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Abstract

The convergence of two popular access technologies, namely WiMAX and Passive Optical Network (PON) is a promising access solution that combines the mobility feature of WiMAX and the ample bandwidth of PONs. In such a converged optical-wireless access network, the provision of Quality of Service (QoS) support is a challenging issue, mainly due to the different bandwidth allocation mechanisms of the two access technologies. Since the considered convergence seems to be dominant, it deserves assiduous analysis and evaluation. In this paper, we investigate the delay performance of a converged optical-wireless network that provides QoS support by considering multiple service-classes with different priorities. In the wireless domain, the IEEE 802.16 standard is applied, while in the optical domain a Wavelength Division Multiplexing Ethernet PON (WDM-EPON) provides connectivity to both wired and wireless users.

We present an analytical framework for the calculation of the average end-to-end packet delay of each service-class, by developing two queuing models for each domain of the converged network. The end-to-end delay is calculated as the sum of the queuing delay in both domains, and the transmission and propagation delay in the optical domain. The accuracy of the proposed analysis has been verified by simulation and found to be quite satisfactory.
1. Introduction

The emergence of bandwidth consuming applications, like Internet Protocol Television (IPTV) and Video-on-Demand (VoD), have boosted the efforts of both service providers and academia to provide efficient and cost-effective access solutions that support differentiated traffic. Indeed, the increasing demand for quadruple play services (broadband, voice, video and mobility) has created new challenges for the development of an access network capable of providing high bandwidth, mobility support and QoS differentiation [1]. The solution can be obtained by the integration of a wireless system and an optical access network, or in other words, by taking advantage of the mobility features of the wireless systems and the bandwidth benefits of fiber-based communications.

A converged optical-wireless access network consists of a wireless sub-network as the front-end and an optical access network as the back-end. Various technologies have been proposed for both sub-networks and have been applied in different converged technologies [2]. Common wireless network designs include Wireless Fidelity (WiFi), Worldwide interoperability for Microwave Access (WiMAX), and Long-Term Evolution (LTE), where the latter two technologies inherently provide QoS support. On the other hand, Passive Optical Networks (PONs) have gained prominence as the back end optical access technology that is able to provide huge bandwidth in a cost effective manner [3]. A PON is a point-to-multipoint optical network that connects a number of Optical Network Units (ONUs), which are located at the users premises, to an Optical Line Terminal (OLT), which in turn is connected to the core network. Current PON deployments utilize the Time Division Multiplexing (TDM), such as Gigabit PON (GPON) and Ethernet PON (EPON) that have been deployed in U.S.A., Europe and Japan [4]. A promising solution for upgrading an EPON is the adoption of the Wavelength Division Multiplexing (WDM) technology. The resulting WDM-EPON is able to provide higher bandwidth to end-users, while supporting services with diverse QoS requirements [5].
In this paper, we focus on the convergence of EPON and WiMAX broadband access networks, whereby the drawback of WiMAX of reducing the data-rate when increasing the distance is drastically faced by the EPON, which can provide 10 Gbps data-rates up to a distance of 20 km [6]. Therefore, this optical-wireless network seems to be a dominant network convergence and deserves assiduous analysis and evaluation. Herein, we present an analytical framework for the calculation of the average packet delay in the uplink of a converged WiMAX and WDM-EPON, capable of providing QoS support. The QoS differentiation is achieved by considering several QoS classes with different service priorities in both the wireless and the optical domain. In the wireless domain the IEEE 802.16 standard is applied, while a TDM scheme is considered for the service delivery to different wireless users, due to its ability to offer better service to multiple QoS classes, compared to a frequency division multiplexing scheme [7]. We assume that the converged network supports the four QoS classes that are defined by the IEEE 802.16 standard: the Unsolicited Grant Service (UGS), the real-time Polling Service (rtPS), the non-real-time Polling Service (nrtPS) and the Best Effort (BE) service [8]. In the optical domain, the WDM-EPON provides service to both wired users (through the ONUs) and wireless users (through the Base Stations (BSs) of the wireless network). The bandwidth allocation to the ONUs is performed by considering the fixed service of the Interleaved Polling with Adaptive Cycle Time (IPACT) protocol [9]. According to the fixed service of the IPACT, the time-slots allocated to each ONU have the same length, as well as the time between two consecutive transmissions is constant. The application of the fixed service simplifies the bandwidth allocation procedure in the EPON, while its packet-delay performance under heavy traffic loads is similar to the other IPACT bandwidth allocation services [10]. We assume that each BS in the wireless domain and each ONU in the optical domain transmit batches of packets, within a time-slot duration, which is a rather realistic assumption and in accordance with the two network architecture standards. A time-slot duration is a multiple integer of a time-unit, during which a single packet is transmitted.
For the calculation of the average end-to-end delay in the uplink of the converged network, we derive two analytical models: the first model describes the delay performance in the wireless domain, while the second model determines the average packet delay in the optical domain. Under the assumption that packets are served in batches, each analytical model comprises two queuing models: One for the queuing delay in the four queues which correspond to the four QoS classes, and another one for the queuing delay when batches of packets from each QoS class form a frame, according to the IPACT fixed service. We first determine statistics on the batches and then on individual packets. Specifically, we provide the analytical framework for the determination of the mean queue length and the mean waiting time in the batch queuing model. These statistics are then used for the calculation of the average delay of the individual packets. Finally, we determine the total packet delay by adding up the transmission and the propagation delay in the optical domain. The accuracy of the proposed models is verified by simulations and found to be quite satisfactory.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we review the related work. In Section III, we present the system model and the analytical models for the delay calculation in the wireless and optical domain. In Section IV, we evaluate the proposed models by comparing analytical and corresponding simulation results, while we study the effect of various parameters to packet delay. We conclude in Section V.

