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# Executive summary

This report deals with the analysis of the compatibility between Medical Body Area Network Systems (MBANS) and other systems operating in the same or adjacent frequency band. It has been developed in response to ETSI system reference document TR 101 557 [1].

The ETSI system reference document suggested ECC to consider a total spectrum portion of 40 MHz within the 2360-2500 MHz range for use by MBANS, of which 30 MHz was intended for use in healthcare facilities. However the studies in this report have been deliberately carried out in the 2400-2500 MHz range.

Three MBANS categories are considered by the studies: Healthcare facility, ambulance and home MBANS. Healthcare facility MBANS are restricted to indoors. Ambulance MBANS are for use only inside the vehicle. Home MBANS are intended for indoor use (inside the patient’s home), however they can be occasionally outdoors (few meters away from home). No mitigation technique(s) has been considered for the co-existence studies given in this Report. The compatibility results presented are to be understood in such context. Mitigation measures such as adaptive frequency selection, listen-before-talk, adaptive power control and other features may improve the compatibility of MBANS with other systems and are subject to future work. Table 1 below, summarizes the results of the compatibility studies, mainly based on average-case SEAMCAT simulations, for all scenarios and considered frequency bands.

Table 1: Overview of risk of interference for the various co-existence scenarios

|  | **Risk of interference from MBANS** |
| --- | --- |
| **MBANS category** | **Healthcare facility MBANS** | **Home****MBANS** | **Ambulance MBANS** |
| **Tx-power, DC** | **1 mW, 10% DC** | **20 mW, 2% DC** | **1 mW, 10% DC** |
| **Description of MBANS application and restriction** | **Only indoor, within healthcare facility** | **Primarily indoor, within patient home.****Occasionally outdoor, few meters from home** | **Only inside vehicle** |
| **2400 – 2483.5****MHz**  | **Wideband Data** | Very low | Very low | Very low |
| **Amateur and Amateur Satellite** | Low | Medium(Note 1)  | Low |
| **BWS****(adjacent LTE below 2400 MHz)** | Low(Note 1, Note 3) |
| **2483.5 – 2500****MHz** | **LP-AMI** | Medium (Note 2) | Low | Medium (Note 2) |
| **MSS** | Low(Note 4) | Very low | Very low(Note 5) |
| **CGC** | Low | Very low | Very low(Note 5) |
| **RNSS/RDSS** | Low | Low | Low |
| **SAP/SAB** | Low | Low | Low |
| **Wideband Data****(adjacent)** | Very low | Very low | Very low |
| **BWS****(adjacent LTE above 2500MHz)** | Low (average case)High (specific case) | MBANS indoor:Low (average case)High (specific case)  | Low (average case)High (specific case) |
| MBANS outdoor: Low/Medium (avrg.)High (specific case) |
| Risk of interference or average bitrate degradation: * very low: ≤1 %
* low: >1 %, ≤5 %
* medium: >5 %, ≤10 %
* high: >10 %
 |

Note 1: The impact of existing systems operating in accordance with Annex 1 and Annex 3 of ERC/REC 70-03, such as WLAN systems, are expected more critical than MBANS interference.

Note 2: Interference mitigation measures will be needed. The future MBANS ETSI standard may specify some means of detecting LP-AMI for improving coexistence.

Note 3: Even though it was suggested to use the entire 2400-2500 MHz band for MBANS, the 2400-2410 MHz portion of this range was excluded from the studies in order to improve adjacent band coexistence with the BWS system to be operated in the 2300-2400 MHz band.

Note 4: The impact of healthcare facility MBANS to Globalstar fixed terminals used for emergency back-up communications inside the hospital premises was not specifically studied in Section 5.3.1. Such use of Globalstar is reported in one administration. The CGC study results (Section 5.4.1) may however be applicable to such situation, leaving the conclusions unaltered.

Note 5: The impact of ambulance MBANS to Globalstar terminals used for emergency back-up communications inside the same ambulance vehicle was not studied. Such use of Globalstar is reported in one administration.

For the 2400-2483.5 MHz band the compatibility study results suggest that wideband data systems (WLAN) could significantly interfere with MBANS deployed in hospitals and patient homes. However, inside the premises of health care facilities, which are commonly operated and controlled by the facility management, there could be some possibility to coordinate the MBANS and WLAN channels. The practicality of implementing such approach is unclear, as the proponent industry observed in own hospital surveys that the 2400-2483.5 MHz band may be too crowded, unpredictable, and not easily manageable by hospitals. Additionally, there may be a medium risk of interference from home MBANS into amateur systems in the lower part of the band (2400-2450 MHz), but it should be noted the impact of existing WLAN systems is expected to be more critical than MBANS interference.

The studies conducted in the 2483.5-2500 MHz band showed that MBANS can coexist with the existing systems using the band except for

* LP-AMI: Co-channel compatibility between MBANS and LP-AMI in healthcare facilities is not given, since significant interference levels are expected, even when both systems are operated in different rooms;
* adjacent BWS systems, if MBANS are used outdoors

However, it is assumed that mechanism(s) for MBANS and LP-AMI to detect each other when operated in close proximity, or other measures, could address the issue of compatibility between MBANS and LP-AMI. Interference effects and possible implant battery life reduction have been identified, thus reducing time frame before implant replacement surgery, especially when MBANS operates in the same room or on the same body as LP-AMI. Interference mitigation measures will be needed. The future MBANS ETSI standard may specify some means of detecting LP-AMI for improving coexistence. Other measures, such as warnings on the devices, may be considered to achieve better co-existence between LP-AMI and MBANS.

In the case of BWS, MBANS should consider the possibility of preventing outdoor usage. The restriction may be de-facto enabled by requiring MBANS sensors to periodically check that they are within operating distance of their MBANS hub. When the MBANS hub is not reachable, MBANS data transmission is stopped. That simple mechanism is part of the light licensing concept proposed in the FCC ruling for MBANS operation in the USA [3].

In the light that ECC WG FM decided not to consider the 2360-2400 MHz band for MBANS, the 2483.5-2500 MHz band could be considered sufficient for the initial introduction of MBANS, even though the initial requirement was set to 30 MHz for healthcare facility usage.

Therefore, by considering the results of statistical simulations of realistic deployment scenarios, it may be concluded that the most promising band for MBANS applications would be 2483.5-2500 MHz, as only mitigation measures are required for the protection of BWS and coexistence with LP-AMI.
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**LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Abbreviation** | **Explanation** |
| **AFA** | Adaptive Frequency Agility |
| **AMPS** | Advanced Mobile Phone System |
| **AP** | Access Point |
| **APC** | Active Power Control |
| **ATV** | Amateur TV |
| **BS** | Base Station |
| **BWS** | Broadband Wireless Systems |
| **CEPT** | European Conference of Postal and Telecommunications Administrations |
| **CGC** | Complementary Ground Component |
| **C/I** | Carrier-to-Interference ratio |
| **dB** | Decibel |
| **dBi** | Decibel isotropic |
| **dBW** | Decibel Watt |
| **DL** | Downlink |
| **ECA** | European Common Allocation Table (ERC Report 25) |
| **ECC** | Electronic Communications Committee |
| **e.i.r.p** | equivalent isotropically radiated power |
| **ENG/OB** | Electronic News Gathering / Outside Broadcasting |
| **FDD** | Frequency Division Duplex |
| **FSL** | Free Space Loss |
| **GSO** | Geo-Stationary Orbit |
| **GSM** | Global System for Mobile Communications |
| **I/N** | Interference-to-Noise ratio |
| **IMT** | International Mobile Telecommunications system  |
| **ISM** | Industrial, Scientific and Medical applications |
| **LBT** | Listen Before Talk |
| **LoS** | Line-of-Sight |
| **LP-AMI** | Low Power - Active Medical Implant |
| **LTE** | Long Term Evolution |
| **MBANS** | Medical Body Area Network System |
| **MCL** | Minimum Coupling Loss |
| **MES** | Mobile Earth Station, a user terminal within MSS |
| **MS** | Mobile Station, handheld user terminal used within mobile communication system |
| **MSS** | Mobile Satellite Service |
| **NFD** | Net Filter Discrimination |
| **NLoS** | Non-Line-of-Sight |
| **NMT** | Nordic Mobile Telephony |
| **OFDMA** | Orthogonal Frequency Division Multiple Access |
| **Pfd** | Power flux density |
| **PPDR** | Public Protection and Disaster Relief |
| **RDSS** | Radiodetermination Satellite Service |
| **RNSS** | Radionavigation Satellite Service |
| **Rx** | Receiver |
| **SAP/SAB** | Services Ancillary to Programme making / Services Ancillary to Broadcasting |
| **SRD** | Short Range Device |
| **TACS** | Total Access Communication System |
| **TDD** | Time Division Duplex |
| **Tx** | Transmitter |
| **UE** | User Equipment |
| **UL** | Uplink |
| **UMTS** | Universal Mobile Telecommunications System |
| **VoIP** | Voice over Internet Protocol (IP) |
| **WiMAX** | Worldwide interoperability for Microwave Access |
| **WLAN** | Wireless Local Area Network |
| **WRC** | World Radiocommunication Conference |

# Introduction

This report deals with the analysis of the compatibility between Medical Body Area Network Systems (MBANS) and other systems operating in the same or adjacent frequencies. It has been developed in response to ETSI system reference document TR 101 557 [1].

MBANS referred to in this Report is a low power radio system used for the transmission of non-voice data to and from medical devices for the purposes of monitoring, diagnosing and treating patients by authorized healthcare professionals. Initially MBANS will be mostly deployed in healthcare facilities, such as hospitals or emergency care facilities. However they will later extend into the patient’s home in order to enable home healthcare. In addition, MBANS are also expected to be used in ambulances for monitoring patient vital signs during patient transportation.

The studies consider, more specifically, the following frequency bands: (1) 2400-2483.5 MHz, and (2) 2483.5-2500 MHz. A third band 2360-2400 MHz was also partially considered, but later on excluded of the scope of this Report. A total spectrum portion of 40 MHz in those bands was originally requested for MBANS operation, of which 30 MHz was intended for use in healthcare facilities.

The studies[[1]](#footnote-2) covered with this Report encompass:

* Sharing scenarios within the 2400-2500 MHz band between MBANS and incumbent services, and
* Adjacent band scenarios between MBANS to be operated in parts of the frequency band 2400-2500 MHz and other services operating either below 2400 MHz or above 2500 MHz.

In this context, three MBANS categories are considered in this Report for operational purposes:

* 1. MBANS operating in healthcare facility
	2. MBANS operating in patient home
	3. MBANS operating in ambulance

The following studies were conducted for these three MBANS categories based on the characteristics given in this Report:

1. Sharing between MBANS and wideband data transmission systems (WLAN) operating in the 2400-2483.5 MHz band;
2. Sharing between MBANS and amateur and amateur satellite service systems in the 2400-2450 MHz band;
3. Sharing between MBANS and Low Power–Active Medical Implants (LP-AMI) in the 2483.5-2500 MHz band;
4. Sharing between MBANS and Mobile satellite service (MSS) system (Globalstar) in the 2483.5-2500 MHz band;
5. Sharing between MBANS and Complementary Ground Component (CGC) of MSS systems in the 2483.5-2500 MHz band;
6. Sharing between MBANS and Radiodetermination Satellite Service (RDSS) system (Galileo) in the 2483.5-2500 MHz band;
7. Sharing between MBANS and Services Ancillary to Programme making/Services Ancillary to Broadcasting (SAP/SAB) in the 2483.5-2500 MHz band;
8. Compatibility between MBANS operating in the 2400-2483.5 MHz band and Broadband Wireless System (BWS) operating in the adjacent 2300-2400 MHz band;
9. Compatibility between MBANS operating in the 2483.5-2500 MHz band and wideband data transmission systems (WLAN) operating in the adjacent 2400-2483.5 MHz band;
10. Compatibility between MBANS operating in the 2483.5 - 2500 MHz band and Broadband Wireless System (BWS) operating in the adjacent 2500-2690 MHz band.

# ALLOCATIONS IN THE BANDS 2400-2483.5 MHZ AND 2483.5-2500 MHZ and considered services / applications

The following table summarises the allocations in the 2400-2500 MHz frequency range according to ERC Report 25 [2]

Table 2: Use of the bands according to ERC Report 25 (ECA Table)

| **Frequency Range** | **Utilisation** | **ERC/ECC Documentation** | **European Standard** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2400 – 2450 MHz | Amateur | - | EN 301 783 |
| Amateur satellite | - | - |
| ISM | - | EN 55011 |
| Non-specific SRDs  | ERC/REC 70-03 | EN 300 440 |
| Radiodetermination applications | ERC/DEC/(01)08ERC/REC 70-03 | EN 300 440 |
| RFID | ERC/REC 70-03 | EN 300 440EN 300 761 |
| Wideband data transmission systems | ERC/REC 70-03 | EN 300 328 |
| 2450 – 2483.5 MHz | ISM | - | EN 55011 |
| Non-specific SRDs  | ERC/REC 70-03 | EN 300 440 |
| Radiodetermination applications | ERC/DEC/(01)08ERC/REC 70-03 | EN 300 440 |
| RFID | ERC/REC 70-03 | EN 300 440EN 300 761 |
| Wideband data transmission systems | ERC/REC 70-03 | EN 300 328 |
| 2483.5 – 2500 MHz | Active medical implants | ERC/REC 70-03 | EN 301 559 |
| IMT-2000 satellite component | - | - |
| ISM | - | EN 55011 |
| Land mobile | - | - |
| MSS Earth stations | ECC/DEC/(07)04ECC/DEC/(07)05ERC/DEC/(09)02 | EN 301 441EN 301 473 |
| PMSE (SAP/SAB) | ERC/REC 25-10 | EN 302 064 |

 Note 1: This table from ERC Report 25 is not exhaustive. Some applications may be missing.

The following table lists typical incumbent services/applications within or adjacent to the 2400-2500 MHz frequency range considered in the compatibility studies, either as adjacent or co-channel:

Table 3: Considered services/applications for compatibility studies

| **MBANS candidate band** | **Typical services / applications potentially relevant for MBANS** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2390 – 2400 MHz | Mobile Service Applications (LTE TDD/FDD, WiMAX TDD)  | Adjacent |
| 2400 – 2483.5 MHz | Wideband data transmission systems - WLAN EN 300 328 (IEEE-802.11) | Co-channel |
| ISM | Co-channel |
| Non-specific SRDs | Co-channel |
| RFID | Co-channel |
| Amateur/ amateur satellite (2400-2450 MHz) | Co-channel |
| 2483.5 – 2500 MHz | Active medical implants (LP-AMI) | Co-channel |
| ISM | Co-channel |
| MSS (Globalstar mobile phones) | Co-channel |
| CGC (Complementary Ground Component of MSS systems) | Co-channel |
| RDSS (Galileo) | Co-channel |
| SAP/SAB (ENG/OB) video links | Co-channel |
| 2500 – 2510 MHz | Mobile Service Applications (LTE TDD/FDD, WiMAX TDD) | Adjacent |

Note 1: Some applications may be missing. Detailed information on such systems was not available at the time of writing this report.

Note 2: For the lower and upper edges of the 2400-2500 MHz frequency range, an adjacent region of 10 MHz was considered. Frequencies beyond 10 MHz from the edges are in the MBANS spurious emissions region.

# characteristics of MBANS

Medical Body Area Network System (MBANS) is a low power radio system used for the transmission of non-voice data to and from medical devices for the purposes of monitoring, diagnosing and treating patients by duly authorized healthcare professionals.

A MBANS consists of one or more on-body wireless sensors—to simultaneously collect multiple vital sign parameters—and/or medical actuator devices that can communicate with a monitoring device placed on/around (up to 10 meters from) the human body. Implantable devices are not part of MBANS. For those implantable devices (LP-AMI) the band 2483.5-2500 MHz is already identified in ERC/REC 70-03 [25] .

Monitoring devices, in their role of MBANS hub, display and process vital sign parameters from MBANS devices and may also forward them (e.g. to a central nurse station) by using wired or wireless technologies other than MBANS. MBANS hubs also control MBANS devices for the purpose of providing monitoring, diagnosis and treatment of patients. It is expected that, as most typical configuration, a MBANS hub will be associated to only one patient; in the same fashion as a patient monitor is typically wired up to a single patient today. Two MBANS examples are depicted below.
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Figure 1: Typical MBANS examples

The typical number of sensor or actuator devices that communicate with an MBANS hub is in the range of 1 to 5 in healthcare facilities and ambulances. In patient homes, the typical number of sensors is expected to be lower, ranging from 1 to 3.

In most cases the location of MBANS hubs will be rather static and in the immediate proximity of the patient, as depicted in Figure 1 (part b). This applies to MBANS used in healthcare facilities, ambulances, and the patient’s home. Within healthcare facilities, it is however expected that some patients carry a portable MBANS hub on their body.

In the remainder of the document, and without any loss of generality, MBANS are depicted in simplified manner consisting of an on-body sensor and an off-body hub.

