

# Dynamic Spectrum Access in DTV Whitespaces: Design Rules, Architecture and Algorithms

Supratim Deb      Vikram Srinivasan  
Bell Labs India, Bangalore  
{supratim, vikramsr}@alcatel-lucent.com

Ritesh Maheshwari  
State University of New York  
ritesh@cs.sunysb.edu

## ABSTRACT

In November 2008, the FCC ruled that the digital TV whitespaces be used for unlicensed access. This is an exciting development because DTV whitespaces are in the low frequency range (50-698 MHz) compared to typical cellular and ISM bands, thus resulting in much better propagation characteristics and much higher spectral efficiencies. The FCC has also mandated certain guidelines for short range unlicensed access, so as to avoid any interference to DTV receivers. We consider the problem of Wi-Fi like access (popularly referred to as Wi-Fi 2.0) for enterprises. We assume that the access points and client devices are equipped with cognitive radios, i.e., they can adaptively choose the center frequency, bandwidth and power of operation. The access points can be equipped with one or more radios. In this paper, we layout the design of a complete system that (i) does not violate the FCC mandate, (ii) dynamically assigns center frequency and bandwidth to each access point based on their demands and (iii) squeezes the maximum efficiency from the available spectrum. This problem is far more general than prior work that investigated dynamic spectrum allocation in cellular and ISM bands, due to the non-homogeneous nature of the whitespaces, i.e., different whitespace widths in different parts of the spectrum and the large range of frequency bands with different propagation characteristics. This calls for a more holistic approach to system design that also accounts for frequency dependent propagation characteristics and radio frontend characteristics. In this paper, we first propose design rules for holistic system design. We then describe an architecture derived from our design rules. Finally we propose demand based dynamic spectrum allocation algorithms with provable worst case guarantees. We provide simulation results showing that (i) the performance of our algorithm is within 94% of the optimal in typical settings and (ii) the DTV whitespaces can provide significantly higher data rates compared to the 2.4GHz ISM band. Our approach is general enough for designing any system with access to a wide range of spectrum.

**Categories and Subject Descriptors:** C.2.0 [General]: Data Communications; C.2.1 [Computer Communication Networks]: Network Architecture and Design-*Wireless communication*

**General Terms:** Design, Algorithms

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Across the world, countries are migrating from analog to digital television broadcasts. For example, in the US, this transition happened on June 12, 2009; while in the UK, this transition is slated to happen in a phased manner from 2008 to 2012. In analog trans-

mission, each TV channel uses a 6 MHz slice of bandwidth, but digital transmissions have the ability to pack four "programs" in one 6 MHz channel. Thus, this analog-to-digital transition frees up a substantial amount of television spectrum that was previously used by analog transmitters. The newly freed up spectrum (along with other slices of unused spectrum in the 50-700 MHz (channels 2-51) television band is known as DTV white-space (DTV-WS).

Signals in the DTV spectrum propagate over long distances and penetrate through obstacles more easily. Also, according to a recent study by Free Press and NAF [14], depending on the local market, somewhere between 100-250 MHz of DTV-WS will be made available. The large amount of spectrum and its superior propagation characteristics make the DTV-WS a highly attractive proposition for wireless broadband deployment and usage.

In November 2008, in its second report and order [4], the FCC ruled that the digital TV whitespaces be used for unlicensed access by *fixed* and *portable* devices. Fixed devices (e.g., IEEE 802.22 base stations) are used for providing last mile internet access in underserved areas, while portable devices can be used to provide short range wireless connectivity for Internet access (e.g., Wi-Fi like access points). Furthermore, the FCC ruled that portable devices could only transmit in channels 21-51 (i.e., 512-698 MHz) and use a transmit power of 40mW when adjacent to a TV channel in the frequency band and 100mW on a non-adjacent channel. FCC has imposed further restrictions on out-of-band emissions etc. that will be described in Section 3.

The FCC ruling can cause the next wireless revolution. The short range wireless access in DTV-WS has been referred to as "Wi-Fi on steroids" and "Wi-Fi 2.0" in the media. Indeed, unlicensed access in DTV-WS can not only decrease congestion on the 2.4 GHz ISM band, but also provide much better data rates and coverage due to superior propagation properties of the spectrum.

In this paper, we perform a comprehensive design exercise of a system for Wi-Fi like unlicensed access in the DTV whitespaces in an enterprise setting. Throughout this paper, we say "Wi-Fi like" system to mean a wireless LAN with (i) access points (APs) connected to the Internet, and (ii) clients who associate with the APs. Enterprise setting allows us to design a system and architecture where a central controller can be responsible for performing efficient spectrum allocation based on access point demands. Our goal is threefold: (i) develop a thorough understanding of the effect of frequency dependent radio propagation and out of band emissions on system design, (ii) derive an FCC compliant multi-radio based architecture based on this understanding and (iii) design algorithms to efficiently allocate variable spectrum to access points based on their demand. We assume that good spectrum sensing techniques for wireless microphones etc. are available to the radios. Moreover we also assume that the available whitespaces in a given location vary slowly over time. In other words, we do not address the issue of correctly detecting primary transmitters and accessing the whitespaces over very small timescales (e.g., [11, 27]).

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. To copy otherwise, to republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee.

MobiCom'09, September 20–25, 2009, Beijing, China.

Copyright 2009 ACM 978-1-60558-702-8/09/09 ...\$10.00.

## 1.1 Challenges and Contributions

We consider a system comprising several access points, each with multiple cognitive radios, i.e., radios with the ability to tune their bandwidth, center frequency and power. While cognitive radios increase the flexibility to efficiently operate the system, it also imposes the challenge of tuning a plethora of system knobs, including power, center frequency, bandwidth, guard band and power spectral density. This is significantly different from traditional systems, where the standardization bodies were responsible for determining center frequencies, channel bandwidths, power spectral density and guard bands, and the system planner only had to allocate power and channels so as to maximize system capacity. There has been some significant recent advancement in the field that design systems and protocols for demand based dynamic spectrum allocation in different contexts [8–10, 18, 23, 29, 30]. However they study different problems where frequency dependent radio propagation and the diverse and fragmented nature of the spectrum do not come into play. Specifically, three key aspects that lead us to a novel system design are the following:

**A1. Propagation Characteristics:** Path loss is directly proportional to the square of the carrier frequency. Specifically lower frequencies propagate much farther than high frequencies.

**A2. Out of Band Emissions:** Radio transmissions are never entirely confined to their operating bandwidth. Some power leaks into the adjacent parts of the spectrum causing adjacent channel interference. This has typically only been accounted for by standardization bodies by providing sufficient guard bands between channels, and recently in [6] to show that partially overlapped channels can be used in Wi-Fi systems.

**A3. Diverse and Fragmented Spectrum:** DTV whitespaces for portable access span a large range (180 MHz ranging from 512 MHz–698 MHz) relative to the band of operation. In several cities, DTV whitespaces are fragmented with several whitespaces only 6 MHz in width.

A1 and A3 together imply that the system cannot be modeled using a single interference graph, i.e., two devices interfering in one whitespace need not interfere with each other in another whitespace. Therefore doing suitable dynamic allocation of spectrum requires the precise knowledge of the interference graph in different whitespaces especially because the whitespaces are spread across a large range of spectrum. Clearly the interference graph in a whitespace can be learnt using interference measurements over that whitespace, but performing such measurements over every whitespace can incur a lot of overhead when the spectrum range is large. A key challenge we address is to learn these interference graphs with minimal overhead. We also note that for a given transmit power and range, lower parts of the spectrum have higher spectral efficiencies (bps/Hz). However, assigning lower part of the spectrum to an AP also increases the interference. A key challenge is to design demand based spectrum allocation algorithms that accounts for this trade-off. The algorithmic challenge is further augmented by the fact that the third facet calls for each access point to have multiple radios. This is primarily due to A3 and other reasons to be explained in Section 5.

A1 and A2 imply that if two devices in the vicinity are transmitting in adjacent parts of the spectrum, then the guard band required between these two parts of the spectrum is a function of the carrier frequency and transmit power. Note that this guard band is required to minimize adjacent channel interference. Thus unlike traditional systems, the system designer cannot ignore this dependence in both architecture and algorithmic design.

Our main contributions are as follows:

1. We abstract out four core design rules that capture the essence of the interactions between the different factors. Our first two

rules determine what transmit power to use and what guard band to use. Our third rule illustrates how interference measurements over one part of the spectrum can be used to infer interference over the entire spectrum. For the fourth design rule, we propose a single metric (called *aggregate spectral efficiency*) that, for each AP, captures the relationship between achievable data rate, spectrum allocated, and client-locations. See Sections 3, 4.

2. Based on the design rules, we design a multi-radio based system architecture for Wi-Fi like unlicensed access in DTV whitespaces with carefully chosen fixed transmit power. Specifically we use a single control channel that serves two purposes (i) to establish communications with clients, learn the client’s demand and compute the aggregate spectral efficiency, and (ii) to make interference measurements with other access points, which can be translated into interference graphs for different whitespaces. We make no assumptions that there is no spatial variation in the whitespaces that different access points see. See Section 5.
3. We develop algorithms for demand based dynamic spectrum allocation in DTV-WS for guaranteeing *proportional fairness*, i.e., for maximizing overall log-utility of the system. Our algorithms provide constant-factor approximation guarantee when the interference graph *at every frequency* is a disc graph. Our algorithms account for spatial variation in the whitespaces seen by different access points. See Section 6.
4. Via simulations we show that, on an average, our algorithms perform within 94% of the optimal fair allocation in typical scenarios. We also capture the performance improvement over dynamic spectrum access in the 2.4 GHz ISM band and show that DTV-WS can provide significant improvements over the optimal allocation in the 2.4 GHz band. Thus, short range unlicensed access in the DTV-WS is indeed *Wi-Fi on steroids*. See Section 7.

## 2. RELATED WORK

**Spectrum Allocation:** The KNOWS [23, 29, 30] project at Microsoft has developed a hardware prototype, a carrier sense MAC and algorithms for dynamic spectrum access. The platform also uses two radios, one to scan the spectrum for detecting white space and another for subsequent data communications. While related to our work, factors such as propagation characteristics, co-channel interference and out-of-band emissions, do not come into play for their system design.

