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1. **Overview**
	1. Scope

This recommended practice provides guidance on the implementation, configuration and commissioning of systems sharing spectrum between IEEE Std 802.11ah-2016 and IEEE Std 802.15.4 Smart Utility Networking (SUN) Frequency Shift Keying (FSK) Physical Layer (PHY) operating in Sub-1 GHz frequency bands.

* 1. Need for the Project

Many millions of devices based on IEEE Std 802.15.4 are currently operating in Sub-1 GHz frequency bands, and the field is expanding rapidly. Critical applications, such as grid modernization (smart grid) and internet of things (IoT) are using the low to moderate data rate capabilities of IEEE Std 802.15.4. IEEE Std 802.11ah-2016 may operate in the same Sub-1 GHz frequency bands and provides higher data rate capabilities than IEEE Std 802.15.4. In consideration of the current usage, as well as anticipation of yet unforeseen usage models enabled by the standards within the scope of this recommended practice, and to fully realize the opportunity for successful deployment of products sharing the spectrum, strategies and tactics to achieve good coexistence performance are critical. This recommended practice enables IEEE Std 802.15.4 and IEEE Std 802.11ah-2016 to most effectively operate in license exempt Sub-1 GHz frequency bands, by providing best practices and coexistence methods. This recommended practice uses existing features of the referenced standards and provides guidance to implementers and users of IEEE 802(R) wireless standards.

1. **Normative reference**
2. **Definitions, acronyms and abbreviations**
	1. Definitions
	2. Acronyms and abbreviations
3. **Overview of Sub-1 GHz band systems considered**

4.1 IEEE 802.11ah

4.2 IEEE 802.15.4g

4.3 LoRa

4.4 SigFox

Provide basic information for the above systems such as frequency band (country dependent), channel width, transmission power, PHY modulation, communication range, deployment scenarios (outdoor/indoor), and possibility of coexistence with others.

1. **Use cases of the IEEE 802 Sub-1 GHz technologies**

5.1 Smart utility

5.2 Smart city

5.3 Field monitoring

5.4 Building automation

For 802.11ah, expect to receive inputs from Wi-Fi alliance and Japan 802.11ah promotion council. Smart utility and smart city are expected to main candidates.

For 802.15.4g, main use scenario is smart utility. Field monitoring and building automation are also candidates. Wi-SUN alliance may provide helpful information

1. **Sub-1 GHz spectrum allocation (informative, could be annex)**

6.1 Japan

6.2 US

6.3 Europe

6.4 others?

How much spectrum is allocated for 802.11ah and 802.15.4g based applications?

Are the non-overlapping frequency bands allocated for 802.11ah and 802.15.4g? If yes, there is no coexistence issue. If no, there is possibility that 802.11ah and 802.15.4g need to coexist.

Following sections are for the countries where 802.11ah and 802.15.4g may be forced to share spectrum.

1. **802.11ah and 802.15.4g coexistence mechanisms and issues (informative)**

7.1 802.11ah coexistence mechanisms (from standard)

7.2 802.15.4g coexistence mechanisms (from standard)

7.3 Coexistence performance of 802.11ah and 802.15.4g (via simulation results)

7.4 Factors that cause coexistence issues (CCA, CSMA, slot duration, etc.)

7.5 Can coexistence performance be improved? (possible technologies and their performance, e.g., simulation results)

1. **Recommendation scenarios**
	1. CSMA/CA recommendations (e.g., 802.11ah uses RAW to give opportunity for 802.15.4g transmission when 802.15.4g is detected)
	2. CCA recommendations (e.g., 802.11ah lows its ED threshold when 802.15.4g is detected)
	3. Transmission duration recommendation (e.g., frame size and TXOP constraints)
	4. Duty cycle recommendation (e.g., Japan allows 10% duty cycle)
	5. PHY parameter recommendation (e.g., ED threshold, CCA time)
	6. MAC parameter recommendation (e.g., number of backoffs, slot duration)
	7. Network topology recommendation (e.g., location of nodes, number of hops)
	8. Application based recommendation (e.g., data priority, packet delivery rate requirement, latency requirement)

The recommendations can be made to three phases:

 Device manufacturing stage

 Device deployment stage

 Device in use stage

1. **Coexistence architectures**

9.1 Distributed coexistence control (nodes do not receive any information about other network, nodes perform coexistence functions based on their own judgment)

9.2 Centralized coexistence control (assume there is some coordination device such as gateway or hybrid device, nodes perform coexistence by considering information received from coordinator and their own information)

1. **Conclusion**
2. **References**

**Annex A**

**Evaluation and simulation practice**

Simulation profiles

Evaluation metrics (e.g., packet delivery ratio and latency) and thresholds (application dependent)

Propagation models

 Model for stations below roof height (stations have similar height)

 Model for stations above or below roof height (stations have different height, e.g., for smart utility, data collectors are mounted on the electric pole, which is much higher than smart meters mounted on the house)