

Communications over Unlicensed sub-8 GHz Spectrum: Opportunities and Challenges

Karim Saifullin, *Member, IEEE*, Hussein Al-Shatri, *Senior Member, IEEE*, and

Mohamed-Slim Alouini, *Fellow, IEEE*,

Electrical and Computer Engineering (ECE)

Computer, Electrical and Mathematical Sciences and Engineering (CEMSE)

King Abdullah University of Science and Technology (KAUST),

Thuwal, 23955-6900, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

karim.saifullin,hussein.shatri,slim.alouini@kaust.edu.sa

Abstract

The utilization of unlicensed spectrum presents a promising solution to the issue of spectrum scarcity in densely populated areas, while also offering a cost-effective means to connect underserved regions. In response to this potential, both academia and industry are actively exploring innovative applications of unlicensed spectrum. This work offers a thorough overview of unlicensed spectrum bands below 8 GHz, including TV White Spaces, Civil Broadband Radio Services, Industrial Scientific Medical bands, and the Unlicensed National Information Infrastructure. The paper focuses on three key aspects: regulations, existing technologies, and applications. It is essential to recognize that "unlicensed" does not equate to "unregulated"; therefore, a clear understanding of permissible and prohibited activities is crucial. From a technological perspective, we examine the current technologies, their capabilities, and relevant applications. Additionally, the shared nature of this spectrum introduces challenges related to interference among users. These collisions can be managed through two primary strategies, that we described: a database-driven approach and coexistence mechanisms at the MAC and PHY layers. This work may serve as a starting point for those who are interested in the unlicensed spectrum, both in academia and industry.

Index Terms

Unlicensed spectrum, TVWS, ISM, CBRS, U-NII, Wi-Fi, LTE unlicensed, NR-U, Coexistence.

ACRONYMS

AFC Automated Frequency Coordination

AIoT Artificial Internet of Things

BS Base Station

CA Carrier Aggregation

CAC Channel Availability Check

CBRS Civil Broadband Radio Service

CCA Clear Channel Assessment

CS Carrier Sensing

CSAT Carrier Sense Adaptive Transmission

CSMA Carrier Sense Multiple Access

CTS Clear-to-Send

DC Dual Connectivity

DCF Distributed Coordination Function

DCS Dynamic Channel Selection

DFS Dynamic Frequency Selection

DIFS DCF Inter-frame Space

DL Downlink

DSS Dynamic Spectrum Sharing

ED Energy Detection

EIRP Effective Isotropic Radiated Power

eMBB enhanced Mobile Broadband

EPC Evolved Packet Core

ETSI European Telecommunications Standards Institute

FCC Federal Communications Commission

FR1 Frequency Range 1

FWA Fixed Wireless Access

GAA General Authorized Access

HARQ Hybrid Automatic Repeat reQuest

IoT Internet of Things

ISM Industrial, Scientific, and Medical

ITU International Telecommunication Union

IU Incumbent Users

LAA Licensed Assisted Access

LBT Listen Before Talk

LPWAN Low Power Wide Area Networks

LTE Long Term Evolution

LWA LTE-WLAN Aggregation

LWIP LTE WLAN Radio Level Integration with internet protocol security

MU Multiuser

NR New Radio

OFDMA Orthogonal Frequency-Division Multiple Access

PAL Priority Access Licenses

PAWS Protocol to Access White-Space

PLMN Public Land Mobile Networks

PUSCH Physical Uplink Shared Channel

QoS Quality of Service

RTS Request-to-Send

SAS Spectrum Access Systems

SRD Short Range Devices

SS Spread Spectrum

TDMA Time Division Multiple Access

TPC Transmit Power Control

TVWS TV White Spaces

TWT Target Wake Time

TXOP Transmit Opportunity

U-NII Unlicensed National Information Infrastructure

UE User Equipment

UL Uplink

UNB Ultra Narrow Band

URLLC Ultra Reliable Low Latency Communication

WLAN Wireless Local Area Networks

WPA Wi-Fi Protected Access

WSDB White Space Database

I. INTRODUCTION

The demand for higher wireless data throughput worldwide is steadily increasing every year. One promising approach to addressing this issue is by occupying unlicensed frequencies, either alone or as addition to licensed ones. Efficiently utilizing the unlicensed spectrum can lead to enhanced data rates, better connectivity, and higher quality communication services. Traditionally, unlicensed spectrum has been used by indoor, short-range, narrowband, and low-mobility devices with low Quality of Service (QoS) due to factors such as spectrum scarcity, favorable propagation characteristics, and free-of-charge access. However, there is now a trend toward utilizing the unlicensed spectrum for high-throughput applications in newly introduced 6 GHz bands. Consequently, both academia and industry are intensifying their focus on utilizing license-exempt spectrum. Within the broad range of unlicensed frequencies, we emphasize the sub-8 GHz range, as it encompasses some of the most widely adopted technologies globally, including cellular ones, Wi-Fi, and other wireless technologies. Although the term "unlicensed" implies freedom from the need for formal approval to access these bands, it is important to note that

wireless equipment must still comply with local and global regulations. This paper aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of systems operating in the license-exempt spectrum by conducting a thorough survey of the relevant regulations, standards, solutions, and potential applications, with a particular emphasis on high-throughput ones. Table I outlines the different topics covered in the paper, along with their motivations.

TABLE I
TOPICS COVERED IN THE PAPER

Group	Subgroup	Reason to consider	Addressed in
Documents	Regulations	Compliance with global/local regulations is essential for any system	Section 1
	Standards	These are specifically designed rules to achieve good performance for given task that define the capabilities of a device built upon them	Section 2
Technical characteristics	Carrier frequency	It defines the propagation, penetration ability of the electromagnetic wave	Section 2
	Bandwidth	This parameter is directly related to data rate and capacity	
	Transmit/receive power	Significantly influences the range and data rate and related to interference	
	Range	Key characteristic for the end user	
	Indoor / Outdoor	Defines the regulations and other parameters applied to the system	
	Data rate	Key characteristic for the end user	
	Security (privacy)	Some applications require the security	
	Primary users	This defines the regulations and spectrum access mechanisms	Section 1
	Interference (coexistence)	In order to efficiently share the spectrum, the fair coexistence and minimum interference are required	Section 2.7
Applications	High throughput systems	Utilizing the unlicensed spectrum for wider bandwidth is natural extension for cellular network	Section 3
	Secure, low latency systems	Establishing local private network might be cheaper, if utilize unlicensed spectrum	
	Massive connectivity	Many IoT applications might be easily and cheaply deployed using unlicensed spectrum	

II. UNLICENSED SPECTRUM OVERVIEW

A. Introduction

The frequency spectrum forms the cornerstone of any wireless technologies. Understanding its properties and regulations is crucial for designing effective communication systems. Therefore, prior to delving into any specific technology, it is essential to familiarize ourselves with the nuances of the available spectrum. This work primarily focuses on the spectrum from Frequency Range 1 (FR1), which extends up to 7125 MHz [1], as detailed in Table II. The discussion includes TV White Spaces (TVWS), Industrial, Scientific, and Medical (ISM) bands, Civil Broad-band Radio Service (CBRS), and finalizes the section with the Unlicensed National Information Infrastructure (U-NII) bands.

TABLE II
ALLOCATION OF SUB-8GHZ UNLICENSED SPECTRUM

Name	Frequency range [MHz]	Standards and technologies	Applications	Comments
TVWS	54 - 72, 76 - 88, 174 - 216, 470 - 694	IEEE 802.11af, IEEE 802.22	Fixed Wireless Access (FWA), post-disaster communications, Internet of Things (IoT)	Introduced in 2010, this frequency portion gained significant attention due to its long-range waveform propagation, which benefits outdoor applications
ISM	433 - 434.8, 902 - 928, 2400 - 2500	IEEE 802.11g/n/ax/be, Bluetooth, Zigbee, LoRa, Sigfox	Low Power Wide Area Networks, IoT, short range networks	Conventional band, used mostly for indoor technologies. Heavily utilized by Wi-Fi and many IoT-related technologies
CBRS	3550 - 3700	LTE, LTE-U, LAA, NR, NR-U	Private networks, FWA	Exclusive band for US, accommodating incumbent, licensed and unlicensed users mostly outdoor
U-NII	5150 - 7125	IEEE 802.11ac/ax/be, LTE, LTE-U, LAA, NR, NR-U	Local and private networks, cellular communications, FWA	Recently introduced bands with large bandwidth available for indoor and outdoor high throughput applications

B. TV White Spaces Spectrum

1) *Introduction:* TVWS, encompassing radio spectrum frequencies from 54 – 72 MHz, 76 – 88 MHz, 174 – 216 MHz, and 470 – 694 MHz bands [2], [3], was initially dedicated to digital broadcasting. Later, some countries recognized its potential for regulated unlicensed use. Presented in the very high frequency and ultra-high frequency bands, TVWS is known

for its distinctive qualities, especially its carrier frequency, which offers small attenuation [4] and extended propagation, leading to high coverage. This feature is particularly beneficial for rural connectivity in sparsely populated areas [5]. Additionally, these frequencies exhibit strong penetration capabilities [6], aiding in circumventing obstacles that block line-of-sight signals. TVWS is therefore well suited for post-disaster communication [7], [8]. With considerable total bandwidth available in these frequencies, TVWS can serve as a primary internet backbone in rural regions [9]. Furthermore, possibility of unlicensed access for these frequency bands makes them economically viable [10].

The formal journey of TVWS commenced in 2002 with initiation of notice of inquiry to consider operation in these bands. Then Federal Communications Commission (FCC) initiated investigations into radio frequencies allocated for digital TV broadcasting. They discovered that certain parts of this spectrum remained unused in various regions, offering the potential to expand connectivity without impacting primary TV broadcasting services. Tests conducted in 2007 [11], revealed challenges in reliably detecting TV signals through spectrum sensing mechanisms. For instance, in the presence of moderate TV signals on a first adjacent channel, some devices were unable to reliably detect the TV signal on the primary channel. During the second phase of real-world tests in 2008, devices with sensing-only capabilities could not achieve desirable quality, whereas devices with White Space Database (WSDB) capability showed reliable operation [12]. Thus, the Commission agreed with the fact, that spectrum sensing alone is not sufficient for protecting licensed users [13]. As a conclusion, the WSDB method emerged in 2010 as the mandatory solution for accessing this spectrum, with use of sensing capabilities to improve the QoS [14].

2) *Regulations:* Currently, numerous countries adopt the US approach by designating these bands for unlicensed use. Notable examples include Canada, New Zealand, Singapore, and South Africa [15]. The summary of regulations are provided in Table III.

The FCC's regulations governing TVWS devices are detailed in Chapter 1, Subchapter A, Part 15, Subpart H [2]. These rules categorize devices into several categories: fixed, mobile, portable (mode 1 and mode 2), and sensing. Each category is subject to distinct regulations regarding transmit power, permissible frequencies, and database access requirements. For example, fixed and Mode 2 devices, while operating in a Base Station (BS) role, should have access to the WSDB. Mode 1 devices cannot act as BS and do not require a WSDB connection. The sensing category refers to devices permitted to employ spectrum sensing for accessing the spectrum.

TABLE III
TVWS REGULATIONS WORLDWIDE

Country	TVWS frequencies [MHz]	Number of channels	Channel bandwidth [MHz]	Device types	EIRP limit over channel [dBm]	WSDB requirements		
						Access frequency	Location accuracy	Time of validity [h]
USA	Fixed WSD: 54 - 72 76 - 88 174 - 216 Fixed and portable: 470 - 698, except 614 - 617	50	6	Fixed, Mode 1, Mode 2, Sensing, Mobile, Narrowband	Fixed: up to 40 Portable: up to 20	60 min	50 m	2
Canada	54 - 72 76 - 88 174 - 216, 470 - 608, 657 - 663	49	6	Fixed, Mode 1, Mode 2, Mobile	Fixed: 36 Portable: up to 20	24 hours	95% confidence	48
Singapore	174 - 188 195 - 202 209 - 230 470 - 534 614 - 694	13	7 or 8	Fixed, Mode 1, Mode 2	Fixed: 36 Mode 1,2: 20	6 hours	50 m	6
South Africa	470 - 694 except 606 - 614	27	8	Fixed, Nomadic	Fixed: 41.2 (Rural) 36 (Urban) Nomadic: 20	Fixed: 24 hours Nomadic: 12 hours	95% confidence	48

Recent discussions by the FCC on TVWS [16] have introduced a new category of devices called narrowband, which operate within a bandwidth of no more than 100 kHz. These devices are required to have a 1 percent duty cycle, which equates to 36 seconds of operation per hour. Furthermore, they must adhere to a channelization plan that allocates each 5.5 MHz segment to 55 narrowband carriers, maintaining a separation of 6 MHz between each channel. These devices are clearly intended to use in IoT scenarios.

The use of the 470 – 614 MHz frequency band (channels 14 – 37) is approved for both fixed and portable devices. However, only mobile devices and fixed devices communicating with other fixed or mobile devices are allowed to operate on the 54 – 77 MHz (channels 2 – 4), 76 – 88 MHz (channels 5 and 6), and 174 – 216 MHz (channels 7 – 13) bands. The 617 – 699 MHz range is generally a licensed band, but devices can utilize it in the absence of licensed devices. Notably, narrowband and mobile devices are restricted to operating below 602 MHz.

The Canadian TVWS regulations [17] largely mirror those of the U.S., with some distinctions, such as the different access requirements and time of validity, and the absence of a sensing device category.

In Singapore, the TVWS requirements are outlined in the Telecommunication Standards Advisory Committee Technical Specification [3]. This framework categorizes devices into three types: fixed, mode 2, and mode 1. The first two categories can function as master devices and must have geolocation capabilities, whereas mode 1 devices operate without such capabilities.

South Africa's regulatory framework for TVWS [18] features two types of devices: fixed and nomadic. This framework offers a relatively limited number of available channels and has the highest potential Effective Isotropic Radiated Power (EIRP) among the standards under consideration. South Africa's deployment of TVWS has been very successful in terms of usage. The main reason for this success is that the country heavily relies on this technology to deliver data.