## Operation Scenario

ETSI TR 101 557 [1] discusses the possible environments in which MBANS are expected to operate and clusters MBANS into two differentiated types: ‘healthcare facility MBANS’ and ‘location independent MBANS’. The latter refers to ambulance and home monitoring scenarios, which in fact present some use case and parameter differences. Whereas the MBANS expected to be used in healthcare facilities and ambulances are fairly similar to each other, the MBANS expected to be used in homes have distinctive requirements, which make them de facto a distinct type of MBANS. For compatibility study purposes, it was considered most appropriate to treat home MBANS and ambulance MBANS as different cases, abandoning so the use of the generic term ‘location independent’. The term “category” is used in this Report to differentiate between ‘healthcare facility MBANS’, ‘home MBANS’, and ‘ambulance MBANS’. The three MBANS categories are schematically depicted in Figure 2, Figure 3, and Figure 4.

MBANS

sensor

e.i.r.p= 0 dBm

*3m*

MBANS

hub

MBANS

sensor

MBANS

hub

e.i.r.p= 0 dBm

13 dB building penetration loss

**Healthcare facility**

*3m*

Figure 2: MBANS operating in healthcare facility

Healthcare facility MBANS operate exclusively indoor and inside a healthcare facility, in which several MBANS are simultaneously used on a subset of patients. The restriction to indoor operation within healthcare facilities may be de-facto enabled by requiring MBANS sensors to periodically check that they are within operating distance of their MBANS hub. When the MBANS hub is not reachable, MBANS data transmission is stopped. That simple mechanism is part of the light licensing concept proposed in the FCC ruling for MBANs operation in the USA [3].
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Figure 3: MBANS operating in patient homes

Home MBANS operate in patient homes, in which an MBANS hub is installed. The patient is mostly inside the home too. However, in a few cases, the patient can be outdoor (e.g. in the backyard) while still in range of the MBANS hub, as depicted in the right part of Figure 3. Worst case interference analyses within this document consider such possibility. The required range and transmit power for home MBANS is higher than for healthcare facility MBANS.

*<3 m*

MBANS

hub

MBANS

sensor

e.i.r.p= 0 dBm

7 dB penetration loss

Figure 4: MBANS operating in ambulance

Ambulance MBANS are similar to healthcare facility MBANS in terms of transmit power, and type and amount of data to be transmitted. Their mobility and the lower shielding from the environment are the main differences. It is expected that only one MBANS be used per ambulance.

An overview of the MBANS parameters used for the present study is presented in the table below. They were selected from the System Reference document ETSI TR 101 557 v1.1.1 [1].

Table 4: MBANS parameters

| **Parameter** | **Healthcare Facility MBANS** | **Home****MBANS** | **Ambulance****MBANS**  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Max Tx power (dBm) | 0 | 13 | 0 |
| Operation environment | Indoor only | Mostly indoor. Outdoor possible. | Inside vehicle only |
| Tx-density (Km-2)(Note 1) | 40 | 10 | 5 |
| Duty cycle per hour  | < 10 % | < 2 % | < 10 % |
| Coverage radius (m) | 3 | 10 | 3 |
| Antenna gain(dBi) | 0 (omnidirectional) |
| Antenna height (m) | 1.5 |
| Bandwidth (MHz) | 1 – 5 (here 3 MHz is used) |
| Noise floor (dBm) | -93.2 |
| Receiver sensitivity (dBm) | -81.9 |
| Emission mask | See Figure 5 |
| Interference criterion | C/I = 15dB |

Note 1: ETSI TR 101 557 provides a range of MBANS density values for compatibility studies. For healthcare facility MBANS, 30-50 MBANS/Km2 are suggested. For other MBANS, and especially for home MBANS, 5-20 MBANS/Km2 are suggested. Ambulance MBANS densities are not specifically considered. For the elaboration of this report, a single density value of 40 healthcare-facility-MBANS/Km2 was assumed. Such value is in the middle of the range suggested by ETSI TR 101 557 and corresponds, for example, to the expected average density of MBANS in hospitals within the environment of a city or a part thereof. Since ambulance MBANS are expected to lead to low density values, 5 ambulance-MBANS/Km2 was assumed—as lowest value in the range 5-20 MBANS/Km2. For home MBANS, a factor 4 lower density than for healthcare facility MBANS was assumed, which corresponds to 10 MBANS/Km2.

Figure 5: MBANS emission mask (reference BW 3 MHz)

# Compatibility Study for the Band 2400-2483.5 MHz

Most compatibility studies presented in this section are structured in the following way:

* Section 4.x: Introduction of the radio service / application analysed in that subsection, including all relevant technical parameters for the studies. MCL calculations may also be included.
* Section 4.x.1: Compatibility with healthcare facility MBANS, including SEAMCAT simulations. MCL calculations may also be included.
* Section 4.x.2: Compatibility with home MBANS, including SEAMCAT simulations. MCL calculations may also be included.
* Section 4.x.3: Compatibility with ambulance MBANS mode, including SEAMCAT simulations. MCL calculations may also be included.
* Section 4.x.4: Summary and conclusions for the analysed radio service / application

## Wideband data transmission systems

WLAN systems based on the IEEE 802.11 b/g standard [19] have been selected as the most representative system for co-existence analysis with MBANS applications. Such systems have extremely proliferated both in residential and hospital areas, having achieved a large install base of Access Points (AP) for wireless data connectivity—e.g. enabling medical personnel to use their smartphones or similar devices for wirelessly accessing the hospital databases, localising medical equipment, download-uploading patients journal’s data, establishing VoIP communications, etc.

For the MCL studies, the typical WLAN was considered to operate with 20 MHz channel bandwidth (at -20dB) and 17 dBm e.i.r.p. Note also that because in the worst-case scenarios MBANS and WLAN Access Point (AP) are located inside the same building, direct LOS coupling should be assumed, suggesting the use of the Free Space Model for path loss calculations. The results of calculated MCL interference distances for the identified critical WLAN applications in the band 2400-2483.5 MHz are presented in Table 5 below.The interference distances obtained with the MCL method made it clear that a more detailed analysis with the SEAMCAT simulation tool was necessary.

Table 5: MCL calculation in 2400-2483.5 MHz band between MBANS and WLAN

| **Scenario** | **1** | **2** | **3** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Victim characteristics** | **Units** | **WLAN 802.11 AP** | **WLAN 802.11 AP** | **MBANS** |
| Receiver bandwidth | MHz | 20 | 20 | 3 |
| Receiver noise figure | dB | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Receiver antenna height | m | 3 | 3 | 1.5 |
| Receiver antenna gain | dBi | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| Operating frequency | MHz | 2420 | 2420 | 2420 |
| N, receiver thermal noise | dBm | -90.82 | -90.82 | -99.1 |
| I/N objective | dB | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Interferer’s characteristics** | **Units** | **MBANS (healthcare facility)** | **MBANS (home)** | **WLAN 802.11 AP** |
| e.i.r.p | dBm | 0 | 13 | 17 |
| Bandwidth | MHz | 1 – 5 (Note 1) | 1 – 5 (Note 1) | 20 |
| BW correction factor | dB | 0 | 0 | -8.24 |
| NFD (adjacent band interf.) | dB | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Antenna height | m | 1.5 | 1.5 | 3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Minimum path loss** | **dB** | **95.8** | **108.8** | **107.8** |
| **Interference distance FSL model** | **km** | **0.61** | **2.72** | **2.43** |

Note 1: Any bandwidth in the indicated range is applicable. Interference distance result is not affected by choice.

Table 6: Wideband data transmission systems (WLAN) parameters

|  | **Parameter** | **Value** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| WLAN Transmitter (AP) | Bandwidth (MHz) | 20 (IEEE 802.11b/g) | 40 (IEEE 802.11n) |
| Max Tx power (dBm) | 17 |
| Antenna gain (dBi) | 5 (omnidirectional assumed) |
| Antenna height (m) | 3 |
| WLAN Receiver | Receiver sensitivity (dBm) | -82 | -79 |
| Antenna gain (dBi) | 0 (omnidirectional) |
| Antenna height (m) | 1.5 |
| C/I objective (dB) | 10 |

Figure 6: WLAN emission masks. Left: IEEE 802.11g (20 MHz). Right: IEEE 802.11n (40 MHz)

### Healthcare facility MBANS

#### Interference from MBANS to wideband data transmission systems

Table 7: Interference from healthcare facility MBANS into WLAN- Settings and results

| **Simulation input/output parameters** | **Settings/Results** |
| --- | --- |
| **Victim Link (VLK): WLAN**  |
| VLK frequency | 2420 MHz |
| VLK bandwidth | 20 MHz | 40 MHz |
| VLT → VLR path | Extended Hata, urban, indoor→indoor, below roof (user-defined radius, 20 m) |
| **Interfering Link (ILK): MBANS** |
| ILK frequency | 2420 MHz |
| ILK bandwidth | 3 MHz |
| ILT Tx power | 0 dBm (10% probability) |
| ILT density | 40/km2 |
| ILT probability of transmission | 1 |
| ILT → VLR interfering path | Extended Hata, urban, indoor→indoor, below roof |
| ILT → VLR positioning mode | Uniform density  |
| ILT → VLR number of transmitters | 1 (for 90 m simulation radius) |
| **Simulation results** |
| dRSS, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -53.75 (14) |
| iRSSunwanted, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -304.08 (64.99) |
| Probability of interference (%) (C/I = 10 dB) | **0.2** |

#### Interference from wideband data transmission systems to MBANS

Table 8: Interference from WLAN into healthcare facility MBANS - Settings and results

| **Simulation input/output parameters** | **Settings/Results** |
| --- | --- |
| **Victim Link (VLK): MBANS**  |
| VLK frequency | 2420 MHz |
| VLK bandwidth | 3 MHz |
| VLT → VLR path | FSL (user-defined radius, 3 m) |
| **Interfering Link (ILK): WLAN** |
| ILK frequency | 2420 MHz |
| ILK bandwidth | 20 MHz | 40 MHz |
| ILT Tx power | 17 dBm (60% probability) |
| ILT density | 625/km2 |
| ILT probability of transmission | 1 |
| ILT → VLR interfering path | Extended Hata, urban, indoor→indoor, below roof |
| ILT → VLR positioning mode | Uniform density  |
| ILT → VLR number of transmitters | 16 (for 90 m simulation radius) |
| **Simulation results** |
| dRSS, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -45.3 (4.42) | -45.35 (4.43) |
| iRSSunwanted, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -69.68 (13.99) | -72.48 (14.21) |
| Probability of interference (%) (C/I = 15 dB) | **23.2** | **19.0** |

### Home MBANS

#### Interference from MBANS to wideband data transmission systems

Table 9: Interference from home MBANS into WLAN- Settings and results

| **Simulation input/output parameters** | **Settings/Results** |
| --- | --- |
| **Victim Link (VLK): WLAN**  |
| VLK frequency | 2420 MHz |
| VLK bandwidth | 20 MHz | 40 MHz |
| VLT → VLR path | Extended Hata, urban, indoor→indoor, below roof (user-defined radius, 20 m) |
| **Interfering Link (ILK): MBANS** |
| ILK frequency | 2420 MHz |
| ILK bandwidth | 3 MHz |
| ILT Tx power | 13 dBm (2% probability) |
| ILT density | 10/km2 |
| ILT probability of transmission | 1 |
| ILT → VLR interfering path | Extended Hata, urban, indoor→indoor, below roof |
| ILT → VLR positioning mode | Uniform density  |
| ILT → VLR number of transmitters | 1 (for 180 m simulation radius) |
| **Simulation results** |
| dRSS, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -53.74 (14.15) |
| iRSSunwanted, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -341 (38.7) |
| Probability of interference (%) (C/I = 10 dB) | **0.1** |

#### Interference from wideband data transmission systems to MBANS

Table 10: Interference from WLAN into home MBANS - Settings and results

| **Simulation input/output parameters** | **Settings/Results** |
| --- | --- |
| **Victim Link (VLK): MBANS**  |
| VLK frequency | 2420 MHz |
| VLK bandwidth | 3 MHz |
| VLT → VLR path | FSL (user-defined radius, 10 m) |
| **Interfering Link (ILK): WLAN** |
| ILK frequency | 2420 MHz |
| ILK bandwidth | 20 MHz | 40 MHz |
| ILT Tx power | 17 dBm (60% probability) |
| ILT density | 625/km2 |
| ILT probability of transmission | 1 |
| ILT → VLR interfering path | Extended Hata, urban, indoor→indoor, below roof |
| ILT → VLR positioning mode | Uniform density  |
| ILT → VLR number of transmitters | 16 (for 90 m simulation radius) |
| **Simulation results** |
| dRSS, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -42.72 (4.58) | -42.79 (4.49) |
| iRSSunwanted, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -69.77 (14.11) | -72.92 (14.04) |
| Probability of interference (%) (C/I = 15 dB) | **18.8** | **14.5** |

### Ambulance MBANS

The use of WLAN in ambulances is regarded as marginal, due to the mobility of ambulances and its detrimental effect on WLAN communications. Therefore it is considered unnecessary to analyse compatibility with ambulance MBANS in further detail. The physical distance between in-building WLANs and in-ambulance MBANS—together with the attenuation added by the building wall and ambulance chassis—provide enough evidence to expect good coexistence.

### Summary wideband data transmission systems

Healthcare facility MBANS and home MBANS:

According to the results presented above, in worst-case situations—modelled with MCL calculations—the interference distance between wideband data transmission systems and MBANS is:

* 0.6 km (healthcare facility MBANS as interferer)
* 2.7 km (home MBANS as interferer)
* 2.4 km (MBANS as victim).

The simulation-based average-case analysis yielded ≤0.2% interference probability from MBANS into wideband data transmission systems. In the other coexistence direction, the obtained results lie in the range of 15% - 23% probability of interference from wideband data transmission systems.

Co-channel compatibility is not given between wideband data transmission systems and MBANS in healthcare facilities and homes. Average case simulation results unveiled significant interference levels from wideband data transmission systems into MBANS.

Due to the widespread deployment of wideband data transmission systems (such as WLANs), separation-based mitigation measures are not practicable, especially in patient homes. Inside the premises of healthcare facilities, which are operated and controlled by the facility management, there could be some possibility to coordinate the MBANS and WLAN channels. Such coordination mechanism should however not be taken for granted in view of the following findings by the MBANS proponent industry during hospital surveys and installation and maintenance of hospital patient monitoring equipment:

* Hospitals are using a wide range of devices radiating in the 2.4GHz spectrum: WLAN (VoIP phones, access points, tablets, medical devices, wireless cameras, etc.), Bluetooth (medical devices, phones, etc.), ZigBee (medical devices, lighting control, etc.), proprietary RF (computer accessories), RF-ID (equipment tracking), and industrial/commercial microwave ovens. All this is often a significant source of interference.
* Most hospitals are not able to proactively manage the spectrum well, largely because of the vast amount of devices using a wide range of wireless technologies that demand access to the 2.4 GHz spectrum.
* As hospitals do not have the skill to cope with such a complex and crowded spectrum, WLAN is typically deployed with dynamic channel selection. This makes sharing this spectrum with low power devices like MBANS impractical or even impossible.
* There is a clear trend towards the further intensification of WLAN spectrum needs. IEEE 802.11n-based devices with channel bonding, mobile Wi-Fi hotspots (e.g. tethered cell phones used by patients and visitors) and Wi-Fi Direct enjoy increasing popularity.
* Wireless equipment belonging to patients and visitors (using e.g. Bluetooth, WiFi Direct, etc.) makes it very difficult, in practice, to implement any spectrum management possibility by the hospital management.

Ambulance MBANS:

Due to the absence or very low footprint of wideband data transmission systems within ambulances, co-channel compatibility with ambulance MBANS can be expected.

## ISM

Some of the examples of ISM applications that could be considered as potential interferers to MBANS for the hospital environment would be e.g. cauterising tools used as surgery aids in hospitals or microwave ovens, which may be found both in hospitals and patient homes. Regarding the cauterising tools, this study could not get hold of any reliable data that would allow deterministic characterising of RF emissions from these devices. Regarding microwave ovens, as discussed in previous ECC reports (such as ECC Report 149 [4]), it appears that the leakage of RF power from microwave ovens is very small (e.g. 0.2 mW/cm2 quoted in some sources [5]) compared to other applications such as WLAN APs.Therefore for the above described reasons, both of these ISM devices were left out of this study.

## Non-specific SRDs

It was decided not to explicitly consider the compatibility between MBANS and non-specific Short Range Devices (SRDs) beyond the considerations in Section 4.1, since WLAN systems are considered as the most critical representative of SRDs for co-existence analysis.

## RFID

It was decided not to explicitly consider the compatibility between MBANS and RFID (including railway applications thereof) beyond the considerations in Section 4.1, since WLAN systems are considered to be a more critical system for co-existence analysis.

## Amateur and Amateur Satellite

The range 2400-2450 MHz is allocated to both the amateur and amateur satellite service on a secondary basis. This section explicitly analyses compatibility with amateur service and amateur satellite service.

The operational characteristics of amateur service vary significantly. However based on the IARU Region-1 VHF Managers Handbook [6] and studies for ECC Report 172 [7], they can be categorised as data, multimedia, and TV repeaters (point-to-point links and area systems). For studies in the 2400-2450 MHz range, it can be assumed that the Amateur Radio stations in this band are used for receiving signals over terrestrial paths (and are unlikely to involve narrowband systems, unless displaced by BWS from their original 2300-2400 MHz range). Recommendation ITU-R M.1732-1 [8] contains parameter ranges for different usage models and frequency bands. The typical parameters of the multimedia and TV repeater operation modes were chosen to represent Amateur Radio in the 2400-2450 MHz range.

