

Extending Internet Access Over LoRa for Internet of Things and Critical Applications

Atonu Ghosh, *Graduate Student Member, IEEE*, Devadeep Misra, and Hirdesh Mewada, *Student Member, IEEE*

Abstract—LoRa bridges the gap between remote locations and mainstream networks, enabling large-scale Internet of Things (IoT) deployments. Despite the recent advancements around LoRa, Internet access over this technology is still largely unexplored. Most existing solutions only handle packets within the local LoRa network and do not interact with web applications. This limits the scalability and the ability to deliver essential web services in disconnected regions. This work proposes and implements “ILoRa” to extend the public Internet to disconnected areas for essential service delivery. ILoRa enables accessing Application Programming Interfaces (APIs) and web pages on the Internet over a LoRa backbone network. It comprises a “ILoRa coordinator code (ICN)” and access point nodes (APNs). The ICN interfaces the LoRa network with the public Internet and interprets content. The APN tethers a WiFi hotspot to which devices connect and access the web content. This work further proposes data handling methods for ICNs and APNs. An actual hardware-based implementation validates the proposed system. The implementation achieves a throughput of 1.06kbps tested for an Internet-based API returning JSON data of 930B. Furthermore, the APN consumed approximately 0.162A current, and the resource utilization on the ICN was minimal.

Index Terms—Internet Over LoRa, Extending Public Internet Over LoRa, Web Over LoRa, Internet API Over LoRa, Narrow Band Internet, LoRa Hardware, Internet of Things (IoT)

I. INTRODUCTION

INTERNET of Things (IoT) encompasses several enablers, such as Web Technology, Cloud Computing, and Artificial Intelligence. Due to the resource-constrained nature of IoT, the services are often rendered as web services, and the heavy-lifting tasks being performed on the Cloud or at least in some powerful computing machine located at some remote location [1], [2]. While IoT and web services are proliferating, developing and underdeveloped nations’ far-off locations remain disconnected from the mainstream network [3], [4]. As a result, these regions cannot harness the potential of the technologies like Cloud Computing and web applications. In addition, they miss out on vital services and information delivered through these modern service delivery mechanisms.

Low-power and long-range technologies such as LoRa hold tremendous potential to amalgam with IoT and deliver services [5], [6]. At the same time, IoT deployments in remote regions lacking mainstream networks result in data silos. Integrating

LoRa with Internet connectivity can bridge this gap, enable seamless data exchange, and unlock advanced IoT functionalities. Such connectivity ensures prolonged network lifetimes with minimal maintenance and supports modern, Internet-driven services that are crucial for far-off locations. However, the limited bandwidth of LoRa becomes a bottleneck for delivering modern services [7], [8].

Example Scenario: This work considers a remote village as in Fig. 1 that lacks adequate Internet infrastructure and thus remains disconnected from the nearest mainstream network. As a result, the local community misses out on vital announcements or services often disseminated through Internet forums or web applications. Thus, there is a pressing need for extending Internet services to these locations. Integrating LoRa-based IoT systems with Internet access can help bridge this gap and enable critical service delivery with low maintenance requirements.




Fig. 1. ILoRa example scenario network deployment highlighting the roles of APNs and ICN

A. Motivation

LoRa has drawn considerable attention within the research community in recent years because of its high potential in modern IoT deployments. Low power consumption, long-range, scalability, and cost-effective capabilities make it suitable for deploying solutions in disconnected and resource-constrained locations. Existing studies on LoRa explore its application in smart city infrastructure, remote environment monitoring, precision agriculture, connected healthcare, real-time disaster response, and asset tracking systems, leading to the rapid deployment of LoRaWAN networks worldwide [9]–[14]. There is a growing interest in utilizing LoRa/LoRaWAN to provide connectivity for large-scale IoT deployments. Numerous works have contributed to this end. However, the works in the literature lack in the following major areas -

Atonu Ghosh is with the Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology Kharagpur, Kharagpur 721302, India (e-mail: atonughosh@outlook.com)

Devadeep Misra is with D.A.V. Model School, Indian Institute of Technology, Kharagpur 721302, India (e-mail: devadeepm@gmail.com)

Hirdesh Mewada is with the Department of Computer Science and Engineering, IES University, Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh 462044, India (e-mail: hirdeshhada200@gmail.com)

- Current research only connects the IoT deployments to the nearest LoRaWAN server.
- The public Internet resources and the public cloud services remain inaccessible over LoRa, restricting their utility for modern, Internet-driven applications.

Motivated by these to address the lacunae, this work proposes ILoRa to extend the public Internet to the disconnected regions albeit the simplified version of the web applications.