2. Related Work

Several studies of converged optical-wireless networks have been published, regarding architecture and physical layer. The interested reader may resort to [2] for an overview of the research into optical-wireless network architectures. Furthermore, Medium Access Control (MAC) issues have also been studied. Several bandwidth allocation and scheduling topics are discussed in [11] for various network architectures, such as the independent, the hybrid, and the unified connection-oriented architecture. The delay performance of an integrated
the EPON-WiMAX network is the subject of [12], where authors propose a centralized scheduling mechanism for QoS support. This mechanism has been studied through simulation and proved to provide a better performance in terms of delay and throughput, compared to the Independent Scheduling (IS) mechanism which is used for the transmission scheduling between EPON and WiMAX. Similar studies that evaluate the delay performance of EPON-WiMAX with QoS support through simulation are presented in [13]-[16], where different scheduling and/or bandwidth allocation schemes are proposed.

To the best of our knowledge, only two publications exist in the literature that propose analytical models for the packet delay calculation in converged EPON-WiMAX networks with QoS support. The model of [17] targets on the queuing delay at the ingress and egress queues of the ONU, without defining a bandwidth allocation scheme. An analytical model for the calculation of the end-to-end delay in an EPON-WiMAX network is presented in [18]; this model considers multiple service-classes and a bandwidth allocation scheme; however, the model assumes an equal arrival rate of each service-class, while it does not consider the different size of packet batches within the transmitted frame.

In summary, in most previous works, the delay performance of a converged WDM-EPON-WiMAX network is studied through simulations, while existing analytical models are based on rather simplified assumptions for the packet arrival and transmission processes. We have mathematically analyzed the delay performance of the optical domain, only [19]. In this paper, we consider the convergence of WDM-EPON and WiMAX network, and propose an analytical framework for the calculation of end-to-end delay, while considering multiple service-classes and a simple but effective bandwidth allocation scheme. In the proposed model, we assume different packet arrival rates and different number of packets transmitted in each transmission cycle per service-class, for the different BSs and ONUs. Moreover, the proposed delay analysis leads to a parametric model of the number of wavelengths, which is applicable to a back end either of a WDM-EPON (multiple wavelengths) or EPON (single wavelength). Furthermore, the proposed model can be applied to a variety of converged network
3. System Model

We study the converged network of Fig. 1 that supports $N$ ONUs connected to the OLT through a tunable wavelength router. Each ONU provides service to both wired and wireless subscribers. For the provision of wireless services, a number $B_n$ of BS are connected to the ONU $n$ ($n = 1, \ldots, N$) that serve $S_{n,b_n}$ Subscriber Stations (SS), $b_n = 1, \ldots, B_n$. The key feature of the converged network is the provision of different QoS classes that are suitable for data, voice and video services. In the following subsections we provide the system architecture and the analysis in the wireless and optical domains.
3.1. Wireless Domain

