Deployment of UAV-Mounted Access Points According to Spatial User Locations in Two-Tier Cellular Networks
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Abstract—We envision small cells mounted on unmanned aerial vehicles, to complement existing macrocell infrastructure. We demonstrate through numerical analysis that clustering algorithms can be used to position the airborne access points and select users to offload from the macrocells. We compare the performance of these deployments against equivalent simulated picocell deployments. We demonstrate that due to their ability to position themselves around exact user locations while maintaining a direct line-of-sight link the airborne access points provide a significantly improved received signal strength than the static picocell alternatives. We also find that the airborne access points provide superior service quality even in the presence of user and access point positioning errors.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The continuing growth of data demand and the resulting increase in wireless traffic rates in modern cellular networks calls for new technologies and designs for commercial telecommunications services. Among other innovations it is predicted that the 5th generation cellular standard will rely much more heavily on a dense network of low-power, short-range access points to deliver adequate data rates to the consumer [1]. This cell densification will ultimately result in higher data rates due to higher spectrum efficiency.

Picocell access points are typically deployed as part of a two-tier heterogeneous network and positioned in hotspots of user activity inside the coverage areas of existing macrocells [2]. The deployment process requires both time and manpower on the part of the mobile network operator as deploying picocells in a hotspot area typically involves trained personnel mounting and configuring the access points one by one. As an alternative to fixed picocells we envision small cells mounted on unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), such as commercially available quadcopters, to complement existing macrocell infrastructure. Once a decision is made by a mobile network operator to deploy these small cells in an area of high user equipment (UE) traffic a group of UAVs is instructed to occupy positions above high concentrations of UEs and service the UEs below. We foresee three benefits of these UAV small cells over the fixed picocell alternative:

1) Performance Improvement. Because the UAVs are rapidly deployed and fully mobile they may be positioned around actual UE locations in real-time, unlike fixed picocells which are deployed around expected concentrations of UEs. Additionally, because of their aerial vantage point the UAVs are more likely to establish line-of-sight (LOS) on the UEs than picocells. As we show in this paper, these factors ensure that UAVs can provide a higher service quality to UEs when compared to otherwise identical fixed picocells.

2) Reduction of Service Overheads. The streamlined deployment process suggests that the UAVs are suitable for deployment in flash demand scenarios where temporary UE hotspots form. In contrast, a fixed picocell deployed to service a temporary hotspot would remain under-utilised once the hotspot moved to a different location or disappeared. A mobile UAV, on the other hand, can be reassigned to another hotspot, thus servicing multiple hotspots at different times rather than remaining under-utilised.

3) Reduction of Cost. Unlike fixed picocells the UAVs do not require manpower to be mounted: these devices will instead hover over an area specified by a control unit. As this control can be largely automated we predict a reduction in cost for deployment compared to the fixed alternative.

In this paper we consider a two-tier network with macrocells that provide coverage and UAVs that provide additional capacity for spatially distributed demand hotspots. For such a network we propose an algorithm based on cluster analysis which calculates suitable UAV locations given a snapshot of UE coordinates. Using simulations we demonstrate that a two-tier network with UAVs positioned according to our proposed solution outperforms a two-tier network with both planned and random picocell deployments in terms of service quality for UEs. In addition, we show that our positioning method is robust to location measurement errors.

II. RELATED WORK

Our work draws on advances in the areas of optimal network deployment for small cell access points, as well as UAVs as a way to augment existing telecommunications infrastructure. Smart deployment of small cells has been a topic of extensive research; examples of such work include [3], where the authors use mixed integer linear programming to selectively place small access points within a heterogeneous network. The solution seeks the minimisation of a cost function representing data delivery cost.

Airborne access points in cellular networks have been proposed in literature since 2G networks. The authors of [4] envision...
a high-altitude platform which can provide service to users over an area spanning several square kilometers from low earth orbit. Improvements in UAV technology have made it possible to apply a similar concept on a smaller scale. The adoption of UAV-mounted access points has been widely examined for use in wireless sensor networks [5], [6], [7], with the telecom community beginning to consider similar technology in commercial cellular networks [8], [9], [10], [11]. In [9] the authors demonstrate in real-life trials that an access point mounted on a UAV is capable of acting as a relay for UEs in a urban environment. In [8], [11] the authors consider UAVs as backups in macrocell networks in the event of BS outage, with the UAVs being used to plug coverage holes that arise from a BS going offline. In [10] the authors analyse the impact of UAV mobility on UE in-service time in heterogeneous networks.