B. Contribution

Addressing the requirements of community networks, ILoRa plays a crucial role in extending the public Internet over a LoRa channel to deliver essential services in remote areas. The proposed system is specifically designed to meet the demands of interconnected devices and applications in various IoT environments and to provide access to essential web applications.

The specific contributions of this work are enumerated below:

- 1) *Public Internet over LoRa*: ILoRa enables accessing APIs and websites from the Internet over a LoRa backhaul network. It extends the Internet to regions previously limited to local servers and thus enables access to essential web-based services.
- 2) *Hardware Implementation*: A practical hardware solution comprising a coordinator device (ICN) and APN is developed. The APN tethers a hotspot to which user devices connect to access the Internet without any modification to the user device.
- 3) *Packet handling mechanism*: The multimedia-based web pages requested by the user over the LoRa channel are simplified and chunked to match the LoRa hardware limitations. Furthermore, the packets are then transmitted to the requesting user device.
- 4) *Real-world validation*: In-depth results and observations gathered through practical hardware deployment are methodically explored and discussed.

II. RELATED WORKS

Many studies have examined LoRa with IoT. We specifically focus on selected areas close to this work's goal.

A. Interfacing LoRa with Other Wireless Technologies

LoRa's IoT potential was quickly recognized by researchers. Thus, many researchers have contributed in this direction. The explosion of IoT devices caused LoRa's low bandwidth to emerge as a concern. Researchers have tried integrating LoRa with WiFi, Zigbee, Bluetooth, and other wireless technologies. In [15], authors proposed an edge-based healthcare IoT system. It improved coverage, latency, and reliability by combining BLE and LoRa. Solar-powered routers and an IoT gateway processed, stored, and secured data. They tested the proposed system in smart hospitals, remote healthcare, and safety monitoring using Lora and achieved 2.4 km BLE coverage. In [16], authors suggested a framework for communication between WiFi and LoRa. The proposed technique did not

require multi-radio gateways. They used OFDM modulation to convert WiFi signals to LoRa-compatible waveforms. This led to energy-efficient communication with over 96% frame reception rate at distances up to 500 m. A similar work [17] suggested using IEEE 802.11ax to communicate from WiFi to LoRa. Researchers used 802.11ax Resource Units (RUs) to replicate LoRa chirps. The system also addressed cyclic prefix problems, sub-frame header artifacts, and channel dynamics via mode flipping, header mapping, and adaptive parameter optimization. They achieved 40 kbps throughput. In a similar work [18], authors suggested "LoFi" to detect weak signals and allow 2.4GHz LoRa and WiFi to coexist in high-interference settings. It boosted weak LoRa signals by changing modulated frequencies and filtering them for SR-based detection. The evaluation showed a 63% increase in LoRa detection accuracy.

B. LoRa in Emergency and Essential Services

Remote and infrastructure-less locations use LoRa for crucial service delivery. Hence, this field has been thoroughly studied. Authors in [20] proposed a novel system that combined UAVs mounted Mobile Edge Computing (MEC) with LoRaWAN for disaster-struck areas. They aimed to design a low-cost, rapidly deployable network for emergency communication and data management. The authors proposed a three-layered architecture comprising the "User Tier", "Service Tier" and "Control Tier". The "Control Tier" consisted of the control servers and the LoRaWAN concentrators. A Markov Chain-based model was applied to manage task allocation and queue handling. Their simulation demonstrated promising results in terms of energy consumption, service time, and channel capacity. In [19], authors presented "Titan DMS," a LoRa-based search and rescue system. It integrated communication, coordination, and navigation solutions. The coordination solution was based on robot platoon configuration and aided the rescue team in setting up a base station. Field tests demonstrated high performance, with the robots communicating and navigating effectively in disaster-stricken environments. Another study [21] suggested a LoRa-based system for search and rescue in the mountains. They developed path-loss models for body-worn LoRa devices in adverse environments. The system located victims using path-loss-based localization. Their experiment showed remarkable localization accuracy and performance even for avalanche-buried casualties. The testing results show LoRa's promise for search and rescue with increased coverage, power efficiency, and precision. In [22], researchers developed a GPS-less localization method for emergencies. It estimated positions using RSSI-based trilateration. The system was built using "Dragino LoRa shields" and "Arduino controller". The results indicate a 9-20-meter location error with little energy usage compared to GPS. In [23], researchers proposed "LoRaMoto," promoting safety awareness among citizens after earthquakes. The device helped civilians and emergency responders communicate. It implemented multi-hop packet forwarding to ensure communication during infrastructure failure. "LoRaMoto" employed low-cost LoRa devices for message transmission and implemented an