In the wireless domain, each SS has a number of uplink queues, one for each QoS class. Figure 2 illustrates a simplified architecture of the SS queues, by considering the four classes of the IEEE 802.16d standard [20]. Packets that belong to QoS-class \( c \) (\( c = 1 \) for UGS, \( c = 2 \) for rtPS, \( c = 3 \) for nrtPS and \( c = 4 \) for BE) wait in the corresponding uplink queue, until they are transmitted to the BS. Each BS is able to transmit batches of packets that form a frame during a specific time interval; this time interval is defined by the characteristics of the uplink queues and the number of SS in the wireless network. We consider that frames of fixed length \( T_{frame} \) are allocated to each SS in a non-contention mode; this case is in accordance with the IEEE 802.16d standard. The consideration of fixed length frames results in a fixed time between two consecutive frame transmissions from the same SS to the BS. For simplicity, we consider that the length \( T_{frame} \) refers to the uplink packets only, while it equals to:

\[
T_{frame} = T_{data} + T_{hdr} \tag{1}
\]

where \( T_{data} \) refers to the data packets of all QoS classes, and \( T_{hdr} \) to the control packets (preamble, frame control header, uplink map). We also assume that packets transmission takes place during a time-slot of duration \( \sigma \); all time intervals are measured in time-slots. We also assume that packets of the UGS class have a fixed length of \( l_1 \) bits, while we assume a variable length for packets of the rtPS, nrtPS and BE classes, with a maximum value of \( l_2 \), \( l_3 \) and \( l_4 \) bits, respectively. The latter assumptions are considered in the IEEE 802.16d standard.

The differentiation between the QoS classes is performed by the allocation of a dissimilar percentage of the frame to each QoS class, so that high-priority classes are able to transmit more packets in each transmission period, compared to low-priority classes. This is achieved by considering the number \( m_c \) of time-slots allocated to the QoS-class \( c \) so that \( m_1 > m_2 > m_3 > m_4 \); the latter consideration is applied to all wireless subscribers. As illustrated in Fig. 3, the
The total number of time-slots that are allocated to all QoS classes is:

\[ T_{\text{data}} = \sum_{c=1}^{4} m_c \]  

(2)

The values of \( m_c \) are invariable with time and are selected based on the mean queue length of the QoS-class with the highest priority, in order to minimize the packet delay of this class.

We consider that packets of all QoS classes arrive at the corresponding uplink queue according to a Poisson process. Even though the characteristics of independent and identically distributed random arrivals of the Poisson process do not perfectly reflect the packet-level traffic features of wireless networks and PONs, the Poisson process is broadly considered as the starting point of a packet-level teletraffic analysis [21]-[25]. The arrival rate of the QoS-class \( c \) packets in SS \( S_{n,b_n} \) that is connected to the BS \( b_n \) of the ONU \( n \), is denoted by \( \lambda_{n,b_n,c} \). These packets are served in batches in each frame, where, for each QoS-class, one packet containing the destination address is always transmitted within each batch, together with the data packets. If more than \( m_c \) packets wait in the queue, only \( m_c \) packets are transmitted, while the remaining packets wait.
for the next transmission frame. The determination of the service time of each queue is based on the time between two consecutive frame transmissions from the same SS. By considering that the BS $b_n$ serves $S_{n,b_n}$ SS, the time interval $T_{w,\text{total}}^{n,b}$ between two consecutive frame transmissions is equal to the sum of the duration of the frames from the remaining $S_{n,b_n} - 1$ SS, plus the sum of the safety intervals $\delta_w$ between two consecutive frames:

$$T_{w,\text{total}}^{n,b} = \sum_{s=1}^{S_{n,b_n}-1} T_{\text{frame}} \cdot \sigma + (S_{n,b} - 1) \cdot \delta_w \quad (3)$$

The time interval $T_{w,\text{total}}^{n,b}$ is the service time of all queues of all SS that are served by the BS $b_n$ of the ONU $n$. Equation (3) shows that the service time is constant; therefore, assuming Poisson arrivals, each queue follows an $M/D[1,m_c]/1$ queuing model, with a single server, since a single frame is transmitted in each transmission period. The notation $[1,m_c]$ highlights the transmission of packet batches with a minimum value of 1 (the single packet that contains the destination address) and with a maximum value of $m_c$ packets.