In [21], the authors consider a problem very similar in nature to ours. However, in this paper, issues of out-of-band emissions and frequency dependent interference graphs do not come into play. This increases the complexity of the problem we address significantly. In [7], the authors design and implement a Wi-Fi-like system with Wi-Fi components that operates over UHF whitespaces. [7] also demonstrates how spectrum fragmentation and spatial variation of spectrum have implication on network design.

Among other work, where propagation characteristics and out-of-band emissions are not critical, notable are [8, 9, 18] for dynamic spectrum allocation in a coordinated fashion for cellular networks.

**Others:** [10] looks at a key design issue in dynamic spectrum access - namely adaptively varying the bandwidth of a radio and its impact on its throughput, range, and power consumption. This uses commodity 802.11 hardware. However since this is in the context of the 2.4 GHz ISM band several of the issues we consider do not come into play here. Another recent paper [15] proposes using spread spectrum codes to perform demand based bandwidth allocation to the different access points. Once again, the context of this paper is different from the problem we wish to address.

Finally [20] provides an alternative perspective on the amount of whitespace available.

## 3. BACKGROUND

This section reviews relevant crucial aspects of radio propagation, out-of-band emissions, FCC regulations and DTV whitespaces.

**Radio Propagation:** In free space, the received power at a distance  $d$  from a point source radiating at wavelength  $\lambda$  with power  $P_t$  and antenna gain  $G$  is  $P_r = GP_t(\lambda/4\pi d)^2$  [26]. To account for additional phenomenon that occur in the real-world, such as, reflection, diffraction and scattering, the ITU has recommended the following path loss model in the range 900 MHz-100 GHz: [1]

$$PL(d) = 10 \log_{10} f_c^2 + 10\eta \log_{10} d + L_f(n) - 28 \text{ (in dB)}, \quad (1)$$

where  $f_c$  is the carrier frequency,  $\eta$  is the path loss coefficient,  $L_f(n)$  is the additional loss due to the number of floors  $n$  between the transmitter and receiver. Thus, there is an  $f_c^2$  dependence of the path-loss on the frequency. Such a dependence has also been experimentally verified for frequencies as low as 450 MHz [5], and also for outdoor environments [2]. Some recent studies have also shown that the frequency dependence is larger than a square law in some cases [19], however for this paper we will assume an  $f_c^2$  dependence which we believe to be largely true.

REMARK 1. *While this appears to be a remarkable result, we do not claim that measurements in one frequency band (say 10MHz), reveals all information about propagation in a much higher band (e.g., 10GHz). This is because material related properties such as absorption etc., vary with frequency. However, we believe that this relationship holds true across a few hundred MHz.*

**Out of Band Emissions (OE):** Signals transmitted by a radio are never entirely confined within the intended bandwidth  $B$ . Out-of-band emission (OE) is the signal energy that leaks outside the main band  $B$ <sup>1</sup>. Regulatory authorities and standardization bodies typically prescribe a *spectrum mask* for any technology in a particular band of operation. The mask specifies the rate at which the power spectral density (PSD) decays relative to the peak power spectral density outside the intended band of transmission. For example, the IEEE 802.11g standard specifies the PSD decay at a rate of 1.1 dB/MHz, outside the main band, as shown in Fig. 1.

The OE of a transmitter, at a frequency  $f$  MHz away from the edge of a  $B$  Hz wide transmission spectrum is given by

$$OE(f) = \frac{P_t L}{B} e^{-\alpha f} \text{ (in W/Hz)} \quad (2)$$

where,  $L$  and  $\alpha$  are constants that depend on the spectrum mask. For example,  $L = -20$  dB,  $\alpha = -1.1$  dB/MHz<sup>2</sup> for the IEEE 802.11g spectrum mask (Fig. 1). Therefore the measured emissions outside the intended band will be determined by the *peak power spectral density*,  $L$  and  $\alpha$  specified by the spectrum mask<sup>3</sup>.




Figure 1: Spectral Mask for IEEE 802.11g/a

**Adjacent Channel Interference (ACI):** The spectrum mask allows us to compute the adjacent channel interference precisely. For example, assume that two devices are separated by a distance  $d$  in

<sup>1</sup>The dominant source of out of band emission is the non linearity of power amplifiers. Other sources are imperfect receiver filters, oscillator radiation and interference from image frequencies

<sup>2</sup>Note that,  $\alpha$  in dB/MHz =  $10 \log(e^{-\alpha})$ .

<sup>3</sup>We note that, for certain spectrum masks, the OBE does not fall linearly outside the bandwidth of interest, rather it falls in a staircase like manner. However, (2) is typical of OFDM systems (e.g., 802.11g spectrum mask) and we will use this to derive our insights.

free space. Furthermore, assume that the first device is transmitting at power  $P_t$  over a bandwidth  $B$  in frequency band  $f_c$ . Assume that the second device is receiving over a bandwidth of  $W$ , and that there is a guard band of  $\delta$  between the two bands. Then the total adjacent channel interference can be computed by integrating the leakage power over the adjacent channel of bandwidth  $W$ , using Eqn. 2 and Eqn. 1 with  $L_f(n) = 0$  as

$$\frac{P_t L 10^{2.8}}{B d^n f_c^2 \alpha} e^{-\alpha \delta} (1 - e^{-\alpha W}) \quad (3)$$

**FCC Regulations:** After the transition to all digital TV transmissions, the available TV bands are 54 – 72 MHz (channels 2 – 4), 76 – 88 MHz (channels 5, 6), 174 – 216 MHz (channels 7 – 13) and 470 – 698 MHz (channels 14-51). In its recent *Second Report and Order* [4], the FCC has ruled that these bands can be used for unlicensed access of *fixed* and *portable* devices. We highlight below the regulations that are relevant to the problem we will be addressing.

**Channel Occupancy Database:** The FCC requires the maintenance of a Channel Occupancy Database (COD) which registers locations of TV transmitters, the channels they operate on and their service areas. In addition the database is also required to register public venues such as entertainment centers and sporting venues to avoid interference with wireless microphones which may be used at these locations.

**Fixed Devices:** Fixed devices can operate from channel 2-51 and are more relevant to the IEEE 802.22 standard and hence are not discussed here.

**Portable Devices:** Portable devices are intended to provide short range communications similar to Wi-Fi, and they can operate in two modes: either as a client (Mode I) or independently (Mode II). In Mode I, the portable device is in a master slave relationship either with a fixed device or a Mode II portable device. A Mode II device (similar to a Wi-Fi access point), should have geo-location ability and the ability to sense wireless microphones/TV signals up to  $-114$  dBm. Portable devices can operate only in channels 21 – 51. A portable device can transmit at a maximum power of 40 mW (resp. 100 mW) when operating in a whitespace adjacent (resp. non-adjacent) to a TV channel.

The FCC specifies that the *out of band emissions from an unlicensed white space device be at least 55dB below the highest average power in the 6MHz channel adjacent to the 6MHz channel in which the unlicensed device is operating.*

**Interference to DTV Receivers:** The FCC requires that in the worst case, a white space device should not cause interference to a DTV receivers due to both co-channel interference or out-of-band emissions (adjacent channel interference). The ATSC standard [3] for TV receivers specifies a SINR value of  $-15.5$  dB. Therefore to protect even weak TV signals (i.e., received signals at  $-83.5$  dBm), the interference level should be below  $-99$  dBm. Since the location of the DTV receiver is unknown, the FCC report (see para 235 in [4]) argues that it is reasonable to assume that the DTV receiver is 10m away in another premise behind a wall. This results in an additional 18dB loss. Consequently, from Eqn. 1, we will assume that the path loss to the DTV receiver at distance  $d$  is given by

$$PL_{dtv}(d) = 10 \log_{10} f_c^2 + 10\eta \log_{10} d - 10 \text{ (in dB)} \quad (4)$$


**Analysis of DTV Whitespaces:** A study conducted [14] shows that there is sufficient whitespace available. Summary statistics of the available whitespace in various markets is shown in Table 1.

## 4. DESIGN RULES

In this section, we distill four design rules to (i) determine transmit power, (ii) determine guard band between adjacent slices of the spectrum, (iii) show how interference graphs in different whitespaces can be learned with minimal overhead and (iv) devise a metric *aggregate spectral efficiency* (units are bits/sec/Hz) that captures

**Table 1: Available DTV-WS in some US urban and rural areas [14]. LOW is 54-88, MID is 174-216 and UP is 470-698 MHz band. The minimum size DTV-WS is 6 MHz everywhere.**

Market	Total available WS(MHz):			Max WS size
	LOW	MID	UP	
Boston	30	36	84	36
Dallas	30	36	72	24
San Francisco	30	36	78	30
Seattle	24	36	120	30
Trenton	30	30	90	30
Little Rock, AR	24	30	138	30
Juneau, AK	12	12	198	84
Columbia, SC	30	36	150	36



**Figure 2: Figure illustrating how a whitespace could be used by a single transmit-receive pair**

the average data rate that each AP can get from unit bandwidth in different whitespaces. These rules allow us to design a simple system architecture that accounts for the complex interplay between various interconnected factors.

### Determining Transmit Power:

We start by considering the following simple scenario. Consider a single transmit-receive pair separated by distance  $d$  in a single DTV whitespace of width  $W$  MHz. Assume an AWGN channel with noise power spectral density  $N_0$ . We pose the following question. *What is the maximum capacity achievable in this whitespace and the corresponding bandwidth and transmit power?* We assume that the white space spans from frequency  $f_l$  to  $f_h$ , with  $f_h - f_l = W$ . We assume that there is a guard band of  $x$  ( $y$ ) MHz between the DTV channel on the left (right) and the white space transmission to avoid ACI to DTV receivers. We assume that  $B$  MHz is used for transmission by the transmit-receive pair. See Figure 2.