To date, the wireless community considers UAV access points primarily as backup devices in emergency scenarios where fixed infrastructure experiences outage and must be compensated for. The mobility and rapid deployment capabilities of UAVs make these devices good candidates for emergency applications; however, these features are also appealing for use in everyday commercial cellular networks. Our contribution in this paper is to demonstrate how mobility and rapid deployment make UAV access points an attractive option for two-tier heterogeneous networks, not merely because they can be deployed in a shorter timeframe than fixed picocells, but because their mobility permits them to configure themselves around rapidly-changing features of user demand. We demonstrate, using simulations, performance gains in a two-tier network including UA Vs, when compared to equivalent BA Vs, because their mobility permits them to con...
the subset and the subset centroid is minimised. The Hartigan-Wong K-Means clustering algorithm [13] is selected to carry out this optimisation through a heuristic iterative process. Taking \( K \) initial points \( X \), the algorithm assigns all of the UEs to the nearest point and generates subsets, then it calculates the centroids for each generated subset. In the second step the algorithm considers for every UE the change to the sum of Euclidean distances that would be observed if the UE was moved from its current subset to the subset with the next closest centroid. Whenever moving a UE from one subset to another decreases the total sum of Euclidean distances the subset assignments are updated and the centroids are recalculated. Once all of the UEs have been checked the points \( X \) are set to the values of the centroids and another iteration is carried out. This process repeats itself until none of the subsets is updated over several iterations. The result found by K-Means clustering is a local optimum and its proximity to the unknown global optimum depends heavily on the initial points \( X \) used in the first iteration. We use the K-Means++ pre-processing algorithm to select the initial points \( X \) which are spaced as far away from one another in the window \( W \) as possible; this selection step is shown to decrease convergence time and increase accuracy when compared to selecting initial points at random [14].

**UAV Subset Selection** Having obtained \( K \) subsets of the \( N \) UEs we wish to determine which of the subsets should be offloaded from the macrocell infrastructure onto an UAV. Intuitively, the UAVs should prioritise servicing subsets with more UEs as well as those subsets that are far away from their servicing macrocell. Therefore we determine two values for each subset \( j \): the cardinality of subset \( j \) and the distance of \( j \)'s centroid to the nearest macrocell. We use the two values to create two ordered sets of the UE subsets. Subsequently, we denote \( n_j \) as the position of subset \( j \) in the set ordered according to the cardinality of \( j \) and \( d_j \) as the position of subset \( j \) in the set ordered according to the distance of \( j \)'s centroid from the macrocell. Now, by \( v_j \) we denote the weighted sum of the two scores \( \alpha n_j + (1-\alpha)d_j \), where \( 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1 \) is the weighing factor. The subset selection can be formulated as an optimisation problem:

\[
\max_{j=1}^{K} \sum_{j=1}^{K} v_j a_j, \tag{5}
\]

where

\[
a_j = \begin{cases} 
1, & \text{if subset } j \text{ serviced by UAV} \\
0, & \text{if serviced by macrocell} 
\end{cases} \tag{6}
\]

subject to:

\[
\sum_{j=1}^{K} a_j = D. \tag{7}
\]

**IV. Numerical Evaluation**

**A. Simulation Model and Parameters**

We compare the performance of the UAV deployments using our two-stage solution discussed above to the performance of fixed picocell deployments. For this, we conduct a numerical evaluation in the statistical environment \( R \). \( N \) UEs are simulated inside window \( W \); the UAVs and picocell deployments are then simulated for the given UE coordinates and the resulting network performance, in terms of average signal strength experienced by a UE, is calculated. This simulation is repeated over 10,000 Monte Carlo trials.

**UE Locations** The UE locations are selected following the proposed 3GPP model in [15]. \( H \) hotspot coordinates are randomly and uniformly placed inside \( W \). These coordinates correspond to demand hotspot centres around which UEs will be generated. A random Poisson-distributed number of UEs with mean \( N_h \) are generated within a radius \( R_h \) of each hotspot. The remaining \( N-\sum H N_h \) UEs are randomly and uniformly distributed inside \( W \) independently of the hotspots. This simulation results in \( N \) randomly distributed UEs inside of window \( W \), a fraction of which are concentrated around randomly placed hotspots. The UE locations are assumed to be known to the central controller, which determines UAV locations, through UE localisation techniques such as observed time difference of arrival (OTDoA) [18], self-reported GPS coordinates or proposed cooperative localisation algorithms where UEs assist each other in determining location [19].