The UK regulator Ofcom issued a document [19] description and discussion on TVWS in 2016. However, as of 2024, Ofcom has announced that the devices authorization framework is no longer available due to the low number of users [20], [21].

3) *Database spectrum management*: The operation and requirements of the WSDB are critical components in the regulatory framework. In the United States, these specifications are provided by the FCC in [22]. Additionally, the Electronic Communications Committee in Europe has issued guidance for the national implementation of regulatory frameworks pertaining to TVWS databases [23]. The European Telecommunications Standards Institute (ETSI) also addresses the topic of TVWS databases in its standard [24], offering guidelines for their management and operation.

WSDB is operated by private companies under the control from official regulator. There may be multiple databases within a single country. In this case, information exchange between databases is mandatory. TVWS devices must register with and regularly consult the WSDB,

which is aligned with their geolocation, to identify accessible channels and maximum transmit power. Despite the unlicensed use of spectrum, device registration in the WSDB incurs a fee. The database includes details on TV broadcasting stations, coverage and operating TVWS devices to assign channel to prevent interference. To calculate potential interference to TV broadcasts from unlicensed users, WSDB utilizes propagation models defined by the regulator. To explore the feasibility of deploying TVWS devices across the United States and gain a deeper understanding of white space availability, visit [25].

The Internet Engineering Task Force developed an open source protocol for WSDB operation called Protocol to Access White-Space (PAWS) [26]. PAWS was successfully used to implement WSDB in several countries, such as India [27].

As stated in the WSDB survey paper [28], database mechanisms face several challenges, primarily related to the unification of access and testing procedures, query languages, and inter-database cooperation both within and between countries.

4) *Standards*: Two standards are mostly adopted for TVWS:

- IEEE 802.22 WRAN: In 2004 IEEE working group started development of the first standard tailored for TVWS [29]. It offers a point-to-multipoint architecture between a BS and User Equipment (UE) and developed for a range up to 100 km, operating in frequencies from 54 to 862 MHz. The physical layer is optimized for long channel response times and highly frequency selective channels, supporting signal bandwidths of 6, 7, and 8 MHz. It incorporates Orthogonal Frequency-Division Multiple Access (OFDMA), cognitive radio techniques such as: spectrum sensing, and spectrum management [30], [31].
- IEEE 802.11af (Super Wi-Fi): Approved in 2014 this standard allows for both point-to-point and point-to-multipoint networks, using channel reservation and distributed beaconing. Based on PHY layer of IEEE 802.11ac, it requires downclocking from 40 MHz bandwidth to 6, 7, or 8 MHz, depending on required channel bandwidth [32]. It supports up to 256 QAM modulation and initially targeted a coverage area of 100 m, extendable to a few kilometers. This standard supports both spectrum sensing, as well as database mechanisms [33].

The industry predominantly utilizes the IEEE802.11af standard for real device implementation. Up to best of our knowledge, Adaptrum Company is the sole developed the IEEE 802.22 standard modem for their device implementation, whereas others predominantly rely on the IEEE 802.11af

standard. For example, modems developed by Mediatek and NICT. Therefore, a valid question concerns the pros and cons of IEEE802.22 and IEEE802.11af [34]. Comparison between the standards is presented in Table IV.

TABLE IV
TVWS SPECIFIC STANDARDS

Standard	IEEE 802.22	IEEE 802.11af
Modulation	up to 64 QAM	up to 256 QAM
Multiple access	OFDMA	CSMA
Similar technologies	WiMAX or LTE	Wi-Fi
Typical range	5 km	1 km
Maximum data rate	300 Mbps	26.7 Mbps
Maximum transmit power	27 dBm	20 dBm
BS and Client equipment	Hardware for BS and Client is different. Spectrum mask conformance for Client is challenging	Hardware for BS and Client are the same. The difference in software
Upper layers implementation	Existence of security gateway and Evolved Packet Core (EPC). It provides authorization and mobility services for the users.	No EPC and security gateway

In conclusion, the appeal of the IEEE802.11af standard for both customers and device manufacturers primarily lies not in standard parameters, but in its cost-effective and user-friendly solution for expanding wireless network coverage and capabilities.

Instead of utilizing specific standards, some companies adopted existing technologies such as LTE to operate in TVWS frequency region [9]. For that, they utilized LTE modem along with carrier frequency conversion.

5) *Product overview and applications:* Initially, TVWS technology has garnered interest from various organizations and technology companies, highlighting its potential in enhancing connectivity and spectrum utilization. For example it was promoted by Dynamic Spectrum Alliance [35] - global organization that advocates for policies, regulations, and practices that promote more efficient spectrum utilization. Microsoft provided several installations to expand the internet access to rural villages using TVWS through the Microsoft Airband [36] initiative. In 2013 Google WSBD implementation were approved for operation in US. Another applications of TVWS are internet access, connectivity, IoT, sensing and monitoring and smart cities [37].

To address the niche in TVWS technology, many vendors have developed specialized devices [38]. A summary for these devices, collected from datasheets is provided in Table V. Main applications of the considered devices: long-range connectivity, internet backhauling, and IoT.

TABLE V
TVWS PRODUCTS CHARACTERISTICS SUMMARY

Distance Covered [km]	Tx Power [dBm]	Data Rate (throughput) [Mbps]	MIMO	Channel Bandwidth [MHz]	Modulation Coding Rate	Topology
2 – 40	23 – 36	13 – 300 (with carrier aggregation)	1x1 – 2x2	6 / 7 / 8 (with carrier aggregation)	BPSK – 256 QAM 1/2 – 5/6	Point to point Point to multipoint

Some of the characteristics raise many questions about real-world deployment. Therefore, we recommend referring to channel measurement papers for practical data. For example, the authors of [39] conducted a series of experiments to establish a connection between a BS and a client using Adaptrum equipment. The average throughput on a 10 MHz channel at a distance of 6.32 km was 16.27 Mbps. The authors state that the actual throughput on the downlink was about 70 percent of the maximum value written in the datasheet.

6) *Conclusion:* After around 14 years of TVWS history, we can draw some conclusions about its feasibility. It turns out that the use of this spectrum is not as widespread as expected around 2015. Despite the large amount of available spectrum, the number of users in several countries is not as high, as evidenced by the situation in the UK. Exceptions include countries that primarily rely on this technology, such as South Africa.

From a technological point of view, despite the promising characteristics of the carrier frequencies, current devices do not achieve high throughput coupled with extensive coverage. This limits the use of TVWS for broadband connectivity. However we think that IoT applications, which require low throughput, are still a promising use case on TVWS.

The research topics in the field of TVWS are resource allocation, spectrum access and management [10], [37]. One of the challenges occurring when considering communication over TVWS is atmospheric ducting. This phenomenon occurs when atmospheric layers act as a waveguide, allowing waveforms to travel over extended distances [40]. This can lead to interference from distant TV broadcast stations that operate hundreds kilometers away, thereby

affecting the quality of the signal received. Investigating strategies to suppress this interference is a practical as well as open research area [41].

C. Industrial Scientific Medical bands

In general, ISM bands span portion of frequencies from 6.7 MHz to 246 GHz. Initially this spectrum were designated for non-communication devices to avoid interference with wireless communication systems [42]. The application domains include medicine, science, and industry, encompassing equipment like microwave ovens, medical sterilizers, and magnetic resonance imaging machines. Over time, various wireless communication devices, for example Short Range Devices (SRD) [43] in Europe began to utilize these frequencies. Nowadays existence of communication systems in that part of the spectrum is widely presented, for example Wi-Fi technology. There are decisions about incorporating parts of these radio bands into mobile networks, as indicated in the documents such as [44]–[47].

The International Telecommunication Union (ITU) Radio Regulations [48] classify ISM band allowances and restrictions across three regions: Region 1 (Europe, Africa, Mongolia, the Middle East, the Persian Gulf, and the Commonwealth of Independent States), Region 2 (the Americas, Greenland, and some Pacific Islands), and Region 3 (Iran, Asian countries, and most of Oceania). ISM regulations distinguish between Type A communication devices, needing approval to use by concerned administration to prevent unwanted interference to working equipment within operating range, and Type B communication devices, operating without any authorization. Regulations are presented in Table VI.

The 433.05 – 434.79 MHz ISM band, accessible in region 1, is notable for its use in embedded applications like smart homes, radio-controlled switches, toys, and wireless sensors. The specific regulations for this band can be found in [49].

In Region 2, frequencies from 902 to 928 MHz are predominantly utilized for Low Power Wide Area Networks (LPWAN). These frequency allocations are governed by the FCC, as outlined in [50]. In Europe, a comparable, yet distinct, band known as the SRD band ranges from 863 to 876 MHz and from 915 to 921 MHz. ETSI has established regulations for this band [49].

The 2.4 – 2.5 GHz ISM band is notably the most heavily utilized due to the widespread adoption of Wi-Fi, Bluetooth, ZigBee technologies, and cordless phones. This frequency range is divided into 14 channels, each separated by 5 MHz [51]. Globally, most countries utilize 13 channels. In the US, channels 12 and 13 are restricted to low power mode to avoid interference

TABLE VI
ISM REGULATIONS WORLDWIDE

Frequency band [MHz]	433.05 – 434.79	863 – 876, 915 – 921	902 – 928	2400 – 2500
Primary users	Radiolocation, Amateur, Earth exploration satellite	Fixed, Mobile, Broadcasting, Amateur, Radiolocation	Fixed, Mobile, Broadcasting, Amateur, Radiolocation	Fixed, Mobile, Mobile-Satellite, Radiolocation, Radiodetermination- Satellite
Aggregated bandwidth [MHz]	1.74	19	≤ 26	≤ 100
Number of channels	69	-	-	14
Transmit power [dBm]	10	14	30	36
Channel occupancy time proportion [%]	100	1	2	100
Device	ISM Type A	SRD	ISM Type B	ISM Type B
Availability	Region 1	Europe	Region 2	Worldwide
Standards	Custom RF switches and IoT	Zigbee, Sigfox, LoRa	Zigbee, Sigfox, LoRa, IEEE 802.11ah	IEEE 802.11b/g/n/ac, Bluetooth, Zigbee

with ground-satellite communication systems [52], while Canada permits the use of 12 channels, and Japan uses all 14.

In conclusion we can say that ISM are of particular interest to IoT devices because their limited bandwidth is suitable primarily for low-throughput applications. The transmission power and channel occupation time for such devices are minimal, reducing the need for extensive coordination similar to that of the WSDB. Instead, coexistence issues are primarily addressed at the physical layer of each standard.

D. The 3.55 to 3.7 GHz spectrum: Civil Broadband Radio Services

CBRS is a 150 MHz unlicensed spectrum band in the U.S., ranging from 3.55 to 3.7 GHz, and aligns with the Long Term Evolution (LTE) and New Radio (NR) n48 band. Discussion to utilize this band began in 2010, and the first baseline standards were released in 2019 [53]. This frequency range is governed by FCC rules [54], which divide the spectrum into a three-tier structure. The top tier is occupied by Federal Incumbent Users (IU), such as satellite services

and naval radars, followed by Priority Access Licenses (PAL), and the lowest tier is occupied by General Authorized Access (GAA). Each channel has a bandwidth of 10 MHz. In the 3550 – 3650 MHz band, each PAL is permitted to use a 10 MHz channel with possibility of channel bonding. However, no more than seven PALs can be assigned simultaneously. The 3650 – 3700 MHz band is reserved for General GAA, but might be extended to 3550 – 3700 MHz. Coordination between tiers is managed by Spectrum Access Systems (SAS), similar to TVWS databases. SAS registers and authorizes users based on their location and identity, allocates channels for PAL and GAA, and protects incumbent users from interference from lower tiers using information from the database and online sensors. Maximum EIRP limits are set at 23 dBm for UE, and at 30 dBm and 47 dBm for lower power and higher power BS, respectively.

As stated in the comprehensive survey [53], resource allocation in such networks is challenging due to several factors, including:

- The need for fast and robust detection of IU.
- Timing allocation for fair coexistence and optimal spectrum usage.
- Effective bandwidth usage, along with avoidance of IU interference.
- Achieving high QoS in case of sharing the channel between different users.
- Preserving the privacy of all-tier users from adversaries.

Today, significant technological advances have been made to address these problems. Numerous vendors have developed BS and UE solutions tailored to CBRS [55], benefiting from alignment with the cellular network bands. This frequency range supports various technologies, including LTE, 5G-NR, and specialized technologies for FWA [56].

Key applications of CBRS include [55]:

- Internet Service Providers, who benefit from enabling mobility and providing cheaper last-mile connectivity.
- Neutral host networks, which can achieve extended (and possibly temporary) capacity in stadiums, centers, and hotels.
- Industry, which can benefit from deploying private networks in this band or using IoT applications in factories or farms.

A notable example of CBRS application is detailed in the white paper [57], which discusses and details the process of deploying a private network in the hospitality sector using CBRS bands.

The white paper proposes establishing a private LTE network for this scenario. In case of using PAL bands, benefits include high reliability, high QoS, performance, coverage, cost-effectiveness, and mobility support.

Furthermore, a comparative study in [58] analyzes commercial Wi-Fi versus CBRS systems, concluding that LTE/NR technology over CBRS ensures more robust and reliable indoor coverage than Wi-Fi 5 with fewer BS required.

The Wireless Innovation Forum [59] plays a key role in supporting the CBRS frequency band. As a standards-developing organization, it not only craft CBRS standards but also issues informative reports and infographics and oversees device registration. Furthermore, the OnGo Alliance [60], previously known as the CBRS Alliance, promotes the interests of its members, including implementers and operators, in the use of CBRS band solutions. This alliance not only promotes CBRS-based technologies, but also offers certification, encompassing a diverse membership ranging from manufacturers to end-user companies.

In conclusion, the future of CBRS is promising. According to the Wireless Innovation Forum infographic [61], hundreds of thousands devices are already being successfully deployed. When comparing this band with TVWS, several differences emerge.