The path loss between the transmit receive pair is given by Equation 1, where  $L_f(n)$  is zero. We assume that the white space device has a spectrum mask with parameters  $L$  and  $\alpha$  as in Equation 2 and that the path loss to the DTV receiver at distance 10 m is given by  $PL_{dtv}(10)$  as in Equation 4. Assume that the maximum interference which can leak into the DTV receiver is given by  $I_{dtv}$ . We assume that we operate in the high SNR regime, i.e.,  $SNR \gg 1$ . Our objective is to maximize the Shannon capacity, i.e.,

$$\max C = B \log_2 \left( \frac{P10^{2.8}}{(f_l + x + \frac{B}{2})^2 d^\eta N_0 B} \right) \quad (5)$$

$$\text{subject to, } \frac{10P}{f_l^2 10^\eta B \alpha} L e^{-\alpha x} (1 - e^{-6\alpha}) \leq I_{dtv} \quad (6)$$

$$\frac{10P}{f_h^2 10^\eta B \alpha} L e^{-\alpha y} (1 - e^{-6\alpha}) \leq I_{dtv} \quad (7)$$

$$B + x + y = W \quad (8)$$

$$x, y, B, P \geq 0 \quad (9)$$

The objective function (5), is obtained by assuming  $SNR \gg 1$  with a transmit power  $P$  at carrier frequency  $f_l + x + \frac{B}{2}$ . The received power is computed using 1. Equations 6, 7 are obtained using Equation 2 and 4 to ensure that the total out-of-band emissions to a DTV receiver (located as per FCC recommendations) receiving TV signals in the left or right DTV channel, does not violate the interference constraints.

**THEOREM 1.** *The solution to the optimization problem 5 is given by:*

$$B^* = \min \left( W, \frac{1}{\alpha} \log \left( \frac{4\gamma f_l^2}{N_0(2f_l + W + z)^2} \right) + \frac{W + z}{2} \right) \quad (10)$$


$$x^* = \frac{W + z - B^*}{2}, \quad y^* = \frac{W - z - B^*}{2}, \quad P^* = \gamma f_l^2 e^{\alpha x^*}$$

$$C^* = B^* \left[ \log_2 \left( \frac{4\gamma f_l^2}{N_0(2f_l + W + z)^2} \right) + \alpha x^* \log_2(e) \right]$$

where

$$\gamma = \frac{I_{dtv} \alpha}{L(1 - e^{-6\alpha})} \left( \frac{10}{d} \right)^\eta, \quad z = \frac{2}{\alpha} \log_e \left( \frac{f_h}{f_l} \right)$$

**PROOF.** Please see [12].  $\square$



**Figure 3: Optimal Bandwidth ( $B^*$ ), Capacity ( $C^*$ ) and Power ( $P^*$ ) versus Whitespace Width ( $W$ ) for  $W = 50, 174, 470$  MHz, computed with a spectrum mask of  $L = -50$ dB and  $\alpha = -2.28$  dB/MHz.**

In order to adhere to the FCC mandate of a 55 dB fall in the adjacent 6 MHz, we set  $L = -50$  dB and  $\alpha = -2.28$  dB/MHz<sup>4</sup> and  $I_{dtv} = -95$  dBm. With these values for the spectrum mask, we plot the optimal capacity, bandwidth and power as a function of the whitespace width for typical whitespace frequency bands in Figure 3. From Figure 3 we observe the following:

**Observation 1:** For the DTV transmission bands, the optimal bandwidth and capacity are *identical* across all frequency bands of operation from 54 MHz - 698 MHz, i.e., channels 2 - 51. This is because the restriction of adjacent channel interference to the DTV receiver, negates any benefit one obtains from moving to lower frequency bands of operation. Note that this observation is always true. However the exact optimal values depend on the spectrum mask parameters  $L$ ,  $\alpha$  and  $I_{dtv}$ . The transmit power however depends on the frequency of operation and increases with the frequency band of operation.

**Observation 2:** For our choice of spectrum mask parameters  $L$  and  $\alpha$ , the optimal bandwidth is equal to the available whitespace width, up to a width of 48 MHz. Thereafter, the optimal bandwidth's dependence on  $W$  is roughly  $W/2$ . For white spaces larger than 48 MHz, a guard band is required between the white space transmission and the DTV transmitter when transmitting at the optimal power. The optimal power goes up to a maximum of about 27 dBm in the 500 MHz range, i.e. channels 21 - 51.

**Observation 3:** Recall that the FCC mandate gives two alternative transmit power limits: either 40 mW over the entire whitespace, or 100 mW with a guard band of at least 6 MHz between

<sup>4</sup>This spectrum mask is used throughout the paper for illustration. Any valid choice of  $L$  and  $\alpha$  has to satisfy  $\int_0^6 OE(f)df \leq P_t 10^{-5.5}$ , where  $OE(f)$  is given by Eqn. 2 with  $P_t = 40$  mW and  $B = 6$  MHz.

operating spectrum of AP and DTV channel. From Figure 3, when  $B^* = W$  (with our parameters, for  $W < 48$  Mhz) the optimal transmit power is  $P^*$  which can be as high as 27 dBm in channels 21 - 51; however, since  $B^*$  is the entire whitespace, the FCC mandate imposes a power cap of 40 mW. When  $B^* < W$  (for  $W > 48$  MHz), even though the optimal transmit power could be higher than 100 mW, operating in a non-adjacent channel imposes a power cap of 100 mW by the FCC mandate. Our computations show that, the capacity loss due to FCC imposed power caps is less than 10% in the first case, and less than 6% in the second case. Thus, the FCC's recommendations for 512-698 MHz are almost optimal in terms of capacity for any whitespace width.

*Observation 4:* For typical cognitive radio systems, there is a maximum bandwidth limit  $B_m$  across which a radio can operate ( $B_m = 40$  MHz with many current technologies, e.g., GNU radio, IEEE 802.11n). Assume that you are operating in an non adjacent channel at 100 mW over a bandwidth  $B_m$ . Then the difference in capacity between using 100 mW and 40 mW is only 7.5% when  $B_m = 40$  MHz.

In summary, we do not lose much in terms of capacity by fixing the transmit power at 40mW. Fixing the transmit power at 40 mW simplifies the design space considerably and more importantly increases spectrum reuse in the system as compared to 100 mW transmit power.

The FCC recommends a  $-55$  dB loss in the adjacent 6 MHz channel when the whitespace device transmits at 40 mW in a 6 MHz channel. The spectrum mask is determined by this requirement. Once the spectrum mask is fixed, the out-of-band emissions are determined by the power spectral density (see Equation 3). Thus an operating bandwidth much lower than 6 MHz with a transmit power of 40 dBm adjacent to a DTV channel will have too high a power spectral density, resulting in out of band emissions that violate the FCC's requirements.

Motivated by the discussion so far and to simplify design, even when multiple pairs share the same whitespace width  $W$  (each using possibly different parts of the whitespace), we propose the following design rule:

**DESIGN RULE 1.** *Consider a white space  $W$ , which is to be shared between several APs. Ensure that each AP gets at least 6MHz and set the transmit power for each AP to 40 mW.*

Note that the rest of the paper does not critically depend on this design choice of 40 mW. All we suggest is that power control is not done. There are more complex choices possible if transmit power control is allowed. However, this significantly increases the complexity of the design space.

### Guard Band:

In the following, we assume each AP can provide coverage up to distance  $d$ . To compute the worst case ACI, we assume that two clients,  $A$  and  $B$  are communicating with two radios  $r_A$  and  $r_B$  respectively (They need not be associated with same AP). Client  $A$  is located at the edge of the transmission range of the  $r_A$ . We consider the following simultaneous transmissions:  $r_A$  receiving from Client  $A$  over bandwidth  $B_m$  and  $r_B$  transmitting to Client  $B$  over a bandwidth of 6MHz. These bandwidths are chosen so as to maximize the ACI (see Equation 3). Our goal is to compute the guard band for two cases: (i) the two radios  $r_A$  and  $r_B$  belong to the same access point and (ii) when  $r_A$  and  $r_B$  belong to different APs separated by a distance  $d_{aci}$ .

For the first case successful reception at  $r_A$  requires a minimum SINR threshold of  $\gamma$ :

$$\frac{\frac{P10^{2.8}}{d^\eta f_c^2}}{\frac{PL e^{-\alpha x}(1-e^{-\alpha B_m})}{6\alpha} + N_0 B_m} \geq \gamma$$

$$\Rightarrow x = \frac{1}{\alpha} \log_e \left( \frac{\frac{\gamma PL(1-e^{-\alpha B_m})}{6\alpha}}{\frac{P10^{2.8}}{d^\eta f_c^2} - \gamma N_0 B_m} \right),$$

where  $x$  is the guard band. Note that beyond this threshold, the data rate depends on the actual SINR.

By setting  $f_c$  to  $f_c(max) = 698$  MHz, transmit power to 40 mW, range of 50 m, a worst case  $\eta = 4.5$  and  $\gamma = 6$  dB, we get the maximum possible adjacent channel separation of about 20 MHz. We note that even with  $f_c$  as low as 512MHz (channel 21), the channel separation only decreases marginally. The corresponding channel separation in the 2.4 GHz ISM band increases to about 25 MHz. This validates experimental results which show that with smaller guard bands in a multi-radio Wi-Fi system, radios on the same AP can either transmit or receive simultaneously, but not do both at the same time [25].

To compute the guard band in the second case, with the same settings as above, our computations show that for  $d_{aci}$  as small as 2 m, the guard band requirement falls to zero.

Based on these computations, we propose the following design principle:

**DESIGN RULE 2.** *The guard band depends on the frequency of operation. For channels 21 - 51, the guard band between frequency allocations on two different radios on the same AP should be separated by at least 20MHz. Thus for the choice of spectrum mask parameters  $L = -50$  dB and  $\alpha = -2.28$  dB/MHz, adjacent channels with no guard band can be allocated to adjacent access points<sup>5</sup>.*

### Interference Graph:

A standard technique to mitigate co-channel interference between two wireless devices (not talking to each other) is to ensure that they are allotted the same channel only if the received power from one device at the other device is less than a certain threshold  $\beta$ . For our problem, the path loss depends on frequency and hence two APs that interfere with each other in one part of the spectrum need not do so in another part of the spectrum. Therefore the interference graph between different APs in the system is a function of the whitespace that is being used. Note that even in the 512 - 698 MHz band, this can hold true as observed in our simulations (Section 7). This effect could be much more pronounced if the FCC allows access to portable devices across Channels 2 - 51. We now illustrate how received power measurement in one part of the spectrum can be used to infer the received power in some other part of the spectrum. Consider two APs  $AP_1$  and  $AP_2$ , and suppose  $AP_1$  is transmitting using power  $P$ . Suppose  $P_r(f_1)$  is the received power at  $AP_2$  when the transmission happens using carrier frequency  $f_1$ , and similarly  $P_r(f_2)$  is defined. Using Equation 1, it can be easily shown that

$$P_r(f_1) - P_r(f_2) = 20 \log \left( \frac{f_2}{f_1} \right). \quad (11)$$

Without loss of generality, assume  $f_1 < f_2$ . Equation 11 shows that if either of  $P_r(f_1)$  or  $P_r(f_2)$  is known, the other can be inferred. If each AP experiences different amounts of ambient interference in each whitespace, then following two step process can be followed. In the first step, each access point reports (via a control channel say) the ambient interference it experiences in each whitespace to a central controller (see Remark 3 in Section 5). In the second step, measurements in any one frequency band are used to estimate if the total interference (ambient plus induced interference) experienced by the AP in the other frequency band exceeds a given threshold. Finally we recommend using the lower frequency bands to estimate interference graphs in the higher frequency bands since for a given receiver sensitivity, it is easier to hear control messages in the lower frequency band.

