

## PRIMARY RESEARCH

# Deploying hand off mechanism with the software defined network vs mobile IP for 5G network: A feasibility study

Khaled Y Alghamdi <sup>1\*</sup>, Robin Braun <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup> School of Electrical and Data Engineering, University of Technology, Sydney Sydney, Australia

## Keywords

Mobile IP  
SDN  
NFV  
Hand off

**Received:** 11 February 2019

**Accepted:** 12 March 2019

**Published:** 20 April 2019

## Abstract

In recent times the Software Defined Network (SDN), Network Functions Virtualization (NFV), Mobile Edge Computing (MEC), and Cloud Radio Access Network (C-RAN) have evolved as emerging technologies with high performance computing capabilities for the deployment of network functions such as mobile Evolved Packet Core (EPC), firewalls, local cache, virtual base station, etc. Also the of the abstractions provided by Software Networks technologies (essentially SDN and NFV) to support an abstracted model for any 5G network function, independent of its nature (network, computational, storage) and the implied resources (optical, wireless, satellite, cloud, etc). The growth in telecommunications has also led to increased deployment of Mobile Internet Protocol (IP) technology besides General Packet Radio Services (GPRS), 3G and 4G Cellular networks for high-end data or packet switched calls. Mobile IP is an outcome of convergence of cellular communication with the IP networks as a Next Generation Network application on traditional networks to support real-time multimedia services, network mobility and 2-way access. However, there are limitations with the Mobile IP which has its own challenges for implementing in the network which includes Security issues like Denial-of-Service attack, Theft of information Passive Eaves Dropping, insider attack, etc. Further, in Mobile IP there exist triangulation problems between the sending and receiving nodes along with latency issues during handoff for the mobile nodes causing huge burden in the network. This paper will try to compare some of the existing deployments of Mobile IP and make comparative analysis with the SDN implementation models for the Cellular Network for the Handoff mechanism.

© 2019 The Author(s). Published by TAF Publishing.

## I. INTRODUCTION

As mobile network becomes difficult to scale with growing video traffic and there is an increase dependency on Operations Support System (OSS) system and its experts for these mobile networks and are inflexible and costly. Open Flow as mentioned in [1, 2] gives several advantages. Further as we see the use cases interference mitigation due to inter cell interference in a wireless system are performed in a distributed fashion and with the Coordinated Multi-point (CoMP) techniques extensive computational processing is involved. SDN Controller with Open Flow is implemented in the Central control layer and optimizes the Radio Resource Management (RRM) Module of the Long Term Evolution (LTE) network for resource allocation. Thus, upgrading the RRM is possible with this implementation using the Open flow that is southbound interface as can be seen in

the Figure 1.




Fig. 1. Open flow enabled network for interference mitigation

This makes SDN Open flow a feasible solution as a replacement for Mobile IP for the HandOff Mechanism. Further in [3, 4]. Mobile IP network has challenges related to its secu-

\*Corresponding author: Khaled Y Alghamdi

†email: kyadg903@hotmail.com



based network deployment and further discusses the implementation of the Open Flow architecture with PMIP with

the reference architecture in Figure 4.




Fig. 4. OF-PMIP architecture and mobile node registration

The controller here performs on behalf of the Mobile Access Gateway (MAG) and communicates with the LMA in the PMIP domain. The OF-PMIP here works either in proactive or reactive mode based on the OMAG configurations for link monitoring and tunnel management for the MN with the network. In the proactive OF-PMIP Open Flow based Proxy Mobile IP the IP tunnel status of MN is maintained by the Open Flow Mobile Access Gateway (OMAG) as temporary or conclusive. In [9] it is further established that proactive OF-PMIP indicates lower latency as compared to the PMIP or reactive OF-PMIP and supports seamless mobility and no disruption on real time services giving QoS experience to the mobile users.

### III. HAND OFF MODELS WITH SDN OPEN FLOW

To be able to ensure reduced latency with Handover of UEs within the network domain with QoE to users as a part of the LTE /LTE Advanced, 5G Networks or Enhanced Mobile Network. We may consider from [3] developing Hand off Models for the mobiles as a part of SDN network. This includes no change with the user session on the UE mobility based on the various SDN setups specified in [10] explained here.