- Technological advantage: This is one of the main reasons. The CBRS band uses LTE and NR bands, allowing for the seamless integration of existing, well-established equipment. In contrast, TVWS products necessitate significant design and development efforts.
- Minimal available bandwidth: The CBRS channel bandwidth is 10 MHz, which is more suitable for high-throughput applications compared to the smaller bandwidth of TVWS channels.
- PAL Bands: The presence of PAL bands in CBRS provides robustness and ensures QoS for critical communication scenarios, unlike TVWS, which does not have a similar licensed tier.
- CBRS is a specific band designated for the US, while TVWS devices have been deployed in various countries worldwide. In some countries that primarily rely on TVWS, such as South Africa, it has proven useful, whereas in others, like the UK, it is not used at all.

E. The 5150 to 7125 MHz spectrum: Unlicensed National Information Infrastructure

This frequency range has recently gained significant interest for unlicensed use due to nearly 2 GHz of available spectrum and, consequently, the potential for up to 160 MHz channel bandwidth. A prime example of this is the U-NII bands in the US, which span from 5.150 to 7.125 GHz and are consist of eight parts with unique rules [62]. Globally, regulations for these bands vary, but they generally align with the FCC separation of the spectrum, as we will explore later in this section.

Before examining the regulations, it is important to be familiar with several specific rules and mechanisms [63], [64] that must be implemented in devices operating in the U-NII frequency range as detailed below. These mechanisms exist to protect primary users, such as radar systems and satellite communications.

- Automated Frequency Coordination (AFC): This regulatory system, implemented as database, continuously authorizes device operation in specified regions on certain frequencies and power levels, safeguarding incumbent users from interference. This works similar to WSDB and SAS.
- Clear Channel Assessment (CCA): Before transmitting, equipment must sense the spectrum to avoid occupied channels. This technique is essentially the carrier sense component used in the Carrier Sense Multiple Access (CSMA) technique, for example, in Wi-Fi. The CCA regulation is mandatory for unlicensed bands in Europe [64] and Japan.
- Channel Availability Check (CAC): Before transmission, device must sense the spectrum to check the presence of radar signals.
- Dynamic Frequency Selection (DFS): This mandates devices to halt transmissions on current frequency band for 30 minutes if a radar signal is detected, to avoid interference to radar.
- Transmit Power Control (TPC): This mechanism adjusts the device's transmit power to minimize interference between, for example two neighboring Wi-Fi networks. For instance, in Europe, devices are required to have the capability to adjust the transmission power by at least 3 dB.

We can divide the device operating modes for this frequency spectrum into three categories:

- Low Power Indoor device with integrated antennas: For fixed indoor use only. EIRP is restricted to 24 dBm for an 80 MHz channel. Example of usage: establishing a LAN, such

as using Wi-Fi.

- Standard Power device: For fixed indoor and outdoor use. Geolocation and coordination with AFC are mandatory. This type might be used for internet access and connectivity.
- Very Low Power device: For mobile indoor and outdoor use. EIRP is restricted to 14 dBm. These devices might be used in vehicles or personal areas.

More detailed regulations on this part of the spectrum are provided in Tables VII and VIII.

TABLE VII
WORLDWIDE REGULATIONS ON 5150 - 5925 MHz SPECTRUM

Frequency band [MHz]	5150 – 5250	5250 – 5350	5350 – 5470	5470 – 5650	5650 – 5725	5725 – 5850	5850 – 5925
Total Bandwidth [MHz]	100	100	120	180	75	125	75
EIRP (for US) [dBm]	23 / 36	23	Not available	30		33 / 36	36
Licensed users	Federal Radiolocation						
	Fixed satellite service	Active spaceborn sensors					Fixed satellite service
	Amateur Radio Networking system		Radionavigation		Amateur radio/satellite		
US	Indoor/Outdoor (U-NII-1)	Indoor/Outdoor DFS/TPC (U-NII-2A)	Not available (U-NII-2B)	Indoor/Outdoor DFS/TPC (U-NII-2C)		Indoor/Outdoor (U-NII-3)	(U-NII-4)
Europe	Indoor	Indoor/Outdoor DFS/CCA/TPC/CAC	Not available	Indoor/Outdoor DFC/CCA/TPC/CAC		Under discussion	
Japan	Indoor	Indoor DFS/TPC	Not available	DFS/TPC		TPC	Not available

The 5G Release 17 technical specification identifies the band n46 (5150 – 5925 MHz) for shared spectrum access, essentially classifying it as unlicensed [65]. Release 18 identifies n46, n96, n102 bands as unlicensed ones [66]. Detailed global regulations for the 5150 – 5925 MHz band, including spectral masks, power requirements, and specific mobile network usage restrictions, are comprehensively outlined in the 3GPP Specification TS38.889 [67].

In case of Japan, the 5150 – 5350 MHz and 5470 – 5830 MHz ranges are designated for unlicensed low-power devices, with power levels restricted by the occupied bandwidth [68], [69]. Europe permits the use of similar bands for establishing local networks [64], [70], while Canada’s regulations closely align with those of the US [71]. It is important to note that ETSI regulations [64] mandate that the occupied channel bandwidth must be at least 80 percent of the nominal channel bandwidth. This needs to be addressed in the case of systems with variable signal bandwidth, for example, those that use OFDMA for the UL.

TABLE VIII
WORLDWIDE REGULATIONS ON 5925 – 7125 MHz SPECTRUM

Frequency band [MHz]	5925 – 6425	6425 – 7125
Total Bandwidth [MHz]	500	700
Licensed users	Microwave links	Mobile
	Fixed - Satellite	
US	14 dBm EIRP AFC	
Saudi Arabia	Indoor/Outdoor AFC	
Europe	Indoor/Outdoor	Not available
Japan	23 dBm EIRP for 20 MHz	Not available

The 5925 – 7125 MHz band, relevant for Wi-Fi 6E, exhibits varying levels of adoption across countries, with a detailed list available on the official website [72]. Additionally, the 5G Release 18 technical specification designates the frequency band n96 (5925 – 7125 MHz) and n102 (5925 – 6425) for unlicensed access in 5G. However, its usage is dependent on specific national regulations [66].

For example, US has embraced the complete band for unlicensed low-power use, setting a specified limit of 14 dBm EIRP as mentioned in [73]. Utilizing higher power modes up to 36 dB EIRP necessitates the use of AFC [74]. Similarly, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has adopted the n96 band for unlicensed use. To protect primary users, such as microwave links, the regulator has implemented an AFC system [75]. In contrast, Europe has sanctioned the 5925 – 6425 MHz segment for unlicensed 5G use [46] and for establishing unlicensed local networks [70]. Similarly, Japan permits the use of the same band for low-power data transmission, specifying a limit of around 23 dBm EIRP for a 20 MHz channel [68].

F. Unified spectrum coordination system

Throughout previous sections, we discussed three database-coordinated sharing systems: WSDB for TV White Space, SAS for CBRS bands, and AFC for the 6 GHz U-NII bands. All three systems serve similar functions, including protecting primary users, monitoring the spectrum, registering devices, and allocating resources. Consequently, the concept of consolidating these systems into a single Database Sharing Management System was proposed in Ofcom's document [76].

The 2023 research report from the Dynamic Spectrum Alliance [77] briefly discusses existing spectrum-sharing frameworks, including:

- **Manual Licensed Access:** Traditionally used for most systems.
- **Semi-Automated Database-Assisted Coordination:** An example is the Federal Communications Commission's coordination of 70/80/90 GHz wireless links. Spectrum access is obtained in two steps: first, ensuring that a new user will not interfere with devices already registered in the database, followed by manual approval from the FCC.
- **Licensed Shared Access:** This framework facilitates two-tier sharing between users. The license holder (usually large government agency) can share part of their spectrum with specific customers, ensuring it will not affect the primary users. This approach is used in different countries in 3.7 – 4.2 GHz spectrum.
- **Fully Automated Database Frequency Coordination:** The first implemented example of this system is the WSDB.
- **Dynamic Coordination Databases:** An example is the SAS for CBRS. The main difference from WSDB is presence of three-tier spectrum sharing policy.

Additionally, the report discusses the development of a generalized spectrum coordination system. The benefits of such a system include streamlining and standardizing access to the spectrum, establishing well-defined policies for spectrum access, enhancing spectrum utilization through more detailed data, and enabling the combination of different sensors. The report also explores the potential for using this system to share unlicensed spectrum for 5G and 6G applications. Furthermore, it envisions future applications of the system for sharing exclusive-use licensed spectrum.

More details on the implementation of a generalized frequency sharing system are provided

in Communications, Space and Technology Commission whitepaper [78]. The authors highlight the importance of advanced spectrum sharing mechanisms, as an example, for addressing local and temporal demand while providing high throughput. They discuss current spectrum sharing initiatives and present a roadmap for an advanced spectrum sharing framework, including the roles and engagement of various stakeholders at both local (e.g., private sector, government agencies) and global levels (e.g., ITU). One of the most challenging aspects is achieving effective collaboration among these stakeholders, as they are not accustomed to share the spectrum together.

In conclusion, automated database coordination systems are now quite advanced and have already been implemented in practice. However, their efficiency of spectrum utilization are still limited, due to their primary goal to protect primary users from interference. On top of that, in situations where a primary user is not present, such as in cases where networks built on different technologies coexist within the same area, PHY and MAC layer coexistence techniques must be addressed. We will discuss these techniques in Section IV-C.

III. AN OVERVIEW OF WIRELESS TECHNOLOGIES EMPLOYING UNLICENSED SPECTRUM

A. Introduction

The frequency spectrum serves as the foundational underpinning for wireless communication, with various communication technologies being the structural elements built upon this foundation. The market offers a diverse array of such technologies. The current section aims to provide an introductory overview of them with a particular emphasis on key aspects related to the usage in unlicensed spectrum, such as: operating frequency, throughput and operating range. Fig. 1 illustrates the two most important parameters that can be achieved from a practical perspective.

As observed, the existing technologies cover most of the possible deployment scenarios. Consequently, it is now crucial to concentrate more on the coexistence among these technologies to fully utilize their potential. The last subsection will discuss coexistence issues, which are closely related to interference. This interference can occur within a single technology in the same network (intra-cell and inter-cell), or when two different standards occupy the same bandwidth, for example, Wi-Fi and NR-U.




Fig. 1. Technology use cases by range and required throughput. Green rectangles represent cellular technologies, red and magenta indicate Wi-Fi-based technologies. Blue rectangles correspond to short-range devices, while orange rectangles represent long-range, low-throughput devices.

B. Low rate technologies

This section covers the technologies used in LPWAN that are capable of establishing long-range, low-throughput communication for up to 10 years using a single battery [79]. Generally, these technologies utilize ISM bands ranging from 433 MHz to 2.5 GHz. However, as noted in [80], TVWS might also be used for LPWAN, specifically with LoRa and Sigfox. Although Bluetooth and Zigbee have significantly shorter operating ranges, they are still included in this section.

The most dominant LPWAN technologies today are NB-IoT, LoRa, and Sigfox [81]. Consequently, we will not delve deeply into technologies such as Ingenu, Weightless, Telensa, DASH7, NB-Fi, IQRF and many more. For more details, refer to [82], which comprehensively explores LPWAN from all relevant perspectives. This source includes several comparison tables that cover the majority of technical characteristics of these technologies, along with discussions on their applications. The most important characteristics for unlicensed use are summarized in Table IX.

TABLE IX
SUMMARY OF LPWAN DEVICE CHARACTERISTICS

	Bluetooth	Zigbee	LoRa	Sigfox	NB-IoT	LTE-M	Wi-Fi HaLow
Supported by	Special Interest Group	Connectivity Standards Alliance	LoRa Alliance	SIGFOX	3GPP	3GPP	IEEE
Operating Frequencies [MHz]	2400 – 2480	868 – 868.6 902 – 928 2400 – 2483	863 – 870 902, 915 – 928 915 – 928 2400 – 2500	868 – 868.6 902 – 928	450 – 1980	450 – 1980	863 – 876 902 – 928 915 – 921
Licensed or Unlicensed	Unlicensed	Unlicensed	Unlicensed	Unlicensed	Licensed	Licensed	Unlicensed
Range (Rural) [m]	100	20	18k	50k	15k	11k	>1k
Range (Urban) [m]	100	20	5k	10k	10k	<11k	1k
Peak data rate (UL) [bps]	2M	250k	50k	600	79k	1M	7.8M
Peak data rate (DL) [bps]	2M	250k	50k	600	106k	1M	7.8M
Encryption standard	AES-128	AES-128	AES-128	AES-128	3GPP 128 – 256	3GPP 128 – 256	WPA3
Organization or standard	IEEE 802.15.1	IEEE 802.15.4	Proprietary	Proprietary	3GPP	3GPP	IEEE 802.11ah

Bluetooth [83] is a widely used technology designed for establishing wireless connections of up to 2 Mbps over short ranges, typically up to 10 meters between two devices. It is primarily utilized for devices such as headphones, wireless mice, and other similar peripherals. The standard is managed by the Bluetooth Special Interest Group [84].

Zigbee [85] serves as an alternative to Bluetooth, targeting different applications. It is used

to create small radio mesh networks for automation and short-range IoT applications. The mesh structure and greater communication range of Zigbee allow it to transmit data over distances of up to 100 meters, compared to the tens of meters typical with Bluetooth. Additionally, Zigbee networks can scale to support thousands of devices, whereas Bluetooth networks typically support around twenty devices [86]. Consequently, Zigbee is more suitable for industrial applications within limited areas. The Connectivity Standards Alliance (formerly the Zigbee Alliance) [87] provides certification and promotes the adoption of devices that comply with this standard.

LoRa, based on the LoRaWAN standard from ITU [88], enables the establishment of low-power, long-distance connections that can reach up to 15 km in rural areas. It offers sufficient throughput for IoT applications and helps establish connectivity in rural communities. This technology strikes a balance between the short range of Zigbee and the very low data rate of Sigfox. Semtech Corporation is a founding member of the LoRa Alliance [89].

Sigfox [90] technology offers the longest range (up to 40 km) and the lowest data rate (up to 600 bps) among LPWAN technologies. Its network structure differs from the mesh networks used by other technologies. Instead, Sigfox's network resembles conventional mobile networks, with BS managed by local providers serving specific areas. It has widespread global coverage, which can be explored further on its official website [91].