The calculation of the mean queuing delay in the $M/D[1,m_c]/1$ model is based on the formulation of a fictitious M/D/1 queue for the packet batches that are transmitted in each frame. In this fictitious queuing model, the batch service time is constant and equal to $T_{w,\text{total}}^{n,b}$, while the number of servers equals to 1, since a single batch is transmitted in each transmission period. As far as the batches arrival rate $\lambda_{w,\text{batch}}^{n,b,s,c}$ is concerned, it can be calculated approximately by considering the batch size $m_c$:

$$\lambda_{w,\text{batch}}^{n,b,s,c} = \frac{\lambda_{n,b,s,c}}{m_c} \quad (4)$$

The mean waiting time $W_{w,\text{batch}}^{n,b,s,c}$ of a type-c batch is calculated by considering the mean waiting time in the M/D/1 [26]:

$$W_{w,\text{batch}}^{n,b,s,c} = \frac{\lambda_{w,\text{batch}}^{n,b,s,c} \cdot (T_{n,b}^{\text{total}})^2}{2 \cdot \left[ 1 - \left( \lambda_{w,\text{batch}}^{n,b,s,c} \cdot T_{n,b}^{\text{total}} \right) \right]} \quad (5)$$
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By applying Little’s law, we calculate the mean length $L^{w:batch}_{n;b;s;c}$ of the fictitious M/D/1 queue:

$$L^{w:batch}_{n;b;s;c} = \lambda^{w:batch}_{n;b;s;c} \cdot W^{w:batch}_{n;b;s;c}$$  \(6\)

The mean length $L^{w:batch}_{n;b;s;c}$ of the M/D/1 queue is used to calculate the mean length $L^{w:packet}_{n;b;s;c}$ of the $M/D[1,m_c]/1$ model, by using the following approximation [27]:

$$L^{w:packet}_{n,b,s,c} \approx m_c \cdot L^{w:batch}_{n,b,s,c} + P^{w}_{n,b,s,c} \cdot \frac{m_c - 1}{2}$$  \(7\)

where $P^{w}_{n,b,s,c}$ is the probability of waiting in the corresponding fictitious M/D/1 queuing system:

$$P^{w}_{n,b,s,c} = P(j \geq 1) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \pi^{n,b,s,c}_{j} = 1 - \pi^{n,b,s,c}_{0} = \lambda^{w:batch}_{n,b,s,c} \cdot T^{w:total}_{n,b}$$  \(8\)

where $j$ is the number of batches in the queue. Finally, the mean waiting time of QoS-class $c$ packets is determined by using (8) and applying Little’s law:

$$W^{w:packet}_{n,b,s,c} = \frac{L^{w:packet}_{n,b,s,c}}{\lambda_{n,b,s,c}}$$  \(9\)

3.2. Optical Domain

In the optical domain a WDM-EPON is considered, where each ONU is connected to both BS and wired subscribers. We consider that the QoS classes offered to the wireless subscribers are also offered to the wired subscribers. Packets from the wired subscribers are directly forwarded to the corresponding ONU queue, while arriving packets from the BS are firstly extracted from the frames and then forwarded to the ONU queues (Fig. 4). We assume that packets belonging to QoS-class $c$ arrive from the wired subscribers to an ONU following a Poisson process; the arrival rate to ONU $n$ is denoted by $r^{wired}_{n,c}$. At the same time, batches of QoS-class $c$ packets arrive at the ONU from all the supported BSs of the ONU $n$, every $T^{w:total}_{n,b}$ time interval (we assume that
the transmission and propagation delay in the wireless domain are negligible, compared to $T^{\text{w, total}}_{n,b}$; therefore, the total number of QoS-class $c$ packets that arrive at ONU $n$ from all $B_n$ BSs in each transmission period equals to:

$$N_{n,c} = \sum_{b=1}^{B_n} \sum_{s=1}^{S_b} \min\left( m_c, L^{w: \text{packet}}_{n,b,s,c} \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (10)

