

# Spectrum Emission Mask for Coexistence between Future WiMAX and Existing Fixed Wireless Access Systems

ZAID A. SHAMSAN, LWAY FAISAL, S. K. SYED-YUSOF, THAREK ABD. RAHMAN

Wireless Communication Center, Faculty of Electrical Engineering

Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

81310 UTM, Skudai, Johor Bahru

MALAYSIA

shamsan22@yahoo.com <http://fke.utm.my/wcc/>

**Abstract:** - This paper introduces a new coexistence study of the future WiMAX system and existing fixed wireless access (FWA) systems and investigates its feasibility. Spectrum emission mask as an interference mitigation technique is used as well as interference to noise ratio ( $I/N$ ) of -6 dB as one of standard sharing criterion value at FWA systems recommended by international telecommunication union radio sector ITU-R. Three channel bandwidths of (3.5, 7, and 10 MHz) of WiMAX system in the band 3500 MHz are selected to be studied with 7 MHz FWA channel in dense urban area. All parameters of the two systems are presented and methodology is explained. It is well known that frequency distance rules are an important of frequency coordination process in most radio services, so frequency and distance separations are determined and analyzed for both terms co-channel interference and adjacent channel interference in the different interference scenarios which are supposed. This coexistence and spectrum sharing study is considered as an initial step toward beyond 3G or IMT-Advanced coexistence with FWA systems.

**Key-Words:** - Coexistence, Sharing, WiMAX systems, Fixed wireless access systems, Interference-to-noise ratio, Spectrum emission mask.

## 1 Introduction

The radio spectrum is a limited and valuable resource, and as a result of the drastic growth demand for wireless communication applications, radio spectrum regulation and management have become increasingly significant [1]. Due to scarcity of the frequency spectrum, many bands are allocated for more than one radio service and therefore the sharing is necessity. The increased sharing of spectrum translates into a higher likelihood of users interfering with one another [2]. WiMAX (worldwide interoperability for microwave access) is based on IEEE 802.16 standard [3] recently considered as the 3rd generation broadband wireless access (BWA) system designed mainly for wireless metropolitan area networks (WMAN) [4]. WiMAX addresses the last-mile BWA problem in metropolitan areas and underserved rural areas for the advantages of fast and cost-effective deployment, it uses the band 3500 MHz which is currently allocated to Fixed Wireless Access (FWA) systems. Therefore, the impact of the interference of WiMAX as a new technology on FWA systems and vice versa needs to be studied.

The interest for the use of 3500 MHz band (3400-3800) for FWA/BWA applications has increased

because its large size, high degree of reliability and wide coverage, particularly in geographical areas with severe rain. A different compatibility studies in the band 3500 MHz between broadband FWA and other services (point-to-point fixed links, electronic news gathering/outside broadcasting (ENG/OB) systems, fixed satellite systems (FSS) and radiolocation) were reported in [5], also impact from Ultra Wide Band (UWB) systems on BWA has been studied in [6]. Han-shin Jo *et al.* [7] studied the coexistence of orthogonal frequency division multiplexing (OFDM)-based systems beyond 3G (B3G) and point-to-point fixed services in the band 3500 MHz. In our study, spectrum emission mask is applied for both WiMAX and FWA systems to investigate the safe distance (geographical) separation and frequency (Spectral) separation between the two systems to ensure that both systems are able to coexist without mutual harmful interference in the dense urban geographical areas.

The reminder of this paper is organized as follows. In section 2, concepts of coexistence and spectrum sharing are displayed while parameters of WiMAX (802.16) and FWA systems are presented in section 3 in detail. Section 4 is devoted to discuss sharing criterion. The method and procedure to do

this work and the used propagation model as well as spectral emissions mask are elaborated and described in details in the sections 5, 6, and 7. Sharing and coexistence scenarios and analyses as well as the compatibility between WiMAX and FWA in co-channel and adjacent channel are executed in sections 8 and 9. Finally, the conclusion is presented in section 10.

## 2 Coexistence and Spectrum Sharing

Multitude of wireless systems and services has been developed and deployed in the recent years. Moreover, many of these applications are being improved and many new radio access technologies (RAT) are developed (e.g., WiMAX and IMT-Advanced), aspiring to get access to the radio spectrum. As there are hardly any free frequency bands available, the new and coming systems are expected to be able to share the spectrum and to co-exist with existing services (e.g., FWA). The WINNER report [8] defines these two concepts for the following:

### 2.1 Spectrum Coexistence

The concurrent operation of different services or systems in the same [9] or in adjacent frequency bands without causing degradation to any service, with emphasis on the indicated limitations in terms of, e.g., frequency separation, physical separation, and transmission powers. In coexistence, the concern is finding the effect on the performance of the systems when they are simply both operating in the same spectrum band. This can either be investigated for systems operating on exactly the same frequencies, i.e. the co-channel case, or when the systems are operating in adjacent frequencies, i.e. the adjacent channel case.

