



























FDD	vs. TDD	
FDD (Freq	uency Division Duplex)	
	10 ms	
Downlink carrier (f <sub>D</sub> )		]
Uplink carrier (f <sub>U</sub> )	$\uparrow \uparrow $	
<u>TDD (Time</u>	<u>e Division Duplex)</u>	
Common carrier	$\begin{array}{c c} \bullet & 10 \text{ ms} \\ \hline & \uparrow & \downarrow & \downarrow$	]
	EE577 - Salam A. Zummo 15	

























014				
□ Fo un	r hexagon cells, to have a iform co-channel distance	i	j	N
D N	for all cells in the system, must obey the relation:	1	0	1
<i>N</i> □ <b>R</b>	$N = i^2 + i \times j + j^2 \qquad i \ge j \ge 0$ Regardless of the cluster	1	1	3
size, each cell has 6 first tier co-channel cells.	2	0	4	
Co-channel cells are identified from ( <i>i</i> , <i>i</i> )	2	1	7	
		2	2	12







	Example	1
Dete syste	ermine the number of channels per cell for the following cellular em for $N = 4$ and $N=7$ : A total of 33 MHz bandwidth is allocated to the system. It is divided into 50-kHz (voice/control) channels. One control channel per cell. Frequency re-use factor of control channels is 3 times less than voice channels.	
□ Solu ■ ■	<ul> <li>tion:</li> <li>Total number of channels = 33000/50 = 660</li> <li>N = 4:</li> <li>12 channels reserved for control.</li> <li>Every cell has 648/4 = 162 voice channels and one control channel</li> <li>N = 7</li> <li>21 channels reserved for control</li> <li>639/7 = 91.3. Two cells have 92 + control, five have 91 + control.</li> </ul>	
	EE577 - Salam A. Zummo	32

































































able 3.4 Ca	pacity of an E	Erlang B Syste	em	
Number of Channels <i>C</i>	= 0.01	Capacity (Erla = 0.005	ngs) for GOS = 0.002	= 0.001
2	0.153	0.105	0.065	0.040
4	0.869	0.701	0.535	0.439
5	1.36	1.13	0.900	0.762
10	4.46	3.96	3.43	3.09
20	12.0	11.1	10.1	9.41
24	15.3	14.2	13.0	12.2
40	29.0	27.3	25.7	24.5
70	56.1	53.7	51.0	49.2
100	84.1	80.9	77.4	75.2











Trunk Utilization			
$\Box U = (1 - P_{\rm p})(A/C)$	Load (E)	# Trunks	U
<ul> <li>Table produced at 1% blockage.</li> <li>Observations:</li> <li>The larger the offered load the better the utilization (to some extent)</li> <li>Increased efficiency in sharing resources</li> </ul>	1	5	0.20
	2	7	0.29
	4	10	0.40
	8	15	0.53
	10	18	0.56
	30	42	0.71
	50	64	0.78
	60	75	0.80
	90	106	0.85
	100	117	0.85

























	Example Example
	Given:
	number of available voice channels = 400, $n = 4$ , $N = 7$ , $A_u = 0.03$ E. We require GoS=0.01.
	Unsectorized design:
	number of channel/cell = 57
	For $GoS = 1\%$ blocking, $A = 44.2$ Erlangs
	For $A_u = 0.03$ E, number of users/cell = 1473
	For the sectored system, $N = 4$ .
	■ Number of channel/cell = 100.
	Number of channels/sector = 33.
_	For $GoS = 1\%$ , A = 22 E. Number of users/sector = 733, per cell = 2199
	Capacity enhancement in terms of number of users $= 2199/1473 = 1.5$
	While Capacity enhancement in terms of number of channels $= 7/4 = 1.75$
	Note that in this example the sectored system still provides marginal <i>SIR</i> Over the unsectored system.
	If we decide to utilize sectorization for the sole purpose of increasing <i>SIR</i> , then the sectored system will result in reduction in number of subscribers.



















![](_page_46_Figure_1.jpeg)