NB-IoT and LTE-M (or LTE-MTC) [92] utilize licensed spectrum and are included in this section for completeness, as they form the foundation for enhanced Mobile Broadband (eMTC) in 5G [93]. Developed by the 3GPP group, these technologies were introduced in LTE Release 13 to enable LPWAN over existing networks. While they offer good throughput characteristics, they come with high deployment costs. In comparison, NB-IoT provides higher coverage and supports denser device placements, whereas LTE-M is better suited for less dense environments where higher throughput links are needed [94].

IEEE 802.11ah, known as Wi-Fi HaLow, was developed for IoT devices and offers a range of approximately 1 km with a low-power connection. The paper [95] provides a detailed overview of Wi-Fi HaLow, investigating scalability, throughput, latency, and energy efficiency in networks with bidirectional traffic. A comprehensive technology overview and comparison with similar technologies are available in the official paper by the Wi-Fi Alliance [96]. The conclusion is that Wi-Fi HaLow provides higher data rates and enhanced security compared to other LPWAN technologies.

To estimate the deployment costs of LPWAN, refer to the report by the Communication Space

& Technology Commission of Saudi Arabia [97]. This report provides an overview of deploying LPWAN in the Kingdom and offers a detailed cost estimation for various technologies, covering everything from network establishment to device manufacturing and deployment. According to the report, Sigfox is the least expensive option, followed by LoRa, with LTE-IoT being the most costly.

In conclusion, LPWAN technologies are designed for specific niches. Operating within traditional ISM bands, these technologies are unsuitable for modern high-throughput applications, such as FWA, and generally do not overlap with them.

IV. WI-FI

1) *Introduction and historical perspective:* Wi-Fi was developed based on the IEEE 802.11 standard and is extensively utilized in setting up Wireless Local Area Networks (WLAN). Understanding its evolution is essential for grasping the history of methods used for unlicensed spectrum sharing, understanding current development, and extrapolating the overall vision for wireless networking using license-exempt spectrum. Fig. 2 provides a visual representation of the evolution of the Wi-Fi standard.

The evolution of Wi-Fi standards commenced with the initial versions, including 802.11b, 802.11a, and 802.11g, and progressed through to 802.11n and 802.11ac, which are widely recognized as Wi-Fi 4 and Wi-Fi 5, respectively. This development journey has continued with the introduction of IEEE 802.11ax [98], leading up to the current iteration, IEEE 802.11be [99]. Unique variants exist, such as IEEE802.11af, tailored for the TVWS band, and IEEE802.11ah, suited for LPWAN applications. Additionally, standards like IEEE802.11ay and IEEE802.11bb have been developed for Wi-Fi operation in the millimeter-wave (WiGig) and light (Li-Fi) spectrums, respectively.

In this section, our primary emphasis will be on the standard suited for establishing WLAN. To provide a brief historical context, we will touch upon Wi-Fi 4 and 5. Subsequently, our focus will shift to Wi-Fi 6 and 7. It's worth noting that the other standards mentioned earlier have either been addressed in previous sections or lie beyond the scope of the paper. Summary on Wi-Fi standard characteristics are provided in Table X.

The enhancements to the MAC layer in Wi-Fi 4, as detailed in [100] and [98], introduced several significant improvements. Multi-level frame aggregation was introduced, allowing the combination of multiple packets into a single frame to significantly reduce overhead caused




Fig. 2. Evolution of Wi-Fi standards. Circle radius corresponds to the peak throughput.

by headers, thereby enhancing overall throughput. The reverse direction mechanism improved the utilization of Transmit Opportunity (TXOP) time — originally allocated for unidirectional communication — by enabling bi-directional communication within the same time frame. To ensure compatibility with older standards, the newest frame structure should start with the old, ineffective, and redundant legacy header. However, with the Greenfield mode — which activates in the absence of legacy devices — requirement to support legacy header is removed, allowing the frame structure to be optimized for higher throughput. Additionally, QoS received a substantial upgrade through the introduction of differentiated channel access parameters for various data categories such as background, best effort, video, and voice, ensuring that network resources are allocated in a manner that reflects the priority and requirements of each type of data.

The Wi-Fi 5 MAC enhancements [98], [100] in addition to adaptation to new PHY level features, such as Multiuser (MU) MIMO, contains improved frame aggregation capabilities that

TABLE X
WI-FI STANDARDS COMPARISON

Name	Wi-Fi 4	Wi-Fi 5	Wi-Fi 6	Wi-Fi 7
Standard	IEEE802.11n	IEEE 802.11ac	IEEE 802.11ax	IEEE 802.11be
Release	Ocotber, 2009	January, 2014	May, 2021	January, 2024
Frequency band [GHz]	2.4, 5	5	2.4, 5, 6	2.4, 5, 6
Bandwidth [MHz]	20 / 40	20 / 40 / 80 / 160	20 / 40 / 80 / 160	20 / 40 / 80 / 160 / 320
Maximum data rate [Gbps]	0.6	3.5	9.6	23 (single link over 6 GHz) 36 (aggregated links over 2.4, 5 and 6 GHz)
Modulation	up to 64 QAM	up to 256 QAM	up to 1024 QAM	up to 4096 QAM
Symbol Time [us]	3.2	3.2	12.8	12.8
Cyclic Prefix [us]	0.8	0.8 / 0.4	0.8 / 1.6 / 3.2	0.8 / 1.6 / 3.2
Multiple Antenna Multiuser	MIMO	MU MIMO DL (up to 4 users)	MU MIMO DL and UL (up to 8 users)	MU MIMO DL and UL (up to 8 users)
OFDMA	No	No	Used	Used
Introduced PHY features	Short guard interval (400 ns)	Dynamic channel bandwidth management, unified beamforming method	Target Wake Time	Triggered uplink access
Introduced MAC mechanisms	Frame Aggregation, Block Acknowledgment, Reverse Direction, Greenfield mode	Enhanced Frame Aggregation, TXOP sharing	Enhanced Frame Aggregation, BSS coloring	512 Compressed block Ack, Multiple resource units to single station

accommodate larger frame sizes to support higher throughput potential.

Wi-Fi security has evolved from the Wired Equivalent Privacy protocol to more advanced Wi-Fi Protected Access (WPA) versions, including the latest WPA3 introduced in 2018. All new devices must support WPA3, addressing vulnerabilities of earlier versions [101]. However, WPA3 still faces issues like rogue AP and evil twin attacks, and address resolution protocol spoofing, allowing hackers to intercept or modify network traffic. New challenges such as downgrade and

side channel attacks have also emerged [102].

The Wi-Fi 6 protocol, as detailed in [103], incorporates OFDMA, aligning Wi-Fi more closely with LTE and NR technologies, while acknowledging the challenges that utilizing unlicensed bands presents for channel quality estimation and scheduling. Target Wake Time (TWT) represents another advancement, enhancing both battery preservation in user devices and spectral efficiency by scheduling device wake-up times based on specific signals from the BS. Additionally, Wi-Fi 6 introduces a MAC enhancement known as basic service set coloring, an innovation where each BS assigns a unique number included in the PHY header. By examining this portion of the frame, a user device can determine whether the frame is relevant, thereby reducing decoding overhead. This feature also reduces interference by enabling simultaneous transmissions to coexist, avoiding interference from unrelated BS.

Wi-Fi 6 adds one more dimension of multiple access through OFDMA. This enhancement of conventional OFDM is based on splitting group of subcarriers to different users within one band. The MU MIMO technology increases capacity in uplink and downlink by introducing beamforming to multiple users simultaneously.

Wi-Fi 6 significantly differs from its predecessors. In [104], the authors carried out practical experiments to assess this standard's performance, focusing on throughput, latency, energy efficiency, and security. Their findings revealed that the new generation, employing OFDMA, achieves up to 3.2 times more throughput gain for Downlink (DL) and Uplink (UL) in dense user environment, five times reduction in latency, however, this comes with an up to six times increase in power consumption. Furthermore, it was demonstrated that the use of unencrypted TWT is susceptible to various malicious attacks.

Wi-Fi 7 has been recently introduced, and research on this new standard is still limited, however, Rodhe & Schwarz already issued a description of PHY level of the standard [105]. According to the technology overview provided by the Wi-Fi Alliance [99], Wi-Fi 7 introduces several notable advancements, including deterministic latency, which is particularly significant for some industrial applications that might utilize unlicensed spectrum. Additionally, modern Wi-Fi systems have the capability to support high-mobility scenarios, making them more similar to cellular technologies than traditional Wi-Fi. Furthermore, Wi-Fi 7 is designed to optimize throughput by enabling a single user to simultaneously utilize three links across different frequency bands, similar to carrier aggregation, potentially achieving data rates of up to 36 Gbps. This framework is called multi-link operation, in addition to increased throughput, it increases

reliability of transmission [106].

A. LTE in unlicensed spectrum

LTE systems, which have seen widespread global deployment [107], offer multiple operational modes within unlicensed spectrum bands. However, despite Wi-Fi 6 adopting OFDMA and moving closer to cellular network functionalities, cellular technologies still maintain notable differences. Cellular networks primarily operate over licensed bands, affording them the advantage of exclusive spectrum access and more controlled resource allocation. They also typically offer broader coverage and enhanced security. While most of Wi-Fi networks still struggle with high mobility and lack of deterministic latency, cellular networks are specifically designed to handle these challenges effectively.

LTE in unlicensed spectrum is represented by several technologies of two main types, as detailed in [108]: those that utilize either the full protocol stack of LTE or only the upper layers, as illustrated in Fig. 3 and Table XI.




Fig. 3. Types of LTE utilizing unlicensed spectrum

The first type is represented by LTE-U, Licensed Assisted Access (LAA), and MulteFire technologies [109].

LTE-U and LAA were initially proposed to enhance system throughput by enabling data transmission over the unlicensed spectrum, while control information is transmitted through the licensed spectrum. The key distinction [110] between them lies in their deployment timelines and regulatory compliance. LTE-U, introduced in Release 12, was designed for countries without Listen Before Talk (LBT) requirement, such as China and the US. This mandates the transmitter to check the spectrum occupancy before utilizing the channel. In contrast, LAA was introduced in Release 13 and includes LBT capability, ensuring its global acceptance. This design choice

TABLE XI
VERSIONS OF LTE IN UNLICENSED SPECTRUM

Name	LTE-U	LAA	MulteFire
Introduced in 3GPP release	12	13	Not standardized
Supporting Organization	LTE-U Forum	3GPP	Alliance for Private Networks
Operation Mode	DL only	DL and UL	DL and UL
Coexistence Mechanisms	Carrier selection, on-off switching, Carrier Sensing Adaptive Transmission	Carrier selection LBT	LBT
Spectrum Utilization	Licensed and unlicensed	Licensed and unlicensed	Unlicensed
Compatibility with 3GPP	Yes	Yes	No
Purpose	Enhancing the throughput of mobile networks	Enhancing the throughput of mobile networks	Establishing standalone network
Comments	Initially developed technology faced limited global acceptance	A globally accepted technology widely prevalent in the 4G market	A fusion of Wi-Fi's simplicity and LTE's performance, served as the foundation for developing solutions in NR-U

reflects the original intention behind LAA's development—to ensure fair coexistence with Wi-Fi networks. For that, the conventional LTE frame was redesigned [111]. This contains replacement of some subframes with signals or functions, required in CSMA protocols, for example channel reservation signal or channel sensing.

Initially, LAA was limited to supporting only data transmission in DL in unlicensed bands. However, Release 14 included scheduled UL (transmission start is controlled by eNodeB) in unlicensed bands, a development known as extended LAA (eLAA) [112]. Subsequently, Release 15 introduced further extended (feLAA), enabling autonomous UL operations in license-exempt spectrum and providing additional starting and ending points for Physical Uplink Shared Channel (PUSCH) transmissions [113].

MulteFire [114] is a technology that establishes a standalone LTE network using unlicensed spectrum. It offers at least double the throughput compared to Wi-Fi 5 [115]. However, the main

disadvantage is its lack of compatibility with 3GPP standards.

The second category of LTE implementations in unlicensed spectrum encompasses technologies that integrate upper LTE layer with lower layers of Wi-Fi. This is represented by LTE WLAN Radio Level Integration with internet protocol security (LWIP) Tunnel and LTE-WLAN Aggregation (LWA) [116].

LWIP operates by dividing packets at Internet Protocol layer, in contrast to the more versatile LWA, which performs splitting at the Packet Data Convergence Protocol layer [117]. Another advantage of LWA includes higher throughput gain when integrating these technologies into existing infrastructure, along with smaller impact on the infrastructure during upgrading it to support LWA [118].

B. 5G-NR in unlicensed spectrum

Building on LTE advancements, 5G NR emerges as the latest mobile communication technology [119]. Release 15 aimed to boost network efficiency with an ultra-lean design that transmits reference and broadcast signals only when necessary, in contrast to LTE's continuous transmissions. Another major enhancement is the introduction of a flexible frame structure, enabling transmissions to initiate at any OFDM symbol, not just at slot boundaries, thereby enhancing spectrum efficiency. Although these improvements were initially designed for licensed spectrum, they are equally applicable and advantageous in unlicensed scenarios. Subsequently, NR-U, specifically tailored for unlicensed spectrum, was introduced in Release 16 [120]. This technology combines the capabilities of LAA and MulteFire's standalone operation, aiming at unlicensed spectrum use in both sub-8 GHz and higher frequencies. Beyond unlicensed applications, it offers two TDD interference mitigation strategies: Cross Link Interference (CLI) handling for short-range issues mostly occurred between high power DL that might affect UL and Remote Interference Management (RIM) for long-range challenges potentially due to atmospheric ducting propagating the signal from distant cells [121]. This mitigation strategies can be implemented through beamforming or adjusting the time delay between the UL and DL transmissions. Additionally, Dynamic Spectrum Sharing (DSS) facilitates LTE and NR coexistence by allowing to share the same carrier, further benefiting shared spectrum use.

