., to have a high learning quality with a limited quantity of data – crucially, data that does not need to travel long distances across the network –, hence, with a limited network overhead.




Fig. 5. Scenario with urban (blue), residential (purple), and rural (green) locations. The traditional approach (left) *hoards* all RUs' data (continuous lines) to a model instance taking decisions (dashed lines) at every location. Our proposal (right) flexibly associates model instances, *chosen* RUs to gather data, and locations to take decisions.

This, in turn, raises the issue of *what* makes certain datasets and certain scenario more amenable to choosing or hoarding. We can conjecture that hoarding works best in homogeneous scenarios, where gathering data from multiple sources helps training; conversely, heterogeneous scenarios might be better tackled by creating multiple model instances and *choosing* the data to train them. Being able to assess *a priori* whether the scenario at hand is better suited for choosing or hoarding – e.g., by computing data-related metrics such as similarity – would greatly help in choosing the right approach, hence, improve performance.

Finally, our results highlight how ML performance, i.e., learning accuracy, does not immediately or directly translate into application performance. This is observed by comparing Fig. 3 and Fig. 4, where minor differences in the learning quality result in more significant differences in the application behavior. This calls for further attention on the fact that ML accuracy is not necessarily the best metric to evaluate the possible learning approaches, as AI/ML in O-RAN is usually a means not an end.

## VI. CONCLUSION

We have proposed and analyzed a new approach to the integration of AI in O-RAN scenario, allowing to assign different model instances to each gNB of the network, and independently *choose* the data each instance is trained on. Our approach deviates from the state of the art in that it does not seek to train one model instance for the whole network and to train it using all available data; therefore, it provides more flexibility than fully-centralized and fully-distributed approaches.

Our performance evaluation, leveraging real-world traces, shows how our approach yields very attractive trade-offs between training time and learning effectiveness, by combining data from different sources in a flexible manner. Future research directions stemming from our work include characterizing *a priori* the usefulness of data for AI training, trade-offs between data transfer delays and AI training time, and the impact of AI accuracy over the performance of concrete applications.

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. Garcia-Saavedra and X. Costa-Perez, “O-RAN: Disrupting the virtualized RAN ecosystem,” *IEEE Communications Standards Magazine*, 2021.
- [2] L. Bonati, S. D’Oro, M. Polese, S. Basagni, and T. Melodia, “Intelligence and learning in O-RAN for data-driven NextG cellular networks,” *IEEE Communications Magazine*, 2021.
- [3] O-RAN Alliance, “O-RAN Working Group 2. AI/MLWorkflow Description and Requirements (O-RAN.WG2.AIML-v01.02),” in *Tech. Rep.*, 2021.
- [4] F. Malandrino, C. F. Chiasserini, N. Molner, and A. De La Oliva, “Network Support for High-performance Distributed Machine Learning,” *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, 2022.
- [5] R. Shafin, L. Liu, V. Chandrasekhar, H. Chen, J. Reed, and J. C. Zhang, “Artificial intelligence-enabled cellular networks: A critical path to beyond-5G and 6G,” *IEEE Wireless Communications*, 2020.
- [6] T. Pamuklu, M. Erol-Kantarci, and C. Ersoy, “Reinforcement learning based dynamic function splitting in disaggregated green Open RANs,” in *IEEE ICC*, 2021.
- [7] J. A. Ayala-Romero, A. Garcia-Saavedra, M. Gramaglia, X. Costa-Perez, A. Banchs, and J. J. Alcaraz, “vrAIn: A deep learning approach tailoring computing and radio resources in virtualized RANs,” in *ACM MobiCom*, 2019.
- [8] Y. Cao, S.-Y. Lien, Y.-C. Liang, K.-C. Chen, and X. Shen, “User Access Control in Open Radio Access Networks: A Federated Deep Reinforcement Learning Approach,” *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, 2021.
- [9] R. Nikbakht, A. Jonsson, and A. Lozano, “Unsupervised learning for C-RAN power control and power allocation,” *IEEE Communications Letters*, 2020.
- [10] C. Pradhan, A. Li, C. She, Y. Li, and B. Vucetic, “Computation offloading for IoT in C-RAN: Optimization and deep learning,” *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, 2020.
- [11] L. Bonati, S. D’Oro, L. Bertizzolo, E. Demirors, Z. Guan, S. Basagni, and T. Melodia, “CelIOS: Zero-touch softwareized open cellular networks,” *Computer Networks*, 2020.
- [12] M. Polese, R. Jana, V. Kounov, K. Zhang, S. Deb, and M. Zorzi, “Machine Learning at the Edge: A Data-Driven Architecture With Applications to 5G Cellular Networks,” *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing*, 2021.
- [13] N. Kazemifard and V. Shah-Mansouri, “Minimum delay function placement and resource allocation for Open RAN (O-RAN) 5G networks,” *Computer Networks*, 2021.
- [14] A. K. Bashir, R. Arul, S. Basheer, G. Raja, R. Jayaraman, and N. M. F. Qureshi, “An optimal multitier resource allocation of cloud RAN in 5G using machine learning,” *Transactions on emerging telecommunications technologies*, 2019.
- [15] S. Wang, Y. Ruan, Y. Tu, S. Wagle, C. G. Brinton, and C. Joe-Wong, “Network-aware optimization of distributed learning for fog computing,” *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, 2021.

**Jorge Martín Pérez** obtained his Ph.D. in Telematics Engineering from University Carlos III of Madrid in 2021. He is currently a postdoc researcher at the same university.

**Nuria Molner** obtained her Ph.D. in Telematics Engineering from University Carlos III of Madrid in 2021. Currently, she is a researcher at Universitat Politècnica de València (iTEAM-UPV).

**Francesco Malandrino** (M’09, SM’19) earned his Ph.D. degree from Politecnico di Torino in 2012 and is now a researcher at the National Research Council of Italy (CNR-IEIT).

**Antonio de la Oliva** received his M.Sc. degree in 2004 and his Ph.D. degree in 2008, is an associate professor at Universidad Carlos III de Madrid.

**Carlos J. Bernardos** received his M.Sc. degree in 2003, and his Ph.D. degree in 2006, both from Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, is an associate professor at Universidad Carlos III de Madrid.

**David Gomez-Barquero** is an associate professor at Universitat Politècnica de València and subdirector of research at iTEAM Research Institute of the same university.