**DESIGN RULE 3.** *The interference map of an AP in a higher frequency band can be inferred from the interference measurements*

<sup>5</sup>This is not true for IEEE 802.11g where the spectrum mask parameters are more lax with  $L = -20$  dB and  $\alpha = -1.1$  dB/MHz


in a lower frequency band using Equation 11 along with appropriate ambient interference measurements.

A word of caution, the path loss need not have an  $f_c^2$  dependence and the exponent could be higher for some frequency bands [5]. This can be easily accounted for via one time measurements prior to deployment.

### Aggregate Spectral Efficiency (ASE):

We introduce a new metric called aggregate spectral efficiency. Recall our goal is to do demand based spectrum allocation to APs. However doing this efficiently requires the knowledge of how much data rate does a given amount of spectrum translate to for each AP in each whitespace. A simple solution is to do a worst case design where the data rate for a given amount of spectrum is achieved using the lowest modulation. This is equivalent to assuming that all users are at the edge of the coverage region which is clearly too conservative. The ASE metric allows us to capture the dependence between the given amount of spectrum and data rate based on (i) the RSSI values of all clients associated with an AP and (ii) the location of the spectrum.

To derive the ASE metric we need to know how the data rate depends on SINR. In the ideal case this is given by Shannon's formula, which essentially says that the spectral efficiency (bits/sec/Hz) is a constant multiplier of the SINR in dB. For many modern physical layer technologies, for a given bit error rate, the achieved spectral efficiency takes discrete values that depend on SINR thresholds. Moreover, these discrete values vary linearly with the SINR thresholds in dB. For example (see Figure 4), we performed linear regression between SINR and spectral efficiency for discrete rates of IEEE 802.16d. A similar trend can be observed for IEEE 802.11g as well. Thus, we assume that spectral efficiency varies with SINR as  $a + bSINR(dB)$  for some constants  $a$  and  $b$  that depend on the physical layer technology.



**Figure 4:** Result of linear regression test we performed for bits/sec/Hz vs. SINR (dB) for discrete rates of IEEE 802.16d.

Consider a carrier frequency  $f_1$  for an AP. Assume the  $k^{\text{th}}$  client perceives  $SINR_k(f_1)(dB)$ . Then the spectral efficiency for the  $k^{\text{th}}$  client is  $\eta_k(f_1) = a + bSINR_k(f_1)$ . Assume there are  $N$  clients and each client has equal opportunity to communicate with the AP. Then the ASE is given by

$$\eta_{avg}(f_1) = a + \frac{b}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N SINR_k(f_1).$$

This shows that in a given band, the ASE can be inferred purely from measurements of SINR. The next question is how does one obtain a good estimate of ASE across all bands in the spectrum without having to do measurements in each band. To compute this, we assume that every client experiences an average interference  $I_{th}$ . Note that the precise value of  $I_{th}$  is not required for our purpose. Consider two carrier frequencies  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  with  $f_1 < f_2$  and let  $RSSI_k(f_1)$  and  $RSSI_k(f_2)$  be the received signal strengths in dB for the  $k^{\text{th}}$  client. Thus  $SINR_k(f_i) = RSSI_k(f_i) - I_{th}$ .

Thus  $SINR_k(f_2) - SINR_k(f_1) = RSSI_k(f_2) - RSSI_k(f_1) = 20 \log_{10}(f_1/f_2)$ , from which it follows that  $\eta_{avg}(f_1) - \eta_{avg}(f_2) = 20 \log_{10}(f_1/f_2)$ . The preceding discussion results in the following design rule.

**DESIGN RULE 4.** For any frequency band, the RSSI measurements from the clients can be used to compute the ASE. The ASE in one frequency band can be computed from the ASE in another frequency band.

**REMARK 2.** The assumption that every client sees an average interference  $I_{th}$  can be relaxed via further measurements as stated earlier. The details are left out in the interest of brevity.

## 5. SYSTEM ARCHITECTURE AND SPECTRUM ALLOCATION PROBLEM

Based on the design rules illustrated in the Section 4, we describe the system architecture in this section. We start by describing the infrastructure components and their capabilities and show interaction between the different components. Finally we formulate the spectrum allocation problem. We point out that our architecture and spectrum allocation problem are general enough to capture spatial variation in whitespace availability, *i.e.*, when the availability of white spaces is not uniform across APs.

### 5.1 Architecture

We consider an enterprise system comprising several access points distributed across the enterprise. There are several DTV whitespaces available in the DTV band. The demand seen by the access points varies over time. The challenge therefore is to assign whitespaces to the access points based on the demand seen by the access points.

**Access Points:** An access point acts as a Mode II device as specified by FCC (see Section 3). Each access point comprises multiple transceivers. One transceiver is dedicated for communications over a common *control channel*. The control channel serves 3 purposes: first, it is used for client-AP association; second, make measurements to infer interference graphs over the whitespaces; and third, make measurements to compute the aggregate spectral efficiency (ASE) across all whitespaces. The control channel should operate over a frequency band lower than channel 21. We recommend this based on Design Rule 3 which implies that the interference graph in a higher frequency band can be inferred from measurements over the control channel located at a lower frequency. We also recommend that the control channel be an ISM band channel (e.g., 433 MHz) since it is available at all locations all the time. Note that the design choice of control channel with a large range in a lower frequency ISM band is deliberate, and choosing the control channel in 900 MHz ISM band (as in [29]) or a higher ISM band is sub-optimal for our case. All other transceivers have the ability to tune into any set of whitespace frequencies authorized by the FCC (currently channels 21-51). Note that current cognitive radio technology already allows transceivers to tune across several GHz [16]. We assume that each radio can tune into only a single contiguous band<sup>6</sup>. Modifying the bandwidth on demand is easily achievable in OFDM based systems and is referred to as channel bonding. See also [10] where the authors achieve this by changing the clock frequency of the PLL on commodity Wi-Fi radios.

We remark that the *medium access mechanism* by which the access point communicates with a client on any white space is left unspecified. It could be an CSMA/CA mechanism as in IEEE 802.11b/g or it could follow a scheduling mechanism as in cellular systems like WiMAX. The access point has geo-location and spectrum sensing capability in accordance with FCC rules for Mode II

<sup>6</sup>Non contiguous bandwidth, via NC-OFDM is also possible, but we do not consider this in our paper since the technology is not yet mature


devices. Based on design principle 1, each access point transmits at a fixed power of 40mW.

**Clients:** We assume that the clients have one or more radios and acts as a Mode I device as specified by the FCC. If it has a single radio, then the client first tunes into the control channel and listens for beacon messages from the various access points. While several complex client-AP association decisions are possible, we assume that the client sends an *association request* to the access point from whom the beacon message is received with the maximum signal strength. The association request message contains its MAC ID, desired data rate (demand) and RSSI from the AP. If the association request is accepted, the access point responds with the set of white spaces, center frequencies and bandwidths over which it can communicate.

When a client is finished with its session, it sends a dissociation request to the access point. Alternatively, if an access point does not hear from the client for more than a certain amount of time, it assumes that the client is no longer associated with it.

**Central Controller:** The central controller has the following functionality. First, it periodically computes the interference graphs in the different whitespaces. Based on Design Rule 3, this can be performed using measurements over a single control channel. Next, for each AP, it computes the ASE in the different whitespaces based on control channel aggregate RSSI measurements provided by the AP (see Design Rule 4 for how this is computed). Finally, it computes an efficient allocation of the available whitespaces based on interference maps, ASEs, ACI constraints (see Design Rule 2), transmit power constraint (see Design Rule 1), and demands. In the next subsection, we precisely formulate this problem and develop algorithms in the subsequent section.

Finally, in Figure 5, we show the interaction between the clients, APs, and the central controller.



**Figure 5: Timing Diagram showing interaction between clients, APs and central controller**

REMARK 3. We note the following:

1. Note that the central controller can efficiently compute the interference graphs on different whitespaces by borrowing techniques for AP beacon scheduling developed in [17, 22, 24].
2. Performing spectrum re-allocation very frequently incurs a cost in communication overhead and switching delays. Hence the duration  $T$  should be chosen judiciously to minimize switching overheads. In addition, there could be a thresholding policy where the allocation is changed only if it is significantly different from the old allocation.
3. The presence of wireless microphones near APs cause non-availability of these whitespaces to APs. Also, since the wireless

microphones operate intermittently, this causes temporal variation in the available whitespaces [7]. This can be handled by APs triggering a spectrum re-allocation when they detect wireless microphones. However, we believe that the time-scale of operation of wireless microphones is of the order of few minutes and thus, this would only marginally increase the overhead due to spectrum re-allocation.

## 5.2 Spectrum Allocation Problem in DTV-band

**Table 2: Notations used.**

Notation	Description
$N_{AP}$	Number of Access Points (AP's)
$AP_i$	Access Point no. $i$
$d_i$	Demand of $AP_i$
$N_{rad}$	Number of radios per AP
$B_m$	Maximum operating bandwidth for a radio
$b_m$	Minimum permissible bandwidth for a radio
$N_{WS}$	Number of DTV White Spaces
$WS_j$	White Space no. $j$ (indexed from left to right in the spectrum)
$f_j$	Center frequency of $WS_j$
$W_j$	Available bandwidth in $WS_j$
$\Delta_{ACI}$	ACI guard band between two radios of an AP
$d_{CCI}$	CCI reuse distance
$N_{ij}$	Set of interfering AP's of $AP_i$ in $WS_j$

There are  $N_{WS}$  distinct white spaces (WS), where the  $j^{\text{th}}$  white space has center frequency  $f_j$  and total available bandwidth  $W_j$ . We wish to distribute the white space bandwidth among  $N_{AP}$  distinct AP's. Each AP has  $N_{rad}$ <sup>7</sup> different radios. For the  $j^{\text{th}}$  white space, associated with  $AP_i$  is a set of other AP's  $N_{ij}$  (called neighbors of  $AP_i$  in white space  $j$ ) that cannot transmit simultaneously with  $AP_i$  over the same spectrum on any of the  $N_{rad}$  radios.