### 2.2 Spectrum Sharing

The use of a same frequency band by different systems or services, either with coordination or possibly without any coordination between the systems, with emphasis on the spectrum access schemes and methods [8]. Capabilities of effective sharing are required as most frequency bands that are well-suited for future systems are already allocated and used to some extent by existing services. Of course, WiMAX must be guaranteed that existing services are not significantly negatively affected. Sharing of the same frequency band by

different services or technologies is only possible through well-defined limitations and technical requirements which facilitate sharing capabilities, these limitation and technical requirements are explaining hereafter.

## 3 WiMAX and Fixed Systems Parameters Description

In order to examine coexisting and sharing issues, it is necessary to clarify the parameters of WiMAX and FWA that will affect the interference level and criterion.

### 3.1 Parameters of WiMAX

WiMAX is a technology using OFDM as one of the most promising techniques to realize the high bit-rate transmission, because OFDM is a multi-carrier transmission scheme [10] moves toward higher data rates through wider modulation bandwidths from 1.25 to 20 MHz for point-to-point and point-to-multipoint fixed applications. IEEE BWA working group [11] defined the radio frequency parameters and characteristics of WiMAX (fixed and mobile), this study will only focus on fixed WiMAX which is based on the IEEE 802.16 standard [12], and these parameters are shown in Table 1 for both transmitter and receiver. As the system can occupy a bandwidth up to 20 MHz we chose three different channel bandwidths 3.5, 7, and 10 MHz (in order comparison with current FWA system) each with center frequency of 3500 MHz. The spectral emission mask requirements follow ETSI-EN302326-2 (EqC-PET=O, EqC-EMO=6) or Type-G mask ETSI-EN301021 [13], [14] specifications and according to [15].

*Note-* EqC-PET means Equipment Classification-Primary Equipment Type and EqC-EMO means Equipment Classification- Equivalent Modulation Order.

### 3.2 Parameters of the Current FWA

In Malaysia the frequency range 3.4-3.7 GHz is allocated for FWA systems [16], it is divided into sub-bands for duplex use (non duplex systems can still be used in this band), 3400–3500 MHz paired with 3500–3600 MHz as well as 3600– 3650 MHz paired with 3650–3700 MHz. These FWA bands are to be used for direct radio connection in the last mile

between a fixed radio central station and subscriber terminal stations in a point-to-point and/or point-to-multipoint configuration. Countries have various frequency channel spacing within the 3.5 GHz bands 1.25, 1.75, 3.5, 7, 8.75, 10, 14, and 28 MHz can be used according to capacity needs. The spectral emission mask (is discussing in a next section) requirements follow ETSI-EN302326-2 (EqC-PET=O, EqC-EMO=4) [13] or Type-F mask ETSI-EN301021 [14] specifications according to [5]. We will focus on the parameters listed in Table 2.

Table 1: WiMAX system parameters

Parameter	Value
Center frequency of operation (MHz)	3500
Bandwidth (MHz)	3.5, 7, 10
Base station transmitted power (dBm)	36
Terminal station transmitted power (dBm)	24
Spectral emissions mask requirements	Type-G ETSI-EN301021
Base station antenna gain (dBi)	16
Receiver antenna gain (dBi)	8
Base station antenna height (m)	30
Receiver antenna height (m)	2
Noise figure of Base station (dB)	4
Noise figure of receiver (dB)	7

Table 2: FWA system parameters

Parameter	Value
Center frequency of operation (MHz)	3500
Bandwidth (MHz)	7
Base station transmitted power (dBm)	35
Terminal station transmitted power (dBm)	22
Spectral emissions mask requirements	Type-F ETSI-EN301021
Base station antenna gain (dBi)	17
Terminal station antenna gain (dBi)	20
Base station antenna height (m)	20
Terminal station antenna height (m)	1.5-10
Noise figure of base station (dB)	5
Noise figure of terminal station (dB)	7

### 4 Sharing Criterion

For discussion of various sharing scenarios, it is necessary to develop appropriate rules for sharing. Intersystem interference can be described as short term or long-term, the short- term interference is rarely evaluated in the coordination literature as it is very much statistical in nature and not found for many services and will be specific to the cases considered [17], [18]. In this paper we consider long term interference only.