**Picocell Deployment** We simulate fixed picocell deployments as a baseline for comparing the service quality improvements that are introduced by mobile UAV deployments. We consider two strategies for deploying picocells: planned and random. The planned strategy follows the UE simulation model in [15] where \( H \) picocells are placed at hotspot centre coordinates, one picocell per hotspot. This represents the case where UE concentrations are known to the operators during picocell deployment and so the picocells are placed at the observed points of higher traffic demand. In the random strategy \( H \) picocells are randomly and uniformly distributed within the window \( W \). This represents the case where operators do not take UE predicted locations into consideration during picocell deployment. Once the picocells are deployed following either strategy the UEs are partitioned into \( H \) subsets following (1) using the picocell coordinates as points \( X \). Fig. 1 shows a single simulation of the UE and picocell deployment.

**Model Parameters** We make the assumption that because the UAVs have an aerial vantage position they are able to maintain a constant LOS on the UEs in their subset. For the macrocell channel we assume NLOS due to the greater distance between the typical UE and its servicing macrocell. In the case of fixed picocells we assume that either channel condition may exist. The pathloss models which capture the LOS and NLOS channel behaviours are based on field measurements...
Fig. 1: Simulated window with 3 hotspots and 3 picocells. Overlaid park map denotes a typical outdoor urban environment.

recommended by the 3GPP in [15]. These models represent urban environments with macrocell antennas mounted above rooftops, and they account for free space path loss in addition to multiple types of diffraction caused by buildings of varying height and density under NLOS conditions [16]. The model parameters are given in Table I.

B. Simulation Results

Received Signal Strength The kmeanspp function belonging to the LICORS package of R is used to perform the K-Means clustering of the dataset and generate UE subsets with their centroids [17]. A visual representation of the subsets generated by partitioning the UEs according to the procedure described in Section III is shown in Fig. 2. Our metric of choice for the network service quality is the downlink received signal strength as experienced by UEs. We calculate the average received signal strength in the downlink for the UAV, planned and random picocell deployment scenarios under both LOS and NLOS channel conditions. The results are shown in Fig 3.

The picocell LOS and NLOS results can be thought of as upper and lower bounds on the channel performance of the picocell-UE link. In real life we expect the UEs to experience a mix of LOS and NLOS signalling, resulting in the received signal

![Fig. 2: Voronoi regions with UE centroids denoting possible UAV coordinates.](image2)

**TABLE I: Model parameters, where r denotes distance in km**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario Simulation</th>
<th>User Equipment</th>
<th>Macrocell</th>
<th>Picocell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Window Size</td>
<td>300x300m</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of UEs N</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Macrocells B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAV capacity M</td>
<td>Hexagonal</td>
<td>500m</td>
<td>40m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macrocell Deployment</td>
<td>Average UEs per Hotspot</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macrocell Inter-site Distance</td>
<td>Lognormal Shadowing σ</td>
<td>3dB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of UE Hotspots H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotspot Radius R₀</td>
<td>43dBm</td>
<td>23dBm</td>
<td>1800MHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average UEs per Hotspot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subset Value Weighing Factor α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macrocell Transmit Power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAV &amp; Picocell Transmit Power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macrocell Frequency Band</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macrocell Pathloss (NLOS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAV &amp; Picocell Pathloss (LOS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picocell Pathloss (NLOS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lognormal Shadowing σ</td>
<td>31.1 + 42.8\log_{10}(r) dB</td>
<td>103.8 + 20.9\log_{10}(r) dB</td>
<td>145.4 + 37.5\log_{10}(r) dB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Fig. 3: Downlink received signal strength with 5 UAVs (grey), 5 picocells with planned deployments (red), 5 picocells with random deployments (purple), and macrocell deployment only (green). Solid bars denote LOS and hashed bars denote NLOS, vertical lines denote 95% confidence interval.](image3)
It is apparent that the UAVs are able to outperform the picocells in providing a higher-quality downlink signal to serviced UEs. Even the planned picocell deployment under pure LOS conditions, representing the absolute best-case scenario for the picocells, is improved upon by approximately 3dB, with an additional 3dB improvement over the random picocell deployments. Employing UAVs results in an improvement of as much as 25dB over cases where the picocell maintains an NLOS channel. This superior performance is attributed to the efficient positioning algorithm of the UAVs, which allows them to orient around actual UE locations rather than expected concentrations. Because of this the UAVs can ensure a shorter range to their serviced UEs than the picocells.