Table 11 summarizes the parameter value choices. Besides ITU-R M.1732-1 [8], ECC Report 172 [7], and ECC Report 064 [9] were also consulted for parameter selection.

Table 11: Amateur Radio parameters (terrestrial)

|  | **Parameter** | **Value****(Multimedia)** | **Value****(ATV Repeater)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| AmateurTransmitter | Bandwidth (MHz) | 0.150 | 6 |
| Max Tx power (dBm) | 40 | 43 |
| Antenna gain (dBi) | 16 (directional) | 10 (omnidirectional) |
| Antenna height (m) | 10 | 30 |
| AmateurReceiver | Receiver sensitivity (dBm) | -110 | -94 |
| Antenna gain (dBi) | 16 (directional) | 10 (omnidirectional) |
| Antenna height (m) | 10 |
| C/I objective (dB) | 20 |

Note: Typical antennas for Repeaters and Beacons are omnidirectional in Azimuth, 10dB gain in Elevation. For directional antennas (e.g for data/multimedia links), 0dBi is assumed in side-lobes.

Recommendation ITU-R M.1732-1 [8] provides characteristics for stations operating in the amateur satellite service. They are summarized in Table 12.

Table 12: Characteristics of Amateur-Satellite systems in the space-to-Earth direction

| **Parameter** | **CW-Morse** | **SSB, FM, Digital Voice, Data** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Transmitter Power (Note 1) (dBW) | 10 | 10 |
| Transmitter Feeder Loss (dB) | 0.2 – 1 | 0.2 – 1 |
| Transmitting antenna gain (dBi). | 0 – 6 | 0 |
| Typical e.i.r.p.(dBW) | 0 – 15 | 9 – 15 |
| Antenna polarisation | Horizontal, Vertical,LHCP, RHCP | Horizontal, Vertical,LHCP, RHCP |
| Receiver IF bandwidth (kHz) | 0.4 | 2.7, 16, 50, 100 |
| Receiver Noise Figure (Note 2) (dB) | 1 – 3 (typically: 1) | 1 – 3(typically: 2) |

Note 1: Maximum power levels are determined by each administration.

Note 2: Receiver noise figures for bands above 50 MHz assume the use of low-noise preamplifiers.

In contrast to the assumptions in ITU M.1732-1 [8], most current amateur satellites are typically picosats (also called ‘cubesats’), which occupy slightly elliptical Sun-Synchronous low Earth orbits (LEO) of 600-800 km altitude. These smaller satellites have relatively low power and antenna gain. Whilst these are most typical, other scenarios can include reception of Digital Amateur TV downlinks from the International Space Station, and weak signal reception of longer range satellites.It may be noted that most amateur satellite communications are internationally coordinated and harmonized towards the lower end of the 2400-2450 MHz range in order to minimise ISM/WLAN interference.

For sharing studies 0 dBW Tx-power, 100 kHz bandwidth (BW), 0.5 dB feeder loss, and 3 dB antenna gain for a patch antenna are assumed for the satellite; and the amateur receiving ground station is assumed to be similar to the amateur service (100 kHz BW, 2dB noise figure). Table 13 summarizes the parameter choices for sharing studies.

The compatibility scenario considered in this section is the reception of a satellite downlink by an amateur radio ground station. MBANS may be in the side-lobe of the amateur receiving station, for which 0dBi gain can be assumed.

Cumulative MBANS transmissions to an overhead LEO satellite uplink receiver are not studied, as it is reasonable to assume a proportionately low power density compared to existing WLANs/ISM equipment. Interference from Amateur TV into MBANSis not studied either, since a preliminary assessment hinted at the absence of coexistence issues.

Table 13: Radio parameters (Amateur Satellite)

|  | **Parameter** | **Value****(Amateur Satellite)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| AmateurTransmitter | Bandwidth (MHz) | 0.100 |
| Max Tx power (dBm) | 30 |
| Antenna gain (dBi) | 0 |
| Antenna height (m) | n.a. |
| AmateurReceiver (Note 1) | Receiver sensitivity (dBm) | -112 |
| Antenna gain (dBi) |  20 (main beam), 0 (side-lobes) |
| Antenna height (m) | 10 |
| C/I objective (dB) | 20 |

Note 1: For the ground station in the downlink scenario

### Healthcare facility MBANS

Table 14: MCL calculation in 2400-2450 MHz band between healthcare facility MBANS and Amateur Multimedia / ATV Repeater and Amateur Satellite

| **Scenario** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Victim characteristics** | **Units** | **Multimedia** | **MBANS** | **ATV Receiver** | **MBANS** | **AmateurSatellite** |
| Receiver bandwidth | MHz | 0.150 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 0.100 |
| Receiver noise figure | dB | 2 | 10 | 2 | 10 | 2 |
| Receiver antenna height | m | 10 | 1.5 | 10 | 1.5 | 10 |
| Receiver antenna gain | dBi | 16 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| Operating frequency | MHz | 2420 | 2420 | 2420 | 2420 | 2420 |
| N, receiver thermal noise | dBm | -120.1 | -99.1 | -104.0 | -99.1 | -121.8 |
| I/N objective | dB | -10 | 0 | -10 | 0 | -10 |
| **Interferer’s characteristics** | **Units** | **MBANS**  | **Multimedia** | **MBANS**  | **ATV Repeater** | **MBANS** |
| e.i.r.p | dBm | 0 | 56 | 0 | 53 | 0 |
| Bandwidth | MHz | 3 | 0.150 | 3 | 6 | 3 |
| BW correction factor | dB | -13 | 0 | 0 | -3 | -14.8 |
| NFD (adjacent band interf) | dB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wall attenuation | dB | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 |
| Antenna height | m | 1.5 | 10 | 1.5 | 30 | 1.5 |
| **Minimum path loss** | **dB** | **120.1** | **142.1** | **111.0** | **136** | **104.1** |
| **Interference distance FSL model** | **km** | **9.9** | **125.6** | **3.5** | **63** | **1.6** |

#### Interference from MBANS to Amateur

The considered interference scenarios (both terrestrial and satellite) are depicted together in Figure 7 and have been simulated in SEAMCAT. The simulation settings and results are summarized in Table 15.
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Figure 7: Interference scenario – healthcare facility MBANS into Amateur

Table 15: Interference from healthcare facility MBANS to Amateur Radio - Settings and results

| **Simulation input/output parameters** | **Settings/Results****(Multimedia)** | **Settings/Results****(ATV Repeater)** | **Settings/Results****(Amateur Satellite)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Victim Link (VLK): Amateur** |
| VLK frequency | 2420 MHz |
| VLK bandwidth | 150 kHz | 6 MHz | 100 kHz |
| VLT → VLR path | Extended Hata, urban,outdoor→indoor,above roof | Extended Hata, suburban,outdoor→indoor,above roof | FSL (VLR dRSS =-100 dBm) |
| User-defined radius5 km | User-defined radius40 km |
| **Interfering Link (ILK): MBANS** |
| ILK frequency | 2420 MHz |
| ILK bandwidth | 3 MHz |
| ILT Tx power | 0 dBm |
| ILT density | 40/km2 |
| ILT probability of transmission | 0.1 |
| ILT → VLR interfering path | Extended Hata, urban, indoor→outdoor, above roof |
| ILT → VLR positioning mode | Closest interferer |
| **Simulation results** |
| dRSS, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -67.32 (11.9) | -88.99 (13.19) | -100 (0) |
| iRSSunwanted, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -140.37 (16.6) | -133.05 (16.65) | -157.98 (16.59) |
| Probability of interference (%)(C/I = 20 dB) | **1.3** | **5.2** | **2.6** |

#### Interference from Amateur to MBANS

The considered interference scenario is depicted in Figure 8 and has been simulated in SEAMCAT. The simulation settings and results are summarized in Table 16. The interference probability from Amateur into MBANS is very low.
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Figure 8: Interference scenario – Amateur into healthcare facility MBANS

Table 16: Interference from Amateur to healthcare facility MBANS - Settings and results

| **Simulation input/output parameters** | **Settings/Results****(Multimedia)** | **Settings/Results****(ATV Repeater)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Victim Link (VLK): MBANS** |
| VLK frequency | 2420 MHz |
| VLK bandwidth | 3 MHz |
| VLT → VLR path | FSL (user-defined radius, 3 m) |
| **Interfering Link (ILK): Amateur** |
| ILK frequency | 2420 MHz |
| ILK bandwidth | 150 kHz | 6 MHz |
| ILT Tx power | 40 dBm(10% probability) | 43 dBm |
| ILT density | 0.2/km2 | 0.001/km2 |
| ILT probability of transmission | 1 |
| ILT → VLR interfering path | Extended Hata, urban,outdoor→indoor,above roof | Extended Hata, suburban,outdoor→indoor,above roof |
| ILT → VLR positioning mode | Uniform density |
| **Simulation results** |
| dRSS, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | - 45.32 (4.39) | - 45.3 (4.37) |
| iRSSunwanted, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | - 316.9 (72.96) | - 125.62 (12.82) |
| Probability of interference (%)(C/I = 15 dB) | **0.1** | **0.01** |

### Home MBANS

Table 17: MCL calculation in 2400-2450 MHz band between home MBANS and Amateur Multimedia / ATV Repeater

| **Scenario** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Victim characteristics** | **Units** | **Multimedia** | **MBANS** | **ATV Receiver** | **MBANS** | **AmateurSatellite** |
| Receiver bandwidth | MHz | 0.150 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 0.100 |
| Receiver noise figure | dB | 2 | 10 | 2 | 10 | 2 |
| Receiver antenna height | m | 10 | 1.5 | 10 | 1.5 | 10 |
| Receiver antenna gain | dBi | 16 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| Operating frequency | MHz | 2420 | 2420 | 2420 | 2420 | 2420 |
| N, receiver thermal noise | dBm | -120.1 | -99.1 | -104.0 | -99.1 | -121.8 |
| I/N objective | dB | -10 | 0 | -10 | 0 | -10 |
| **Interferer’s characteristics** | **Units** | **MBANS**  | **Multimedia** | **MBANS**  | **ATV Repeater** | **MBANS** |
| e.i.r.p | dBm | 13 | 56 | 13 | 53 | 13 |
| Bandwidth | MHz | 3 | 0.150 | 3 | 6 | 3 |
| BW correction factor | dB | -13 | 0 | 0 | -3 | -14.8 |
| NFD (adjacent band interf) | dB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wall attenuation(Note 1) | dB | 0 (outdoor) | 0 (outdoor) | 0 (outdoor) | 0 (outdoor) | 0 (outdoor) |
| Antenna height | m | 1.5 | 10 | 1.5 | 30 | 1.5 |
| **Minimum path loss** | **dB** | **146.1** | **155.1** | **137.0** | **149.0** | **130.1** |
| **Interference distance FSL model** | **km** | **198** | **558** | **70** | **280** | **31.4** |

Note 1: Worst case configuration assumed, in which MBANS transmitter or receiver is outdoors.

#### Interference from MBANS to Amateur

The considered interference scenarios (both terrestrial and satellite) are depicted together in Figure . The SEAMCAT simulation settings and results are summarized in Table 18.
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Figure 9: Interference scenario – home MBANS into Amateur

Table 18: Interference from home MBANS to Amateur Radio - Settings and results

| **Simulation input/output parameters** | **Settings/Results****(Multimedia)** | **Settings/Results****(ATV Repeater)** | **Settings/Results****(Amateur Satellite)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Victim Link (VLK): Amateur** |
| VLK frequency | 2420 MHz |
| VLK bandwidth | 150 kHz | 6 MHz | 100 kHz |
| VLT → VLR path | Extended Hata, urban,outdoor→indoor,above roof | Extended Hata, suburban,outdoor→indoor,above roof | FSL (VLR dRSS =-100 dBm) |
| User-defined radius5 km | User-defined radius40 km |
| **Interfering Link (ILK): MBANS** |
| ILK frequency | 2420 MHz |
| ILK bandwidth | 3 MHz |
| ILT Tx power | 13 dBm |
| ILT density | 10/km2 |
| ILT probability of transmission | 0.02 |
| ILT → VLR interfering path | Extended Hata, urban, indoor→outdoor, above roof |
| ILT → VLR positioning mode | Uniform density |
| **Simulation results** |
| dRSS, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -67.29 (11.91) | -89.16 (13.02) | -100 (0) |
| iRSSunwanted, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -141 (13.37) | -133.98 (13.35) | -158.67 (13.38) |
| Probability of interference (%) (C/I = 20 dB) | **0.5** | **2.6** | **1.0** |

#### Interference from Amateur to MBANS

The considered interference scenario is depicted in Figure 10 and has been simulated in SEAMCAT. The simulation settings and results are summarized in

MBANS

sensor

MBANS

hub

e.i.r.p= 13 dBm

13 dB building penetration loss

**Home**

Amateur receiver

*Wanted signal paths*

*Interference paths*

Amateur transmitter

Table 19. The interference probability from Amateur into MBANS is very low.

Figure 10: Interference scenario – Amateur into healthcare facility MBANS

Table 19: Interference from from Amateur to home MBANS - Settings and results

| **Simulation input/output parameters** | **Settings/Results****(Multimedia)** | **Settings/Results****(ATV Repeater)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Victim Link (VLK): MBANS** |
| VLK frequency | 2420 MHz |
| VLK bandwidth | 3 MHz |
| VLT → VLR path | FSL (user-defined radius, 10 m) |
| **Interfering Link (ILK): Amateur** |
| ILK frequency | 2420 MHz |
| ILK bandwidth | 150 kHz | 6 MHz |
| ILT Tx power | 40 dBm(10% probability) | 43 dBm |
| ILT density | 0.2/km2 | 0.001/km2 |
| ILT probability of transmission | 1 |
| ILT → VLR interfering path | Extended Hata, urban, outdoor→indoor, above roof | Extended Hata, suburban, outdoor→indoor, above roof |
| ILT → VLR positioning mode | Uniform density |
| **Simulation results** |
| dRSS, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -42.82 (4.4) | -42.75 (4.47) |
| iRSSunwanted, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -317.46 (72.61) | -125.91 (12.81) |
| Probability of interference (%)(C/I = 15 dB) | **0.1** | **0.03** |

### Ambulance MBANS

Table 20: MCL calculation in 2400-2450 MHz band between ambulance MBANS and
Amateur Multimedia / ATV Repeater

| **Scenario** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Victim characteristics** | **Units** | **Multimedia** | **MBANS** | **ATV Receiver** | **MBANS** | **AmateurSatellite** |
| Receiver bandwidth | MHz | 0.150 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 0.100 |
| Receiver noise figure | dB | 2 | 10 | 2 | 10 | 2 |
| Receiver antenna height | m | 10 | 1.5 | 10 | 1.5 | 10 |
| Receiver antenna gain | dBi | 16 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| Operating frequency | MHz | 2420 | 2420 | 2420 | 2420 | 2420 |
| N, receiver thermal noise | dBm | -120.1 | -99.1 | -104.0 | -99.1 | -121.8 |
| I/N objective | dB | -10 | 0 | -10 | 0 | -10 |
| **Interferer’s characteristics** | **Units** | **MBANS**  | **Multimedia** | **MBANS**  | **ATV Repeater** | **MBANS** |
| e.i.r.p | dBm | 0 | 56 | 0 | 53 | 0 |
| Bandwidth | MHz | 3 | 0.150 | 3 | 6 | 3 |
| BW correction factor | dB | -13 | 0 | 0 | -3 | -14.8 |
| NFD (adjacent band interf) | dB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wall attenuation | dB | 7  | 7  | 7  | 7 | 7 |
| Antenna height | m | 1.5 | 10 | 1.5 | 30 | 1.5 |
| **Minimum path loss** | **dB** | **126.1** | **148.1** | **117** | **142.0** | **110.1** |
| **Interference distance FSL model** | **km** | **20** | **250** | **7.0** | **125** | **3.14** |

#### Interference from MBANS to Amateur
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Figure 11: Interference scenario – Ambulance MBANS into amateur

Table 21: Interference from ambulance MBANS to Amateur Radio - Settings and results

| **Simulation input/output parameters** | **Settings/Results****(Multimedia)** | **Settings/Results****(ATV Repeater)** | **Settings/Results****(Amateur Satellite)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Victim Link (VLK): Amateur** |
| VLK frequency | 2420 MHz |
| VLK bandwidth | 150 kHz | 6 MHz | 100 kHz |
| VLT → VLR path | Extended Hata, urban, outdoor→outdoor, above roof | Extended Hata, suburban, outdoor→outdoor, above roof | FSL (VLR dRSS =-100 dBm) |
| User-defined radius5 km | User-defined radius40 km |
| **Interfering Link (ILK): MBANS** |
| ILK frequency | 2420 MHz |
| ILK bandwidth | 3 MHz |
| ILT Tx power | 0 dBm |
| ILT density | 5/km2 |
| ILT probability of transmission | 0.1 |
| ILT → VLR interfering path | Extended Hata, urban, indoor→outdoor, above roof |
| ILT → VLR positioning mode | Uniform density |
| **Simulation results** |
| dRSS, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -67.32 (12.04) | -89.15 (13.15) | -100 (0) |
| iRSSunwanted, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -138.10 (12.36) | -131.24 (12.32) | -155.96 (12.14) |
| Probability of interference (%) (C/I = 20 dB) | **0.7** | **3.2** | **1.3** |

#### Interference from Amateur to MBANS
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Figure 12: Interference scenario – Amateur into ambulance MBANS

Table 22: Interference from Amateur to ambulance MBANS - Settings and results

| **Simulation input/output parameters** | **Settings/Results****(Multimedia)** | **Settings/Results****(ATV Repeater)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Victim Link (VLK): MBANS** |
| VLK frequency | 2420 MHz |
| VLK bandwidth | 3 MHz |
| VLT → VLR path | FSL (user-defined radius, 3 m) |
| **Interfering Link (ILK): Amateur** |
| ILK frequency | 2420 MHz |
| ILK bandwidth | 150 kHz | 6 MHz |
| ILT Tx power | 40 dBm(10% probability) | 43 dBm |
| ILT density | 0.2/km2 | 0.001/km2 |
| ILT probability of transmission | 1 |
| ILT → VLR interfering path | Extended Hata, urban, outdoor→outdoor, above roof | Extended Hata, suburban, outdoor→outdoor, above roof |
| ILT → VLR positioning mode | Uniform density |
| **Simulation results** |
| dRSS, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -45.38 (4.37) | -45.2 (4.36) |
| iRSSunwanted, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -316.05 (74.24) | -119.48 (12.85) |
| Probability of interference (%)(C/I = 15 dB) | **0.1** | **0.1** |

### Summary Amateur and Amateur Satellite

Healthcare facility MBANS:

According to the results presented above, in worst-case situations—modelled with MCL calculations and using an interference criterion of I/N=-10dB for Amateur systems and I/N=0dB for MBANS—the interference distance between Amateur and MBANS is in the range of 2 km – 10 km (MBANS as interferer) and 63 km – 126 km (Amateur as interferer). The three different simulation-based average-case analyses yielded 1.3%, 2.6%, and 5.2% probability of interference from MBANS. In the other coexistence direction, the obtained result is ≤0.1% probability of interference from Amateur systems.