Furthermore, associated with  $AP_i$  are two parameters: (i) demand in terms of data rate, denoted by  $d_i$ , and (ii) ASE over whitespaces  $WS_j$   $\eta_{ij}$ . Our goal is to assign spectrum to all/some of the radios of each AP in the different WS's. The algorithms we develop assume that each radio gets a contiguous chunk of bandwidth but is extensible to cases with non-contiguous allocation also.

Note that, our algorithms are generic enough to account for spatial variation in white space availability. Specifically, we can set  $\eta_{ij} = 0$  if  $WS_j$  is not available to  $AP_i$ . In the following, we describe the system constraints and the optimization objective while performing the allocation.

### 5.2.1 System Constraints and Objective

We next delve into the several constraints that the system imposes, and the objective function.

**Operating Spectrum Width (OSW):** From the discussion in Section 4,  $B_m$  is the maximum allocable bandwidth to each radio of an access point.

**Minimum Spectrum Width (MSW):** To ensure that the power spectral density at the edge of the operating spectrum of a radio does not become too large, we need to ensure that the minimum allocable bandwidth is  $b_m = 6\text{MHz}$ .

**Co-channel Reuse Constraint (CCI):** The CCI constraints are determined by the interference graph computed by the central controller for each whitespace as described earlier.

**Adjacent-channel Reuse Constraint (ACI):** This states that, there should be a bandwidth separation of at least  $\Delta_{ACI} = 20\text{MHz}$  (see Design Rule 2 in Section 4) between any two radios of an AP.

**Objective function:** For most resource allocation problems, there is a tussle between maximizing system capacity and ensuring fairness to competing users. For example, in wireless systems like EV-DO, the objective is such that it maximizes the sum of the logarithm of data rates given to different users. On the other hand, maximizing system capacity is best utilization of system resources.

<sup>7</sup>Our results easily apply when there are different number of radios with different AP's, but for ease of exposition we will assume that all AP's have same number of radios.

The first objective function we consider is that of ensuring fairness. We choose the tried and tested practice of ensuring *proportional fairness*. In proportional fairness based schemes, the goal is to maximize overall system *utility* where the logarithm of the data rates are taken as a measure of utility. In such a scheme, the objective is to find data rate  $r_i$  to  $AP_i$ , so as to achieve the following.

$$\text{Maximize } \sum_i d_i \log(1 + r_i)$$

Instead of  $d_i$ , we can chose some other weight that reflects the demand (for example, number of clients with the AP's). However, choosing  $d_i$  as the weight has the following intuitive interpretation: if  $r_i$  is increased to  $r_i + \delta$  for  $AP_i$ , then the utility of  $AP_i$  increases by  $\delta d_i / (1 + r_i) \approx \delta d_i / r_i$ ; thus, the additional utility of an additional  $\delta$  amount of data rate is directly proportional to demand  $d_i$  and inversely proportional to existing data rate  $r_i$ . We have chosen the utility functions as  $d_i \log(1 + r_i)$  instead of  $d_i \log r_i$  to ensure that the system utility is always positive. This does not make any difference to the motivation behind considering a logarithmic utility functions and our algorithms.

We also consider the problem of maximizing system capacity. For this problem, our objective will be to maximize the total data rate across all AP's, subject to the constraint that no AP gets more than the requested demand. In, other words, if  $r_i$  is the data rate that  $AP_i$  gets as a result of the spectrum allocation, then, our goal is to choose  $r_i$ 's so that the following is achieved (recall that,  $d_i$  denotes the demand of  $AP_i$ ):

$$\text{Maximize } \sum_i \min(r_i, d_i)$$

This is equivalent to maximizing the system capacity subject to the constraint that no AP gets more than the requested demand.

### 5.2.2 Problem Statement

We are now in a position to state our problem.

#### Proportionally Fair White-Space Spectrum Allocation Problem (PF-WSA):

*Given:*  $N_{AP}$  APs and their demands  $d_i, i = 1, \dots, N_{AP}$ ;  $N_{rad}$  radios for each AP;  $N_{WS}$  whitespaces (WS's) and their widths  $W_j, j = 1, 2, \dots, N_{WS}$  and center frequencies  $f_{c_j}$ ; the ASE for  $AP_i$  over spectrum  $WS_j$   $\eta_{ij}$ ; and  $N_{ij}$ , the set of interfering APs of  $AP_i$  in  $WS_j$ ; the maximum operating spectrum  $B_m$  for each radio of each AP,  $b_m$  the minimum bandwidth allocable to any radio and the minimum bandwidth separation  $\Delta_{ACI}$  required between two radios of the same AP.

*To find:* An allocation of spectrum to the  $N_{rad}$  radios of the AP's subject to the system constraints OSW, MSW, CCI, and ACI such that, if  $r_i$  is the data rate achieved by  $AP_i$ , then  $\sum_i d_i \log(1 + r_i)$  is maximized.

We have also developed algorithms for the problem of maximizing system capacity subject to the constraint that no AP gets allocation more than its demand (this problem is called CM-WSA). For further details about CM-WSA, we refer the reader to [12].

REMARK 4. *It is easy to see that the problem is at least as hard as computing the maximum weight independent set in a graph. Clearly if there is a single whitespace of width  $b_m$ , and the ASEs are identical for all APs, then our problem reduces to the problem of computing the maximum weight independent set by setting the demands as the weights. Thus PF-WSA is NP-hard to approximate within  $n^{1-\epsilon}$  of the optimal.*

## 6. ALGORITHMS

In this section, we will describe our algorithm for PF-WSA. Throughout this section, we will use the notation  $x^+$  as  $x^+ = \max(x, 0)$ .

### 6.1 Overview and Key Intuition

As noticed in some of the previous work [30], spectrum allocation problems are much generalized versions of graph coloring where each node has to be assigned an interval in the frequency band. However, PF-WSA has two additional complexities. Firstly, there are multiple radios with each AP which makes PF-WSA a problem of assigning multiple disjoint (and sufficiently separated so as to not violate ACI constraint) intervals to nodes. Secondly, there is no fixed graph as the interference map giving rise to graph structure is different for different WS's. We develop algorithms that deal with these complexities in two steps: first solve the problem with single WS and single radio, and then perform a *local search* to iteratively improve the objective function. More precisely, our algorithm has the following key components:

- *Spectrum allocation for single WS and single radio per AP:* This sub-routine solves the problem when each AP is equipped with a single radio and the total width of the WS is such that we can use single interference graph for the entire WS (clearly, this is not possible for large WS's). The key intuition for this step is the fact that the problem can be solved easily for a clique: greedily assign spectrum to AP's that give higher increase in the utility per unit of spectrum. However, since identifying cliques in a graph is a hard problem, we perform the following approximation. Identify cliques formed by neighbors of a node for all nodes  $u$ , and then greedily assign spectrum by giving higher priority to those cliques that give the best improvement in the objective function. In the next subsections, we not only show how these steps can be carried out efficiently, but also show that this algorithm provides a provable constant factor approximation for disc graphs.
- *Iterative local search procedure:* To solve the general problem, we divide the entire spectrum into chunks of width  $B_m$ . With such a partitioning, in a single chunk, we will assign spectrum to no more than one radio of any AP. We will solve the general problem in two steps. First, perform any feasible assignment of spectrum to the AP's in each of the chunks. Next is the *local search*, that checks whether changing the allocation for any of the WS's provides improvement over the existing solution or not. We keep repeating the local search step a fixed number of times. In each of the steps, we ensure that none of the constraints of the problem are violated. In the next section, we outline the details of the algorithm.

We will first describe the algorithms for a single WS, and then we will show how the algorithms can be extended for multiple WS's.

### 6.2 Algorithms for Single WS

We will develop the algorithm for a slightly more generic log utility of the following form:

$$U_i(r_i) = d_i \log(1 + (r_i - m_i)^+) \quad (12)$$

Our goal is to maximize  $\sum_i U_i(r_i)$ . The generic form can be interpreted in the following manner: data rates to  $AP_i$  is useful only if the data rate  $r_i$  is more than a minimum threshold of  $m_i$ ; if  $r_i \leq m_i$ , then the log utility is zero. Our original log utility can be recovered by setting  $m_i = 0$ . This more generic form will be useful for us later when we develop algorithms for multiple WS's using the algorithm for single WS as a sub-routine.

We now describe our solution to the PF-WSA problem for a single while space.

**Solving PF-WSA for a clique:** The algorithm is shown in Algorithm *PfSpecAllocClique*. The algorithm starts by expressing the achievable log utility of an AP in terms of the bandwidth, and then quantizing the data rates in steps of  $\epsilon_q, \epsilon_q(1 + \epsilon_q), \epsilon_q(1 + \epsilon_q)^2, \epsilon_q(1 + \epsilon_q)^3, \dots$  (step 1- 4). The parameter  $\epsilon_q$  can be chosen

**Algorithm 1** *PfSpecAllocClique*: Prop. fair Spectrum Allocation in  $WS_j$  when the interference graph is a Clique  $C_G$

- 1: **for all** nodes  $y \in C_G$  **do**
- 2: Define the utility as a function of bandwidth by accounting for the spectral efficiency. Define

$$U_y(b) = d_y \log(1 + (\eta_{yj}b - m_y)^+), \quad b \geq 6,$$

and  $U_y(b) = 0$  for  $b < b_m = 6$ .