#### A. Centralized SDN

We may develop a Centralized SDN Network for inter operator handover and intra frequency or inter frequency handover with reference to the architecture in Figure 5 as follows:




Fig. 5. Centralised SDN network setup for handoff

In the case of evolved LTE and 5G network MME, PCRF and Target eNodeBs and Source eNodeBs the handover functionality is being handled by the centralized SDN controller. The advantage to deploy this solution there is no specific implementation or support related to Mobile Node and

the IP address remains unchanged. This also reduces the round trip time between the eNodeBs, MMEs and the Mobile Nodes. With a proactive setup using Open Flow the latency time can be further reduced. Here using the RRM messages on the SDN controller mobile SDN is also enabled

Disadvantage of deploying another SDN network with a centralized SDN controller will require implementation as data centric and highly compute intensive considering inter operator handover scenarios making it cost intensive.

### B. Deploying Multiple SDN Controller Network

The Multi SDN Controller Network can be set as follows:




Fig. 6. Geographically separated SDN controllers for multi SDN controller handover mechanism

- 1) *Semi centralized SDN controller*: Here the network will be separated into different domains within the same setup or geographically separated setup. Each SDN domain will function as part of the same SDN domain. During the handover, mobile will need to inform about the SDN domain it intends to attach with and update its status for continued user sessions. The SDN cloud can also be deployed using for each of these SDN domains to handle seamless handover based on traffic condition with the mobile SDNs.
- 2) *Hierarchical SDN controllers*: We may consider the Hierarchical Cell Structure as mentioned in [11]:




Fig. 7. Handoff with hierarchical SDN controller setup

It is seen in Figure 7 that with the network control plane for different Functional Elements distributed as higher or lower layer the current setup will not only manage the control plane functionality for handover but also enable sup-

port for power control and other interference mitigation. However, it is expected that the information exchange will be highly complex in nature and will include huge implementation and maintenance efforts. It is analyzed that an SDN Cloud setup is highly recommended to reduce the computational complexity and to simplify the exchange of these messages across the hierarchy.

## IV. PROPOSING HAND OFF MECHANISM IN SDN FOR 5G NETWORK

The author based on the analysis done in Section III propose following Hand off Mechanism Model for a 5G Network with advantages of SDN over Mobile IP.

### A. Proposing SDN Controllers for 5G Network Slicing

Another model can be developed for Network Slicing by deploying SDN on it as mentioned in [12] for the 5G Network in Figure 7. The authors found that this can be extended for the Handoff mechanism based on the setup from the SDN model of Figure 6.




Fig. 8. Proposing SDN controller for network slicing implementation

This also mentions fulfillment of requirement regarding the sharing of RAN resources among different slices, it is required to efficiently use radio and transport network resources between different slices (including both common channels and dedicated channels). From that perspective some radio Network Functions (such as schedulers) are either defined as “common NFs” or “independent/dedicated NFs” with (at least some) coordination mechanisms between NFs from different slices. This means that the radio NFs of one slice do not operate in complete isolation from another slice. Possible implementation of such scenario could include a set of common radio NFs which provides slicing as a service to higher layers for which North-

bound APIs can be used for deploying SDN Controllers from the SDN Reference Architecture in [13]. The admission control mechanisms can be protected deploying SDN interfaces for different slices so that congestion in the channel of one slice does not have impact on the other slice with seamless handoff. Further, Priority Scheduling mechanism can be deployed for call congestion scenarios while dealing Call capacity handing in SDN Radio Network Slicing configurations with constrained radio resources allocated during the hand-off. The priority scheduling criteria can be implemented with parameters like "Timing Advance" sent in the measurement reports by the UE to its Radio Resource Units.

### B. Hand Off Model from SDN to non-SDN Network

In the feasibility study carried out by the author it was felt that for SDN Handoff implementation we are using Abstraction of Physical Infrastructure via Southbound API from the SDN Reference Architecture in [13]. Further, implementing the SDN Network solutions with existing networks which are not supporting SDN Open Flow can be compute intensive. The author felt the need to create interworking for different Handoff Scenarios for the SDN Cellular Network Architecture from [3] with the existing 4G Networks (LTE, LTE Advanced and WiFi) and extending to 3G. It was felt to deploy seamless handover of UE between SDN and non-SDN Domain can also be deployed using the topology in Figure 8 that has been proposed based on SDN Controller to Controller Communication Model as mentioned in [13].