Average case simulation results suggest co-channel coexistence between Amateur systems in the 2400-2450 MHz band and healthcare facility MBANS, if an average interference probability up to 5% would be accepted.

Home MBANS:

In worst-case situations—modelled with MCL calculations—the interference distance between Amateur and MBANS is in the range of 70 km – 200 km (MBANS as interferer). The simulation-based average-case analyses yielded 0.5% to 2.6% probability of interference from MBANS. In the other coexistence direction, the obtained result is ≤0.1% probability of interference from Amateur systems.

Average case simulation results suggest co-channel coexistence between Amateur systems in the 2400-2450 MHz band and home MBANS if an average interference probability up to 3% would be accepted. However in unfavorable conditions (e.g. when an MBANS is located just outside the patient’s home), the required protection distances between Amateur receivers and home MBANS transmitters reach 200 km. The interference potential should not be disregarded and, hence, coexistence cannot be guaranteed.

Ambulance MBANS:

In worst-case situations—modelled with MCL calculations—the interference distance between Amateur and MBANS is in the range of 7 km – 20 km (MBANS as interferer). The simulation-based average-case analyses yielded 0.7% to 3.2% probability of interference from MBANS. In the other coexistence direction, the obtained result is ≤0.1% probability of interference from Amateur systems.

Average case simulation results suggest co-channel coexistence between Amateur systems in the 2400-2450 MHz band and ambulance MBANS, if an average interference probability up to 3% would be accepted.

It should be noted the existing WLAN systems operating in the 2400-2450 MHz band are expected to be more critical than MBANS with respect to interference into Amateur and Amateur Satellite communications.

## ADJACENT broadband wireless systems (BWS)

LTE systems operating in the whole band as well as the upper segment of the 2300-2400 MHz band, for example at 2395 MHz, is subject to adjacent band interference from MBANS operating in the lowest segment of the 2400-2483.5 MHz band. Since the amount of spectrum available in the latter band is significantly higher than the amount sought for MBANS operation, it was regarded appropriate to limit the operational frequency for MBANS to a subrange of the 2400 -2483.5 MHz band that excludes the lowest 10 MHz. Thus the frequency separation between the LTE band edge and MBANS channel centre frequency would be equal to or greater than 11.5 MHz. Despite the frequency separation of both adjacent systems, a preliminary investigation of MBANS co-existence was performed. The MBAN spectrum mask was extended with a constant value (-40 dBc) beyond the range defined in Section 3.1. The result indicated that interference is in general acceptable, but cannot be always excluded.

In view of (1) the preliminary results using an estimated extended spectrum mask, (2) the frequency separation between LTE and MBANS, (3) the higher levels of interference into LTE originated from WLAN systems, (4) the expectation that MBANS will implement additional mitigation measures, and (5) the possibility revising the levels of spurious from MBANS, it was not judged necessary to further investigate adjacent band compatibility in the proximity of 2400 MHz. Adjacent band compatibility with BWS uplinks is considered in Section 5.8, in the proximity of 2500 MHz.

# Compatibility Study for the Band 2483.5-2500 MHz

Most compatibility studies presented in this section are structured in the following way:

* Section 5.x: Introduction of the radio service / application analysed in that subsection, including all relevant technical parameters for the studies. MCL calculations may also be included;
* Section 5.x.1: Compatibility with healthcare facility MBANS, including SEAMCAT simulations. MCL calculations may also be included;
* Section 5.x.2: Compatibility with home MBANS, including SEAMCAT simulations. MCL calculations may also be included;
* Section 5.x.3: Compatibility with ambulance MBANS mode, including SEAMCAT simulations. MCL calculations may also be included;
* Section 5.x.4: Summary and conclusions for the analysed radio service / application.

## Active Medical Implants

Low Power – Active Medical Implants (LP-AMI) are application-specific SRDs allowed to operate in the 2483.5 – 2500 MHz band. Due to the physical proximity of MBANS and LP-AMI devices (possibly on the same patient’s body) and their common usage scenarios (e.g. hospital wards, elderly care houses, and medical ambulatories), it was considered necessary to study the compatibility with LP-AMI.

LP-AMI is used for implantable device applications and related external telemetry medical products and is composed by two integral components: (1) LP-AMI implantable device and (2) Peripheral interrogator unit – LP-AMI-P. In general, LP-AMI may transmit only when queried by an LP-AMI-P device, a stationary device installed indoors. In practice, this restriction ensures indoor operation for all LP-AMI components.

The transmit power of battery-driven LP-AMI is anticipated to be lower than that of mains-driven LP-AMI-P. Additionally LP-AMI are attenuated some 20-30 dB or more due to body loss as reported in ETSI TR 102 655 [10], when the implant is located 10 mm or deeper inside the patient’s body.

Based on ETSI TR 102 655 [10], the LP-AMI was assumed to be implanted at 3 cm depth, with the corresponding body attenuation (27 dB). The wanted signal received from LP-AMI-P was taken as constant for a constant distance of 5 m between LP-AMI and LP-AMI-P. Some safety margin to tolerate LOS obstruction by people around the LP-AMI patient was also accounted for.

LP-AMI-P is in most cases required [11] to use LBT and AFA when is transmitting. To model this functionality in SEAMCAT, a random uniform frequency channel selection within the 2484-2499 MHz band was used. This approach was also utilized for the elaboration of ECC Report 149 [4].

According to ETSI EN 301 559-1 [11], when a Medical Implant Event occurs, the LP-AMI implant may immediately transmit time critical data associated with that Medical Implant Event to a LP-AMI-P without regard to channel occupancy. This operation mode—without utilizing LBT and AFA—is limited to 0.83% of any 1-hour period. Moreover it is limited to emergency situations, such as heart attacks, Medical Implant Events are treated differently in subsections 5.1.1, 5.1.2, and 5.1.3, due to the differences in the operational environment.

The main system parameters for LP-AMI are presented in Table 23**.**

Table 23: LP-AMI parameters

|  | **Parameter** | **Value** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| LP-AMI transmitter | Bandwidth (MHz) | Usually 1. Occasionally 3. |
| Frequency distribution (MHz) | Uniform (2484-2499) with step 1 |
| Max Tx power (dBm) | 10 |
| Antenna gain (dBi) | 0 |
| Antenna height (m) | 1.5 |
| LP-AMI receiver | User defined dRSS (dBm/MHz) | -80 (Note 1) |
| Antenna gain (dBi) | 0  |
| Antenna height (m) | 1.5 |
| C/I objective (dB) | 12 |

Note 1: In ECC Report 149, a dRSS value of -75.3 dBm/MHz is assumed, at an operational range of 10 m between LP-AMI-P and the implant. For the elaboration of this Report, newer information from LP-AMI industry representatives was received and considered. Consequently it was regarded appropriate to assume a dRSS value of -80 dBm/MHz. The following orientative link budget justifies the choice: 0 dBm LP-AMI-P Tx power, -5 dB antenna gain loss, -8 dB tissue attenuation, -7 dB skin-air interface loss, -60 dB loss over 3m operational range (using attenuation exponent n=2.5).

### Healthcare facility MBANS

Table 24 shows the MCL calculations for the minimum interference distances between LP-AMI-P and MBANS (both for same and next room) and between LP-AMI and MBANS (same room). Since the obtained distances do not guarantee coexistence, a more detailed analysis via SEAMCAT simulations is presented in the remainder of the subsection.LP-AMI may use the aggregation of 3 channels (equivalent to 1 channel of 3 MHz) for download sessions of recorded data. This mode of communication should not influence the DC of LP-AMI and is referred to as ‘turbo mode’ in the remainder of the report. The turbo mode is expected to be used mainly in hospitals. Hence this additional case is considered in the simulations of this subsection.

Table 24: MCL calculation in 2483.5-2500 MHz band between healthcare facility MBANS and
LP-AMI

| **Scenario** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Victim characteristics** | **Units** | **LP-AMI-P** | **MBANS** | **LP-AMI** | **MBANS** |
| Receiver bandwidth | MHz | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Receiver noise figure | dB | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Receiver antenna height | m | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| Receiver antenna gain | dBi | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Operating frequency | MHz | 2490 | 2490 | 2490 | 2490 |
| N, receiver thermal noise | dBm | -103.8 | -99.1 | -103.8 | -99.1 |
| I/N objective | dB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Interferer’s characteristics** | **Units** | **MBANS**  | **LP-AMI-P** | **MBANS**  | **LP-AMI** |
| e.i.r.p | dBm | 0 | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| Bandwidth | MHz | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| BW correction factor | dB | -4.77 | 0 | -4.77 | 0 |
| NFD (adjacent band interf) | dB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wall attenuation | dB | 10(next room) | 0 | 10(next room) | 0 | 27(body) | 27(body) |
| Antenna height | m | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| **Minimum path loss** | **dB** | **89.1** | **99.1** | **99.1** | **109.1** | **72.1** | **82.1** |
| **Interference distance FSL model** | **km** | **0.27** | **0.86** | **0.86** | **2.72** | **0.04** | **0.12** |

#### Interference from MBANS to LP-AMI-P

The considered scenarios (next and same room) are depicted in Figure 13 and Figure 14 correspondingly. For the neighbouring room case, an attenuation of 10 dB is applied to the free space propagation model as result of the indoor wall. The simulations analyse several point-to-point interference scenarios at different MBANS-LP-AMI separation distances. Medical Implant Events are not considered in this healthcare facility scenario. The settings for all cases and their results are summarized in Table 25.
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Figure 13: Interference scenario – healthcare facility MBANS into LP-AMI-P (next room)
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Figure 14: Interference scenario – healthcare facility MBANS into LP-AMI-P (same room)

Table 25: Interference from healthcare facility MBANS to LP-AMI-P - Settings and results

| **Simulation input/output parameters** | **Settings/Results** |
| --- | --- |
| **Victim Link (VLK): LP-AMI TO LP-AMI-P**  |
| VLK frequency | Uniform 2484-2499 MHz |
| VLK bandwidth | 1 MHz (normal mode) | 3 MHz (turbo mode) |
| VLR dRSS  | -80 dBm/1 MHz  | -75.3 dBm/3 MHz |
| **Interfering Link (ILK): MBANS** |
| ILK frequency | 2490 MHz |
| ILK bandwidth | 3 MHz |
| ILT Tx power | 0 dBm (10% probability) |
| ILT → VLR positioning mode | Correlated |
| ILT → VLR interfering path | FSL |
| ILT → VLR distance | 1 m | 5 m | 10 m | 1 m | 5 m | 10 m |
| Probability of interference (%) (same room)(C/I = 12 dB) | **10.2** | **10.1** | **-** | **10.1** | **9.9** | **-** |
| Probability of interference (%) (next room)(C/I = 12 dB) | **-** | **7.8** | **2.7** | **-** | **8.3** | **4.6** |

#### Interference from MBANS to LP-AMI

A worst-case scenario was considered in which LP-AMI and MBANS are used simultaneously on the same user (patient) and in the same part of the body. In such scenario—depicted in Figure 15—the MBANS transmitter is located directly over the LP-AMI device, which is implanted at 3 cm depth. An attenuation of 27.04 dB was applied to the free space propagation model to model the attenuation caused by the body tissue.
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Figure 15: Interference scenario – healthcare facility MBANS into LP-AMI

The SEAMCAT parameters of the MBANS wearable transmitter and the LP-AMI receiver are identical to those shown in Table 25 except for the interfering path, which is FSL with an offset -27.04 dB, and the ILT-VLR distance, which is 3 cm. The resulting interference probability is **10%**, both for normal and turbo mode.

#### Interference from LP-AMI-P to MBANS

The considered interference scenarios are depicted in Figure 16 and Figure 17. The simulation approach is equivalent to that used in Section 5.1.1.1. The simulation settings and results are summarized in Table 26.
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Figure 16: Interference scenario – LP-AMI-P into healthcare facility MBANS (next room
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Figure 17: Interference scenario – LP-AMI-P into healthcare facility MBANS (same room)

Table 26 : Interference from LP-AMI-P to healthcare facility MBANS - Settings and results

| **Simulation input/output parameters** | **Settings/Results** |
| --- | --- |
| **Victim Link (VLK): MBANS**  |
| VLK frequency | 2490 MHz |
| VLK bandwidth | 3 MHz |
| VLT → VLR path | FSL (user-defined radius, 3 m) |
| **Interfering Link (ILK): LP-AMI-P TO LP-AMI** |
| ILK frequency | Uniform 2484-2499 MHz |
| ILK bandwidth | 1 MHz (normal mode) | 3 MHz (turbo mode) |
| ILT Tx power | 10 dBm (10% probability) |
| ILT → VLR positioning mode | Correlated |
| ILT → VLR interfering path | FSL |
| ILT → VLR distance | 1 m | 5 m | 10 m | 1 m | 5 m | 10 m |
| Probability of interference (%) (same room)(C/I = 15 dB) | **3** | **2.7** | **-** | **4.9** | **4.8** | **-** |
| Probability of interference (%) (next room)(C/I = 15 dB) | **-** | **2.2** | **1.3** | **-** | **4** | **2.8** |

#### Interference from LP-AMI to MBANS

Similarly to Section 0, a worst-case scenario is considered in which LP-AMI and MBANS are used simultaneously on the same user (patient) and in the same part of the body. The scenario is depicted in Figure 18.

The parameters of the MBANS wearable transmitter and the LP-AMI receiver are identical to those in Table 26, except for the interfering path, which is FSL with an offset -27.04 dB, and the MBANS-LP-AMI separation distance, which is 3 cm. The resulting interference probability is **3.4%**. For the turbo mode, when LP-AMI uses 3 MHz bandwidth, the interference probability is **5.7 %**.
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Figure 18: Interference scenario – LP-AMI into healthcare facility MBANS

### Home MBANS

Table 27 shows the MCL calculations for the minimum interference distances between LP-AMI-P and home MBANS (both for same and next rooms) and between LP-AMI and home MBANS (same room). Only the one direction of interference is presented; MBANS on LP-AMI(-P). The complementary calculations—LP-AMI(-P) on MBANS—are the same as for the healthcare facility case presented in Table 24, since the MBANS interference criterion remains unaffected. The obtained distances do not guarantee coexistence. Therefore a more detailed analysis via SEAMCAT simulations is presented in the remainder of the subsection.