- 3: Quantize the utility as follows. Compute the bandwidth required to get an utility of  $\epsilon_q(1 + \epsilon_q)^r$ ,  $r = 0, 1, 2, \dots, r_{y,\max}$ , where  $r_{y,\max}$  depends on the demand  $d_y$ . In other words, compute

$$q_y(r) = \min\{b : U_y(b) \geq \epsilon_q(1 + \epsilon_q)^r\}.$$

- 4: **end for**
- 5: Initialize spectrum given to  $AP_y$  as  $b_y := 0$  for every  $y \in C_G$ . Also denote by  $r_y$  (valid only when  $b_y > 0$ ) the bandwidth offered to  $AP_y$  in terms of what quantized level is reached by  $U_y(\cdot)$ .
- 6: Initialize used bandwidth as  $UB := 0$  and  $Y := C_G$ . Also,  $W$  is the width of the WS.
- 7: **while**  $UB < W$  or  $Y \neq \emptyset$  **do**
- 8:   **for all**  $y \in Y$  **do**
- 9:     Compute  $\text{slope}(y)$  as follows:

$$\text{slope}(y) = \begin{cases} \frac{\epsilon_q(1+\epsilon_q)^{r_y+1} - \epsilon_q(1+\epsilon_q)^{r_y}}{q_y(r_y+1) - q_y(r_y)} & ; b_y \neq 0 \\ \max_{s \geq 0} \frac{\epsilon_q(1+\epsilon_q)^s}{q_y(s)} & ; b_y = 0 \end{cases}$$

- 10:   **if**  $b_y = 0$  **then**
- 11:      $\delta_y = \arg \max_{s \geq 0} \frac{\epsilon_q(1+\epsilon_q)^s}{q_y(s)}$
- 12:   **else**
- 13:      $\delta_y = 1$
- 14:   **end if**
- 15: **end for**
- 16: Among nodes in  $y' \in Y$ , find the node  $y_m$  such that

$$y_m = \arg \max_y [\text{slope}(y)]$$

{ $y_m$  is the node that best utilizes the spectrum for going to the next quanta.}

- 17:  $UB \leftarrow UB + (q_{y_m}(r_{y_m} + \delta_{y_m}) - q_{y_m}(r_{y_m}))$
- 18: If  $b_{y_m} = 0$ , then set  $r_{y_m} = \delta_{y_m}$ ; else update  $r_{y_m} \leftarrow r_{y_m} + \delta_{y_m}$
- 19:  $b_{y_m} \leftarrow q_{y_m}(r_{y_m})$
- 20: **if**  $r_{y_m} = r_{y_m,\max}$  **then**
- 21:    $Y \leftarrow Y - \{y_m\}$
- 22: **end if**
- 23: **end while**
- 24: **if**  $UB > W$  **then**
- 25:    $r_{y_m} \leftarrow r_{y_m} - \delta_{y_m}$
- 26: **end if**
- 27: Compute the total utility  $TU(C_G)$  attainable by the nodes in  $C_G$ , and total bandwidth used  $TB(C_G)$  by these nodes as

$$TU(C_G) = \sum_{y \in C_G, b_y > 0} \epsilon_q(1 + \epsilon_q)^{r_y}, \quad TB(C_G) = \sum_{y \in C_G} b_y \quad (13)$$

- 28: **if**  $TU(C_G) < U_{y_m}(\delta_{y_m})$  **then**
- 29:    $TU(C_G) = U_{y_m}(\delta_{y_m})$ , and  $r_{y_m} = \delta_{y_m}$  and  $r_i = 0$  for  $i \neq y_m$ .
- 30: **end if**

to trade-off computational complexity and accuracy of the algorithm. Then the algorithm greedily assigns spectrum to the AP's till the total WS width is exhausted (step 5- 23). At each stage of the greedy allocations, the following two requirements are ensured:

1. If an AP is assigned spectrum in a greedy stage, then assign sufficient spectrum so that the AP's log utility becomes  $\epsilon_q(1 + \epsilon_q)^r$  for some  $r$ . Also, if an AP has already been allocated some spectrum, the greedy choice just allocates enough spectrum for the utility to increase by one quantization level, *i.e.*, the greedy step increases the log utility from  $\epsilon_q(1 + \epsilon_q)^r$  to  $\epsilon_q(1 + \epsilon_q)^{r+1}$ .

2. The greedy choice is to assign spectrum to the AP for whom allocating spectrum for increasing the log utility to one of the next quantization levels is spectrally most efficient. There are two cases depending on whether an AP had been allocated spectrum till the previous greedy step or not. If  $AP_y$  was not allocated any spectrum till the previous greedy step, we compute  $\text{slope}(y)$  as

$$\text{slope}(y) = \max_{s \geq 0} \frac{\epsilon_q(1 + \epsilon_q)^s}{q_y(s)}.$$

On the other hand, if  $AP_y$  was allocated spectrum till the previous step so that the utility was  $\epsilon_q(1 + \epsilon_q)^{r_y}$ , then we compute  $\text{slope}(y)$  as

$$\text{slope}(y) = \frac{\epsilon_q(1 + \epsilon_q)^{r_y+1} - \epsilon_q(1 + \epsilon_q)^{r_y}}{q_y(r_y + 1) - q_y(r_y)}$$

where  $q_y(r_y)$  is the minimum spectrum required for the utility of  $AP_y$  to become  $\epsilon_q(1 + \epsilon_q)^{r_y}$ . The greedy choice is the allocate spectrum to  $AP_y$  for which  $\text{slope}(y)$  is maximum.

In the end, the algorithm computes the total utility achieved by the clique. Note that the updates in last iteration of the greedy choice is discarded if the used bandwidth exceeds the available bandwidth of the white space (step 24). However, if the last iteration alone contributes to the utility more than the other iterations combined, we allocate bandwidth only to the greedy choice in the last iteration (step 28).

**Solving PF-WSA for a General Interference graph:** The solution of PF-WSA in the case of general graphs is shown in Algorithm *BestNeighborhoodFirst*, and has the following key stages.

*Stage-1: Computing the total utility in the neighborhoods:* This is shown in one iteration of the *for loop* in step 3 because this step is repeated. In this stage, we first compute the total system utility  $TU(u)$ ,  $\forall u$  achievable by the neighborhoods of the different nodes. We do this as follows for the neighborhood of  $u$  (step 5-14):

- For every node  $v$  that is a neighbor of  $u$ , we consider the set of nodes that are neighbors of both  $v$  and  $u$ , *i.e.*, we consider the set  $N_{uj} \cap N_{vj}$ . Next, we treat this set  $N_{uj} \cap N_{vj}$  as a clique and use Algorithm *PfSpecAllocClique* to find the total attainable utility  $TU(u, v)$ . The algorithm then finds the node  $v_m \in N_{uj}$  for which  $TU(u, v)$  is maximum, and the corresponding  $TU(u, v_m)$  is added to the existing value of  $TU(u)$ .

- We remove the following nodes from consideration: the node  $v_m$ , its neighbors (that also belong to  $N_{uj}$ ) who get allocation in the previous step, and neighbors of all nodes who get allocation. The previous step is then repeated within the neighborhood of  $u$ , till all neighbors of  $u$  are exhausted.

*Stage-2: Allocating spectrum to the best neighborhood:* As shown in step 16, we then find the node  $u$  for which  $TU(u)$  is maximum, *i.e.* find the node  $u_m$  whose neighborhood produces the maximum value of total utility. *Actual spectrum allocation is then done to the nodes in  $N_{uj}$  in accordance with the previous stage.*

*Stage-3: Repetition of the steps:* All the nodes that get allocation are removed from consideration, and also removed are their neighbors (step 17). The algorithm then repeats the first two stages on the new graph, and enters one more iteration of the *for loop* in step 3.

The computational complexity of the algorithm is

$$O(N_{AP}^4 \log(W_{max}) / \log(1 + \epsilon_q)),$$

<sup>8</sup>Note that, in reality,  $CN_{uj} \cap N_{vj}$  need not form a clique, but we will show later that treating it like a clique does result in good approximation.

---

**Algorithm 2** *BestNeighborhoodFirst*: Greedy Algorithm for PF-WSA

---

- 1: Let  $G$  denote the graph formed by the interference maps of each nodes. Initialize  $G_{\text{cand}} := G$  as the graph on which we will next perform greedy allocation of spectrum. At each step,  $G_{\text{cand}}$  only consists of AP's that are candidate for allocation.
  - 2: **while**  $G_{\text{cand}}$  has at least one node **do**
  - 3:   **for all**  $u \in G_{\text{cand}}$  **do** ( $G_{\text{cand}}$  denotes the interference graph in this  $WS_j$ )
  - 4:     Initialize  $TU(u)$ , the total capacity attainable by the nodes in the neighborhood of  $u$  as  $TU(u) := 0$ .
  - 5:     Let  $CN_{uj}$  be the candidate neighbors for spectrum allocation. Initialize  $CN_{uj} := N_{uj} \cap \{v : v \text{ belongs to } G_{\text{cand}}\}$ .
  - 6:     **while**  $CN_{uj} \neq \emptyset$  **do**
  - 7:       **for all**  $v \in CN_{uj}$  **do**
  - 8:          Find nodes that belong to  $CN_{uj} \cap N_{vj}$ .
  - 9:          Apply *PfSpecAllocClique* to  $CN_{uj} \cap N_{vj}$  to compute (i) the total capacity  $TU(u, v)$  attainable by the nodes in  $CN_{uj} \cap N_{vj}$ , and (ii) total bandwidth used  $TB(u, v)$  by these nodes<sup>8</sup>.
  - 10:       **end for**
  - 11:       Find  $v_m \in CN_{uj}$  for which  $TC(u, v)$  is maximized, and assign spectrum according to *PfSpecAllocClique*.
  - 12:       Update  $TU(u)$  as
 
$$TU(u) \leftarrow TU(u) + TU(u, v_m).$$
  - 13:       Remove from  $CN_{uj}$  nodes in  $CN_{uj} \cap N_{vj}$ , and also neighbors of  $CN_{uj} \cap N_{vj}$  (i.e., nodes that have a neighbor in  $CN_{uj} \cap N_{vj}$ ).
  - 14:     **end while**
  - 15:   **end for**
  - 16:   Allocate spectrum to the node  $u_m$  in  $G_{\text{cand}}$  that has maximum  $TU(u)$ , i.e.,
 
$$u_m = \arg \max_{u \in \text{Nodes in } G_{\text{cand}}} TU(u)$$
  - 17: Let  $V$  be the set of nodes that get some spectrum in the previous step. Now, update  $G_{\text{cand}}$  by deleting all nodes in  $V$  and their neighbors.
  - 18: **end while**
- 

where  $W_{max}$  is the maximum white space width and  $\epsilon_q$  is the quantization step size.

The performance guarantee of Algorithm *BestNeighborhoodFirst* is very difficult to prove for arbitrary topologies. However, our problem can be viewed as a much more complex version of finding maximum weight independent sets (MWIS) in a graph. While MWIS is hard to approximate in general graphs, good approximations are known for special class of graphs known as disc graphs. The questions we ask is the following: for the case of disc graphs, is there any provable approximation guarantee for our algorithm? In the following, we will show that, if the interference graph in a frequency is a disc graph, then the performance of Algorithm *BestNeighborhoodFirst* is within a constant factor of the optimal. We have the following result.