Note that the number of QoS-class $c$ packets that are transmitted in each transmission period is $m_c$, if the mean queue length $L^{w: \text{packet}}_{n,b,s,c}$ is higher than $m_c$, or this number is equal to $L^{w: \text{packet}}_{n,b,s,c}$, when the number of packets in the uplink queues is less than the maximum number $m_c$. By dividing the number of QoS-class $c$ packets that arrive from each BS by the transmission period $T^{\text{w, total}}_{n,b}$, we derive the average arrival rate of QoS-class $c$ packets from all the SS to the ONU $n$:

$$r^{\text{wireless}}_{n,c} = \left[ \sum_{b=1}^{B_n} \sum_{s=1}^{S_b} \min\left( m_c, L^{w: \text{packet}}_{n,b,s,c} \right) \right] / T^{\text{w, total}}_{n,b}$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)

By considering both wired and wireless subscribers, the total arrival rate of QoS-class $c$ packets to the ONU $n$ equals to:
\[ R_{n,c} = r_{n,c}^{\text{wired}} + r_{n,c}^{\text{wireless}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (12)

The arriving packets are accommodated to the four queues of the ONU in a first-come-first-serve basis. Assuming a Poisson packet arrival process from the wired subscribers and a constant packet inter-arrival time from the wireless subscribers (due to the constant value of \( T_{w,\text{total}} \)), the resultant arrival process of packets to the ONU queues is approximated as a Poisson process, with a mean arrival rate that is given by (12). This approximation has been widely used in the literature for modeling the superposition of a Poisson and deterministic arrival processes [28], [29].

For the transmission of the received packets to the OLT, the ONUs form frames by following the same procedure, as the one used for the frame formation in the BS. Since the PON supports multiple wavelengths, a number of frames (equal to the number of wavelengths) is transmitted simultaneously by each ONU in each transmission period. We consider that all ONUs support the same number \( W \) of wavelengths. In each ONU \( W \) transmitters are installed; each transmitter operates on a different wavelength.

The calculation of the mean queuing delay in the ONU queues is realized by following a similar procedure, as the one used for the delay calculation in the SS queues. Specifically, in order to describe the queue for the QoS-class \( c \) packets, we consider the \( M/D^{[1,d_n,c]}/W \) queuing model of \( W \) servers, where \( d_n,c \) is the number of QoS-class \( c \) packets that are transmitted in each frame. At each transmission period, each transmitter sends a frame to the OLT; thus, \( W \) frames per ONU are transmitted simultaneously in each transmission period.

Similar to the same procedure of the previous subsection, we first calculate the time interval between two consecutive frame transmissions from the ONU \( n \). Since the PON supports \( N \) ONUs, this time interval equals to:

\[ T_{n,b}^{\text{total}} = \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} T_{n}^{\text{frame}} + (N - 1) \cdot \delta_o \]  \hspace{1cm} (13)

where \( T_{\text{frame}}^{n} = \sum_{c=1}^{4} d_{n,c} \) is the frame duration and \( \delta_o \) is the safety interval.
Figure 4: Packet arrivals from both wired and wireless subscribers to the ONU.

between two consecutive frames. The arrival rate of the type-c batches $R_{n,c}^{batch}$ is a function of the arrival rate $R_{n,c}$ of type-c packets and the batch size $d_{n,c}$:

$$ R_{n,c}^{batch} = \frac{R_{n,c}}{d_{n,c}} $$

By considering the fictitious queuing system M/D/W for batches, we calculate the mean waiting time of the type-c batches, when using the following approximation, which is derived by the general M/G/W queuing system [27]:

$$ W_{n,c}^{batch} = \frac{P_{n,c} \cdot T_{n,b}^{total} \cdot \sigma}{1 - A_{n,c}^{batch}} \cdot \frac{1}{2 \cdot W} $$

where $A_{n,c}^{batch} = R_{n,c}^{batch} \cdot T_{n,b}^{total}$, $\sigma$ is the time-slot duration and $P_{n,c}$ is the probability of waiting in the M/D/W system [27]:

$$ P_{n,c}^{o} = \frac{\left( W \cdot A_{n,c}^{batch} \right)^{W}}{W! \cdot (1 - A_{n,c}^{batch})} \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{W-1} \frac{\left( W \cdot A_{n,c}^{batch} \right)^{i}}{i!} + \frac{\left( W \cdot A_{n,c}^{batch} \right)^{W}}{W! \cdot (1 - A_{n,c}^{batch})} $$