Table 27: MCL calculation in 2483.5-2500 MHz band between home MBANS and LP-AMI (P)

| **Victim characteristics** | **Units** | LP-AMI-P | LP-AMI |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Receiver bandwidth | MHz | 1 | 1 |
| Receiver noise figure | dB | 10 | 10 |
| Receiver antenna height | m | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| Receiver antenna gain | dBi | 0 | 0 |
| Operating frequency | MHz | 2490 | 2490 |
| N, receiver thermal noise | dBm | -103.8 | -103.8 |
| I/N objective | dB | 0 | 0 |
| **Interferer’s characteristics** |  | MBANS  | MBANS  |
| e.i.r.p | dBm | 13 | 13 |
| Bandwidth | MHz | 3 | 3 |
| BW correction factor | dB | -4.77 | -4.77 |
| NFD (adjacent band interf) | dB | 0 | 0 |
| Wall attenuation | dB | 10(next room) | 0 | 27(body) |
| Antenna height | m | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| **Minimum path loss** | **dB** | **102.1** | **112.1** | **85.1** |
| **Interference distance FSL model** | **km** | **1.22** | **3.84** | **0.17** |

#### Interference from MBANS to LP-AMI-P

The assumed scenarios are the same as in Section 5.1.1.1. In this case the turbo mode is not considered in the analysis. The simulation parameters and the results for the point-to-point interference scenarios are summarized in Table 28.
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Figure 19: Interference scenario – home MBANS into LP-AMI-P (next room)
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Figure 20: Interference scenario – home MBANS into LP-AMI-P (same room

Table 28: Interference from home MBANS to LP-AMI-P - Settings and results

| **Simulation input/output parameters** | **Settings/Results** |
| --- | --- |
| **Victim Link (VLK): LP-AMI TO LP-AMI-P**  |
| VLK frequency | Uniform 2484-2499 MHz |
| VLK bandwidth | 1 MHz |
| VLR dRSS  | -80 dBm/1 MHz |
| **Interfering Link (ILK): MBANS** |
| ILK frequency | 2490 MHz |
| ILK bandwidth | 3 MHz |
| ILT Tx power | 13 dBm |
| ILT → VLR positioning mode | Correlated |
| ILT → VLR interfering path | FSL |
| ILT → VLR distance | 1 m | 5 m | 10 m |
| Probability of interference (%) (same room)(C/I = 12 dB) | **2.1** | **2** | **-** |
| Probability of interference (%) (next room)(C/I = 12 dB) | **-** | **1.7** | **1.9** |

Note 1: Medical Implants Events have also been considered by changing the victim link (VLK) central frequency to a fixed value of 2490 MHz. The obtained interference probability values do not differ and are hence not explicitly presented.

#### Interference from MBANS to LP-AMI

Here the same justification applies as in case 0. The resulting interference probability is **2.1** %.
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Figure 21: Interference scenario – home MBANS into LP-AMI

#### Interference from LP-AMI-P to MBANS

The assumed scenarios are the complementary to those of Section 5.1.2.1 and are depicted in Figure 22 and Figure 23. The simulation parameters and the corresponding results are in Table 29.
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Figure 22: Interference scenario – LP-AMI-P into home MBANS (next room)
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Figure 23: Interference scenario – LP-AMI-P into home MBANS (same room)

Table 29: Interference from LP-AMI-P to home MBANS - Settings and results

| **Simulation input/output parameters** | **Settings/Results** |
| --- | --- |
| **Victim Link (VLK): MBANS**  |
| VLK frequency | 2490 MHz |
| VLK bandwidth | 3 MHz |
| VLT → VLR path | FSL (user-defined radius, 10 m) |
| **Interfering Link (ILK): LP-AMI-P TO LP-AMI** |
| ILK frequency | Uniform 2484-2499 MHz |
| ILK bandwidth | 1 MHz |
| ILT Tx power | 10 dBm |
| ILT → VLR positioning mode | Correlated |
| ILT → VLR interfering path | FSL |
| ILT → VLR distance | 1 m | 5 m | 10 m |
| Probability of interference (%) (same room)(C/I = 15 dB) | **2.8** | **2.6** | **-** |
| Probability of interference (%) (next room)(C/I = 15 dB) | **-** | **2** | **0.5** |

#### Interference from LP-AMI to MBANS

Here the same justification applies as in Section 5.1.1.4. The resulting interference is **3.7 %.**
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Figure 24: Interference scenario – LP-AMI into home MBANS

### Ambulance MBANS

The compatibility situation may be equivalent to the situation within healthcare facilities.Therefore the conclusions of Section 5.1.1 are also applicable for the ambulance MBANS case.

### Summary Active Medical Implants

Healthcare facility and ambulance MBANS:

According to the results presented above, in worst-case situations—modelled with MCL calculations—the interference distance between active medical implants (LP-AMI) and MBANS is 40 m - 860 m (MBANS as interferer) and 120 m – 2.7 km (LP-AMI as interferer). The simulation-based analysis yielded 2.7% - 8.3% probability of interference from MBANS into LP-AMI, when both systems are located in a neighbouring room and up to a distance of 10 m from one another. When operated in the same room or on the same patient, the probability of interference from MBANS into LP-AMI raises to approximately 10%. In the other coexistence direction, the probability of interference from LP-AMI into MBANS lies in the ranges of 1.3% - 4% (neighbouring room and up to a distance of 10 m), 2.7% - 4.9% (same room), and 3.4% - 5.7% (same patient).

Co-channel compatibility between MBANS and LP-AMI in healthcare facilities is not given, since significant interference levels are expected, even when both systems are operated in different rooms. Mitigation measures will hence be required and should be specified by ETSI standards (primarily by the future MBANS ETSI standard).

ETSI is considering mitigation measure possibities—with regard to both intereference effects and implant battery life reduction—and is expected to provide CEPT with the results of their considerations.

Home MBANS:

In worst-case situations—modelled with MCL calculations—the interference distance between active medical implants (LP-AMI) and MBANS is 170 m – 3.8 km (MBANS as interferer). The simulation-based analysis yielded around 2% probability of interference from MBANS into LP-AMI, when both systems are located in the same room or on the same patient. In the other coexistence direction, the probability of interference from LP-AMI into MBANS lies in the range of 2.6% - 3.7%, when both systems are located in the same room or on the same patient.

Co-channel compatibility between MBANS and LP-AMI in patient homes appears possible, based on the obtained simulation results, because of the much lower duty cycle and density of home MBANS.

## ISM

ISM devices are left out of the study, as explained in Section 4.2.

## MSS Systems (Globalstar mobile phones)

The band 2483.5-2500 MHz is used for MSS communications in the direction Space-to-Earth, paired with 1610-1626.5 MHz for transmissions Earth-to-Space. Today this MSS allocation is being utilised by the Globalstar system, which is based on CDMA IS-95 technology and serves around 500000 reported subscribers worldwide.

The danger of interference from MSS into MBANS may be discarded based on the following analysis:

* Globalstar downlink signal should comply with maximum Pfd limit (for single satellite) of -124.5 dBW/m2/MHz on the ground;
* Effective antenna area at 2483.5 MHz is -30.2 dB(m2), MBANS receiver bandwidth 5 MHz;
* Resulting MSS downlink signal power in MBANS receiver is -147.7 dBW= -117.7 dBm;
* Even considering power summation from multiple Globalstar satellites, the resulting interfering power compares favourably with the noise floor of MBANS receiver of -91 dBm.

It thus may be concluded that MSS downlink should not pose any danger to MBANS operations. Therefore it was decided to limit the statistical study only to the case of interference from MBANS to Globalstar MES (Mobile Earth Station) receivers, as considered by previous studies [4]. The relevant parameters for Globalstar MES to be used in statistical study were taken from the ECC Report 165 [12].

### Healthcare facility MBANS

Table 30: MCL calculation in 2483.5-2500 MHz band between healthcare facility MBANS and MSS

| **Victim characteristics** | **Units** | **MSS MES** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Receiver bandwidth | MHz | 1.23 |
| Receiver noise figure | dB | 3 |
| Receiver antenna height | m | 1.5 |
| Receiver antenna gain | dBi | 0 |
| Operating frequency | MHz | 2490 |
| N, receiver thermal noise | dBm | -109.9 |
| I/N objective | dB | -12 |
| **Interferer’s characteristics** | **Units** | **MBANS**  |
| e.i.r.p | dBm | 0(single MBANS) | 13(additive contribution of 20 MBANS) |
| Bandwidth | MHz | 3 |
| BW correction factor | dB | -3.9 |
| NFD (adjacent band interf) | dB | 0 |
| Wall attenuation | dB | 13 |
| Antenna height | m | 1.5 |
| **Minimum path loss** | **dB** | **105.1** | **118.1** |
| **Interference distance FSL model** | **km** | **1.72** | **7.67** |
| **Interference distance P.452 model with 50% probability** | **km** | **0.65** | **1.65** |

Table 30 presents interference distances considering the impact of a single MBANS and the impact of several MBANS (area with high density). The latter is calculated assuming that a significant part of the MBANS concentrated in a hospital are next to the wall that separates the hospital from the street on which the MSS MES (MSS terminal) is located. The assumed 20 MBANS are not shielded by the hospital inner clutter and their e.i.r.p values are added.

Using the propagation model described in Recommendation ITU-R P.452 [13]—which is valid for point-point propagation on the Earth surface for frequencies above 0.7 GHz—the minimum distances are lower than using FSL, as shown in the last row of Table 30. The propagation distance was calculated with the P.452 model with a probability of 50%.A probability of 50% means that the propagation loss could be lower than the given value 50% of the time and should be higher or equal 50% of the time. Therefore the given distance will be sufficient or more than needed at least 50% of the time.

#### Interference from MBANS to Globalstar MES receivers

The considered scenario is depicted in Figure 25 and simulation settings are in Table 31.
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Figure 25: Interference scenario – healthcare facility MBANS into MSS MES

Table 31: Interference from healthcare facility MBANS to MSS MES - Settings and results

| **Simulation input/output parameters** | **Settings/Results** |
| --- | --- |
| **Victim Link (VLK): MSS SATELLITE TO MSS MES**  |
| VLK frequency | 2490 MHz |
| VLK bandwidth | 1.23 MHz |
| VLR dRSS  | -100 dBm |
| VLR noise floor | -110 dBm |
| **Interfering Link (ILK): MBANS** |
| ILK frequency | 2490 MHz |
| ILK bandwidth | 3 MHz |
| ILT Tx power | 0 dBm |
| ILT density | 40/km2 |
| ILT probability of transmission | 0.1 |
| ILT → VLR interfering path | Extended Hata, urban, indoor→outdoor, below roof |
| ILT → VLR positioning mode | Closest interferer  |
| **Simulation results** |
| dRSS, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -100 (0) |
| iRSSunwanted, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -163.25 (19.82) |
| Probability of interference (%) (I/N = -12 dB) | **3.6** |

### Home MBANS

Table 32: MCL calculation in 2483.5-2500 MHz band between home MBANS and MSS

| **Victim characteristics** | **Units** | **MSS MES** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Receiver bandwidth | MHz | 1.23 |
| Receiver noise figure | dB | 3 |
| Receiver antenna height | m | 1.5 |
| Receiver antenna gain | dBi | 0 |
| Operating frequency | MHz | 2490 |
| N, receiver thermal noise | dBm | -109.9 |
| I/N objective | dB | -12 |
| **Interferer’s characteristics** | **Units** | **MBANS**  |
| e.i.r.p | dBm | 13 |
| Bandwidth | MHz | 3 |
| BW correction factor | dB | -3.9 |
| NFD (adjacent band interf) | dB | 0 |
| Wall attenuation | dB | 0 (outdoor) (Note 1) |
| Antenna height | m | 1.5 |
| **Minimum path loss** | **dB** | **131.1** |
| **Interference distance FSL model** | **km** | **34.26** |
| **Interference distance P.452 model with 50% probability** | **km** | **4.76** |

Note 1: Worst case configuration assumed, in which MBANS transmitter or receiver is outdoors.

According to the MCL calculations, home MBANS could interfere with MSS receivers located less than 4.8 km around the MBANS. Since such a distance was regarded problematic the probability of interference is analysed in further detail in the following subsections.

#### Interference from MBANS to Globalstar MES receivers

Scenario is depicted in Figure 26 and simulation settings are in Table 33.
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Figure 26: Interference scenario – home MBANS into MSS MES

Table 33: Interference from home MBANS to MSS MES - Settings and results

| **Simulation input/output parameters** | **Settings/Results** |
| --- | --- |
| **Victim Link (VLK): MSS SATELLITE TO MSS MES**  |
| VLK frequency | 2490 MHz |
| VLK bandwidth | 1.23 MHz |
| VLR dRSS  | -100 dBm |
| VLR noise floor | -110 dBm |
| **Interfering Link (ILK): MBANS** |
| ILK frequency | 2490 MHz |
| ILK bandwidth | 3 MHz |
| ILT Tx power | 13 dBm (2% probability) |
| ILT density | 10/km2 |
| ILT probability of transmission | 1 |
| ILT → VLR interfering path | Extended Hata, urban, indoor→outdoor, below roof |
| ILT → VLR positioning mode | Uniform density  |
| ILT → VLR number of transmitters | 785 (for 5 km simulation radius) |
| **Simulation results** |
| dRSS, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -100 (0) |
| iRSSunwanted, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -158.76 (10.48) |
| Probability of interference (%) (I/N = -12 dB) | **1.1** |

### Ambulance MBANS

Table 34: MCL calculation in 2483.5-2500 MHz band between healthcare facility MBANS and MSS

| **Victim characteristics** | **Units** | **MSS MES** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Receiver bandwidth | MHz | 1.23 |
| Receiver noise figure | dB | 3 |
| Receiver antenna height | m | 1.5 |
| Receiver antenna gain | dBi | 0 |
| Operating frequency | MHz | 2490 |
| N, receiver thermal noise | dBm | -109.9 |
| I/N objective | dB | -12 |
| **Interferer’s characteristics** | **Units** | **MBANS**  |
| e.i.r.p | dBm | 0 |
| Bandwidth | MHz | 3 |
| BW correction factor | dB | -3.9 |
| NFD (adjacent band interf) | dB | 0 |
| Wall attenuation | dB | 7 (ambulance) |
| Antenna height | m | 1.5 |
| **Minimum path loss** | **dB** | **111.1** |
| **Interference distance FSL model** | **km** | **3.43** |
| **Interference distance P.452 model with 50% probability** | **km** | **0.98** |

#### Interference from MBANS to Globalstar MES receivers

Scenario is depicted in Figure 27 and simulation settings are on Table 35.
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Figure 27: Interference scenario – ambulance MBANS into MSS MES

Table 35: Interference from ambulance MBANS to MSS MES- Settings and results

| **Simulation input/output parameters** | **Settings/Results** |
| --- | --- |
| **Victim Link (VLK): MSS SATELLITE TO MSS MES**  |
| VLK frequency | 2490 MHz |
| VLK bandwidth | 1.23 MHz |
| VLR dRSS  | -100 dBm |
| VLR noise floor | -110 dBm |
| **Interfering Link (ILK): MBANS** |
| ILK frequency | 2490 MHz |
| ILK bandwidth | 3 MHz |
| ILT Tx power | 0 dBm  |
| ILT density | 5/km2 |
| ILT probability of transmission | 0.1 |
| ILT → VLR interfering path | Extended Hata, urban, intdoor→outdoor, below roof |
| ILT → VLR positioning mode | Uniform density  |
| ILT → VLR number of active transmitters | 2 (for 1 km simulation radius) |
| **Simulation results** |
| dRSS, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -100 (0) |
| iRSSunwanted, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -166.88 (14.7) |
| Probability of interference (%) (I/N = -12 dB) | **1.4** |

### Summary MSS Systems

Healthcare facility MBANS:

According to the results presented above, in worst-case situations—modelled with MCL calculations—the interference distance between MSS and MBANS is 0.7 km - 1.7 km (single MBANS as interferer) and 1.7 km - 7.7 km (multiple MBANS as interferers). The simulation-based average-case analysis yielded 3.6% interference probability from MBANS into MSS.

MSS systems operating in the 2483.5-2500 MHz range and healthcare facility MBANS operating in the same range can coexist, assuming that an interference probability of about 3% would be acceptable.

Home and ambulance MBANS:

In worst-case situations—modelled with MCL calculations—the interference distance between MSS and MBANS is 4.8 km - 34 km (home MBANS as interferer) and 980 m – 3.4 km (ambulance MBANS as interferer). The simulation-based average-case analysis yielded an interference probability into MSS of 1.1% (from home MBANS) and 1.4% (from ambulance MBANS).

MSS systems operating in the 2483.5-2500 MHz range and home and ambulance MBANS operating in the same range can coexist.

## CGC (Complementary Ground Component of MSS systems)

The CGC is an emerging future possible idea of supplementary evolution of the MSS networks whereas terrestrial base stations would be installed in order to improve the coverage of MSS signals, e.g. within conditions of dense urban environments where very low sky observation angles severely hamper reliable reception of MSS satellite signals (so called “city canyon” scenario). A detailed description of intended operation of CGC as a part of Globalstar system may be found in ECC Report 165 [12].

For systems to be considered in the studies related to the introduction of CGC associated with non GSO MSS systems in the bands 1.6 and 2.5 GHz, it was decided to limit the studies to the GLOBALSTAR case in the band 2483.5-2500 MHz and IRIDIUM and GLOBALSTAR in the band 1610-1626.5 MHz, for which parameters were received by CEPT.