TABLE I
COMPARISON OF THIS WORK WITH RELATED WORKS

Works	Public Internet Over LoRa	Multi-Hop Solution	Real-Time Data Processing	Integration with IoT	Scalability	Energy Efficiency
Chen et al. [18]	X	X	X	X	✓	✓
Manuel et al. [19]	X	✓	✓	✓	X	X
Gao et al. [16]	X	✓	X	✓	X	✓
Wu et al. [15]	X	X	✓	✓	✓	✓
Zheng et al. [17]	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
This Work	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

acknowledgment system to enhance network efficiency. It featured bidirectional communication and let civilians report and receive announcements. Finally, in [24], authors proposed a UAV-based emergency environment monitoring system. A LoRa mesh network collected data quickly in disaster-stricken areas lacking infrastructure. The UAV carried relay nodes (RNs) to extend coverage of sensor nodes and gateway. It routed using a bespoke ALOHA protocol GPS-assisted directed flooding. The line-of-sight range exceeded 10 km by employing the proposed technology.

C. Service Extension by LoRa

LoRa can expand services beyond standard communication infrastructure. In [25], researchers proposed "LoRaX" to provide Internet services to underserved areas using LoRa technology. "LoRaX" uses an initiate-then-update (ITU) paradigm to enable partial data transactions via LoRa using a low-bandwidth, long-range LoRa network and a high-bandwidth, geographically limited network. Requests were fulfilled only with high-bandwidth connectivity. LoRa is used for low-power message origination, and proxies manage complex transactions using Internet-based APIs. In [26], the authors suggested a LoRa-based system to improve messaging platforms in disconnected areas. The suggested system allows SMS-like text message sending and receiving using a web interface. The LoRa network also integrated "Telegram" communications. They used LoPy2 devices and achieved satisfactory results. Successful transfer time was proportional to message size. The experiment contained 14 simultaneous users. Authors in [27] integrated voice messaging functionality aimed at illiterate individuals in rural and remote areas. Users could record a 50-second voice message, which was compressed into MP3 and sent over LoRa. The system exchanged messages over MQTT. Experimental findings revealed significant performance over distances up to 6 km, with 100 kB messages transferred in 7.5 minutes.

Synthesis: The reviewed studies underscore LoRa's versatility in addressing IoT and communication challenges, particularly in low-power, long-range, and infrastructure-limited environments. Advancements in integrating LoRa with other wireless technologies have enhanced its use in emergency services and service delivery in disconnected regions. However, significant limitations persist, including application-specific solutions, complex configurations, bandwidth constraints, and slow transfer rates, which hinder real-time and high-volume data applications. Moreover, many studies lack detailed implementation insights and robust experimental results. The need for universal, user-centered, and scalable solutions leveraging




Fig. 2. Communication Flow between LoRa Nodes and User's Smartphone

LoRa's strengths while addressing its limitations remains critical, particularly for seamless Internet access and integration with existing infrastructure. Although some efforts have explored Internet-based services via LoRa, comprehensive methodologies for achieving seamless connectivity are scarce. This study addresses these gaps in the literature.

III. SYSTEM DESCRIPTION

Users connect their WiFi-enabled devices to the WiFi hotspot tethered by the APN as in Fig. 2. Furthermore, several APNs may connect to one or more gateways forming a star network. The other topology is the star of stars, when multiple user devices connect to one APN and several such APNs are in the network. Section V gives a detailed description of the hardware used in this work.

A. Access Point Node

Users request web resources through a web browser or any application capable of generating requests over the Internet. The APNs run a web server locally. The user devices connected to the WiFi network place the requests on the same port as the web server. The server then translates the request and forwards it to the ICN over the LoRa channel. Once the ICN sends back the content fetched from the Internet, the local web server on the APN displays the content received.

B. Coordinator Node

The ICN interfaces LoRa with WiFi and Ethernet. It receives the requests forwarded by the APN, decodes the message, and fetches the requested resources from the public Internet. It returns the contents to the APNs for all valid requests. However, if the requests are invalid, the ICN notifies the APNs. The ICN constantly listens for incoming requests.

C. Network Representation

Let the network consist of:

- A set of n access points:

$$A = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\}, \quad |A| = n. \quad (1)$$

- A set of m coordinators:

$$C = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_m\}, \quad |C| = m, \quad m \geq 1. \quad (2)$$

- A relation $R \subseteq A \times C$ representing the connectivity between access points and gateways:

$$(a_i, c_j) \in R \quad \text{if } a_i \text{ is connected to } c_j. \quad (3)$$

The network can be defined as:

$$N = (A, C, R), \quad (4)$$

where A is the set of access points, C is the set of coordinators, and R is the connectivity relation.