By using the mean waiting time of batches and Little’s law, we derive the mean queue length for the batches:

$$ L_{n,c}^{batch} = R_{n,c}^{batch} \cdot W_{n,c}^{batch} $$

The values of the mean queue length $L_{n,c}^{batch}$ of the fictitious queuing system are used for the calculation of the mean queue length $L_{n,c}^{packet}$ of the individual
type-c packets, by applying the following approximation [27]:

\[ L_{o,\text{packet}}^{n,c} \approx d_{n,c} \cdot L_{n,c}^{\text{batch}} + P_{n,c}^{n} \cdot \frac{d_{n,c} - 1}{2} \]  

(18)

Finally, the mean waiting time of type-c packets in the corresponding queue is given by Little’s law:

\[ W_{n,c}^{o,\text{packet}} = \frac{L_{n,c}^{o,\text{packet}}}{R_{n,c}} \]  

(19)

In the wireless domain, packets that are transmitted from end-users to the BS suffer propagation and transmission delay. We assume that the propagation delay is not significant, assuming that end users are close to the BSs [30], [31]. The maximum transmission delay \( W_{tr,c}^{w} \) for QoS class \( c \) equals to \( l_{c}/B^{w} \), where \( l_{c} \) is the maximum length of QoS class \( c \) packets and \( B^{w} \) is the bit-rate in the wireless uplink. Packets that are transmitted from ONUs to the OLT also suffer transmission and propagation delay. Similarly to the transmission delay in the wireless domain, the transmission delay \( W_{tr,c}^{o} \) in the optical domain equals to \( l_{c}/B^{o} \), where \( B^{o} \) is the bit-rate in the optical uplink. Furthermore, the propagation delay from ONU \( n \) is given by:

\[ W_{pr} = \frac{h_{n}}{\tilde{c}} \]  

(20)

where \( h_{n} \) is the distance of the ONU \( n \) from the OLT, \( \tilde{c} = c_{0}/\tilde{n} \) is the speed of light in the optical fiber, \( c_{0} \) is the speed of light in the vacuum \( (3 \cdot 10^{8}\text{m/s}) \) and \( \tilde{n} \) is the refractive index of the optical fiber.

By using the aforementioned delay parameters, we calculate the end-to-end packet delay from the SS \( s \) that is connected to the BS \( b_{n} \) of the ONU \( n \):

\[ E[W_{c}^{\text{wireless}}] = W_{n,b,s,c}^{w,\text{packet}} + W_{n,c}^{o,\text{packet}} + W_{tr}^{w} + W_{tr}^{o} + W_{pr} \]  

(21)

while, for the wired subscribers, the mean end-to-end delay is:

\[ E[W_{c}^{\text{wired}}] = W_{n,c}^{o,\text{packet}} + W_{tr} + W_{pr} \]  

(22)
Table 1: Values of the parameters used in the optical domain of the 1st application scenario.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>number of wavelengths $W$</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distance $h_n$</td>
<td>10 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frame $T_{frame}$</td>
<td>10 ms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>safety interval $\delta_n$</td>
<td>50 $\mu$s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slot duration $\sigma$</td>
<td>50 $\mu$s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(d_{n,1}, d_{n,2}, d_{n,3}, d_{n,4})$</td>
<td>(80, 60, 40, 20) packets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>packet length $l$</td>
<td>1000 bits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upstream channel bit-rate $B$</td>
<td>1 Gbps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refractive index $\tilde{n}$</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Evaluation and Discussion