**THEOREM 2.** *Suppose the interference graph at every frequency is a disc graph, i.e., the interfering AP's of any  $AP_i$  lie in a disc around  $AP_i$ . Also, suppose  $TU$  is the total utility computed by Algorithm *BestNeighborhoodFirst*, and  $OU$  is the optimal utility of PF-WSA for single WS and single radio per AP. Then, there is a constant,  $\psi > 1$ , independent of the input to the problem such that the following holds:*

$$OU < \psi \cdot TU$$

We refer the reader to [12] for the proof.

### 6.3 Multiple White Space and Multiple Radio

We now focus our attention on the main problem of solving PF-WSA for multiple WS's and multiple radios per AP. This is quite

different from the problem in single WS and single radio per AP because, unlike the problem in single WS, in this case the AP's can be assigned  $N_{rad}$  distinct contiguous WS's as long as the spectrum chunks allocated to an AP respect the ACI constraint. Nevertheless, we will show that the algorithm for single WS can be used to develop an algorithm for the more generic problem. The key idea here is the idea of *local search* where we iteratively improve upon the solution by by improving the solution for individual WS's.

The idea of *local search* has been applied to other NP-hard combinatorial problem like  $k$ -median and *maximum generalized assignment problem* (GAP) [13]. Our *local search* approach is motivated by the GAP problem. The maximum GAP problem is as follows: given bins and items, value of packing item- $i$  in bin- $j$ , and a packing constraint for each bin that only allows certain subset of items for each bin, the GAP problem is to find an assignment that maximizes the total value of the packed items. In [13], among other things, the authors have shown that, if the problem for single bin can be solved within a constant factor of the optimal, then the GAP problem can also be solved within a constant factor of the optimal by using the idea of *local search*. The details are fairly technical and can be found in [13]. At a high level, the approach in [13] is iterative where every iteration of the algorithm finds a bin such that, if the items of that bin *alone* are rearranged, then the solution improves more than doing such a rearrangement for any other bin. We will show that, such an approach can be adapted to our problem. However, it is important to note that our problem is much more complex than GAP because spectrum is divisible and cannot be viewed as item. Furthermore, multiple radios and the non-linear objective function make our problem richer.

For ease of exposition, we will describe the algorithm for the case when  $W_j \leq B_m$ , i.e., when the white space widths are no more than the maximum bandwidth a radio can support. Indeed, this is mostly the case as white space widths are no more than 30 MHz or 42 MHz for most large cities and  $B_m$  is typically larger than this (for example,  $B_m = 40$  MHz for latest GNU-radios). The case in which width of some of the white spaces can be more than  $B_m$ , our algorithm first performs a pre-processing step called Procedure *DivideSpectrum* that performs the following: (i) partitions the white spaces with bandwidth more than  $B_m$  into *segments* of width  $B_m$  (except for the last segment) and treats each segment as a white space, and (ii) for each segment to be treated as a white space, it finds the white space properties like center frequency, bandwidth, and data rate for the AP's per unit of bandwidth.

We will now describe the algorithm when  $W_j \leq B_m$  for all  $j$ . The algorithm is shown in Algorithm *PfMultWSMultRadio*.

*Iterative local search:* The key algorithm is shown in Algorithm *PfMultWSMultRadio*. Note that, since  $W_j \leq B_m$ , spectrum allocation within a single white space is still no different from spectrum allocation in a single WS and single radio per AP. We make use of this simple observation to iteratively improve the solution. The solution starts with simply allocating no spectrum to any radio of any of the AP's. One step of the iteration is shown in step 2-12. In each of the iteration the algorithm performs the following:

1. For each whitespace, we compute the improvement that can be had by reallocating spectrum in that whitespace alone. In the following, we describe how this step can be performed using the spectrum allocation algorithm for single WS. Consider the whitespace  $WS_l$ . Note that, allocating spectrum to an AP in  $WS_l$  could end up violating two constraints, namely, ACI and the constraint that no AP can be allocated more than  $N_{rad}$  distinct chunks of spectrum (we will call this maximum radio or MR constraint). Thus, allocating spectrum to an AP in  $WS_l$  would be feasible if these two constraints are not violated. Clearly, this can be achieved if spectrum reallocation in  $WS_l$  is followed by removal of allocation from whitespaces that violate ACI and MR constraints. To this end, we define variables  $m_{il}$  that denote the

---

**Algorithm 3** *PfMultWSMultRadio*: Prop. fair Spectrum Allocation

1: Initialize the bandwidth allocation. Denote by  $r_{il}$  the data rate  $AP_i$  gets in  $WS_l$ , and  $R_i$  as the total data rate given to  $AP_i$ .

$$r_{il} := 0, R_i = \sum_l r_{il}$$

2: **repeat**

3:   **for**  $l = 1$  to  $N_{WS}$  **do**

4:    Compute,  $n_{il}$ , the total data rate to  $AP_i$  in the ACI causing whitespaces of  $WS_l$  as

$$n_{il} = \sum_{\text{lsACI} \leq j \leq \text{rsACI}, j \neq l} r_{ij},$$

where lsACI (rsACI) is the leftmost (rightmost) ACI causing whitespace of  $WS_l$ .

5:    Define  $m_{il}$  as the threshold above which data rate to  $AP_i$  is useful in  $WS_l$  as follows:

$$m_{il} = \begin{cases} n_{il} & \text{if } n_{il} \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{else if } |\{l : r_{il} > 0\}| < N_{rad} \\ \min_j r_{ij} & \text{else} \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

6:    Define the following log-utility for  $AP_i$

$$U_i^{(l)}(x_{il}) = d_i [\log(1 + R_i - r_{il} + (x_{il} - m_{il})^+) - \log(1 + R_i - r_{il})] \quad (15)$$

$$= d_i \log \left( 1 + \frac{(x_{il} - m_{il})^+}{1 + R_i - r_{il}} \right). \quad (16)$$

7:    Run *BestNeighborFirst* to maximize  $\sum_i U_i^{(l)}(x_{il})$ . Let  $TU_l$  be the total utility as computed by *BestNeighborFirst*.

8:    **end for**

9:    Find the WS which gives the best improvement, i.e., find  $l^*$  such that

$$l^* = \arg \max_l \left[ TU_l + \sum_i d_i \log(1 + R_i - r_{il}) \right].$$

10:    Reallocate spectrum to  $WS_{l^*}$  according to spectrum allocation produced by running *BestNeighborFirst* for maximizing  $\sum_i U_i^{(l)}$ .

11:    Perform the following steps:

1. For every AP, remove spectrum allocation from adjacent ACI-causing whitespaces of  $l^*$ , if any.
2. For every AP, if there was no allocation in the ACI-causing whitespaces, then remove spectrum allocation from the whitespace that provides  $N_{rad}^{\text{th}}$  least data rate to AP (this could be zero if less than  $N_{rad}$  radios have spectrum allocation).

12:    **until** the loop is executed  $\Theta(N_{WS} \log(1/\epsilon))$  times

---

amount of data rate that has to be deducted from current (i.e., at the end of the previous iteration) data rate to  $AP_i$  so that allocation in  $WS_l$  to  $AP_i$  does not violate ACI and MR constraint. The computation of  $m_{il}$ 's is shown in step 4-5. Essentially, in this step, we minimize the reduction in data rate of  $AP_i$  so that allocation in  $WS_l$  does not violate ACI and MR. Step 6 defines the objective functions that captures the best reallocation we can perform in  $WS_l$ . To understand this, first note that, if reallocation is performed in  $WS_l$ , we first need to do away with the current allocation in  $WS_l$ . Suppose the current data rate to  $AP_i$  in  $WS_l$  is  $r_{il}$  and  $R_i = \sum_l r_{il}$ . Thus, an additional  $x_{il}$  unit of data rate to  $AP_i$  from reallocation in  $WS_l$  results in a total data rate of  $R_i - r_{il} + (x_{il} - m_{il})^+$  to  $AP_i$ . The term  $(x_{il} - m_{il})^+$  can be explained by the fact that, if  $x_{il} < m_{il}$ , then it is better to not perform reallocation in  $WS_l$ . Thus the improvement (as compared to allocation left after doing away with the allocation

in  $WS_l$  from the previous iteration) in log utility of  $AP_i$  that can be had from the reallocation is

$$U_i^{(l)}(x_{il}) = d_i [\log(1 + R_i - r_{il} + (x_{il} - m_{il})^+) - \log(1 + R_i - r_{il})]$$

This explains step 6. In the next step, step 7, we use Algorithm *BestNeighborFirst* to maximize  $\sum_i U_i^{(l)}(x_{il})$ . The output of the previous step is the improvement that can be had from the reallocation and we denote this by  $TU_l$ .

2. In step 9-11, we find the whitespace where reallocation results in maximum improvement in the total utility, and then, do reallocation in that whitespace. For the AP's that get this re-allocated spectrum, we also make sure that, the ACI and MR constraints are not violated by reducing the data rates appropriately (as described in the previous paragraph).
3. Finally, the iterative steps are repeated  $\Theta(N_{WS} \log(1/\epsilon))$  times. The computation complexity of the entire algorithm is captured in the following.

**PROPOSITION 6.1.** *The computation complexity of Algorithm PfMultWsMultRadio is  $O(N_{WS} N_{AP}^4 \log(1/\epsilon) \log W_{max} / \log(1 + \epsilon_q))$ , where  $W_{max}$  is the maximum width of a white space, and  $\epsilon_q$  is the quantization step size in Algorithm PfSpecAllocClique.*

We skip the proof of the above which is not difficult to show from the described algorithms. We also have the following result that captures the performance guarantee of our algorithm.

**THEOREM 3.** *Suppose the interference graph at every frequency is a disc graph, i.e., the interfering AP's of any  $AP_i$  lie in a disc around  $AP_i$  (the disc is different for different WS). Also, suppose  $TU$  is the total capacity computed by Algorithm PfMultWSMultRadio, and  $OPT$  is the optimal utility of PF-WSA for multiple WS and multiple radio per AP. If Algorithm *BestNeighborFirst* is  $\psi$ -approximate for some constant  $\psi > 1$ , then there is a constant  $\rho$  such that*

$$OPT < \frac{\rho}{1 - \epsilon} \cdot TU$$


with  $\rho = \psi + 2 + \lceil \log(\frac{2\Delta_{ACI}}{b_m}) / \log b_m \rceil$ . In the other words, Algorithm *PfMultWSMultRadio* provides a constant approximation guarantee.