IV. METHODOLOGY

As an APN receives a request i.e., a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) from a user device, it forwards the request to the ICN over the LoRa backbone. This task of entering a URL in the APN's user interface initiates a sequence of activities to fulfill the request. The following subsections provide details of the activities.

A. Data Handling and Server Mechanisms

As an HTTP POST request is received by the APN's web server, it extracts the URL and transmits it to the ICN. Then, the APN awaits a response from the ICN. Now, the ICN formats the received URL and initiates an HTTP GET request over the public Internet (Algorithm 1). If it receives a valid response, then it slices the web content into chunks of size that are transmittable on the LoRa channel. Furthermore, it transmits the chunks to the APN after attaching a "chunk ID" to each chunk. The strategy to ensure chunk delivery is detailed in section IV-B.

The APN processes the received chunks and assembles them to derive the original message. Before accepting a chunk, it verifies that the data is received from the intended coordinator. The APN's web server is asynchronous, updating the web page as a new chunk is received. Algorithm 2 describes the methodology implemented by the APNs.

B. Data Transmission Over LoRa

As discussed in section IV-A, the ICN implements a data segmentation strategy to overcome the hardware limitations of LoRa. The method in the ICN transmits the data chunks till the last chunk is sent to the requester APN. It maintains a delay between successive transmissions to allow the data to get transmitted, propagated and received. Moreover, this delay also helps avoid data collisions.

Algorithm 1 Coordinator Data Transmission

```

1: Initialize LoRa.
2: Set to continuous reception.
3: Assign callback ON_RECV for messages.
4: Function ON_RECV(payload):
5:     Decode URL and sender from payload.
6:     If sender is unexpected:
7:         Return.
8:     Try:
9:         Fetch content and split into chunks.
10:    For each chunk:
11:        Transmit with retries.
12:    Except:
13:        Transmit error message.
14: Activate LoRa reception.
15: Set callback ON_RECV.
16: while True do
17:     Keep node active for message handling.
18: end while

```

Algorithm 2 APN Operation

Require: LoRa Config, WiFi Config, Server Config

```

1: Initialize LoRa and WiFi AP.
2: Serve HTML at "/" using AsyncWebServer.
3: Handle POST at "/submit":
4:     Send URL via LoRa.
5:     Log status.
6: Serve Data at "/received" with dynamic updates.
7: Start AsyncWebServer to handle requests.
8: while True do
9:     If LoRa packet received:
10:        Verify packet integrity.
11:        If packet is valid:
12:            Assemble message.
13:            Update webpage.
14: end while

```

C. Reliability Mechanisms

The proposed APN and the ICN implement robust mechanisms to ensure data delivery. It implements an acknowledgment message-based confirmation mechanism where the recipient confirms each reception by sending an ACK message. The number of retries is customizable and depends on the user's quality-of-service (QoS) requirements. In our implementation, the APN acknowledges data reception by setting the flag to 1; otherwise, it does not set the ACK flag. When the sender (ICN) encounters the ACK flag set to 0, it understands that the APN hasn't received the previous chunk. So, the ICN retries to send the chunk. The ACK mechanism makes the network reliable and improves the QoS. However, it increases network latency and bandwidth usage, [28].

D. Error Handling

The web server on the APN renders the user interface and, at the same time, validates the input and handles errors. After decoding the input URL, it waits and renders the resultant




Fig. 3. UI to request URL



Fig. 4. Loaded URL

web page upon a successful attempt. However, a corresponding HTTP error status code is raised if the request fails and no web content is returned. A similar practice is adopted by the ICN, which, when encounters an error, transmits the corresponding status code to the requesting APN.

E. Complexity of Proposed Methods

The Algorithm 1 has a time complexity of $O(m.n)$, where m is the number of messages and n is the message size. Initialization and setup take $O(1)$, while message processing involves decoding, sender verification, fetching content, splitting into chunks, and transmitting with retries, all contributing to $O(n)$ per message. In contrast, the Algorithm 2 has a time complexity of $O(p + h)$, where p represents the number of packets required to assemble a complete message, and h corresponds to the size of the HTML content for dynamic updates. This algorithm is less computationally intensive as it primarily focuses on packet handling and web page generation, making it more lightweight and suitable for real-time operations.

V. EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

A. Hardware and Software Configuration

To evaluate the proposed system, the APN was built using an ESP32 microcontroller, RFM95W LoRa transceiver, and an 868MHz antenna with 5 dBi gain. The onboard WiFi module of the ESP32 microcontroller was used to connect with the clients. The components were connected using a custom printed circuit board (PCB). Conversely, the ICN consisted of a Raspberry Pi 3B+ with Cortex-A53 (ARMv8) 64-bit SoC @ 1.4GHz and 1GB LPDDR2 SDRAM, a LoRa transceiver, and an 868MHz antenna with 5dBi gain. The ICN connected to the Internet either over Ethernet or WiFi. Figure 2 depicts the APN and the ICN hardware. The configurations of the experimental setup are listed in Table II.

The firmware for the ESP32-based APN was created using embedded C. The APN also consisted of a User Interface (UI) built using HTML and CSS. The UIs are depicted in Figs. 3 and 4. The software for the ICN was written in Python.

B. Evaluation Method and Parameters

The proposed ILoRa system was evaluated for different chunk sizes. The experiment was conducted in twenty rounds,

and the observations were recorded. The evaluation parameters considered in the experiment are -

1) **Request Fulfill Time (RFT)**: This is the total time required to process a user's API/web page request. It is measured as the duration from receiving a URL request to delivering the fully rendered web page back to the user. This metric encompasses the following components:

a) **APN URL Processing Time**: The time taken by the ESP32 to send the user's URL request to the ICN and receive the first response. This is calculated as:

$$URL_{total} = URL_{end} - URL_{start} \quad (5)$$

where:

- URL_{start} : Timestamp recorded when the URL request is sent from ESP32.
- URL_{end} : Timestamp recorded when the ESP32 receives the first response.

b) **Request Processing Time**: The time it takes for the ICN to fetch the content of the received URL request from the Internet. This is calculated as:

$$RT_{total} = RT_{end} - RT_{start} \quad (6)$$

where:

- RT_{start} : Timestamp recorded when the ICN receives the LoRa message containing the URL.
- RT_{end} : Timestamp recorded when the ICN receives the response from the Internet.

c) **LoRa Transmission Time**: The time the Raspberry Pi (ICN) takes to transmit the received response from the Internet to the APN in chunks. This is calculated as:

$$LT_{total} = LT_{end} - LT_{start} \quad (7)$$

where:

- LT_{start} : Timestamp recorded when the first chunk of the response is transmitted.
- LT_{end} : Timestamp recorded when the last chunk of the response is transmitted.

The overall **Request Fulfill Time (RFT)** can be expressed as:

$$RFT = URL_{total} + RT_{total} + LT_{total} \quad (8)$$

2) **Current Consumption**: To measure the current consumed by the ICN and the APN during each test run, an MX19 USB 3.0 meter device was used. The determination of actual current consumption (I_{actual}) involved subtracting the recorded idle current (I_{idle}) from the reception (Rx) and transmission (Tx) current readings obtained at various stages for each of the twenty experiment rounds. The computation for the receiving phase is represented as:

TABLE II
EXPERIMENT CONFIGURATIONS

S. No.	Parameter	Value
1	Frequency	868 MHz
2	Spreading Factor (SF)	7
3	Bandwidth (BW)	500 kHz
4	Coding Rate (CR)	4/5
5	Transmission Power	20 dBm
6	Payload Size	Up to 250 bytes
7	Topology	Star
8	Access Point Node (APN)	ESP32 with RFM95W module
9	Gateway Node (GN)	Raspberry Pi or IoT Gateway
10	Client Protocol	HTTP over LoRa and Wi-Fi
11	Wi-Fi Frequency	2.4 GHz
12	Range	1–2 km

$$I_{\text{actual Rx}} = I_{\text{Rx}} - I_{\text{idle}} \quad (9)$$

and for the transmission phase:

$$I_{\text{actual Tx}} = I_{\text{Tx}} - I_{\text{idle}} \quad (10)$$

- 3) **RAM Consumption:** The amount of RAM consumed by the proposed methods running on the ICN was recorded using the Linux `TOP` application. The average (M_{avg}) RAM values were systematically documented. The actual average RAM utilization ($M_{\text{actual avg}}$) for each of these observations was then calculated as follows:

$$M_{\text{actual avg}} = M_{\text{avg}} - M_{\text{idle}} \quad (11)$$

where M_{idle} represents the recorded idle RAM at the beginning of each round.

- 4) **CPU Consumption:** The assessment of the efficiency and practicality of our approaches on resource-constrained devices involves examining the actual CPU utilization ($C_{\text{actual avg}}$) during their execution on the ICN. To gauge this, we recorded the idle state CPU utilization (C_{idle}) when only the operating system, system services, VNC Server, and one terminal were running, using Linux's `Top` program. The average of the CPU utilization values (C_{avg}) were documented with the code executing. The actual CPU utilization for each of these values was computed as:

$$C_{\text{actual avg}} = C_{\text{avg}} - C_{\text{idle}} \quad (12)$$

C. Testing Conditions

The ILoRa system was tested with one coordinator and one APN. A client (smartphone) device connected to the WiFi tethered by the APN to access Internet resources over the LoRa network. The ICN and the APN were placed 25 meters apart with no obstructions in the Line of Sight (LoS).