Release 17 introduced support for Ultra Reliable Low Latency Communication (URLLC) in the license-exempt spectrum below 7.125 GHz [122]. This included harmonizing the UL data transfer and feedback mechanisms between URLLC and NR-U, alongside channel access improvements,

to ensure both LBT capability and low latency [123]. Additionally, the introduction of support for non-terrestrial networks expands the backbone capabilities for NR-U. The latest Release 18 aims to extend sidelink operations — communication between devices without a base station, for example, vehicle-to-vehicle communication — to unlicensed spectrum [124], [125].

NR's framework supports five deployment scenarios, named by letters A to E. These include standalone unlicensed operation using NR-U BS, as well as configurations that combine NR, NR-U, or LTE BS utilizing either licensed or unlicensed spectrum [126].

In order to increase the throughput and improve reliability, two types of connectivity might be used. The first one is Dual Connectivity (DC) – that indicates the possibility of exchanging the data between UE and BS one of which is considered primary. The second one is Carrier Aggregation (CA) – that allows transmit data using two contiguous or non-contiguous carriers. This mode might be applicable in all deployment scenarios [126]. Presented in Fig. 4.




Fig. 4. NR-U deployment options

- Scenario A includes DC of the user with NR and NR-U BS, featuring CA between them.
- Scenario B consists of DC of the user with LTE BS operating over licensed bands and NR-U over unlicensed bands.
- Scenario C is defined by standalone NR-U operation.
- Scenario D features an NR BS operating in shared spectrum for downlink and exclusively in licensed spectrum for uplink.
- Scenario E involves DC of the user with NR and NR-U BS, similar to Scenario A. The key difference is that in Scenario E, there is a connection to the core network for both BS.

The NR-U has several challenges [127]:

- Designing waveforms to meet ETSI’s minimum bandwidth standards requires that the actual signal’s bandwidth be at least 80 percent of the allocated channel width [64]. However, this requirement may be violated in the UL OFDMA scenario, especially with a limited number of connected devices. In such cases, dedicated carriers may not utilize sufficient bandwidth, necessitating the implementation of alternative strategies. One straightforward approach—sending dummy data—is not energy efficient.
- Operating across multiple channels can complicate the handling of the LBT mechanism and the determination of primary versus secondary channels.
- The energy detection threshold must be adjusted to guarantee fair coexistence with Wi-Fi. (We will elaborate more in the following section).
- Given that NR-U scheduling for DL and UL is asynchronous, it is important to account for uncertainties in system timings. For instance, after transmitting data, we must keep in mind that the acknowledgment signal may be delayed due to the channel being occupied.
- The design of Hybrid Automatic Repeat reQuest (HARQ) presents a challenge for transmissions in unlicensed spectrum due to the probabilistic nature of channel access.
- The initial access procedure parameters, such as waiting time before new attempt to access the channel for the user should be carefully adjusted to ensure fair coexistence with Wi-Fi.

C. Coexistence between technologies in unlicensed bands

Coexistence between these technologies can be categorized into different groups as in Table XII, highlighting the possibility to address interference problems individually.

1) *Coexistence between short-range devices and LoRa*: Yellow table entries indicate interference between short-range devices and long-range LoRa at 2.4 GHz. The necessity to address this issue is debatable. This problem becomes significant only when short-range and LoRa devices are in close proximity, as the attenuation of short-range signals prevents interference at greater distances. One of the solutions is to use LoRa on lower available frequencies, thus completely avoiding interference.

The paper [128] explores the coexistence of Bluetooth and LoRa within the 2.4 GHz band, presenting measurement outcomes and suggesting that adjusting transmitting parameters could enhance their coexistence.

TABLE XII
COEXISTENCE OF VARIOUS TECHNOLOGIES WITHIN THE SAME SPECTRUM

	IEEE 802.11af	IEEE 802.22	IEEE 802.11ah	Bluetooth	Zigbee	LoRa	Sigfox	Wi-Fi	LTE	NR	FWA
IEEE 802.11af											
IEEE 802.22	470 - 694										
IEEE 802.11ah											
Bluetooth											
Zigbee			902 – 928 915 – 921	2400 – 2500							
LoRa			902 – 928 915 – 921	2400 – 2500	2400 – 2500						
Sigfox			863 – 876 902 – 928 915 – 921		902 – 928 915 – 921	902 – 928 915 – 921					
Wi-Fi				2400 – 2500	2400 – 2500	2400 – 2500					
LTE	470 – 694	470 – 694						470 – 694 3550 – 3700 5150 – 7125			
NR	470 – 694	470 – 694						470 – 694 3550 – 3700 5150 – 7125	470 – 694 3550 – 3700 5150 – 7125		
FWA	470 – 694	470 – 694						470 – 694 3550 – 3700 5150 – 7125	470 – 694 3550 – 3700 5150 – 7125	470 – 694 3550 – 3700 5150 – 7125	

2) *Coexistence between short-range devices and Wi-Fi:* The blue entries indicate interference between Wi-Fi networks and short-range devices, which poses a challenge due to their co-location and the need for high throughput. Research, such as [129], [130], and [131], explores the impact of Wi-Fi on Zigbee, mutual interference between Wi-Fi and Bluetooth, and coexistence between Wi-Fi and LoRa, respectively. Solutions for improving coexistence include adjusting transmission parameters—such as code rate or transmission power—or device placement that minimizes interference between them.

3) *Coexistence of LPWAN technologies:* Table entries highlighted in orange correspond to interference between LPWAN technologies. The coexistence of this group of devices is crucial since they are dedicated to long-range, low-power communication scenarios. However, a question arises regarding the necessity of coexistence mechanisms: since the duty cycles of the devices are small, is it likely that collisions will not occur? It turns out that if we want to support the massive deployment of devices within the same area, we should expect collisions. To quantify the probability of collision, the authors of [132] considered the time and frequency occupation of the same channel by LoRa, Sigfox, and IQRF technologies. Assuming transmission of 140 messages per day for each device, they computed the probability of collision for two or more devices and concluded that with around 320 devices operating in the same frequency range, collisions will occur with a probability of 0.5. For 1300 devices, the probability of collision increases to more than 0.95. However, the results of such collisions are not considered by authors.

In order to efficiently coexist, LPWAN devices utilize two primary modulation techniques: Ultra Narrow Band (UNB) and Spread Spectrum (SS). Work [133] discusses these techniques and explains how each modulation type affects the downlink and uplink performance of the other, with the uplink being more significantly affected. The findings indicate that UNB networks can achieve up to five times greater capacity than SS; however, this potential is difficult to realize in practice due to the high cost of the implementation. Conversely, SS provides higher throughput and a significantly lower power spectral density requirement for the transmitter than UNB. The authors conclude that equitable coexistence between modulation techniques is feasible with a limited number of active devices.

The authors of [134] came to a similar conclusion. They studied network performance depending on the number of devices, concerning throughput across a given coverage area. The authors ultimately concluded that LPWAN networks are suited only for low-rate, sparsely distributed sensing applications.

To tackle the issue of coexistence in LPWAN, the authors of [135] proposed modifications across several layers of LPWAN. At the intra-technology level, they propose several improvements, including the need in adaptive data rate MAC scheduling protocols with variable slot sizes and corresponding PHY level improvements such as fast and low power synchronization. Additionally, they note that the CSMA-CA protocol, despite being bandwidth efficient for a single device transmission, does not fully meet LPWAN demands. This is due to the large number of devices transmitting small amounts of data. Consequently, Time Division Multiple Access (TDMA) based protocols or joint time-frequency scheduling are proposed as alternatives. The authors address inter-technology coexistence by highlighting the need for reliable detection techniques and the use of additional sources of information to detect other technologies. Inter-technology coexistence might be managed through more robust coding schemes, limiting packet sizes, and employing granular TDMA schemes. However, such mechanisms are not widely supported in the existing devices.

In conclusion, LPWAN technologies face unique coexistence challenges. The use cases typically involve dense device placement with long-range coverage and low throughput. However, a review of the literature indicates that modern LPWAN technologies can only support a limited number of different devices in given area. Additionally, the broad variety of standards and the lack of coordination mechanisms for intra-technology coexistence make coexistence particularly difficult. Consequently, the approaches for ensuring coexistence can be significantly different from, or even opposite to, those used in high-throughput applications (for example, using TDMA-based MAC protocols access instead of CSMA/CA or employing database regulator). Naturally, LPWAN technologies do not overlap with high-throughput technologies, as they occupy lower frequency spectrum. This fact allows LPWAN technologies coexistence issues to be addressed independently of others.

4) *Coexistence between high throughput technologies:* The green table entries indicate interference arising between devices operating in high-throughput applications, such as Wi-Fi and unlicensed versions of LTE and NR-U. High throughput requirements automatically imply that systems occupy the spectrum as much as possible, making collisions unavoidable. To mitigate these collisions, a database coordination system might be applied in some of these frequency bands. We briefly discussed this concept in Section II-F, and we assume the absence of database coordination.

The second method for spectrum sharing involves the identification of unoccupied frequency

channels for operation, a process termed Dynamic Channel Selection (DCS). This approach is utilized in unlicensed LTE, NR-U, and similarly in Wi-Fi. However, when it becomes necessary for multiple users to share a particular channel, alternative techniques must be employed.

The common adopted approach to ensure coexistence in shared spectrum is based on very similar mechanisms called LBT in LTE and NR-U and CSMA/CA in Wi-Fi. Other technologies, employing time, frequency or power adjustments are exist, but not major and specific to cellular based technologies [136].

For inter-cell coexistence, Wi-Fi standards initially employed the Distributed Coordination Function (DCF), which combines CSMA/CA and an exponential backoff algorithm. The CSMA algorithm begins by sensing the channel to determine its occupancy. This sensing occurs over a period called the DCF Inter-frame Space (DIFS) and involves two approaches: Carrier Sensing (CS), which detects Wi-Fi preambles that can be decoded, and Energy Detection (ED), which identifies signals that are not decodable. Each approach has a specific detection threshold, while CS having a threshold approximately 20 dB lower than ED.

If the channel is free, devices perform a backoff, i.e counting down for a period known as the contention window. The contention window size is randomly sampled from a defined range of minimum and maximum sizes. If the spectrum remains free, transmission begins. If the spectrum is busy at any moment, devices pause their countdown until it is free again. If the counter reaches zero and channel is free, the Request-to-Send (RTS) Clear-to-Send (CTS) mechanism might be employed to avoid collisions. The transmitting device sends an RTS frame to the destination. Upon receiving this frame, the destination responds with a CTS frame, notifying all other devices that the channel is now occupied for a specific duration. Following this, data transmission occurs during the TXOP, and the sender expects an acknowledgment frame in response. In case of a failed transmission, the contention window size doubles. Example of such procedure is presented in Fig. 5.




Fig. 5. CSMA/CA protocol example

In this example, the channel was initially occupied. However, during the sensing time indicated by the magenta rectangle, the channel remained free. After that, a random number of periods

were sampled, with 6 periods being chosen in this case. During the countdown, the channel became occupied again, so the countdown continued only while the channel was free. Once the countdown reached zero, the RTS/CTS protocol was initiated, followed by data transmission.

Wi-Fi 4 introduced a newer version of the DCF called the Hybrid Coordination Function, utilizing Enhanced Distributed Channel Access to prioritize packets by adjusting access parameters such as minimum and maximum contention window sizes and transmit times. On top of that, DIFS were replaced by Arbitration Inter-Frame Spacing with variable size. This enhancement improves QoS for various data categories, including background, best effort, video, and voice [100].

In LTE and NR-U, devices with LBT capability perform spectrum scanning for minimum 16 μ s and determine occupancy based on an ED threshold that is unique to each technology and may be regulated. This process is also known as CCA. After detecting free spectrum, similar to Wi-Fi, devices perform a random backoff before transmitting data. In the case of LTE-LAA, as soon as a device is ready to start transmission, a channel reservation signal is used until the start of the next LTE slot for data transmission [111].

During the discussion of establishing LBT for LTE-LAA [127], [137], four different LBT categories (CAT) were defined:

- CAT1-LBT: Immediate channel access without LBT.
- CAT2-LBT: LBT without random back-off.
- CAT3-LBT: LBT with random back-off with fixed size of contention window.
- CAT4-LBT: LBT, where the device must follow the CSMA/CA procedure with exponential random backoff for channel access, and variable size of contention window.

LTE-LAA utilize CAT4-LBT. NR-U includes CAT1, CAT2 and CAT4 [127], [138]. Different categories can be applied to different transmissions during COT. For instance, CAT1 is used for back to back transmissions in a short time, while frame-based LBT is used in CAT2 to ensure transmission of critical frames, such as discovery frames. Similarly, CAT4 LBT is used by the BS or the UE to initiate a transmission [139].

Now we can proceed to the examples of coexistence. Note that in the following text, we will use word fair, but actually there is no strict definition of fairness for coexistence of different technologies [136]. To study, optimize, or coexist in unlicensed bands, various approaches have been proposed. These approaches are based on: game theory [140], the multi-armed bandit

approach [141], Markov chains [142], machine learning [143], and reinforcement learning [144], [145].

Coexistence of LTE-LAA and Wi-Fi is expected to be fair, because of design assumption under LAA technology. Research done supports this statement: LTE-LAA is usually better coexist with Wi-Fi rather than other Wi-Fi network [146]. However, several challenges are presented in case, among them the disparity in ED thresholds between Wi-Fi and cellular technologies, notably Wi-Fi's ED threshold at -62 dBm compared for example to LTE-LAA's -72 dBm. This discrepancy has profound implications for the fairness of coexistence [147].

LTE-U's coexistence with Wi-Fi presents distinct challenges due to the lack of a CSMA-like mechanism, relying instead on the Carrier Sense Adaptive Transmission (CSAT) protocol. This protocol dictates spectrum access by alternating between "on" and "off" states, with these periods adjusted based on Wi-Fi utilization measurements [148]. Such a mechanism may complicate the management of confirmation signal transmissions, potentially restricting Wi-Fi's ability to transmit [149]. But in reality, contrary to the widely held belief that LTE-U exhibits poorer coexistence with Wi-Fi compared to LAA, the authors of [110] have demonstrated through real-world experiments that this is not always the case.