As UAVs and picocells provide a superior received signal strength when compared to macrocells we expect the overall average received signal strength of all UEs in the window to increase as we increase the number of UAVs and picocells, and therefore the proportion of UEs that are offloaded from the macrocells. Fig. 4 shows the overall average received signal strength for the different deployment models.

The results agree with those shown in Fig. 3: the average received signal strength values are higher for the UAV deployments than for the picocell deployments. This occurs not just because of shorter ranges between UAVs and their UEs but also because the UAV deployment is able to offload more UEs from the macrocell network. Recall that a picocell will offload up to \( M \) UEs inside its assigned UE subset, with the remaining UEs staying connected to the macrocell network. Inefficient picocell placement will result in certain subsets having more than \( M \) UEs and others fewer than \( M \); as a result certain picocells will be overloaded while others will not be used to their full capacity. The effect of this is a smaller number of UEs offloaded from the macrocell network than if every subset utilised its picocell to full capacity without overloading it. Fig. 5 shows the average percentage of UEs in the window \( W \) that are served by a UAV/picocell for a given number of deployed UAVs/picocells.

It is apparent that the K-Means clustering algorithm in combination with optimal subset selection allows the UAVs to offload more UEs from the macrocell network than the picocell deployments. The UAVs offload almost the maximum possible number of UEs given the capacity constraint across the tested numbers of UAVs \( D \). Because the UAVs are mobile and can arrange themselves around UE locations in real-time they can shape their coverage areas to ensure that each UAV covers the exact number of UEs needed to take full advantage of its capacity without overloading it, leading to more efficient use of resources, including better offload performance.

**Positioning Errors** Up to now we have assumed perfect knowledge of UE positioning and precise placement of UAVs. Let us now consider a case where the UE locations are reported with an error of several meters and a similar error occurs in...
placing the UAVs. The authors of [18] report that 67% of OTDoA localisation errors are below 5 m and 95% are below 10 m; this can be closely approximated via a zero-mean normal distribution with standard deviation $\sigma$ of 5 m. The authors of [19] cite 95% of cooperative localisation errors below 20 m which we approximate with a normal distribution with $\sigma = 10$ m. For every simulation of the window each UE location is displaced in a random direction by a random error vector of a given mean length. These perceived UE locations are then partitioned using the K-Means algorithm and UAV subsets are selected. The UAVs are also shifted with respect to the subset centroids in a random direction by a random error vector of the same mean and standard deviation; this represents imperfect navigation of the UAVs in their environment. Fig. 6 shows the received signal strength for UEs serviced by the UAVs given an error standard deviation $\sigma$ setting of 5, 10 and 20 m.

The results show that there is approximately a 2dB signal strength difference between the best and worst-case error scenarios. Under all tested error scenarios the UAVs perform better than the best-case picocell deployment. Even with this large error the UAVs still retain their aerial vantage and so benefit from LOS channels.

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper we have explored the concept of UAV-mounted picocells servicing UEs in a two-tier heterogeneous network. We have demonstrated how cluster analysis algorithms may be applied to UE positioning data to deploy a set of UAV picocells in a manner that maximises the service quality of the serviced UEs. Through simulations we have shown that as the UAVs are able to position themselves in real-time around actual UE locations rather than expected UE hotspots they outperform equivalent picocell deployments, even under ideal deployment conditions such as perfect LOS and full a priori knowledge of hotspot centres. Even greater performance gains arise from the fact that the UAVs are able to maintain LOS to their serviced UEs with far greater reliability than terrestrial picocells when used in an outdoor scenario. These two performance benefits suggest that UAV platforms may complement fixed picocells in providing users with cellular service.

In future work we will expand the system model to consider spectrum allocation and UE traffic demand with UEs being served from a limited pool of resource blocks. This will enable us to consider the benefits that UAV mobility may bring to deliverable data rates and area spectral efficiency of two-tier networks. We will consider UAV backhaul as another resource requiring optimisation. Additionally, we may consider a scenario where UAVs are deployed to provide a specific type of service and so are positioned to prioritise certain UEs over others, subject to traffic type or service plan.
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