The interference protection criteria can be defined as an absolute interference power level  $I$ , interference-to-noise power ratio  $I/N$ , or carrier-to-interfering signal power ratio  $C/I$  as shown in Fig. 1 [18]. ITU-R Recommendation F.758-2 details two generally accepted values for the interference-to-thermal-noise ratio ( $I/N$ ) for long-term interference into fixed service receivers. When considering interference from other services, it identifies an  $I/N$  value of  $-6$  dB or  $-10$  dB matched to specific requirements of individual systems. This approach provides a method for defining a tolerable limit that is independent of most characteristics of the victim receiver, apart from noise figure.

Each fixed service accepts a 1 dB degradation (i.e., the difference in decibels between carrier-to-noise ratio ( $C/N$ ) and carrier to noise plus interference ratio  $C/(N + I)$ ) in receiver sensitivity. In some regard, an  $I/N$  of  $-6$  dB becomes the fundamental criterion for coexistence [19], so it should be that [20]:

$$I - N \geq \alpha \tag{1}$$

Where  $I$  is the interference level in dBm,  $N$  is the thermal noise floor of receiver in dBm and  $\alpha$  is the protection ratio in dB and here has value of  $-6$  dB which means that the interference must be approximately 6 dB below thermal noise as Fig. 1 shows.




Fig. 1: Interference protection criterions

### 5 Method and Procedure

The method consists in calculating the  $I/N$  ratio and then comparing it with the necessary  $I/N$  (-6 dB) at the victim receiver.

Firstly Calculation of the interference level  $I$  (dBm) at the victim receiver by assessing the level of emissions from the interferer falling within the victim receiver bandwidth for both co-channel frequency and adjacent frequency situations according to [7]:

$$I(\Delta f) = Pt + Gt + Gr + Mask(\Delta f) + corr\_band - Att \tag{2}$$

Where

- $Pt$ : transmitted power of the interferer in dBm,
- $Gt$ : gain of the interferer transmitter in dBi
- $Gr$ : gain of the victim receiver antenna in dBi
- $Mask(\Delta f)$ : attenuation of adjacent frequency due to mask where  $(\Delta f)$  is the difference between the carriers of interferer and the victim.
- $corr\_band$ : correction factor of band ratio, where  $corr\_band = 0$  dB if  $BW_{interference} < BW_{victim}$  or  $corr\_band = -10 \log(BW_{interference}/BW_{victim})$ , if not.
- $Att$ : attenuation due to the propagation (model in ITU-R P.452 is used).

In the second phase Determine the thermal noise floor of victim receiver as the following:

$$N = -114 + NF + 10 \log_{10}(BW_{victim}) \tag{3}$$

Where  $NF$  is noise figure of receiver in dB and  $BW_{victim}$  represent victim receiver bandwidth in MHz.

Finally, substitute  $I$  and  $N$  of steps 2 and 3 above into (1) to determine the sharing and coexistence feasibility between the two systems and derive the relationship between:

- a). frequency separation  $\Delta f$  and  $I/N$  ratio
- b). distance separation and  $I/N$  ratio.
- c). distance and frequency separation.

### 6 Propagation Model

In particular, there is no single propagation model used for different sharing studies because the particular deployment of the systems requires using specific propagation model relevant to the specific system. WiMAX has a specific usage as it may be fixed or mobile and to operate in line or non-line of sight environment. The standard model agreed upon in CEPT and ITU for a terrestrial interference

assessment at microwave frequencies is clearly marked in ITU-R P.452-12 [21]. This is model which is used for this coexistence study includes the attenuation due to clutter in different environments.

$$L(d) = 92.5 + 20 \log d + 20 \log f + Ah \tag{4}$$

Where  $d$  is the distance between interferer and victim receiver in kilometers,  $f$  is the carrier frequency in GHz, and  $Ah$  is loss due to protection from local clutter or called clutter loss, it is given by the expression:

$$Ah = 10.25e^{-d_k} \left[ 1 - \tanh \left[ 6 \left( \frac{h}{h_a} - 0.625 \right) \right] \right] - 0.33 \tag{5}$$

Where  $d_k$  is the distance (km) from nominal clutter point to the antenna,  $h$  is the antenna height (m) above local ground level, and  $h_a$  is the nominal clutter height (m) above local ground level. In [21], clutter losses are evaluated for different categories: trees, rural, suburban, urban, and dense urban, etc.

Table 3: Nominal clutter heights and distances

Clutter category	Clutter height $h_a$ (m)	Nominal distance $d_k$ (km)
Rural	4	0.1
Suburban	9	0.025
Urban	20	0.02
Dense urban	25	0.02




Fig. 2: Clutter loss for rural, suburban, urban, and dense urban areas