Study in [127] addresses the challenges of coexistence between NR-U Rel 16 and Wi-Fi 5 (IEEE802.11ac), including simulation-based throughput comparisons in both indoor and outdoor scenarios within the 5 GHz and 6 GHz bands. Generally, under high throughput scenario, NR-U exhibits higher spectrum utilization, leading to higher throughput and lower latency. However, in the high throughput scenario outdoors, Wi-Fi might achieve higher throughput and lower latency due to the different ED threshold.

Additionally, the research presented in [150] offers simulation for NR and Wi-Fi 6 coexistence specifically in the 6 GHz band. The results show that different detecting threshold leads to probability of successful transmission of NR-U be consistently 20 – 30 percent lower than Wi-Fi 6. Secondly, Employing MU OFDMA for Wi-Fi UL is beneficial for coexisting NR-U and Wi-Fi itself.

Other research challenges for unlicensed spectrum sharing are highlighted in [151]. These challenges include the optimization of coexistence within a single technology and between different unlicensed technologies. For example, challenges involve ensuring fairness in the coexistence of Wi-Fi 7 with legacy devices, with respect to advanced mechanisms such as MU-MIMO and OFDMA. Additionally, optimization is needed for coexistence between different unlicensed

technologies, such as addressing the lack of a global clock required to implement a unified frame-based coexistence mechanism for NR-U and Wi-Fi.

One approach to coexistence goes beyond conventional spectrum management and access methods based on time and frequency adjustments. It utilizes Space-Time Adaptive Processing techniques to tailor beam nulls towards the direction of interference. This strategy can be applied to the entire signal or targeted at individual sub-bands [152]. The emergence of MU-MIMO in Wi-Fi and the existence of MIMO in cellular systems demonstrate that these technologies utilize beamforming. However, more research should be conducted on spatial spectrum sensing issues for the coexistence of high-throughput technologies.

The core idea is to sense channel not from all directions to determine occupancy, but rather to sense from the direction of the user, which is essentially beamform-assisted sensing. This concept originates from cognitive radio and has been proposed for UAV communications [153], as well as described in applications for secure communications in 5G [154].

V. APPLICATIONS IN UNLICENSED SPECTRUM

A. Introduction

This section covers the real-world applications of technologies in unlicensed spectrum. The applications are categorized into three sections based on ITU-defined usage scenarios of 5G [155], which include enhanced Mobile Broadband (eMBB), URRLC, and eMTC. Specifically within the context of unlicensed spectrum utilization, we categorize applications into three main directions, according to their unique demands and usage. Table XIII describes the division of the applications in the case of unlicensed spectrum.

B. High-throughput applications

This direction consists of two directions: Increasing throughput of the licensed systems by sending the data over unlicensed spectrum and FWA.

The first direction aims to alleviate the load on licensed spectrum by utilizing the unlicensed one. This was one of the main drivers behind the development of LTE-U and LAA technologies, and thus of all mobile networks over the unlicensed spectrum. According to report from Global mobile Suppliers Association, operators of 4G and 5G continue to demonstrate steady interest in unlicensed technologies [156]. This report states that more than the half of the LAA

TABLE XIII
APPLICATIONS UTILIZING UNLICENSED SPECTRUM

Name	High-throughput applications	Privacy and latency demanding applications	Massive connectivity applications
Use cases	Increasing throughput of licensed cellular systems Fixed Wireless Access Establishing local networks	Private networks	IoT
Most suitable frequency spectrum	TVWS, CBRS, UNII	CBRS, UNII	TVWS, ISM
Most suitable technologies	Wi-Fi, LTE, NR	LTE, NR	LPWAN

devices are phones, which indicates the importance of unlicensed spectrum for broadband mobile connectivity.

FWA involves using wireless technology to provide internet connectivity or backhaul to areas where traditional methods may not be economically viable. This application is commonly presented as a last mile internet access. ITU data reveals a stark divide in internet usage, with approximately 46 percents in rural and 82 percents in urban areas [157]. Traditional solutions like fiber or copper wiring are economically prohibitive, especially in rural and some urban areas. Consequently, a more viable option is reliable wireless access, which offers a cost-effective alternative to wired connections. Many big and small tech companies are entering the 5G-based FWA market, making it a lively and competitive area [158].

Given the unique challenges and operational requirements of FWA systems, it is clear that existing technologies must be customized to meet these specific needs. For instance, technologies should be designed to accommodate factors such as absence of mobility, long-distance communication over several kilometers, high-volume data transmission with low latency, and potential interference from other users and technologies.

C. Privacy and latency demanding applications

Some examples of such applications include private networks, which are localized wireless networks dedicated to specific purposes, offering several notable advantages such as complete network control, predictable QoS, low latency for critical operations, guaranteed coverage, and

advanced security [159]. The primary users of these networks span a wide range of sectors, including factories, warehouses, ports, hospitals, mines, airports, and campuses. There are numerous real-world implementations of private networks relevant to the topics considered [117].

Private networks can be independent from Public Land Mobile Networks (PLMN), allowing for the possibility of standalone private networks that do not require PLMN access. In such cases, the BS databases, and both control and user planes are exclusively managed within the private domain. Other variations may share some aspects of control with the PLMN [159].

Both LTE and 5G private network solutions are currently available from many vendors and have seen widespread deployment. Additionally, there exist private networks that utilize Wi-Fi technology, typically selected in scenarios where connection reliability and security demands are less stringent [160].

1) Massive connectivity applications: This type of application might be addressed by IoT—an emergent technology developed to manage various aspects of future life, including industry, smart cities, agriculture, healthcare, energy, waste management, and transportation [161], [162].

Unlicensed bands for IoT is a preferable way for industry and community in order to reduce the cost and broaden the connectivity. However, for some of the applications, the reliability constraints may demand the usage of licensed spectrum [163]. The reason lies in random channel access, due to collisions. Nonetheless, the demand for IoT devices grows tremendously [164] and for many of applications, such as sensing, unlicensed spectrum is still considered a suitable choice [165].

Many whitepapers related to the deployment of LoRa are presented in [166], [167]. These whitepapers include real-world deployment applications across a broad variety of topics, such as establishing sensor networks for water, gas, and parking occupancy monitoring. A notable example of utilizing unlicensed spectrum technologies for IoT is in agriculture [168]. Key scenarios include the transmission of sensor information, such as temperature, sunshine intensity, soil moisture, and water levels. LoRa has also been used to establish remote control of irrigation systems. More specifically, the work in [169] describes the practical deployment of an IoT network in southwestern Romania. This deployment covers approximately 25,000 hectares of land with altitudes varying from 35 to 151 meters. Twenty-five stations were deployed to collect information about eleven parameters. Beyond transmission, LoRa-based technology provides geolocation capability as noted in whitepaper [170]. Technology provides up to 20-meter accuracy using time of arrival technology and up to 1-kilometer accuracy when based on received signal

strength indicators.

Another successful adoption of unlicensed spectrum is wildlife monitoring based on the Sigfox network. To study the ecology and behavior of wildlife, the authors of [171] established a network to collect telemetry data from sensors attached to animals, including global positioning, accelerometer, thermometer, and barometer data. They achieved a maximum line-of-sight communication distance of 280 km, with an average transmission success rate of around 68 percents for flying species and 54 percent for terrestrial species. The location accuracy based on received signal strength indicators is approximately 12 km. Another application of Sigfox is to establish connectivity for fire and smoke sensors, which could potentially be installed in every home [172].

Despite the success of the LPWAN technologies, their capabilities of supporting massive connectivity are limited, as we discussed in coexistence section. Thus for the massive, reliable connectivity, the 5G is the only available option. The work [163] covers the main aspects of reliable communications for IoT such as URLLC and eMBB in NR. Additionally it provides requirements for different applications. As an example, latency requirements may vary from less than 1 ms to 100 ms, reliability which is defined as error probability [173] from 10^{-9} to 10^{-2} , throughput up to 300 Mbps and cellular density from $10 \frac{Gbps}{km^2}$ to $1000 \frac{Gbps}{km^2}$.

However, 5G currently faces challenges in adequately supporting massive IoT due to limitations in data rate, latency, power consumption, and the ability to support only one of URLLC or eMBB at a time. Other challenges include insufficient connection capacity and the relatively small physical coverage of 5G cells. In light of these challenges, the authors of [174] expressed skepticism about 5G's ability to support massive IoT deployments, leading them to outline 6G requirements to enable such technology. However, as we think, the advent of tinyML [175] and the consequent shift towards Artificial Internet of Things (AIoT) [176] may alter this scenario. AIoT, focusing on edge-based inference, reduces network data traffic by transmitting inference results rather than raw data, potentially increasing the amount of connected devices. This shift raises the possibility that 5G's or even LoRa or Sigfox capabilities might suffice for massive AIoT scenario, a hypothesis necessitating further research.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we delve into the complex dimensions of unlicensed sub-8 GHz spectrum technologies, focusing on their frequency spectrum regulations, technological perspectives, co-

existence management strategies, and various applications. We offer an overview of unlicensed spectrum regulations globally, including ISM bands, TVWS, CBRs, and U-NII bands. The regulatory landscape for the sub-5 GHz bands varies worldwide, showing a trend towards harmonization, especially in the 6 GHz band. Restrictions in the lower frequency range primarily concern transmit power, whereas spectrum access becomes more crucial at higher frequencies. We introduced and discussed mechanisms to manage these issues. We briefly discussed the database-based coexistence in the corresponding frequency ranges.

Our review of technology covers a range of unlicensed spectrum technologies, from low-rate solutions suitable for the IoT, through TVWS-based technologies for various applications, to high-throughput options in the 5 and 6 GHz unlicensed bands. We explore the vital issue of coexistence among these technologies, underscoring the necessity for specific coexistence strategies for particular groups, such as LPWAN technologies in IoT scenarios. High-throughput technologies like LTE, NR, and Wi-Fi require robust coexistence mechanisms. Although current strategies utilize various spectrum access protocols, future research should focus on more advanced interference mitigation techniques, such as smart beamforming.

Lastly, we discuss the extensive application potential of unlicensed technologies, highlighting the increasing relevance of private networks, FWA, enhancing the throughput of licensed technologies, and IoT applications.

REFERENCES

- [1] *38.101-1 NR; User Equipment (UE) radio transmission and reception; Part 1: Range 1 Standalone 2018*. Jan. 2018.
- [2] Federal Communications Commission, “FCC Chapter 1, Subchapter A, Part 15, Subpart H — White Space Devices.” Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [3] Info-communications Media Development Authority, “Television White Space Devices: IMDA TS WSD,” tech. rep., 10 Pasir Panjang Road, #10-01 Mapletree Business City, Singapore 117438, October 2016. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [4] International Telecommunication Union, “Recommendation ITU-R P.676-13: Attenuation by Atmospheric Gases and Related Effects,” tech. rep., August 2022. Radiowave propagation.
- [5] M. Oliver and S. Majumder, “Motivation for TV white space: An explorative study on Africa for achieving the rural broadband gap,” 2nd Europe - Middle East - North African Regional Conference of the International Telecommunications Society (ITS): “Leveraging Technologies For Growth”, Aswan, Egypt, 18th-21st February, 2019, (Calgary), International Telecommunications Society (ITS), 2019.
- [6] W. C. Stone, “Nist construction automation program report no. 3: Electromagnetic signal attenuation in construction materials,” tech. rep., National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), October 1997. Tech. rep.
- [7] M. Matracia, N. Saeed, M. A. Kishk, and M.-S. Alouini, “Post-disaster communications: Enabling technologies, architectures, and open challenges,” *IEEE Open Journal of the Communications Society*, vol. 3, pp. 1177–1205, 2022.
- [8] “Disaster safety services.” Innonet, 2023. Accessed: 2024-10-16.

- [9] WiFROST, “WiFROST LT100E Datasheet,” 2023. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [10] W. Zhang, J. Yang, G. Zhang, L. Yang, and C. Kiat Yeo, “Tv white space and its applications in future wireless networks and communications: a survey,” *IET Communications*, vol. 12, no. 20, pp. 2521–2532, 2018.
- [11] Federal Communications Commission, “Initial evaluation of the performance of prototype TV-band white space devices,” tech. rep., Technical Research Branch, Laboratory Division, Office of Engineering and Technology, July 2007. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [12] Federal Communications Commission, “Evaluation of the Performance of Prototype TV-Band White Space Devices: Phase II,” tech. rep., Technical Research Branch, Laboratory Division, Office of Engineering and Technology, October 2008. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [13] Federal Communications Commission, “FCC second report and order and memorandum opinion and order,” November 2008. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [14] Federal Communications Commission, “FCC second memorandum opinion and order,” September 2010. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [15] S. W. Oh, Y. Ma, M.-H. Tao, and E. C. Y. Peh, “An overview and comparison of tv white space regulations worldwide,” in *International Conference on Frontiers of Communications, Networks and Applications (ICFCNA 2014 - Malaysia)*, pp. 1–6, 2014.
- [16] Federal Communications Commission, “Unlicensed White Space Device Operations in the Television Bands,” May 2023. Federal Register, 47 CFR Parts 15, [ET Docket Nos. 20-36 and 14-165; FCC 23-24; FRS 139311].
- [17] Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada, “White space policies: Technical and operational requirements.” Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [18] Independent Communications Authority of South Africa (ICASA), “Regulations on the use of television white spaces,” 2018. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [19] Ofcom, “Implementing tv white spaces: Statement,” February 2015. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [20] P.-J. Muller, “Ofcom UK has today given notice that the tv white space device (wsd) authorisation framework is no longer available,” 2024. Accessed: 2024-09-26.
- [21] Telecompaper, “Ofcom removes tv white space device authorisation framework,” *Telecompaper*, 2024. Accessed: 2024-09-26.
- [22] Federal Communications Commission, “Fcc white space database administration.” Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [23] European Conference of Postal and Telecommunications Administrations, “Ecc report 236: Guidance for national implementation of a regulatory framework for tv wsd using geo-location databases,” tech. rep., May 2015. Approved: May 2015. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [24] European Telecommunications Standards Institute, “ETSI EN 301 598 V1.1.1: White Space Devices; Wireless Access Systems Operating in the 470 MHz to 790 MHz TV Broadcast Band; Harmonized EN Covering the Essential Requirements of Article 3.2 of the Directive,” April 2014. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [25] Red Technologies, “Channel search,” 2024. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [26] V. Chen, S. Das, L. Zhu, J. Malyar, and P. McCann, “Protocol to Access White-Space (PAWS) Databases,” December 2018. RFC 7545, Internet Engineering Task Force.
- [27] S. Ghosh, G. Naik, A. Kumar, and A. Karandikar, “OpenPAWS: An open source PAWS and UHF TV White Space database implementation for India,” in *2015 Twenty First National Conference on Communications (NCC)*, pp. 1–6, 2015.
- [28] K. H. Anabi, R. Nordin, and N. F. Abdullah, “Database-assisted television white space technology: Challenges, trends and future research directions,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 4, pp. 8162–8183, 2016.