An important feature of CGC to be considered in this study is that CGC would be operated in a portion of the same frequency bands as their satellite-based mother-systems. In other words, the CGC for Globalstar system deployed in the frequency band 2483.5-2500 MHz would also operate in the same band but just on a sub-set of available radio channels. Therefore when analysing CGC as part of co-existence analysis with MBANS applications, we still need to consider the same MSS MES device as victim receiver, but now we need to consider CGC BS (Base Station) emissions as potential interferer to the MBANS receiver. Previous studies in ECC Report 149 [4] have selected CGC BS transmitters as the largest source of interference. The required parameters of CGC BS emissions are taken from ECC Report 165 [12]. It should be also noted that, when used with CGC, the MES will have better link budget and could be therefore operated indoors.

### Healthcare facility MBANS

Table 36: MCL calculation in 2483.5-2500 MHz band between healthcare facility MBANS and
MSS-CGC

| **Victim characteristics** | **Units** | **CGC MES** | **MBANS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Receiver bandwidth | MHz | 1.23 | 3 |
| Receiver noise figure | dB | 3 | 10 |
| Receiver antenna height | m | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| Receiver antenna gain | dBi | 0 | 0 |
| Operating frequency | MHz | 2490 | 2490 |
| N, receiver thermal noise | dBm | -109.9 | -99.1 |
| I/N objective | dB | -12 | 0 |
| **Interferer’s characteristics** |  | **MBANS**  | **CGC BS Tx** |
| e.i.r.p | dBm | 0 | 17 |
| Bandwidth | MHz | 3 | 1.23 |
| BW correction factor | dB | -3.9 | 0 |
| NFD (adjacent band interf) | dB | 0 | 0 |
| Wall attenuation | dB | n.a. (indoor) | 13 |
| Antenna height | m | 1.5 | 30 |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Minimum path loss** | **dB** | **118.1** | **103.1** |
| **Interference distance FSL model** | **km** | **7.67** | **1.36** |
| **Interference distance P.452 model with 50% probability** | **km** | **1.65** | **1.36** |

#### Interference from MBANS to Globalstar MES receivers in CGC mode
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Figure 28: Interference scenario – healthcare facility MBANS into CGC MES

Table 37: Interference from healthcare facility MBANS to CGC MES - Settings and results

| **Simulation input/output parameters** | **Settings/Results** |
| --- | --- |
| **Victim Link (VLK): CGC BASE STATION TO CGC MES**  |
| VLK frequency | 2490 MHz |
| VLK bandwidth | 1.23 MHz |
| VLR dRSS  | -100 dBm |
| VLR noise floor | -110 dBm |
| **Interfering Link (ILK): MBANS** |
| ILK frequency | 2490 MHz |
| ILK bandwidth | 3 MHz |
| ILT Tx power | 0 dBm |
| ILT density | 40/km2 |
| ILT probability of transmission | 0.1 |
| ILT → VLR interfering path | Extended Hata, urban, below roof |
| indoor→indoor | indoor→outdoor |
| ILT → VLR positioning mode | Closest interferer  |
| **Simulation results** |
| dRSS, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -100 (0) | -100 (0) |
| iRSSunwanted, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -176.25 (21.43) | -163.27 (19.81) |
| Probability of interference (%) (I/N = -12 dB) | **1.9** | **3.6** |

#### Interference from CGC base station to MBANS
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Figure 29: Interference scenario – GC BS into healthcare facility MBANS

Table 38: Interference from CGC BS to healthcare facility MBANS - Settings and results

| **Simulation input/output parameters** | **Settings/Results** |
| --- | --- |
| **Victim Link (VLK): MBANS** |
| VLK frequency | 2490 MHz |
| VLK bandwidth | 3 MHz |
| VLT → VLR path | FSL (user-defined radius, 3 m) |
| **Interfering Link (ILK): CGC link (BS to MES)** |
| ILK frequency | 2490 MHz |
| ILK bandwidth | 5 MHz |
| ILT Tx power | 43 dBm |
| ILT peak antenna gain | 19 dBi |
| ILT density | 0.02/km2 |
| ILT probability of transmission | 1 |
| ILT → VLR interfering path | Extended Hata, urban, outdoor→indoor, above roof |
| ILT → VLR positioning mode | Uniform density |
| ILT → VLR number of active transmitters | 1 |
| **Simulation results** |
| dRSS, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -45.61 (4.39) |
| iRSSunwanted, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -103.23 (12.9) |
| Probability of interference (%) (C/I = 15 dB) | **0.4** |

### Home MBANS

Table 39: MCL calculation in 2483.5-2500 MHz band between home MBANS and MSS-CGC

| **Victim characteristics** | **Units** | **CGC MES** | **MBANS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Receiver bandwidth | MHz | 1.23 | 3 |
| Receiver noise figure | dB | 3 | 10 |
| Receiver antenna height | m | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| Receiver antenna gain | dBi | 0 | 0 |
| Operating frequency | MHz | 2490 | 2490 |
| N, receiver thermal noise | dBm | -109.9 | -99.1 |
| I/N objective | dB | -12 | 0 |
| **Interferer’s characteristics** |  | **MBANS**  | **CGC BS Tx** |
| e.i.r.p | dBm | 13 | 17 |
| Bandwidth | MHz | 3 | 1.23 |
| BW correction factor | dB | -3.9 | 0 |
| NFD (adjacent band interf) | dB | 0 | 0 |
| Wall attenuation (Note 1) | dB | 0 (indoor) | 0 (outdoor) |
| Antenna height | m | 1.5 | 30 |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Minimum path loss** | **dB** | **131.1** | **116.1** |
| **Interference distance FSL model** | **km** | **34.26** | **6.09** |
| **Interference distance P.452 model with 50% probability** | **km** | **4.76** | **5.24** |

Note 1: Worst case configuration assumed, in which MBANS transmitter or receiver is outdoors.

#### Interference from MBANS to Globalstar MES receivers in CGC mode
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Figure 30: Interference scenario – home MBANS into CGC MES

Table 40: Interference from home MBANS to CGC MES - Settings and results

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Simulation input/output parameters** | **Settings / Results** |
| **Victim Link (VLK): CGC BASE STATION TO CGC MES**  |
| VLK frequency | 2490 MHz |
| VLK bandwidth | 1.23 MHz |
| VLR dRSS  | -100 dBm |
| VLR noise floor | -110 dBm |
| **Interfering Link (ILK): MBANS** |
| ILK frequency | 2490 MHz |
| ILK bandwidth | 3 MHz  |
| ILT Tx power | 13 dBm (2% probability) |
| ILT density | 10/km2 |
| ILT probability of transmission | 1 |
| ILT → VLR interfering path | Extended Hata, urban, below roof |
| indoor→indoor | indoor→outdoor |
| ILT → VLR positioning mode | Uniform  |
| ILT → VLR number of transmitters | 785 (for 5 km simulation radius) |
| **Simulation results** |
| dRSS, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -100 (0) | -100 (0) |
| iRSSunwanted, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -167.97 (10.98) | -158.81 (10.48) |
| Probability of interference (%) (I/N = -12 dB) | **0.5** | **1.1** |

#### Interference from CGC base station to MBANS
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Figure 31: Interference scenario – CGC BS into home MBAN

Table 41: Interference from CGC BS to home MBANS - Settings and results

| **Simulation input/output parameters** | **Settings/Results** |
| --- | --- |
| **Victim Link (VLK): MBANS** |
| VLK frequency | 2490 MHz |
| VLK bandwidth | 3 MHz |
| VLT → VLR path | FSL (user-defined radius, 10 m) |
| **Interfering Link (ILK): CGC link (BS to MES)** |
| ILK frequency | 2490 MHz |
| ILK bandwidth | 5 MHz |
| ILT Tx power | 43 dBm |
| ILT peak antenna gain | 19 dBi |
| ILT density | 0.02/km2 |
| ILT probability of transmission | 1 |
| ILT → VLR interfering path | Extended Hata, urban, outdoor→indoor, above roof |
| ILT → VLR positioning mode | Uniform density |
| ILT → VLR number of active transmitters | 1 |
| **Simulation results** |
| dRSS, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -44.2 (4.44) |
| iRSSunwanted, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -103.84 (12.92) |
| Probability of interference (%) (C/I = 15 dB) | **0.3** |

### Ambulance MBANS

Table 42: MCL calculation in 2483.5-2500 MHz band between ambulance MBANS and MSS-CGC

| **Victim characteristics** | **Units** | **CGC MES** | **MBANS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Receiver bandwidth | MHz | 1.23 | 3 |
| Receiver noise figure | dB | 3 | 10 |
| Receiver antenna height | m | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| Receiver antenna gain | dBi | 0 | 0 |
| Operating frequency | MHz | 2490 | 2490 |
| N, receiver thermal noise | dBm | -109.9 | -99.1 |
| I/N objective | dB | -12 | 0 |
| **Interferer’s characteristics** |  | **MBANS**  | **CGC BS Tx** |
| e.i.r.p | dBm | 0 | 17 |
| Bandwidth | MHz | 3 | 1.23 |
| BW correction factor | dB | -3.9 | 0 |
| NFD (adjacent band interf) | dB | 0 | 0 |
| Wall attenuation | dB | 7 | 7 |
| Antenna height | m | 1.5 | 30 |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Minimum path loss** | **dB** | **111.1** | **109.1** |
| **Interference distance FSL model** | **km** | **3.43** | **2.72** |
| **Interference distance P.452 model with 50% probability** | **km** | **0.98** | **2.71** |

#### Interference from CGC base station to MBANS
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Figure 32: Interference scenario – CGC BS into ambulance MBAN

Table 43: Interference from CGC BS to ambulance MBANS - Settings and results

| **Simulation input/output parameters** | **Settings/Results** |
| --- | --- |
| **Victim Link (VLK): MBANS** |
| VLK frequency | 2490 MHz |
| VLK bandwidth | 3 MHz |
| VLT → VLR path | FSL (user-defined radius, 3 m) |
| **Interfering Link (ILK): CGC link (BS to MES)** |
| ILK frequency | 2490 MHz |
| ILK bandwidth | 5 MHz |
| ILT Tx power | 43 dBm |
| ILT peak antenna gain | 19 dBi |
| ILT density | 0.02/km2 |
| ILT probability of transmission | 1 |
| ILT → VLR interfering path | Extended Hata, urban, outdoor→indoor, above roof |
| ILT → VLR positioning mode | Uniform density |
| ILT → VLR number of active transmitters | 1 |
| **Simulation results** |
| dRSS, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -46.8 (4.44) |
| iRSSunwanted, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -97.84 (12.82) |
| Probability of interference (%) (C/I = 15 dB) | **0.9** |

#### Interference from MBANS to Globalstar MES receivers in CGC mode

This interference situation is believed to be equivalent to that analyzed in 5.3.3.1. The same results apply, namely 1.4% probability of interference.

### Summary CGC

Healthcare facility MBANS:

According to the results presented above, in worst-case situations—modelled with MCL calculations—the interference distance between CGC and MBANS is 1.7 km - 7.7 km (MBANS as interferer) and 1.4 km (CGC BS as interferer). The simulation-based average-case analysis yielded 1.9% - 3.6% interference probability from MBANS into CGC (i.e. MSS terminal in CGC mode). In the other coexistence direction, the probability of interference from CGC into MBANS is 0.4%.

CGC systems operating in the 2483.5-2500 MHz range and healthcare facility MBANS operating in the same range appear to be compatible, if we assume that about 3% interference probability would be acceptable.

Home MBANS:

In worst-case situations—modelled with MCL calculations—the interference distance between CGC and MBANS is 4.8 km - 34 km (MBANS as interferer) and 5.2 km – 6.1 km (CGC BS as interferer). The simulation-based average-case analysis yielded 0.5% - 1.1% interference probability from MBANS into CGC (i.e. MSS terminal in CGC mode). In the other coexistence direction, the probability of interference from CGC into MBANS is 0.3%.

CGC systems operating in the 2483.5-2500 MHz range and home MBANS operating in the same range appear to be compatible.

Ambulance MBANS:

In worst-case situations—modelled with MCL calculations—the interference distance between CGC and MBANS is 980 m – 3.4 km (MBANS as interferer) and 2.7 km (CGC BS as interferer). The simulation-based average-case analysis yielded 1.4% interference probability from MBANS into CGC (i.e. MSS terminal in CGC mode). In the other coexistence direction, the probability of interference from CGC into MBANS is <1%.

CGC systems operating in the 2483.5-2500 MHz range and ambulance MBANS operating in the same range appear to be compatible.

## RDSS/RNSS (Galileo)

The upgrading of Radiodetermination Satellite Service (RDSS) in this frequency band to primary status on a global basis has been agreed by WRC-12. The approved global primary allocation is intended to facilitate new navigation signals for the next generation of Galileo satellites in subject frequency band. The band 2483.5-2500 MHz, because of its proximity to the mobile service allocations above 2.5 GHz, may offer attractive synergies of Radionavigation-satellite (RNSS) with terrestrial mobile systems due to improved antenna efficiencies and use of shared hardware not possible with other RNSS bands. Although upgrading of allocation is conditional on the new service being able to prove its compatibility with other primary services already existing in the band, it was regarded as necessary to consider the co-existence between MBANS and RNSS.

The interference scenario with RDSS/RNSS is very similar to the scenario with MSS discussed in Section 5.3. RNSS would also be operated in downlink mode only, and interference from the satellite signal to MBANS receivers may be disregarded. For that reason, only the interference from an MBANS transmitter to a RNSS receiver is considered. Another similarity with the MSS case is that also RNSS victim receivers are supposed to be operated outdoors only.

The relevant technical RNSS-receiver parameters used for the study were collected from ECC Rep 150 [14]. ECC Rep 165 [12] and ECC Rep149 [4] were also consulted.

Table 44: RNSS (Galileo) system parameters

|  | **Parameter** | **Value** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| SatelliteTransmitter | Bandwidth (MHz) | 1 (reference value) (from ECC Report 165 and ECC Report 149) | 4 (from range of values in ECC Report 150) |
| Max power on ground (dBm/MHz) | -116 |
| MobileReceiver |  Maximum interference value | -116 (dBm/MHz) | -110 (dBm/4MHz) |
| Antenna height (m) | 1.5 |
| Antenna gain (dBi) | 0 |

### Healthcare facility MBANS

Table 45: MCL calculation in 2483.5-2500 MHz band between healthcare MBANS and RNSS

| **Victim characteristics** | **Units** | RNSS Receiver |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Receiver bandwidth | MHz | 1 | 4 |
| Receiver antenna height | m | 1.5 |
| Receiver antenna gain | dBi | 0 |
| Operating frequency | MHz | 2490 |
|  Maximum interference value | dBm/BWv | -116 | -110 |
| **Interferer’s characteristics** | **Units** | MBANS  |
| e.i.r.p | dBm | 0 |
| Bandwidth | MHz | 3 |
| BW correction factor | dB | -4.77 | 0 |
| NFD (adjacent band interf) | dB | 0 |
| Wall attenuation | dB | 13 |
| Antenna height | m | 1.5 |
| **Minimum path loss** | **dB** | **98.2** | **97** |
| **Interference distance FSL model(propagation exponent n=2)** | **km** | **0.78** | **0.68** |
| **Interference distance FSL model(propagation exponent n=3)** | **km** | **0.08** | **0.08** |

#### Interference from MBANS to RNSS receivers (Galileo)

The considered interference scenario is depicted in Figure 33 and the simulation settings and results are summarized in Table 46.
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Figure 33: Interference scenario – healthcare facility MBANS into RNSS receiver

Table 46: Interference from healthcare facility MBANS to RNSS - Settings and results

| **Simulation input/output parameters** | **Settings/Results** |
| --- | --- |
| **Victim Link (VLK): RNSS DL (satellite to mobile receiver)** |
| VLK frequency | 2490 MHz |
| VLK bandwidth | 1 MHz | 4 MHz |
| VLR Noise floor  | -116 dBm/MHz | -110 dBm/4MHz |
| **Interfering Link (ILK): MBANS** |
| ILK frequency | 2490 MHz |
| ILK bandwidth | 3 MHz |
| ILT Tx power | 0 dBm |
| ILT density | 40/km2 |
| ILT probability of transmission | 0.1 |
| ILT → VLR interfering path | Extended Hata, indoor→outdoor, below roof |
| Urban | Suburban | Urban | Suburban |
| ILT → VLR positioning mode | Closest interferer |
| **Simulation results** |
| dRSS, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -100 (0) |
| iRSSunwanted, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -164.04 (19.86) | -152.24 (18.88) | -159.38 (19.94) | -147.46 (18.88) |
| Probability of interference(%) (I/N = 0 dB) | **2.6**  | **4.5** | **2.6** | **4.2** |

### Home MBANS

Table 47: MCL calculation in 2483.5-2500 MHz band between home MBANS and RNSS

| **Victim characteristics** | **Units** | RNSS Receiver |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Receiver bandwidth | MHz | 1 | 4 |
| Receiver antenna height | M | 1.5 |
| Receiver antenna gain | dBi | 0 |
| Operating frequency | MHz | 2490 |
|  Maximum interference value | dBm/BWv | -116 | -110 |
| **Interferer’s characteristics** | **Units** | MBANS  |
| e.i.r.p | dBm | 13 |
| Bandwidth | MHz | 3 |
| BW correction factor | dB | -4.77 | 0 |
| NFD (adjacent band interf) | dB | 0 |
| Wall attenuation (Note 1) | dB | 0 (outdoor) |
| Antenna height | M | 1.5 |
| **Minimum path loss** | **dB** | **124.2** | **123** |
| **Interference distance FSL model(propagation exponent n=2)** | **Km** | **15.6** | **13.51** |
| **Interference distance FSL model(propagation exponent n=3)** | **Km** | **0.62** | **0.57** |

Note 1: Worst case configuration assumed, in which MBANS transmitter or receiver is outdoors.