VI. RESULTS AND PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

A. Request Fulfill Time

The Request Fulfill Time (RFT) was measured for chunk sizes 150B, 200B, and 250B. The experiment was repeated twenty times for each chunk size, and our web API at

`http://13.232.192.17:5000/api/data` was accessed each time. The API returns 930B of JSON content. Figure 5 depicts the observations of the experiments. The average RFT with 150B, 200B, and 250B chunk sizes was approximately 12.3735s, 8.811s, and 7.0265s, respectively. However, in a practical IoT application, the API calls typically deal with much smaller data sizes. To mimic such a scenario, we accessed one record instead of all. The API `http://13.232.192.17:5000/api/data/1` returns 67B JSON content and fits in the lowest chunk size of 150B. The RFT in this was observed to be approximately 1.6s. To assess the performance of the proposed system further, we also accessed `http://13.232.192.17:5000/lora`, which returns a web page with HTML and CSS only. The client device receives 2225B of data and fully loads the web page in approximately 21.39s.




Fig. 5. Request Fulfill Times for various data chunk sizes

The results demonstrate that the RFT and chunk size are inversely proportional. For smaller data sizes, as in the single record API access, the RFT dropped to 1.6s. This showcases the efficiency of ILoRa in IoT applications. On the other hand, it was observed that larger payload sizes impacted the system performance.

B. System Throughput Comparison

We calculate the *system throughput* of ILoRa for chunk sizes 150B, 200B, and 250B following Eq.8.

The throughput is calculated as:

$$\Theta = \frac{\lambda}{\text{RFT}} \quad (13)$$

Where:

- θ : The system throughput, often measured in units such as bits per second.
- λ : The total data transferred (e.g., the size of a fully rendered web page or the data from an API delivered to the user, in bits or bytes).
- RFT (Request Fulfill Time): The total time required to process a user's web page request as in Eq.8.

Throughput While Accessing API:

Using Eq.13 for chunk size 150B,

$$\Theta_{150B} = \frac{930}{12.3735} \approx 75.16Bps \approx 0.6kbps \quad (14)$$

For chunk size 200B,

$$\Theta_{200B} = \frac{930}{8.811} \approx 105.55Bps \approx 0.84kbps \quad (15)$$




Fig. 6. Current consumption by APN (upper subplot) and by ICN (lower subplot)

For chunk size 250B,

$$\Theta_{250B} = \frac{930}{7.0265} \approx 132.36Bps \approx 1.06kbps \quad (16)$$

While Fetching Web Page with 250B chunk size:
Using Eq.13,

$$\Theta_{web} = \frac{2225}{21.39} \approx 104.02Bps \approx 0.83kbps \quad (17)$$

The throughput was directly proportional to the chunk size. The throughput increased with larger chunk sizes when accessing API. This demonstrates the efficiency of larger chunks in reducing overhead and improving data transmission rates. On the other hand, the throughput while accessing the web page was slightly lower than accessing API with the same chunk size. This is due to additional complexities and processing overheads associated with a web page.

C. Current Consumption

The current consumption by the ILoRa system was evaluated using Eq.9 and Eq.10. The current consumed by the APN to transmit the URL request was approximately 0.01A. On the other hand, the average current consumed to receive the data chunks of sizes 150B, 200B, and 250B from the ICN was observed to be approximately 0.013A, 0.015A, and 0.016A, respectively, while the idle current consumption was approximately 0.551A. The current consumption data showed a clear trend where the consumption increased as the chunk size increased. Although the differences are marginal, cumulative effects can significantly affect battery-powered devices.

The ICN consumed approximately 0.905A in the idle state. The observations in Fig. 6 suggest an incremental rise in average total current with larger chunk sizes. The chunks 150B, 200B, and 250B consumed approximately 0.092A, 0.093A, and 0.094A, respectively. It suggests that the energy required for transmitting larger data chunks increased proportionally. Although the Pi consumed slightly more current for larger




Fig. 7. RAM consumption in ICN for various chunk sizes




Fig. 8. CPU consumption in ICN for various chunk sizes

chunks, the close clustering of readings highlights the energy efficiency of the ICN hardware for LoRa transmission within the tested range.