- [29] C. Cordeiro, K. Challapali, D. Birru, and S. Shankar, "Ieee 802.22: the first worldwide wireless standard based on cognitive radios," in *First IEEE International Symposium on New Frontiers in Dynamic Spectrum Access Networks, 2005. DySPAN 2005.*, pp. 328–337, 2005.
- [30] A. N. Mody and G. Chouinard, "Ieee p802.22 wireless rans," tech. rep., BAE Systems and Communications Research Center, Canada, P. O. Box 868, MER 15-2350, Nashua, NH 03061.
- [31] IEEE, "Iso/iec/ieee 8802-22-2021: Telecommunications and information exchange between systems—wireless regional area networks (wran)—specific requirements—part 22: Cognitive wireless ran medium access control (mac) and physical layer (phy) specifications: Policies and procedures for operation in the bands that allow spectrum sharing," June 2021. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [32] K. Ishizu, K. Mizutani, T. Matsumura, Z. Lan, and H. Harada, "Ieee 802.11af wi-fi in tv white space," in *Handbook of Cognitive Radio*, pp. 1509–1535, Springer Singapore, 2019.
- [33] B. Bellalta, L. Bononi, R. Bruno, and A. Kassler, "Next generation ieee 802.11 wireless local area networks: Current status, future directions and open challenges," *Computer Communications*, vol. 75, pp. 1–25, 2016.
- [34] D. S. George and S. N. Rao, "Enabling rural connectivity:long range wi-fi versus super wi-fi," in *2017 IEEE International Conference on Computational Intelligence and Computing Research (ICIC)*, pp. 1–4, 2017.
- [35] Dynamic Spectrum Alliance, "Dynamic spectrum alliance." Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [36] Microsoft, "Microsoft airband initiative." Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [37] M. Rahman and A. Saifullah, "A comprehensive survey on networking over tv white spaces," *Pervasive and Mobile Computing*, vol. 59, p. 101072, 2019.
- [38] J. D. Alejandrino, R. S. Concepcion, S. C. Laugico, E. T. Trinidad, and E. P. Dadios, "Feasibility of television white space spectrum technologies for wide range wireless sensor network: A survey," in *2019 IEEE 11th International Conference on Humanoid, Nanotechnology, Information Technology, Communication and Control, Environment, and Management (HNICEM)*, pp. 1–6, 2019.
- [39] M. Z. Islam, J. F. O'Hara, D. Shadoan, M. Ibrahim, and S. Ekin, "Tv white space based wireless broadband internet connectivity: A case study with implementation details and performance analysis," *IEEE Open Journal of the Communications Society*, vol. 2, pp. 2449–2462, 2021.
- [40] F. Liu, J. Pan, X. Zhou, and G. Y. Li, "Atmospheric ducting effect in wireless communications: Challenges and opportunities," *Journal of Communications and Information Networks*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 101–109, 2021.
- [41] A. Constantinides, S. Najat, and H. Haralambous, "Atmospheric ducting interference on dab, dab+ radio in eastern mediterranean," *Electronics*, vol. 11, no. 24, 2022.
- [42] *SM.1056 : Limitation of radiation from industrial, scientific and medical (ISM) equipment.* Apr. 2007.
- [43] "ITU workshop on short range devices and ultra wide band," 2014.
- [44] "3GPP workshop lte in unlicensed spectrum," 2014.
- [45] "3GPP TSG RAN meeting 86. RP-201834 Sitges," 2019.
- [46] "3rd generation partnership project; technical specification group services and system aspects; release 16 description; summary of rel-16 work items (release 16)," 2020.
- [47] GSA, "LTE in Unlicensed and Shared Spectrum: Trials, Deployments and Devices," January 2019. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [48] "ITU radio regulations, edition of 2020: Volume 1: Articles," 2020.
- [49] "ETSI EN 300 220-1 v2.4.1 electromagnetic compatibility and radio spectrum matters (erm); short range devices (srd); radio equipment to be used in the 25 mhz to 1 000 mhz frequency range with power levels ranging up to 500 mw; part 1: Technical characteristics and test methods," 2020.

- [50] “Title 47: Telecommunication, part 15: Radio frequency devices, section 15.247: Operation within the bands 902-928 mhz, 2400-2483.5 mhz, and 5725-5850 mhz,” 2024. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [51] IEEE, “Ieee std 802.11-2020: Standard for information technology—telecommunications and information exchange between systems—local and metropolitan area networks—specific requirements—part 11,” 2020. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [52] Globalstar, “Globalstar licensed 2.4 ghz technical review,” tech. rep., January 2017. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [53] P. Agarwal, M. Manekiya, T. Ahmad, A. Yadav, A. Kumar, M. Donelli, and S. T. Mishra, “A Survey on Citizens Broadband Radio Service (CBRS),” *Electronics*, vol. 11, p. 3985, 12 2022.
- [54] Federal Communications Commission, “Part 96—Citizens Broadband Radio Service.” Authority: 47 U.S.C. 154(i), 303, and 307. Source: 80 FR 36222, June 23, 2015, unless otherwise noted. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [55] WIA Innovation & Technology Council, “The cbrr opportunity: New spectrum, stakeholders, networks and devices,” tech. rep., March 2020. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [56] Tarana Wireless, “Tarana wireless solutions.” Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [57] Hospitality Technology Next Generation, “Citizen’s Broadband Radio Service (CBRS) White Paper,” tech. rep., September 2018. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [58] V. Sathya, L. Zhang, M. Goyal, and M. Yavuz, “Warehouse Deployment: A Comparative Measurement Study of Commercial Wi-Fi and CBRS Systems,” in *2023 International Conference on Computing, Networking and Communications (ICNC)*, pp. 242–248, 2023.
- [59] Wireless Innovation Forum, “Wireless innovation forum.” Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [60] ON.GO Alliance, “On.go alliance.” Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [61] Wireless Innovation Forum, “CBRS Ecosystem Infographic,” 2024. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [62] Federal Communications Commission, “Part 15 subpart e u-nii 6 ghz: General guidance bands 5, 6, 7, 8,” 2024. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [63] Federal Communications Commission, “Fcc 15.407: General technical requirements.” Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [64] European Telecommunications Standards Institute, “ETSI EN 301 893 V2.1.1: 5 GHz RLAN; Harmonised Standard Covering the Essential Requirements of Article 3.2 of Directive 2014/53/EU,” May 2017. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [65] European Telecommunications Standards Institute, “Etsi ts 138 104 v17.5.0: 5g; nr; base station (bs) radio transmission and reception (3gpp ts 38.104 version 17.5.0 release 17),” April 2022. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [66] 3rd Generation Partnership Project, “Tr 21.918 v1.1.0: 3rd generation partnership project; technical specification group services and system aspects; release 18 description; summary of rel-18 work items,” tech. rep., August 2024. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [67] 3GPP, “Study on nr-based access to unlicensed spectrum,” Technical Report 38.889. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [68] Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications, “Japan frequency allocation table.” Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [69] Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications, “Japan annex 8.5.” Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [70] European Conference of Postal and Telecommunications Administrations (CEPT), “European frequency allocation table,” 2023. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [71] Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada, “Rss-247: Digital transmission systems (dtss), frequency hopping systems (fhss) and licence-exempt local area network (le-lan) devices,” August 2023. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [72] Wi-Fi Alliance, “Countries enabling wi-fi in 6 ghz: Wi-fi 6e,” 2024. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [73] Federal Communications Commission, “Fcc adopts new rules for the 6 ghz band, unleashing 1,200 megahertz of spectrum for unlicensed use,” April 2020. Accessed: 2024-09-23.

- [74] Federal Communications Commission, “Unlicensed use of the 6 ghz band: Expanding flexible use in mid-band spectrum between 3.7 and 24 ghz,” April 2020. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [75] Communications and Information Technology Commission (CITC), “Citc performed the globally first live demo of the afc system to enable wi-fi 6e technology,” August 2022. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [76] Ofcom, “A framework for spectrum sharing,” July 2015. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [77] M. Calabrese, “Dynamic Spectrum Alliance solving the spectrum crunch: Dynamic spectrum management system,” 2023. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [78] CST, “Future paradigms for spectrum sharing: Towards a common framework for advanced spectrum management,” 2024. Accessed: 2024-09-29.
- [79] B. Foubert and N. Mitton, “Long-range wireless radio technologies: A survey,” *Future Internet*, vol. 12, p. 13, 1 2020.
- [80] “Lpwan technologies for iot and m2m applications,” 2020.
- [81] Statista, “Lpwa market share by technology.” Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [82] N. S. Chilamkurthy, O. J. Pandey, A. Ghosh, L. R. Cenkeramaddi, and H.-N. Dai, “Low-power wide-area networks: A broad overview of its different aspects,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 10, pp. 81926–81959, 2022.
- [83] Bluetooth Special Interest Group, “Core specification.” Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [84] Bluetooth Special Interest Group, “Bluetooth special interest group.” Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [85] Connectivity Standards Alliance, “Zigbee standard specifications download request.” Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [86] S. J. Danbatta and A. Varol, “Comparison of Zigbee, Z-Wave, Wi-Fi, and Bluetooth Wireless Technologies Used in Home Automation,” in *2019 7th International Symposium on Digital Forensics and Security (ISDFS)*, pp. 1–5, 2019.
- [87] Connectivity Standards Alliance, “Connectivity standards alliance.” Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [88] International Telecommunication Union, “Y.4480: Low power protocol for wide area wireless networks,” tech. rep., November 2021. Approved: 2021-11-29. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [89] LoRa Alliance, “LoRa Alliance.” Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [90] J. Perdomo, “System and method for digital communication between computing devices,” 2015. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [91] Sigfox, “Sigfox.” Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [92] Halberdbastion, “LTE-M (Cat M1).” Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [93] GSMA, “Mobile IoT in the 5G Future - NB-IoT and LTE-M in the Context of 5G,” 2018. Accessed: 2024-10-06.
- [94] M. Lauridsen, I. Z. Kovacs, P. Mogensen, M. Sorensen, and S. Holst, “Coverage and Capacity Analysis of LTE-M and NB-IoT in a Rural Area,” in *2016 IEEE 84th Vehicular Technology Conference (VTC-Fall)*, pp. 1–5, 2016.
- [95] A. Šljivo, D. Kerkhove, L. Tian, J. Famaey, A. Munteanu, I. Moerman, J. Hoebeke, and E. De Poorter, “Performance Evaluation of IEEE 802.11ah Networks With High-Throughput Bidirectional Traffic,” *Sensors*, vol. 18, p. 325, 1 2018.
- [96] Wi-Fi Alliance, “Wi-Fi CERTIFIED HaLow™ Technology Overview,” 2021. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [97] “Internet of Things: LPWAN Overview and Strategic Perspective,” tech. rep., February 2021. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [98] E. Khorov, A. Kiryanov, A. Lyakhov, and G. Bianchi, “A tutorial on ieee 802.11ax high efficiency wlans,” *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 197–216, 2019.
- [99] Wi-Fi Alliance, “Wi-fi certified 7™ technology overview,” 2024. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [100] R. Karmakar, S. Chattopadhyay, and S. Chakraborty, “Impact of ieee 802.11n/ac phy/mac high throughput enhancements on transport and application protocols—a survey,” *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 2050–2091, 2017.
- [101] C. P. Kohlios and T. Hayajneh, “A comprehensive attack flow model and security analysis for wi-fi and wpa3,” *Electronics*, vol. 7, p. 284, 10 2018.