We evaluate the proposed analysis through simulation. To this end, we consider a WDM-EPON-WiMAX network that supports $N = 16$ ONUs and tackle two evaluation scenarios. For presentation purposes, in the first scenario each ONU supports 10 BS ($B_n = 10$), while each BS provides service to the same number $S_{n,b} = 50$ of end-users. In the wireless domain, the frame duration is $T_{frame} = 1$ ms, while the time-slot duration is $\sigma_w = 50$ $\mu$s, and the safety interval is $\delta_w = 50$ $\mu$s. The number of packets from each class that are transmitted in each frame is $m_1 = 10$, $m_2 = 7$, $m_3 = 5$ and $m_4 = 3$, per BS and ONU, (in accordance to (2)). In order to highlight the delay differentiation among the QoS classes due to the frame distribution, we assume that users of all QoS classes transmit packets of the same length, which is equal to 1500 bytes, while the transmission rate is assume to be equal to 25 Mbps. Furthermore, we assume an error free channel, while the propagation in the wireless domain is negligible, compared to the queuing delay. In the optical domain, the values of the applied parameters are listed in Table 1.

For this evaluation, a simulator has been built by using Simscript III [32]. All simulation results have been obtained with ten replications, each time with a different random seed, and 95% confidence interval. The simulator is based
Table 2: Analytical and simulation results for the end-to-end packet delay of BE and nrtPS QoS classes, in the 1st application scenario.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arrival rate (packets/s)</th>
<th>BE delay (ms) Analysis</th>
<th>Simulation</th>
<th>BE delay (ms) Analysis</th>
<th>Simulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48.36</td>
<td>47.19 ± 0.732</td>
<td>37.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36.36 ± 0.535</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50.94</td>
<td>49.70 ± 0.819</td>
<td>38.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37.15 ± 0.599</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>53.72</td>
<td>52.42 ± 0.874</td>
<td>39.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37.97 ± 0.626</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56.74</td>
<td>55.37 ± 0.932</td>
<td>40.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38.83 ± 0.655</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60.02</td>
<td>58.57 ± 0.970</td>
<td>41.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39.72 ± 0.658</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>63.59</td>
<td>62.05 ± 1.032</td>
<td>42.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40.65 ± 0.703</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>67.48</td>
<td>65.84 ± 1.145</td>
<td>43.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41.63 ± 0.724</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>71.73</td>
<td>69.99 ± 1.218</td>
<td>44.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.64 ± 0.770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>76.39</td>
<td>74.53 ± 1.250</td>
<td>45.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43.71 ± 0.785</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>81.51</td>
<td>79.54 ± 1.274</td>
<td>46.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44.82 ± 0.793</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>87.19</td>
<td>85.08 ± 1.379</td>
<td>47.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.98 ± 0.806</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We first study the impact of the packet arrival rate to the end-to-end delay. In Table 2, we present analytical and simulation results for the average end-to-end delay of the BE and nrtPS QoS classes, versus the packet arrival rate. Similarly, in Table 3 we present analytical and simulation results for the average end-to-end delay of the rtPS and UGS QoS classes. We consider an equal mean arrival rate for all QoS-classes, in order to have a common benchmark for the end-to-end delay. As the results reveal, the accuracy of the proposed
models is quite satisfactory; due to the approximations of (7) and (18), the proposed analytical framework overestimates the queuing delay and therefore analytical results are slightly higher than the corresponding simulation results. Furthermore, as it was anticipated, the high priority QoS classes perform better in terms of the end-to-end delay.

In the first application scenario, we study the effect of the frame size distribution on the QoS classes in both optical and wireless domains. We assume a constant frame size $T_{frame}$, while we alter the frame distribution to the QoS classes, only in the optical domain, as indicated in the first four columns of Table 4. The arrival rates of the four service-classes are also kept constant; for both the wired and the wireless users the arrival rate is 28 packets/s. In Table 4, we present analytical results for the end-to-end delay of the four QoS classes, together with the delay only in the optical domain; the latter results are presented since the frame distribution is altered only in the optical domain. We
### Table 4: End-to-end delay and delay in the optical domain results for various frame distributions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame distribution</th>
<th>End-to-end delay (delay in the optical domain) (ms)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>33.46 (0.238)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>33.43 (0.214)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>33.42 (0.204)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>33.40 (0.185)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>33.40 (0.177)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>33.38 (0.161)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>33.37 (0.154)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>33.36 (0.140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>33.35 (0.135)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>33.34 (0.124)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>33.34 (0.119)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observe that the increase of the batch size of the two higher-priority QoS classes reduces their packet delay, especially in the optical domain. This reduction has a negative effect on the delay of the two lower-priority service-classes. This behavior is due to the frame distribution to the QoS classes, as indicated in the first four columns of Table 4. When the number of high-priority packets in the frame increases, the number of low-priority packets in the transmitting frame reduces; therefore more high priority packets are transmitted in each transmitting period, which results in low delay for these packets. On the contrary, the small number of the transmitted low-priority packets results in the increase of the delay of low-priority classes.