D. RAM Consumption

While the ICN was idle it utilized approximately 395.2MB of RAM. As depicted in Fig. 7, minimal variation was observed across data chunk sizes. The average memory consumption increases slightly with larger chunks. The average RAM consumption for chunk sizes 150B, 200B, and 250B was approximately 18.73MB, 16.09MB, and 18.87MB, respectively. The consistent RAM usage across chunk sizes indicates efficient memory management during LoRa transmission. Furthermore, the close clustering of the RAM consumption readings highlights the ICN's efficiency in handling varying chunk sizes without significant memory overhead, making it suitable for resource-constrained applications.

E. CPU Consumption

The CPU utilization for data chunk sizes 150B, 200B, and 250B were approximately 20.2%, 18.64%, and 18.46%, respectively. This suggests that larger chunk sizes resulted in more efficient CPU utilization due to reduced overhead per byte of data transmitted. Figure 8 depicts the observations of the experiment.

VII. LIMITATIONS

. One significant limitation of ILoRa is the inability to handle multimedia content, such as images and videos, when accessing web pages over the LoRa backhaul network. This

constraint arises from the low data rates and high latency characteristics of LoRa technology, making it unsuitable for efficiently transmitting large payloads. While this design choice allows the system to perform well with textual and lightweight data, such as simple web pages, it may limit its applicability in use cases requiring multimedia content. Addressing this limitation could involve exploring advanced data optimization techniques or integrating higher-bandwidth solutions for handling multimedia requests.

VIII. CONCLUSION

In this study, we demonstrated accessing Internet services over a LoRa network. We accessed the feasibility of accessing APIs and web pages from the Internet over a LoRa backhaul network. Through rigorous evaluation of the key performance indicators, we established that larger chunk sizes improve throughput and CPU utilization while maintaining RAM and energy consumption. The system's efficient handling of smaller data chunks in a short time frame makes it suitable for typical IoT applications. The findings establish ILoRa as a promising solution for enabling reliable and efficient solutions to extend Internet-based services over a long range and disconnected regions.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors gratefully acknowledge the use of QuillBot and ChatGPT for assisting in refining certain paragraphs and formatting equations in this manuscript.