#### Interference from MBANS to RNSS receivers (Galileo)
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Figure 34: Interference scenario – home MBANS into RNSS receiver

Table 48: Interference from home MBANS to RNSS - Settings and results

| **Simulation input/output parameters** | **Settings/Results** |
| --- | --- |
| **Victim Link (VLK): RNSS DL (satellite to mobile receiver)** |
| VLK frequency | 2490 MHz |
| VLK bandwidth | 1 MHz | 4 MHz |
| VLR Noise floor  | -116 dBm/MHz | -110 dBm/4MHz |
| **Interfering Link (ILK): Home MBANS** |
| ILK frequency | 2490 MHz |
| ILK bandwidth | 3 MHz |
| ILT Tx power | 13 dBm |
| ILT density | 10/km2 |
| ILT probability of transmission | 0.02 |
| ILT → VLR interfering path | Extended Hata, indoor→outdoor, below roof |
| Urban  | Suburban | Urban  | Suburban |
| ILT → VLR positioning mode | Uniform |
| **Simulation results** |
| dRSS, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -100 (0) |
| iRSSunwanted, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -166.56 (14.13) | -153.25 (13.8) | -160.41 (14.15) | -148.27 (13.93) |
| Probability of interference (%) (I/N = 0 dB) | **0.7** | **1.5** | **0.6** | **1.5** |

### Ambulance MBANS

Table 49: MCL calculation in 2483.5-2500 MHz band between ambulance MBANS and RNSS

| **Victim characteristics** | **Units** | RNSS Receiver |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Receiver bandwidth | MHz | 1 | 4 |
| Receiver antenna height | m | 1.5 |
| Receiver antenna gain | dBi | 0 |
| Operating frequency | MHz | 2490 |
|  Maximum interference value  | dBm/BWv | -116 | -110 |
| **Interferer’s characteristics** | **Units** | Ambulance MBANS |
| e.i.r.p | dBm | 0 |
| Bandwidth | MHz | 3 |
| BW correction factor | dB | -4.77 | 0 |
| NFD (adjacent band interf) | dB | 0 |
| Wall attenuation | dB | 7 |
| Antenna height | m | 1.5 |
| **Minimum path loss** | **dB** | **104.2** | **103** |
| **Interference distance FSL model(propagation exponent n=2)** | **km** | **1.56** | **1.35** |
| **Interference distance FSL model****(propagation exponent n=3)** | **km** | **0.13** | **0.12** |

#### Interference from MBANS to RNSS receivers (Galileo)

The considered interference scenario is depicted in Figure 35 and the simulation settings and results are summarized in Table 50.
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Figure 35: Interference scenario ambulance MBANS into RNSS receiver

Table 50: Interference from MBANS (ambulance mode) to RNSS - Settings and results

| **Simulation input/output parameters** | **Settings/Results** |
| --- | --- |
| **Victim Link (VLK): RNSS DL (satellite to mobile receiver)** |
| VLK frequency | 2490 MHz |
| VLK bandwidth | 1 MHz | 4 MHz |
| VLR Noise floor  | -116 dBm/MHz | -110 dBm/4MHz |
| **Interfering Link (ILK): ambulance MBANS** |
| ILK frequency | 2490 MHz |
| ILK bandwidth | 3 MHz |
| ILT Tx power | 0 dBm |
| ILT density | 5/km2 |
| ILT probability of transmission | 0.1 |
| ILT → VLR interfering path | Extended Hata, indoor→outdoor, below roof |
| Urban  | Suburban | Urban  | Suburban |
| ILT → VLR positioning mode | Uniform |
| **Simulation results** |
| dRSS, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -100 (0) |
| iRSSunwanted, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -164.2 (13.88) | -150 (13.08) | -157.51 (13.71) | -145.25 (13.36) |
| Probability of interference (%) (I/N = 0 dB) | **1.1** | **2.2** | **1.0** | **2.2** |

### Summary RDSS/RNSS

According to the results presented above, in worst-case situations—modelled with MCL calculations—the interference distance between RNSS and MBANS is 80 m - 780 m (healthcare facility MBANS), 570 m - 15 km (home MBANS), and 120 m – 1.6 km (ambulance MBANS). The simulation-based average-case analysis yielded probability of interference levels of ≤4.5% from healthcare facility MBANS, ≤1.5% from home MBANS, and ≤2.2% from ambulance MBANS.

RDSS/RNSS systems operating in the 2483.5-2500 MHz range and MBANS operating in the same range appear to be compatible, if we assume that 5% interference probability could be accepted.

## SAP/SAB (ENG/OB) video links

The SAP/SAB (ENG/OB) tuning range extends up to 2500 MHz. Although ECC Report 002 [15] shows that most of the SAP/SAB use is concentrated below 2400 MHz, some CEPT countries have reported using the entire tuning range for SAP/SAB operations, which leads to the consideration of SAP/SAB as incumbent in the 2483.5-2500 MHz band.

Services Ancillary to Programme making / Services Ancillary to Broadcasting (SAP/SAB) are also known as Electronic News Gathering / Outside Broadcasting (ENG/OB). According to ECC Report 002 [15], typical SAP/SAB applications in this frequency range are the video reportage links, with signal being transmitted to transportable studio from handheld or vehicle mounted cameras. Sometimes such links might be also used in airborne configuration, e.g. with the reportage camera being mounted on board a helicopter. However in this case the receiver is still a ground-based studio.

The parameters of SAP/SAB links as victim receivers used in this study were mainly taken from ECC Report 100 [16], which considers interference to similar SAP/SAB links in the 3400-3600 MHz band. ECC Report 02 [15], ERC Report 38 [17] and ETSI EN 300 744 [18] were also consulted.

Two different types of SAP/SAB video links are considered, the parameters of which are summarized in the following tables.

Table 51: SAP/SAB video link parameters (Type 1 - mobile link, airborne)

|  | **Parameter** | **Value** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| AirborneTransmitter | Bandwidth (MHz) | 8 |
| Max Tx power (dBm) | 30 |
| Antenna gain (dBi) | 4 (omnidirectional) |
| Antenna height (m) | Up to 700 (375 assumed) |
| GroundReceiver(on vehicle) | Receiver sensitivity (dBm) | -89.8 |
| Antenna gain (dBi) | 10 (omnidirectional) |
| Antenna height (m) | 3 |
| C/I objective (dB) | 16 |

Table 52: SAP/SAB video link parameters (Type 2 - terrestrial link)

|  | **Parameter** | **Value** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Transmitter | Bandwidth (MHz) | 8 |
| Max Tx power (dBm) | 43 |
| Antenna gain (dBi) | 0 (omnidirectional) |
| Antenna height (m) | 1.5 |
| Receiver | Receiver sensitivity (dBm) | -99 |
| Antenna gain (dBi) | 17 (directional) |
| Antenna diagram | See Figure 36 |
| Antenna height (m) | 1.5 |
| C/I objective (dB) | 10 |

Figure 36: Antenna radiation diagram of SAP/SAB receiver (Type 2)

According to ERC Report 38 [17], SAP/SAB receivers on the roof of communications vehicles can use both omnidirectional and directional antennas. For ‘type 1’ video links, omnidirectional antennas have been assumed as worst case scenario. The use of directional antennas would lead to significantly lower levels of interference from MBANS to SAP/SAB and vice versa.

### Healthcare Facility MBANS

Table 53: MCL calculation in 2483.5-2500 MHz band between healthcare facility MBANS and
SAP/SAB video links

| **Scenario** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Victim characteristics** | **Units** | **SAP/SAB****(type 1)** | **MBANS** | **SAP/SAB****(type 2)** | **MBANS** |
| Receiver bandwidth | MHz | 8 | 3 | 8 | 3 |
| Receiver noise figure | dB | 5 | 10 | 2 | 10 |
| Receiver antenna height | m | 3 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| Receiver antenna gain | dBi | 10 | 0 | 17 | 0 |
| Operating frequency | MHz | 2490 | 2490 | 2490 | 2490 |
| N, receiver thermal noise | dBm | -99.8 | -99.1 | -102.8 | -99.1 |
| I/N objective | dB | -6 | 0 | -6 | 0 |
| **Interferer’s characteristics** | **Units** | **MBANS**  | **SAP/SAB****(type 1)** | **MBANS** | **SAP/SAB****(type 2)** |
| e.i.r.p | dBm | 0 | 34 | 0 | 43 |
| Bandwidth | MHz | 3 | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| BW correction factor | dB | 0 | -4.3 | 0 | -4.3 |
| NFD (adjacent band interf) | dB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wall attenuation | dB | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 |
| Antenna height | m | 1.5 | 375 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| **Minimum path loss** | **dB** | **102.8** | **115.8** | **112.8** | **124.8** |
| **Interference distance FSL model****(propagation exponent n=2)** | **km** | **1.3** | **5.9**  | **4.2** | **16.7** |
| **Interference distance FSL model (propagation exponent n=3)** | **km** | **0.12** | **0.33** | **0.26** | **0.65** |

#### Interference from MBANS to SAP/SAB video links

The considered interference scenario is depicted in Figure 37 and has been simulated in SEAMCAT. The simulation settings and results are summarized in Table 54. The interference probability from MBANS into SAP/SAB is low.
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Figure 37: Interference scenario – healthcare facility MBANS into SAP/SAB video link (type1)

Table 54: Interference from healthcare facility MBANS to SAP/SAB - Settings and results

| **Simulation input/output parameters** | **Settings/Results** |
| --- | --- |
| **Victim Link (VLK):**  | **SAP/SAB (type 1)** | **SAP/SAB (type 2)** |
| VLK frequency | 2490 MHz |
| VLK bandwidth | 8 MHz |
| VLT → VLR path | FSL (user-defined radius, 10 Km) | Extended Hata, urban, outdoor→outdoor, below roof (user-defined radius, 500 m) |
| **Interfering Link (ILK):**  | **MBANS** |
| ILK frequency | 2490 MHz |
| ILK bandwidth | 3 MHz |
| ILT Tx power | 0 dBm | 0 dBm (10% probability) |
| ILT density | 40/km2 |
| ILT → VLR number of active Tx | - | 31 |
| ILT probability of transmission of all Tx | 0.1 | 1 |
| ILT → VLR simulation radius | - | 500 m |
| ILT → VLR interfering path | Extended Hata, urban, indoor→outdoor, below roof |
| ILT → VLR positioning mode | Closest interferer | None |
| **Simulation results** |
| dRSS, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -72.06 (4.36) | -125.59 (17.79) |
| iRSSunwanted, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -143.29 (19.26) | -144.61 (38.64)  |
| Probability of interference (%)(C/I = 16 dB, type 1)(C/I = 10 dB, type 2) | **1.5** | **4.3** |

#### Interference from SAP/SAB video links to MBANS

The considered interference scenario is depicted in Figure 38 and has been simulated in SEAMCAT. The simulation settings and results are summarized in Table 55. The interference probability from SAP/SAB into MBANS is very low.
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Figure 38: Interference scenario – SAP/SAB video link (type 1) into healthcare facility MBANS

Table 55: Interference from SAP/SAB to healthcare facility MBANS - Settings and results

| **Simulation input/output parameters** | **Settings/Results** |
| --- | --- |
| **Victim Link (VLK):** | **MBANS** |
| VLK frequency | 2490 MHz |
| VLK bandwidth | 3 MHz |
| VLT → VLR path | FSL (user-defined radius, 3 m) |
| **Interfering Link (ILK):** | **SAP/SAB (type 1)** | **SAP/SAB (type 2)** |
| ILK frequency | 2490 MHz |
| ILK bandwidth | 8 MHz |
| ILT Tx power | 30 dBm | 43 dBm |
| ILT density | 1/km2 |
| ILT probability of transmission | 1 | 1 |
| ILT → VLR number of active Tx | 1 | 1 |
| ILT → VLR simulation radius | 564 m | 500 m |
| ILT → VLR interfering path | Extended Hata, urban, outdoor→indoor, above roof | Extended Hata, urban, outdoor→indoor, below roof |
| ILT → VLR positioning mode | Uniform density | None |
| **Simulation results** |
| dRSS, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | 45.51 (4.52) | -45.56 (4.44) |
| iRSSunwanted, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -94.02 (12.81) | -120 (18.63) |
| Probability of interference (%)(C/I = 15 dB) | **0.9** | **1.1** |

### Home MBANS

Table 56: MCL calculation in 2483.5-2500 MHz band between home
MBANS and SAP/SAB video links

| **Scenario** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Victim characteristics** | **Units** | **SAP/SAB****(type 1)** | **MBANS** | **SAP/SAB****(type 2)** | **MBANS** |
| Receiver bandwidth | MHz | 8 | 3 | 8 | 3 |
| Receiver noise figure | dB | 5 | 10 | 2 | 10 |
| Receiver antenna height | m | 3 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| Receiver antenna gain | dBi | 10 | 0 | 17 | 0 |
| Operating frequency | MHz | 2490 | 2490 | 2490 | 2490 |
| N, receiver thermal noise | dBm | -99.8 | -99.1 | -102.8 | -99.1 |
| I/N objective | dB | -6 | 0 | -6 | 0 |
| **Interferer’s characteristics** | **Units** | **MBANS** | **SAP/SAB****(type 1)** | **MBANS** | **SAP/SAB****(type 2)** |
| e.i.r.p | dBm | 13 | 34 | 13 | 43 |
| Bandwidth | MHz | 3 | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| BW correction factor | dB | 0 | -4.3 | 0 | -4.3 |
| NFD (adjacent band interf) | dB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wall attenuation (Note 1) | dB | 0 (outdoor) | 0 (outdoor) | 0 (outdoor) | 0 (outdoor) |
| Antenna height | m | 1.5 | 375 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| **Minimum path loss** | **dB** | **128.8** | **128.8** | **138.8** | **137.8** |
| **Interference distance FSL model****(propagation exponent n=2)** | **km** | **26.4** | **26.4** | **83.5** | **74.4** |
| **Interference distance FSL model (propagation exponent n=3)** | **km** | **0.9** | **0.9** | **1.9** | **1.8** |

Note 1: Worst case configuration assumed, in which MBANS transmitter or receiver is outdoors.

#### Interference from MBANS to SAP/SAB video links
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Figure 39: Interference scenario – healthcare facility MBANS into SAP/SAB video link (type 1

Table 57: Interference from home MBANS to SAP/SAB - Settings and results

| **Simulation input/output parameters** | **Settings/Results** |
| --- | --- |
| **Victim Link (VLK):** | **SAP/SAB (type 1)** | **SAP/SAB (type 2)** |
| VLK frequency | 2490 MHz |
| VLK bandwidth | 8 MHz |
| VLT → VLR path | FSL (user-defined radius, 10 Km) | Extended Hata, outdoor→outdoor, below roof (user-defined radius, 500 m) |
| urban | suburban | rural |
| **Interfering Link (ILK):**  | **MBANS** |
| ILK frequency | 2490 MHz |
| ILK bandwidth | 3 MHz |
| ILT Tx power | 13 dBm | 13 dBm (2% probability) |
| ILT density | 10/km2 |
| ILT → VLR number of active Tx | 1 | 8 |
| ILT probability of transmission of all TX | 0.02 | 1 |
| ILT → VLR simulation radius | 1.26 km | 500 m |
| ILT → VLR interfering path | Extended Hata, urban, indoor→outdoor, below roof | Extended Hata, indoor→outdoor, below roof |
| urban | suburban | rural |
| ILT → VLR positioning mode | Uniform density | None |
| **Simulation results** |
| dRSS, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -72.08 (4.3) | -125.7 | -125.67 | -125.75 |
| iRSSunwanted, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -144.34 (14.02) | -294.71  | -283.01 | -264.6 |
| Probability of interference (%)(C/I = 16 dB, type 1)(C/I = 10 dB, type 2) | **0.5** | **0.5**  | **1.0** | **3.4** |

#### Interference from SAP/SAB video links to MBANS
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Figure 40: Interference scenario – SAP/SAB video link (type 1) into home MBANS

Table 58: Interference from SAP/SAB to home MBANS - Settings and results

| **Simulation input/output parameters** | **Settings/Results** |
| --- | --- |
| **Victim Link (VLK):** | **MBANS** |
| VLK frequency | 2490 MHz |
| VLK bandwidth | 3 MHz |
| VLT → VLR path | FSL (user-defined radius, 10 m) |
| **Interfering Link (ILK):** | **SAP/SAB (type 1)** | **SAP/SAB (type 2)** |
| ILK frequency | 2490 MHz |
| ILK bandwidth | 8 MHz |
| ILT Tx power | 30 dBm | 43 dBm |
| ILT density | 1/km2 |
| ILT probability of transmission | 1 |
| ILT → VLR number of active Tx | 1 |
| ILT → VLR simulation radius | 564 | 500 |
| ILT → VLR interfering path | Extended Hata, urban, outdoor→indoor, above roof | Extended Hata, urban, outdoor→indoor, below roof |
| ILT → VLR positioning mode | Uniform density | None |
| **Simulation results** |
| dRSS, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -43 (4.45) | -43.05 (4.47) |
| iRSSunwanted, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -93.93 (12.86) | -119.97 (18.53) |
| Probability of interference (%) (C/I = 15 dB) | **0.6** | **1.0** |