- [102] A. Halbouni, L.-Y. Ong, and M.-C. Leow, "Wireless security protocols wpa3: A systematic literature review," *IEEE Access*, vol. 11, pp. 112438–112450, 2023.
- [103] E. Mozaffariahrar, F. Theoleyre, and M. Menth, "A survey of wi-fi 6: Technologies, advances, and challenges," *Future Internet*, vol. 14, p. 293, 10 2022.
- [104] R. Liu and N. Choi, "A first look at wi-fi 6 in action: Throughput, latency, energy efficiency, and security," *Proceedings of the ACM on Measurement and Analysis of Computing Systems*, vol. 7, pp. 1–25, 2 2023.
- [105] "Rohde & schwarz: Wi-fi 7 technology introduction." White Paper, 2023. Accessed: 2024-10-02.
- [106] M. Carrascosa-Zamacois, G. Geraci, E. Knightly, and B. Bellalta, "Wi-fi multi-link operation: An experimental study of latency and throughput," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, vol. 32, pp. 308–322, 2 2024.
- [107] C. Zhang, S. Dang, M.-S. Alouini, and B. Shihada, "Big communications: Connect the unconnected," *Frontiers in Communications and Networks*, vol. 3, 2 2022.
- [108] Intel, "Unlicensed lte: Enhancing mobile connectivity," tech. rep. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [109] M. Labib, V. Marojevic, J. H. Reed, and A. I. Zaghoul, "Extending lte into the unlicensed spectrum: Technical analysis of the proposed variants," *IEEE Communications Standards Magazine*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 31–39, 2017.
- [110] B. Bojović, L. Giupponi, Z. Ali, and M. Miozzo, "Evaluating unlicensed lte technologies: Laa vs lte-u," *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 89714–89751, 2019.
- [111] J. Zhang, M. Wang, M. Hua, T. Xia, W. Yang, and X. You, "Lte on license-exempt spectrum," *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 647–673, 2018.
- [112] 5G Americas, "Wireless technology evolution: Transition from 4g to 5g 3gpp releases 14 to 16," tech. rep., October 2018. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [113] ETSI, "Digital cellular telecommunications system (phase 2+) (gsm); universal mobile telecommunications system (umts); lte; 5g; release description; release 15," Tech. Rep. ETSI TR 121 915 V15.0.0, 2018. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [114] C. Rosa, M. Kuusela, F. Frederiksen, and K. I. Pedersen, "Standalone lte in unlicensed spectrum: Radio challenges, solutions, and performance of multefire," *IEEE Communications Magazine*, vol. 56, no. 10, pp. 170–177, 2018.
- [115] Qualcomm Technologies, Inc., "Multefire technology progress and benefits, and how it enables a new breed of neutral hosts," tech. rep., May 2016. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [116] H.-L. Määttänen, G. Masini, M. Bergström, A. Ratilainen, and T. Dudda, "Lte-wlan aggregation (lwa) in 3gpp release 13 and release 14," in *2017 IEEE Conference on Standards for Communications and Networking (CSCN)*, pp. 220–226, 2017.
- [117] M. Wen, Q. Li, K. J. Kim, D. López-Pérez, O. A. Dobre, H. V. Poor, P. Popovski, and T. A. Tsiftsis, "Private 5g networks: Concepts, architectures, and research landscape," *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 7–25, 2022.
- [118] Intel, "Lte-wlan aggregation (lwa): Benefits and deployment considerations," tech. rep. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [119] A. Dogra, R. K. Jha, and S. Jain, "A survey on beyond 5g network with the advent of 6g: Architecture and emerging technologies," *IEEE Access*, vol. 9, pp. 67512–67547, 2021.
- [120] S. Parkvall, Y. Blankenship, R. Blasco, E. Dahlman, G. Fodor, S. Grant, E. Stare, and M. Stattin, "5g nr release 16: Start of the 5g evolution," *IEEE Communications Standards Magazine*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 56–63, 2020.
- [121] 3GPP, "Cross link interference (cli) handling and remote interference management (rim) for nr," Technical Report 38.828. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [122] G. Pocovi, R. Abreu, P. Andres, M. Deghel, K. Hugl, T. Jacobsen, K. Jayasinghe, P. Kela, J. Korhonen, P.-H. Kuo, L. Kuru, Z. Li, T. Lunttila, E. Peralta-Calvo, C. Rosa, and T. Tao, "Further enhanced urllic and industrial iot support with release-17 5g new radio," *IEEE Communications Standards Magazine*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 12–19, 2023.

- [123] T.-K. Le, U. Salim, and F. Kaltenberger, "An overview of physical layer design for ultra-reliable low-latency communications in 3gpp releases 15, 16, and 17," *IEEE Access*, vol. 9, pp. 433–444, 2021.
- [124] 3GPP, "Views on sl positioning over unlicensed spectrum in r18," 2022. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [125] X. Lin, "An overview of 5g advanced evolution in 3gpp release 18," *IEEE Communications Standards Magazine*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 77–83, 2022.
- [126] ETSI, "5g; nr; nr and ng-ran overall description; stage-2," Tech. Rep. ETSI TS 138 300 V16.2.0, 2023. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [127] M. Hirzallah, M. Krunz, B. Kecicioglu, and B. Hamzeh, "5g new radio unlicensed: Challenges and evaluation," *IEEE Transactions on Cognitive Communications and Networking*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 689–701, 2021.
- [128] L. Polak, F. Paul, M. Simka, R. Zedka, J. Kufa, and R. Sotner, "On the interference between lora and bluetooth in the 2.4 ghz unlicensed band," in *2022 32nd International Conference Radioelektronika (RADIOELEKTRONIKA)*, pp. 1–4, 2022.
- [129] H. Jiang, B. Liu, and C. W. Chen, "Performance analysis for zigbee under wifi interference in smart home," in *2017 IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC)*, pp. 1–6, 2017.
- [130] S. He, B. Zhang, J. Luo, and M. Qu, "Research on coexistence and mutual interference of wi-fi and bluetooth," in *2021 International Conference on Microwave and Millimeter Wave Technology (ICMMT)*, pp. 1–3, 2021.
- [131] L. Polak and J. Milos, "Performance analysis of lora in the 2.4 ghz ism band: coexistence issues with wi-fi," *Telecommunication Systems*, vol. 74, pp. 299–309, 3 2020.
- [132] L. Krupka, L. Vojtech, and M. Neruda, "The issue of lpwan technology coexistence in iot environment," in *2016 17th International Conference on Mechatronics - Mechatronika (ME)*, pp. 1–8, 2016.
- [133] N. Naik, "Lpwan technologies for iot systems: Choice between ultra narrow band and spread spectrum," in *2018 IEEE International Systems Engineering Symposium (ISSE)*, pp. 1–8, 2018.
- [134] B. Ghena, J. Adkins, L. Shangguan, K. Jamieson, P. Levis, and P. Dutta, "Challenge: Unlicensed lpwans are not yet the path to ubiquitous connectivity," *MobiCom '19: The 25th Annual International Conference on Mobile Computing and Networking*, ACM, 10 2019.
- [135] E. De Poorter, J. Hoebeke, M. Strobbe, I. Moerman, S. Latré, M. Weyn, B. Lannoo, and J. Famaey, "Sub-ghz lpwan network coexistence, management and virtualization: An overview and open research challenges," *Wireless Personal Communications*, vol. 95, pp. 187–213, 6 2017.
- [136] R. K. Saha, "Coexistence of cellular and ieee 802.11 technologies in unlicensed spectrum bands -a survey," *IEEE Open Journal of the Communications Society*, vol. 2, pp. 1996–2028, 2021.
- [137] 3GPP, "Status report to tsg: Study on licensed-assisted access to unlicensed spectrum," March 2015. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [138] 3GPP, "3gpp ts 37.213: Physical layer procedures for shared spectrum channel access (release 16)," tech. rep., July 2020. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [139] N. Rastegardoost, "The unlicensed journey." Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [140] A. U. Rahman, M. A. Kishk, and M.-S. Alouini, "A game-theoretic framework for coexistence of wifi and cellular networks in the 6-ghz unlicensed spectrum," *IEEE Transactions on Cognitive Communications and Networking*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 239–251, 2023.
- [141] I. Diógenes do Rego, J. M. de Castro Neto, S. F. G. Neto, P. M. de Santana, V. A. de Sousa, Jr., D. Vieira, and A. Venâncio Neto, "A multiarmed bandit approach for lte-u/wi-fi coexistence in a multicell scenario," *Sensors*, vol. 23, p. 6718, 7 2023.

- [142] N. Rastegardoost and B. Jabbari, "Statistical characterization of wifi white space," *IEEE Communications Letters*, vol. 21, no. 12, pp. 2674–2677, 2017.
- [143] S. M. Kala, V. Sathya, K. Dahiya, T. Higashino, and H. Yamaguchi, "Optimizing unlicensed coexistence network performance through data learning," *ArXiv*, vol. abs/2111.07583, 2021.
- [144] G. Mishra, H. K. Rath, S. Nadaf, R. Mukhopadhyay, and M. Menon, "A reinforcement learning approach to improve wifi network performance coexisting with lte," in *2024 IEEE 13th International Conference on Communication Systems and Network Technologies (CSNT)*, pp. 12–17, 2024.
- [145] Y. Liu, H. Zhou, Y. Deng, and A. N. Allanathan, "DRL-based Channel Access in NR Unlicensed Spectrum for Downlink URLLC," in *GLOBECOM 2022 - 2022 IEEE Global Communications Conference*, pp. 591–596, 2022.
- [146] J. Wszolek, S. Ludyga, W. Anzel, and S. Szott, "Revisiting lte laa: Channel access, qos, and coexistence with wifi," *IEEE Communications Magazine*, vol. 59, no. 2, pp. 91–97, 2021.
- [147] M. Mehrnoush, V. Sathya, S. Roy, and M. Ghosh, "Analytical modeling of wi-fi and lte-laa coexistence: Throughput and impact of energy detection threshold," *IEEE/ACM Trans. Netw.*, vol. 26, p. 1990–2003, Aug. 2018.
- [148] Y. Huang, Y. Chen, Y. T. Hou, W. Lou, and J. H. Reed, "Recent advances of lte/wifi coexistence in unlicensed spectrum," *IEEE Network*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 107–113, 2018.
- [149] V. Sathya, M. Mehrnoush, M. Ghosh, and S. Roy, "Wi-fi/lte-u coexistence: Real-time issues and solutions," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 9221–9234, 2020.
- [150] G. Naik and J.-M. J. Park, "Coexistence of wi-fi 6e and 5g nr-u: Can we do better in the 6 ghz bands?," in *IEEE INFOCOM 2021 - IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*, pp. 1–10, 2021.
- [151] G. Naik, J.-M. Park, J. Ashdown, and W. Lehr, "Next Generation Wi-Fi and 5G NR-U in the 6 GHz Bands: Opportunities and Challenges," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 153027–153056, 2020.
- [152] D. Branlund, "Non-line of sight wireless communication system and method," 2016. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [153] B. Shang, V. Marojevic, Y. Yi, A. S. Abdalla, and L. Liu, "Spectrum sharing for uav communications: Spatial spectrum sensing and open issues," *IEEE Vehicular Technology Magazine*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 104–112, 2020.
- [154] R. Atat, L. Liu, H. Chen, J. Wu, H. Li, and Y. Yi, "Enabling cyber-physical communication in 5g cellular networks: challenges, spatial spectrum sensing, and cyber-security," *IET Cyber-Physical Systems: Theory and Applications*, vol. 2, pp. 49–54, 4 2017.
- [155] International Telecommunication Union (ITU), "Setting the scene for 5g: Opportunities & challenges," tech. rep., 2018. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [156] GSA, "Unlicensed spectrum: August 2020 – lte & 5g executive summary," 2020. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [157] International Telecommunication Union, "Time series of ict data." Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [158] GSMA Intelligence, "The 5g fwa opportunity: Disrupting the broadband market," tech. rep., 2021. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [159] GSMA, "Private 5g industrial networks: An analysis of use cases and deployment," 2023. Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [160] AT&T, "5g strategic design considerations for private cellular." Accessed: 2024-09-23.
- [161] M. Saqib and A. H. Moon, "A concise review on internet of things: Architecture, enabling technologies, challenges, and applications," *International Journal of Sensors, Wireless Communications and Control*, vol. 12, pp. 629–650, 11 2022.
- [162] M. Saqib and A. H. Moon, "A concise review on internet of things: Architecture, enabling technologies, challenges, and applications," *International Journal of Sensors, Wireless Communications and Control*, vol. 12, pp. 629–650, 11 2022.
- [163] B. S. Khan, S. Jangsher, A. Ahmed, and A. Al-Dweik, "Ullc and embb in 5g industrial iot: A survey," *IEEE Open Journal of the Communications Society*, vol. 3, pp. 1134–1163, 2022.
- [164] AIMultiple, "30 internet of things (iot) stats in 2024 from reputable sources." Accessed: 2024-09-23.

- [165] P. Asghari, A. M. Rahmani, and H. H. S. Javadi, "Internet of things applications: A systematic review," *Computer Networks*, vol. 148, pp. 241–261, 1 2019.
- [166] "Lora technology white papers." <https://www.semtech.com/lora/resources/lora-white-papers>, 2023. Accessed: 2024-10-06.
- [167] "Lora alliance white papers." <https://resources.lora-alliance.org/whitepapers>, 2023. Accessed: 2024-10-06.
- [168] L. Aldhaheri, N. Alshehhi, I. I. J. Manzil, R. A. Khalil, S. Javaid, N. Saeed, and M.-S. Alouini, "LoRa Communication for Agriculture 4.0: Opportunities, Challenges, and Future Directions," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, pp. 1–1, 2024.
- [169] A. Zarnescu, R. Ungurelu, M. Secere, G. Varzaru, and B. Mihailescu, "Implementing a large lora network for an agricultural application," in *2020 7th International Conference on Energy Efficiency and Agricultural Engineering (EE and AE)*, pp. 1–5, 2020.
- [170] "Lora alliance geolocation white paper." <https://resources.lora-alliance.org/whitepapers/lora-alliance-geolocation-whitepaper>, 2023. Accessed: 2024-10-06.
- [171] T. A. Wild, L. van Schalkwyk, P. Viljoen, G. Heine, N. Richter, B. Vorneweg, J. C. Koblitz, D. K. N. Dechmann, W. Rogers, J. Partecke, N. Linek, T. Volkmer, T. Gregersen, R. W. Havmøller, K. Morelle, A. Daim, M. Wiesner, K. Wolter, W. Fiedler, R. Kays, V. O. Ezenwa, M. Meboldt, and M. Wikelski, "A multi-species evaluation of digital wildlife monitoring using the sigfox iot network," *Animal Biotelemetry*, vol. 11, 3 2023.
- [172] Sigfox, "Home lifestyle use cases." <https://www.sigfox.com/use-cases/home-lifestyle/>, 2023. Accessed: 2024-10-06.
- [173] E. Mohyeldin, "Requirements for imt-2020." ITU-R Workshop on IMT-2020 Terrestrial Radio Interfaces, 2020. Accessed: [Insert date of access here].
- [174] F. Guo, F. R. Yu, H. Zhang, X. Li, H. Ji, and V. C. M. Leung, "Enabling massive iot toward 6g: A comprehensive survey," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 8, no. 15, pp. 11891–11915, 2021.
- [175] R. Kallimani, K. Pai, P. Raghuwanshi, S. Iyer, and O. L. A. López, "Tinyml: Tools, applications, challenges, and future research directions," *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, vol. 83, pp. 29015–29045, 9 2023.
- [176] J. Zhang and D. Tao, "Empowering things with intelligence: A survey of the progress, challenges, and opportunities in artificial intelligence of things," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 8, no. 10, pp. 7789–7817, 2021.