REFERENCES

- [1] E. H. Houssein, M. A. Othman, W. M. Mohamed, and M. Younan, "Internet of things in smart cities: Comprehensive review, open issues, and challenges," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 11, no. 21, pp. 34 941–34 952, 2024.
- [2] A. Hazra, A. Kalita, and M. Gurusamy, "Meeting the requirements of internet of things: The promise of edge computing," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 11, no. 5, pp. 7474–7498, 2024.
- [3] Y. Zhang, D. J. Love, J. V. Krogmeier, C. R. Anderson, R. W. Heath, and D. R. Buckmaster, "Challenges and opportunities of future rural wireless communications," *IEEE Communications Magazine*, vol. 59, no. 12, pp. 16–22, 2021.
- [4] M. A. Imran, M. Zennaro, O. R. Popoola, L. Chiaraviglio, H. Zhang, P. Manzoni, J. van de Beek, R. Stewart, M. Arij Cox, L. Leonel Mendes, and E. Pietrosemoli, "Exploring the boundaries of connected systems: Communications for hard-to-reach areas and extreme conditions," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 112, no. 7, pp. 912–945, 2024.
- [5] M. Jouhari, N. Saeed, M.-S. Alouini, and E. M. Amhoud, "A survey on scalable lorawan for massive iot: Recent advances, potentials, and challenges," *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 1841–1876, 2023.
- [6] A. Pagano, D. Croce, I. Tinnirello, and G. Vitale, "A survey on lora for smart agriculture: Current trends and future perspectives," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 3664–3679, 2023.
- [7] G. Premsankar, B. Ghaddar, M. Slabicki, and M. D. Francesco, "Optimal configuration of lora networks in smart cities," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, vol. 16, no. 12, pp. 7243–7254, 2020.
- [8] B. Su, Z. Qin, and Q. Ni, "Energy efficient uplink transmissions in lora networks," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 68, no. 8, pp. 4960–4972, 2020.
- [9] L. Leonardi, F. Battaglia, and L. Lo Bello, "Rt-lora: A medium access strategy to support real-time flows over lora-based networks for industrial iot applications," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 6, no. 6, pp. 10 812–10 823, 2019.
- [10] Q. Zhou, K. Zheng, L. Hou, J. Xing, and R. Xu, "Design and implementation of open lora for iot," *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 100 649–100 657, 2019.
- [11] D. Wu and J. Liebeherr, "A low-cost low-power lora mesh network for large-scale environmental sensing," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 10, no. 19, pp. 16 700–16 714, 2023.
- [12] J.-M. Kang, D.-W. Lim, and K.-M. Kang, "On the lora modulation for iot: Optimal preamble detection and its performance analysis," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 9, no. 7, pp. 4973–4986, 2022.
- [13] M. J. Faber, K. M. van der Zwaag, W. G. V. dos Santos, H. R. d. O. Rocha, M. E. V. Segatto, and J. A. L. Silva, "A theoretical and experimental evaluation on the performance of lora technology," *IEEE Sensors Journal*, vol. 20, no. 16, pp. 9480–9489, 2020.
- [14] A. S. Deese, J. Jesson, T. Brennan, S. Hollain, P. Stefanacci, E. Driscoll, C. Dick, K. Garcia, R. Mosher, B. Rentsch, A. Bechtel, and E. Rodriguez, "Long-term monitoring of smart city assets via internet of things and low-power wide-area networks," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 222–231, 2021.
- [15] F. Wu, C. Qiu, T. Wu, and M. R. Yuce, "Edge-based hybrid system implementation for long-range safety and healthcare iot applications," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 8, no. 12, pp. 9970–9980, 2021.
- [16] D. Gao, H. Wang, S. Wang, W. Wang, Z. Yin, S. Mumtaz, X. Li, V. Frascolla, and A. Nallanathan, "Wilo: Long-range cross-technology communication from wi-fi to lora," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, pp. 1–1, 2024.
- [17] X. Zheng, D. Xia, F. Yu, L. Liu, and H. Ma, "Enabling cross-technology communication from wifi to lora with ieee 802.11ax," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 1936–1950, 2024.
- [18] G. Chen, W. Dong, and J. Lv, "Lofi: Enabling 2.4ghz lora and wifi coexistence by detecting extremely weak signals," in *IEEE INFOCOM 2021 - IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*, 2021, pp. 1–10.
- [19] M. P. Manuel, M. Faied, and M. Krishnan, "A lora-based disaster management system for search and rescue mission," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 11, no. 20, pp. 34 024–34 034, 2024.
- [20] J. Xu, K. Ota, and M. Dong, "Big data on the fly: Uav-mounted mobile edge computing for disaster management," *IEEE Transactions on Network Science and Engineering*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 2620–2630, 2020.
- [21] G. M. Bianco, R. Giuliano, G. Marrocco, F. Mazzenga, and A. Mejia-Aguilar, "Lora system for search and rescue: Path-loss models and procedures in mountain scenarios," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 1985–1999, Feb 2021.
- [22] A. Mackey and P. Spachos, "Lora-based localization system for emergency services in gps-less environments," in *IEEE INFOCOM 2019 - IEEE Conference on Computer Communications Workshops (INFOCOM WKSHPS)*, 2019, pp. 939–944.
- [23] R. Pueyo Centelles, R. Meseguer, F. Freitag, L. Navarro, S. F. Ochoa, and R. M. Santos, "Loramoto: A communication system to provide safety awareness among civilians after an earthquake," *Future Generation Computer Systems*, vol. 115, pp. 150–170, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167739X20306063>
- [24] M. Pan, C. Chen, X. Yin, and Z. Huang, "Uav-aided emergency environmental monitoring in infrastructure-less areas: Lora mesh networking approach," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 2918–2932, 2022.
- [25] M. Vigil-Hayes, M. N. Hossain, A. K. Elliott, E. M. Belding, and E. Zegura, "Lorax: Repurposing lora as a low data rate messaging system to extend internet boundaries," in *Proceedings of the 5th ACM SIGCAS/SIGCHI Conference on Computing and Sustainable Societies*, ser. COMPASS '22. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2022, p. 195–213. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3530190.3534807>
- [26] A. M. cardenas, M. K. N. Pinto, E. Pietrosemoli, M. Zennaro, M. Rainone, and P. Manzoni, "A lora enabled sustainable messaging system for isolated communities," in *Proceedings of the 4th EAI International Conference on Smart Objects and Technologies for Social Good*, ser. Goodtechs '18. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2018, p. 118–123. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3284869.3284888>
- [27] K. Nakamura, P. Manzoni, M. Zennaro, J.-C. Cano, and C. T. Calafate, "Adding voice messages to a low-cost long-range data messaging system," ser. GoodTechs '20. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2020, p. 42–47. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3411170.3411238>
- [28] A.-I. Pop, U. Raza, P. Kulkarni, and M. Sooriyabandara, "Does bidirectional traffic do more harm than good in lorawan based lpwa networks?" in *GLOBECOM 2017 - 2017 IEEE Global Communications Conference*, 2017, pp. 1–6.