Fig. 9. Topology for hand off mechanism for a non-SDN to SDN network using a wrapper between EMS/NMS and the Northbound API of the SDN network

Here the mobility of the Host h3 (UE) moves from a non-SDN network (i.e, a GSM or LTE or 3G Network without Open Flow) to an SDN Network. The author further proposes an

algorithm for the wrapper in this case in the North bound API with the EMS/NMS as:

TABLE 1  
ALGORITHM

Handoff Wrapper with Non-SDN Network
1: Set up a Border Gateway Protocol between the SDN and non-SDN Network at the control plane
2: Setup a TCP session between Northbound API and the API on the EMS/NMS port of the non-SDN Network
3: Setup S1 as a mobility switch
4: As the host h3 leaves the source non-SDN network send the QoS profile via EMS/NMS API to the North Bound API of the target SDN network and also send the allocated IP address
5: Attach host h3 to the Switch S1

## V. CONCLUSION

During the feasibility study on various models studied by the author they were able to develop proposed topology and

models for Handoff mechanism with SDN Open Flow making it the most feasible solution for its deployment in the 5G Network. It was found that since SDN does not deploy tri-



angular routing seamless handover latency issue is lower as compared to Mobile IP which will need higher bandwidth. This was identified in the case when no change was seen in the user session as it moves from source to a target network in a Mobile IP environment even in a 5G Network with FMIP and HMIP implementation for Mobile IP. The author further summarized that the capacity constraint may lead to call congestion for the SDN network slicing. The author proposes priority scheduling using "Timing Advance" pa-

rameters sent as a part of measurement report by UEs to the Radio Resource Unit and can be taken as future scope of work for understanding its implementation. This should also take care of latency issues for mobiles at varying distances and handled by multiple SDN controllers. The author, also intends to verify the SDN deployments in a simulated environment and consider verifying the interworking of the SDN with the existing non-SDN Network for handoff and verify security issues during handoff.

## REFERENCES

- [1] C. Kolias, S. Ahlawat, C. Ashton, M. Cohn, S. Manning, and S. Nathan, "Openflow-enabled mobile and wireless networks," *Open Network Foundation*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 1-13, 2013.
- [2] S. H. Al Ahmadi, "Survey of designing user interface for mobile applications," *Journal of Advances in Technology and Engineering Studies*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 74-79, 2017. doi: <https://doi.org/10.20474/jater-3.2.4>
- [3] R. Ramakrishnaiah, A. A. Alkheraif, D. D. Divakar, K. F. Alghamdi, J. P. Matinlinna, C. Y. K. Lung, S. Cherian, and P. K. Vallittu, "The effect of lithium disilicate ceramic surface neutralization on wettability of silane coupling agents and adhesive resin cements," *Silicon*, vol. 10, no. 6, pp. 2391-2397, 2018. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12633-017-9670-6>
- [4] O. A. Osahenvenwun and O. F. Odiase, "Effective management of handover process in mobile communication network," *Journal of Advances in Technology and Engineering Studies*, vol. 2, no. 6, pp. 176-182, 2016. doi: <https://doi.org/10.20474/jater-2.6.1>
- [5] G. Chellani and A. Kalla, "A review: Study of handover performance in mobile IP," *International Journal of Computer Networks & Communications*, vol. 5, no. 6, pp. 137-151, 2013. doi: <https://doi.org/10.5121/ijcnc.2013.5608>
- [6] A. H. Hashim, F. Anwar, S. Mohd, and H. Liyakthali, "Mobility issues in hierarchical mobile IP," in *IEEE 3rd International Conference SETIT*, New York, NY, 2005.
- [7] R. Adamu, "A usability evaluation of mobile banking applications in Nigeria," *International Journal of Technology and Engineering Studies*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 38-44, 2017. doi: <https://doi.org/10.20469/ijtes.3.40005-1>
- [8] R. Koodli, "System and method for providing address discovery of services in mobile networks," 2003. [Online]. Available: <https://bit.ly/2QmT5IV>
- [9] S. M. Raza, D. S. Kim, D. Shin, and H. Choo, "Leveraging proxy mobile IPV6 with SDN," *Journal of Communications and Networks*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 460-475, 2016. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1109/jcn.2016.000061>
- [10] S. Kukliński, Y. Li, and K. T. Dinh, "Handover management in SDN-based mobile networks," in *IEEE Globecom Workshops (GC Wkshps)*, Seoul, South Korea, 2014.
- [11] Network, Evolved Universal Terrestrial Radio Access, "3rd generation partnership project: Technical specification group services and system aspects General Packet Radio Service (GPRS) enhancements for evolved universal terrestrial radio access network," 2011. [Online]. Available: <https://bit.ly/2ZOQGUD>
- [12] V. Garcia Cruz, "5g radio access network slicing," B.S. thesis, Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, Barcelona, Spain, 2018.
- [13] J. Ordóñez-Lucena, P. Ameigeiras, D. Lopez, J. J. Ramos-Munoz, J. Lorca, and J. Folgueira, "Network slicing for 5G with SDN/NFV: Concepts, architectures, and challenges," *IEEE Communications Magazine*, vol. 55, no. 5, pp. 80-87, 2017. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1109/mcom.2017.1600935>