In the first application scenario we also study the effect of the number of wavelengths and the number of ONUs on the end-to-end delay. The number of wavelengths equals to the number of frames that are simultaneously transmitted by each ONU, in each transmission cycle; therefore, according to Fig. 5, the increase of the number of wavelengths results in the delay decrease for all QoS
classes, since more frames are simultaneously transmitted, and more packets of all QoS classes are conveyed in each transmitting period. The results of Fig. 5 are obtained for wireless users, while considering that the arrival rate is the same for all end-users and equals to 28 packets/s. Note that the end-to-end delay values i.e. the sum of the queuing and transmission delay values in the wireless domain, plus the transmission and propagation delay values in the optical domain, converge to (33.20, 38.94, 43.96, 67.78) ms, which are not affected by the number of wavelengths; this is clearly shown in Fig. 5. Furthermore, in Fig. 6 we present analytical results for the end-to-end delay of all QoS classes versus the number of ONUs. The results of Fig. 6 are obtained by using the same parameter set of Fig. 5, when $W = 4$. The increase of the ONU number results in the increase of the number of transmitting users and therefore in the increase of the packet arrival rate. As a result, under high packet arrival-rate conditions, more packets arrive at the ONU queues and need to wait more time for service. Consequently, the proposed model can be used for the derivation of the optimal parameter set, which ensures that the end-to-end delay is kept below predefined levels.

Finally, the second application scenario highlights the effect of the different arrival rate distributions (among the ONUs), on the delay of wired and wireless users. To this end, we consider the same parameter set, as the one used in the first scenario, but the arrival rates of different ONUs and BSs are as listed in Table 5. By applying this arrival rate set on the proposed model, we obtain different delay results for BS and each ONU; therefore, in Table 5 we present the minimum and maximum end-to-end delay of each QoS class. The results of Table 5 reveal that the delay statistics are strongly affected by the arrival-rate values.

5. Conclusion

We present an analytical framework for the determination of the end-to-end delay in a converged WDM-EPON-WiMAX network that supports QoS
Figure 5: End-to-end analytical results versus the number of supported wavelengths.

Figure 6: End-to-end analytical results versus the number of supported ONU's.
differentiation. The proposed model assumes that packets belong to multiple QoS classes with different priorities. This prioritization is expressed by the allocation of a dissimilar percentage of the frame duration to each QoS class. The consideration of the transmission of batches in each transmission cycle leads to the development of two queuing models in both the wireless and optical domain; the first queuing model refers to the batches, while the second model refers to the individual packets. Based on these models, we calculate the average end-to-end delay as the sum of the queuing delay in both domains, and the transmission and propagation delay in the optical domain. The accuracy of the proposed calculations is quite satisfactory as was verified by simulations. The proposed model can be used by the network operator to determine the optimal set of network parameters, such as the number of the supported wavelengths or the distribution of packets in the transmitted frames. In this way, the converged WDM-EPON-WiMAX network is capable of the provision of QoS guarantees to the end users, in terms of low packet delays. In our future work, we will consider two different cases for the wireless domain: the first case refers to the IEEE 802.16d, where users are able to transmit multiple packets in the same time-slot by considering multiple sub-carriers, and the second case is the use of the LTE. Moreover, we intend to determine the packet delay distribution, which is the first step for the determination of higher moments of the packet delay.
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Table 5: Analytical results for the end-to-end delay for wired and wireless users, under various arrival-rate distributions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arrival rate distribution (packets/s)</th>
<th>End-to-end delay (ms)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wired users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>((\lambda_{w, k, i}, \lambda_{w, k, j}))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n;b;s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(22, 19, 17, 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(28, 26, 24, 22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(24, 21, 19, 17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(33, 31, 29, 27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(35, 33, 31, 29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(37, 35, 33, 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(39, 37, 35, 33)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=2,4,\ldots,16

n=1,3,\ldots,15
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