See [12] for the proof.

## 7. SIMULATIONS

In this section we show simulation results with two objectives in mind: (i) evaluate the performance of our algorithms versus an upper bound for the PF-WSA problem and (ii) evaluate the performance benefit from doing dynamic spectrum allocation in the DTW whitespaces as opposed to doing dynamic spectrum allocation in the 2.4GHz ISM band. The results are representative sub-set of more extensive simulations.

We describe our simulation scenarios below. For the first objective, we use the following scenario. We assume that there are five access points distributed on a square of side 400 m. The transmit power is 40 mW. We assume that there are two available whitespaces: 512-524 MHz and 680-692 MHz. Note that these are whitespaces available in Philadelphia according to [14]. We assume that  $I_{th} = -75$  dBm,  $\beta = -87$  dBm, and  $\Delta_{ACI} = 20$  MHz. To compute spectral efficiency, we use the linear regression constants shown in Figure 4. Path losses are computed using the multi-wall model in [28] (Equation 3, pp. 47), with five light walls between any pair of APs and a per wall loss of 6 dB. We assume that the number of users associated with each access point is uniformly distributed from 0 to 50. Each user has a demand of 3 Mbps. Even in



**Figure 6:** 6(a): our algorithm vs. the optimal for PF-WSA. 6(b):ISM band vs. DTV WS band for Philly and Dallas.

these simple scenarios we observe that the number of APs that an AP interferes with is a function of the whitespace being used. In one case, an access point had three neighbors in the first whitespace and only one neighbor in the second.

In Figure 6(a), we compare the performance of our algorithm against an upper bound for the PF-WSA. The upper bound can be obtained as follows. Recall that we are trying to maximize  $\sum_i d_i \log(1 + r_i) = D \sum_i p_i \log(1 + r_i)$ , where  $D = \sum_i d_i$  and  $p_i = \frac{d_i}{D}$ . Therefore applying Jensen's inequality we have  $\sum_i d_i \log(1 + r_i) \leq D \log(1 + \sum_i p_i r_i)$ . Since log is an increasing function, this is optimized by maximizing  $\sum_i p_i r_i$  which is a linear optimization and can be solved using GLPK for simple scenarios. We observe that our algorithm's solutions are within 94% of the upper bound on an average. With the same setting but with more APs and WS's, the GLPK based MILP takes days to compute a solution, highlighting the need for efficient algorithms developed in this paper.

Finally, we compare the following scenario for the capacity maximizing CM-WSA (see Section 5.2) problem. We consider the 80 MHz ISM band in the 2.4 GHz range. This is the band used for IEEE 802.11b/g/e/n standards. For the Wi-Fi system we set  $\Delta_{ACI} = 25$  MHz. Correspondingly, we consider two sets of whitespaces adding up to 78 MHz (each is a subset of the whitespace available in Philadelphia and Dallas). 10 access points are distributed uniformly over a square of side 500 m. The path loss models and the thresholds for  $I_{th}$  and  $\beta$  are the same as described earlier. Each user's demand is once again 3 MBps. In the ISM band the access points are allowed to transmit at 100 mW. We compute the optimal solution to the CM-WSA problem for the ISM band using the GLPK solver. The GLPK solver was unable to find a solution to the CM-WSA problem for the DTV whitespaces in reasonable time and hence we use our algorithm to compute the performance for the whitespaces. In Figure 6(b), we compare the performance in the DTV whitespaces versus the performance in the ISM band.

We observed the following interesting facts. First, for the ISM band case, none of the access points interfered with each other, while for the DTV whitespaces, several access points interfered with each other, with the number of neighbors as high as 4 in some cases. However, the spectral efficiency in the whitespaces (typically  $> 2.5$ ) is much higher than the spectral efficiency in the ISM band (typically close to 1). Therefore, even though the interference graph in the ISM band is much better, the spectral efficiency in the whitespaces more than makes up for the poorer interference properties. Second, we are comparing a lower bound on performance in the DTV band with the optimal performance achievable in the ISM band with dynamic allocation. Even in this case, the DTV whitespaces out performs the ISM band by up to 42%. However note that typically the Wi-Fi only affords fixed allocations of 22MHz in IEEE802.11b/g. Also, typically available whitespace can be much more than 80 MHz (see table 1) which we have used for a fair comparison. This clearly illustrates the fact that unlicensed Wi-Fi access in DTV whitespaces holds significant potential as next-gen Wi-Fi 2.0 networks.

## 8. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we argued that designing systems for short range unlicensed access is a complex and challenging task. We proposed four design rules that allow us to manage this complexity, and based on these rules, we proposed an architecture and algorithms for efficient demand-based spectrum allocation.

**Acknowledgement:** The authors are grateful to Victor Bahl for valuable comments and suggestions to improve the paper.

## 9. REFERENCES

- [1] Propagation Data and Prediction Methods for the Planning of Indoor Radiocomm. Systems and Radio Local Area Networks in the Frequency Range 900 Mhz to 100 Ghz. *Recommendation ITU-R P.1238-1*, 1999.
- [2] Propagation Data and Prediction Methods for the Planning of Short-Range Outdoor Radiocomm. Systems and Radio Local Area Networks in the Frequency Range 300 Mhz to 100 Ghz. *Recommendation ITU-R P.1411*, 1999.
- [3] ATSC Recommended Practice: Receiver Performance Guidelines. *Doc. A/74*, Jun 2007.
- [4] FCC 08-260. *Second Rep. and Order and Memorandum Opinion and Order*. 2008.
- [5] J. Citre A. Affandi, G El Zein. Investigation on Frequency Dependence of Indoor Radio Propagation Parameters. In *IEEE VTC*, 1999.
- [6] S. Bannerjee A. Mishra, V. Shrivastava and W. Arbaugh. Partially Overlapped Channels Not Considered Harmful. In *ACM Sigmetrics 2006*.
- [7] P. Bahl, R. Chandra, T. Moscibroda, R. Murty, and M. Welsh. White Space Networking with Wi-Fi like Connectivity. In *ACM SIGCOMM 2009*.
- [8] M.M. Buddhikot, P. Kolodzy, S. Miller, K. Ryan, and J. Evans. DIMSUMnet: new directions in wireless networking using coordinated dynamic spectrum. *IEEE WoWMoM 2005*, pages 78–85, June 2005.
- [9] M.M. Buddhikot and K. Ryan. Spectrum management in coordinated dynamic spectrum access based cellular networks. *IEEE DySPAN 2005*, pages 299–307, Nov. 2005.
- [10] R. Chandra, R. Mahajan, T. Moscibroda, R. Raghavendra, and P. Bahl. A Case for Adapting Channel Width in Wireless Networks. In *ACM SIGCOMM 2008*.
- [11] N. B. Chang and M. Liu. Optimal Channel Probing and Transmission Scheduling for Opportunistic Spectrum Access. In *ACM MobiCom 2007*.
- [12] S. Deb, V. Srinivasan, and R. Maheswari. Dynamic Spectrum Access in DTV Whitespaces: Design Rules, Architecture and Algorithms. *Bell Labs Technical Memorandum*, 2009.
- [13] L. Fleischer, M.X. Goemans, V.S. Mirrokni, and M. Sviridenko. Tight Approximation Algorithms for Maximum General Assignment Problems. In *ACM SODA*, 2006.
- [14] New America Foundation and Free Press. *Measuring the TV "White Space" Available for Unlicensed Wireless Broadband*. 2007.
- [15] R. Gummadi and H. Balakrishnan. Wireless Networks Should Spread Spectrum Based on Demands. In *ACM HotNets-VII 2008*.
- [16] H. Harada. A Software Defined Cognitive Radio Prototype. In *IEEE PIMRC 2007*.
- [17] V. N. Padmanabhan J. Padhye, S. Agarwal and L. Qiu. Estimation of link interference in static multi-hop wireless networks. In *ACM IMC 2005*.
- [18] T. Kamakaris, M.M. Buddhikot, and R. Iyer. A case for coordinated dynamic spectrum access in cellular networks. *IEEE DySPAN 2005*, 2005.
- [19] J-E. Berg F. Harrysson H. Asplund M. Riback, J. Medbo. Carrier Frequency Effects on Path Loss. In *IEEE VTC 2006*.
- [20] M. Mishra and A. Sahai. How Much Whitespace is There? In *Tech. Report available from web*.
- [21] T. Moscibroda, R. Chandra, Y. Wu, S. Sengupta, P. Bahl, and Y. Yuan. Load-Aware Spectrum Distribution in Wireless LANs. In *IEEE ICNP 2008*.
- [22] S. Keshav N. Ahmed. SMARTA: A self-managing architecture for thin access points. In *ACM CoNEXT 2006*.
- [23] S. Narlanka, R. Chandra, P. Bahl, and J. I. Ferrell. A Hardware Platform for Utilizing the TV Bands with a Wi-Fi Radio. In *IEEE LANMAN*.
- [24] D. Niculescu. Interference map for 802.11 networks. In *ACM IMC 2007*.
- [25] B. Raman and K. Chebrolu. Revisiting MAC Design for an 802.11-based Mesh Network. In *ACM HotNets-III*, Nov. 2004.
- [26] Theodore S. Rappaport. *Wireless Communications, Principles and Practice*. Prentice Hall, 2002.
- [27] X. Liu S. Huang and Z. Ding. Opportunistic spectrum access in cognitive radio networks. In *IEEE Infocom 2008*.
- [28] M. Klepal S. Zvanovec, P. Pechac. Wireless LAN Networks Design: Site Survey or Propagation Modeling? In *Radio Engineering*, vol. 12, No. 4, Dec. 2003.
- [29] Y. Yuan, P. Bahl, R. Chandra, P. A. Chou, J. I. Ferrell, T. Moscibroda, S. Narlanka, and Y. Wu. KNOWS: Kognitiv Networking Over White Spaces. In *IEEE DySPAN 2007*.
- [30] Y. Yuan, P. Bahl, R. Chandra, T. Moscibroda, and Y. Wu. Allocating dynamic time-spectrum blocks in cognitive radio networks. In *ACM MobiHoc*, 2007.