### Ambulance MBANS

Table 59: MCL calculation in 2483.5-2500 MHz band between ambulance MBANS and SAP/SAB video links

| **Scenario** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Victim characteristics** | **Units** | **SAP/SAB****(type 1)** | **MBANS** | **SAP/SAB****(type 2)** | **MBANS** |
| Receiver bandwidth | MHz | 8 | 3 | 8 | 3 |
| Receiver noise figure | dB | 5 | 10 | 2 | 10 |
| Receiver antenna height | m | 3 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| Receiver antenna gain | dBi | 10 | 0 | 17 | 0 |
| Operating frequency | MHz | 2490 | 2490 | 2490 | 2490 |
| N, receiver thermal noise | dBm | -99.8 | -99.1 | -102.8 | -99.1 |
| I/N objective | dB | -6 | 0 | -6 | 0 |
| **Interferer’s characteristics** | **Units** | **MBANS**  | **SAP/SAB****(type 1)** | **MBANS** | **SAP/SAB****(type 2)** |
| e.i.r.p | dBm | 0 | 34 | 0 | 43 |
| Bandwidth | MHz | 3 | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| BW correction factor | dB | 0 | -4.3 | 0 | 4.3 |
| NFD (adjacent band interf) | dB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wall attenuation | dB | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Antenna height | m | 1.5 | 375 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| **Minimum path loss** | **dB** | **108.8** | **121.8** | **118.8** | **130.8** |
| **Interference distance FSL model****(propagation exponent n=2)** | **km** | **2.6** | **11.8**  | **8.4** | **33.3** |
| **Interference distance FSL model (propagation exponent n=3)** | **km** | **0.19** | **0.52** | **0.41** | **1.0** |

#### Interference from MBANS to SAP/SAB video links
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Figure 41: Interference scenario – ambulance MBANS into SAP/SAB video link (type 1)

Table 60: Interference from ambulance MBANS to SAP/SAB - Settings and results

| **Simulation input/output parameters** | **Settings/Results** |
| --- | --- |
| **Victim Link (VLK):**  | **SAP/SAB (type 1)** | **SAP/SAB (type 2)** |
| VLK frequency | 2490 MHz |
| VLK bandwidth | 8 MHz |
| VLT → VLR path | FSL (user-defined radius, 10 Km) | Extended Hata, urban, outdoor→outdoor, below roof (user-defined radius, 500 m) |
| **Interfering Link (ILK):**  | **MBANS** |
| ILK frequency | 2490 MHz |
| ILK bandwidth | 3 MHz |
| ILT Tx power | 0 dBm | 0 dBm (10% probability) |
| ILT density | 5/km2 |
| ILT → VLR number of active Tx | 2 | 4  |
| ILT probability of transmission of all Tx | 0.1 | 1 |
| ILT → VLR simulation radius | 1.13 | 500 m  |
| ILT → VLR interfering path | Extended Hata, urban, indoor→outdoor, below roof |
| ILT → VLR positioning mode | Uniform density | None |
| **Simulation results** |
| dRSS, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -72.1 (4.32) | -125.61 (18.02) |
| iRSSunwanted, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -141.4 (13.45) | -264.96 (86.64) |
| Probability of interference (%)(C/I = 16 dB, type 1)(C/I = 10 dB, type 2) | **0.7** | **0.8** |

#### Interference from SAP/SAB video links to MBANS
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Figure 42: Interference scenario – SAP/SAB video link (type 1) into healthcare facility MBANS

Table 61: Interference from SAP/SAB to ambulance MBANS - Settings and result

| **Simulation input/output parameters** | **Settings/Results** |
| --- | --- |
| **Victim Link (VLK):**  | **MBANS** |
| VLK frequency | 2490 MHz |
| VLK bandwidth | 3 MHz |
| VLT → VLR path | FSL (user-defined radius, 3 m) |
| **Interfering Link (ILK):** | **SAP/SAB (type 1)** | **SAP/SAB (type 2)** |
| ILK frequency | 2490 MHz |
| ILK bandwidth | 8 MHz |
| ILT Tx power | 30 dBm | 43 dBm |
| ILT density | 1/km2 |
| ILT probability of transmission | 1 |
| ILT → VLR number of active Tx | 1 |
| ILT → VLR simulation radius | 564 m | 500 m |
| ILT → VLR interfering path | Extended Hata, urban, outdoor→indoor, above roof | Extended Hata, urban, outdoor→indoor, below roof |
| ILT → VLR positioning mode | Uniform density | None |
| **Simulation results** |
| dRSS, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -45.61 (4.36) | -45.55 (4.47) |
| iRSSunwanted, dBm (Std.dev., dB) | -88 (12.93) | -113.9 (18.81) |
| Probability of interference (%)(C/I = 15 dB) | **2.6** | **1.6** |

### Summary SAP/SAB

In absence of available SAP/SAB information specific for the 2483.5-2500 MHz band, the typical system parameters of SAP/SAB video links operating in the band 2360-2400 MHz band were used for this compatibility study.

Healthcare facility MBANS:

Average case simulation results suggest coexistence between SAP/SAB and healthcare facility MBANS. Even in unfavorable conditions, the required distances between SAP/SAB and healthcare facilities are in a range that corresponds to most situations in practice. Therefore coexistence with MBANS within healthcare facilities appears possible.

Home MBANS:

Average case simulation results suggest good coexistence between SAP/SAB and home MBANS. However in unfavorable conditions, the required distances between SAP/SAB and the homes of MBANS users would be unpractical. Such potential interference to SAP/SAB applications—even with low deployment values of 10 MBANS per km2—lead to the conclusion that coexistence might be possible in areas where SAP/SAB is used in the 2483.5-2500 MHz band but cannot be guaranteed without additional mitigation measures.

Ambulance MBANS:

Average case simulation results suggest good coexistence between SAP/SAB and ambulance MBANS. However in unfavorable conditions, the required distances between SAP/SAB and ambulances could not be guaranteed, due to the high mobility of the latter. The potential interference to SAP/SAB applications—even with low deployment values of 5 MBANS per km2—lead to the conclusion that coexistence might be possible in areas where SAP/SAB is used in the 2483.5-2500 MHz band but cannot be guaranteed without additional mitigation measures

## ADJACENT Wideband data transmission systems

This section studies the compatibility between MBANS operating in the 2483.5-2500 MHz range and wideband data transmission systems–represented by WLAN– operating in the adjacent 2400-2483.5 MHz range. Due to the equivalence to the co-channel compatibility study in Section 4.1, this section is presented in compact form. More details and considerations can be found in Section 4.1.

Based on the WLAN standard [19] the last channel of wideband data transmission on the upper side of the band ends at 2482 MHz that results in 1.5 MHz guard band between WLAN and the possible MBANs implementation in the band studied in this section (2483.5-2500 MHz). However, it was considered appropriate to also study possible interference between these technologies in these two adjacent bands. The MCL calculations for 20 MHz WLAN channel bandwidth are presented in Table 62.The same approach as in the co-channel compatibility analysis in Section 4.1 was used.

Table 62: Adjacent MCL calculation in 2483.5 MHz band limits between MBANS and WLAN

| **Scenario** | **1** | **2** | **3** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Victim characteristics** | **Units** | **WLAN 802.11 AP** | **WLAN 802.11 AP** | **MBANS** |
| Receiver bandwidth | MHz | 20 | 20 | 3 |
| Receiver noise figure | dB | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Receiver antenna height | m | 3 | 3 | 1.5 |
| Receiver antenna gain | dBi | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| Operating frequency | MHz | 2472 | 2472 | 2485 |
| N, receiver thermal noise | dBm | -90.82 | -90.82 | -99.1 |
| I/N objective | dB | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Interferer’s characteristics** | **Units** | **MBANS (healthcare facility)** | **MBANS (home)** | **WLAN 802.11 AP** |
| e.i.r.p | dBm | 0 | 13 | 17 |
| Bandwidth | MHz | 3 | 3 | 20 |
| BW correction factor | dB | 0 | 0 | -8.24 |
| NFD (adjacent band interf.) | dB | -25 | -25 | -40 |
| Antenna height | m | 1.5 | 1.5 | 3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Minimum path loss** | **dB** | **70.8** | **83.8** | **67.8** |
| **Interference distance FSL model** | **km** | **0.03** | **0.15** | **0.02** |

### Healthcare facility MBANS

The SEAMCAT simulations are summarized in the following table. The study approach is identical to that Section 4.1.1. The parameter and scenario choices are described in that section of the report. For obtaining the interference probability in SEAMCAT, the combination of unwanted and blocking response was used. A value of 30 dB blocking response was used for MBANS.

Table 63: Interference in 2483.5 MHz band limits between healthcare facility MBANS and
WLAN – Simulation results

| **Interferer** | **Victim** | **Interferer central frequency****(MHz)** | **Victim****central frequency****(MHz)** | **Simulation parameters** | **Interference probability** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| MBANS | WLAN (20 MHz) | 2485 | 2472 | See Section 4.1.1.1 | 0.1 % |
| WLAN (40 MHz) | 2462 | 0 % |
| WLAN (20 MHz) | MBANS | 2472 | 2485 | See Section 4.1.1.2 | 4.2 % |
| WLAN (40 MHz) | 2462 | 3.9 % |

### Home MBANS

The SEAMCAT simulations are summarized in the following table. The study approach is identical to that Section 4.1.1. The parameter and scenario choices are described in that section of the report. For obtaining the interference probability in SEAMCAT, the combination of unwanted and blocking response was used. A value of 30 dB blocking response was used for MBANS.

Table 64: Interference in 2483.5 MHz band limits between home MBANS and
WLAN –Simulation results

| **Interferer** | **Victim** | **Interferer central frequency****(MHz)** | **Victim****central frequency****(MHz)** | **Simulation parameters** | **Interference probability**  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| MBANS | WLAN (20 MHz) | 2485 | 2472 | See Section 4.1.2.1 | 0 % |
| WLAN (40 MHz) | 2462 | 0.1 % |
| WLAN (20 MHz) | MBANS | 2472 | 2485 | See Section 4.1.2.2 | 3.1 % |
| WLAN (40 MHz) | 2462 | 3 % |

### Summary ADJACENT wideband data transmission systems

All simulation-based average-case analyses yielded ≤0.1% probability of interference from MBANS. In the other coexistence direction, the obtained results range from 3% to 4.2% probability of interference from wideband data transmission systems.

Wideband data transmission systems operating in the 2400-2483.5 MHz range and MBANS in healthcare facilities, homes, and ambulances operating in the 2483.5-2500 MHz range are compatible.

## ADJACENT Broadband Wireless Systems (bws)

The first international mobile communication system was the analogue NMT system which was introduced in the Nordic countries in 1981, at the same time analogue AMPS was introduced in North America and TACS and J-TACS deployed worldwide. In Europe, the telecommunication administrations in CEPT initiated the GSM project. GSM is the most popular standard for mobile telephony systems in the world. The third generation mobile system UMTS was designed to enable voice and data services in addition to richer mobile multimedia services, including internet access. It started to be deployed in 2001, and by now has 300+ networks deployed, and the number of UMTS connections is estimated to be over 520 million including HSPA (Q1 2010).

The next steps in the 3GPP standardisation of mobile communications systems are referred to as LTE (3GPP technology) and mobile WiMAX (IEEE technology). The main target for the evolution of 3G mobile communication is to provide the possibility for significantly higher end user data rates compared to what is achievable with for example the first release of the 3G standard. This includes the possibility for higher peak data rate even more possibility for significantly higher data rates over the entire cell area as well as users at the cell edge. Network quality and performance is becoming a clear competitive advantage, as usage and traffic patterns change. With the rapid uptake of smartphones mobile data traffic is expected to grow 15 times by 2017. This enormous amount of data traffic puts requirements on both optimal performance of mobile systems and on emissions from other coexisting technologies.

The investigated frequency allocation is shown in Figure 43. There are allocations adjacent to IMT bands. LTE-TDD and FDD is now gaining market traction in all regions as it is commonly considered in the evolution path of any wireless cellular technology, especially TDD (TD-SCDMA, UTRA-TDD and WiMAX™). Globally, many LTE networks were launched in different countries between December 2009 and June 2012. In the indicated 2500-2570 MHz band 7, the BS is receiving, and the UE is transmitting, which reduces the number of scenarios.

Figure 43: Spectrum allocation for LTE and the proposed MBANS designation

Most of the LTE parameters considered in this report are based on 3GPP TS 36-series documents, describing the LTE standard, as it is the technology adopted for the utilization of IMT-A framework. More specifically the documents TS 36.101 [20], TS 36.104 [21] and TS 36.942 [22] were used, accompanied by the Report ITU-R M.2039-2 (11/2010) [23] for sharing studies. SEAMCAT is equipped with an OFDMA module specifically designed for LTE. The basis for the SEAMCAT simulations was the similar studies by ECC Report 172 [7]. An overview of LTE parameters is presented in Table 65. The definition used for cell radius in SEAMCAT is illustrated in Figure 44 and the patterns of the base station antennas, which are taken from the LTE standard, are shown in Figure 45.

In this section the coexistence of LTE systems and MBANS is evaluated. Results from both MCL calculations and SEAMCAT simulations are presented.

Table 65: LTE parameters

|  | **Parameter** | **Value** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Base Station (BS) | Bandwidth (MHz) | 10 (Note 1) |
| Max Tx power (dBm) | 46 |
| Antenna gain (dBi) | 17 |
| Antenna height (m) | 30 (Note 2) |
| Antenna tilt (deg) | -3 |
| Feeder loss (dB) | 3 |
| ACLR (dB) | Wide area BS: the least stringent of 45 dB and -15 dBm/MHz.Local area BS: the least stringent of 45 dB and -32 dBm/MHz.Home BS: the least stringent of 45 dB and -50 dBm/MHz |
| Spurious emissions (dBm/MHz) | -30(beyond 10MHz outside operating band) |
| Receiver ACS (dB) | 46 |
| Noise figure (dB) | 5 |
| Interference criterion I/N (dB) | -6 |
| User Equipment (UE) | Bandwidth (MHz) | 10 (Note 1) |
| Max Tx power (dBm) | 23 |
| Antenna gain (dBi) | 0 (omnidirectional) |
| Antenna height (m) | 1.5 |
| ACLR (dB) | 30 (1st adjacent channel) |
| Spurious emissions (dBm/MHz) | -30 (beyond 10MHz outside operating band) |
| Receiver ACS (dB) | 33 |
| Noise figure (dB) | 9 |
| Interference criterion I/N (dB) | -6 |
| System | Cell Radius R (m) | 250 (in urban scenarios)500 (in suburban scenarios) |
| Cell Layout | 2 tiers, Tri-sector |
| Bandwidth of Resource Block (kHz) | 180 |

Note 1: Other bandwidth values are possible according to the LTE standard. 10 MHz was selected as most representative value.

Note 2: Varies between 10 m - 37.5 m above clutter height. 30 m was selected as most representative value.

Figure 44: Cell Radius as defined in SEAMCAT

(a) (b)

Figure 45: Tri-sector antenna (a) horizontal and (b) vertical pattern

The total emission mask of the system is taken from the standard TS 36.101 [20] and implemented in SEAMCAT as shown in Figure 46.

Figure 46: Unwanted emission mask of LTE UE

This section presents an adjacent band compatibility study. The worst case was considered in terms of frequency separation, in which both technologies are utilizing the edge of their allocated (or presumably designated) spectrum without any guard bands. The ACLR values of LTE devices were taken from the LTE standard. The ACLR value for MBANS is taken as the average of the adjacent band emissions in the considered spectrum of 10 MHz for LTE.

### Healthcare facility MBANS

The MCL calculations for minimum interference distances between MBANS and LTE are shown in Table 66.

Table 66: MCL calculation in 2483.5 – 2500 MHz band between healthcare facility MBANS and LTE UL

| **Victim characteristics** | **Units** | MBANS | LTE UL |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Receiver bandwidth | MHz | 3 | 10 |
| Receiver noise figure | dB | 10 | 5 |
| Receiver antenna height | m | 1.5 | 30 |
| Receiver antenna gain | dBi | 0 | 14 |
| Operating frequency | MHz | 2498.5 | 2505 |
| N, receiver thermal noise  | dBm | -99.1 | -98.8 |
| I/N objective | dB | 0 | -6 |
| **Interferer’s characteristics** |  | LTE UL | MBANS |
| e.i.r.p | dBm | 23 | 0 |
| Bandwidth | MHz | 10 | 3 |
| BW correction factor 10 MHz | dB | -5.2 | 0 |
| NFD (adjacent band interf) | dB | -30 | -25 (Note 1) |
| Wall attenuation | dB | 0 | **13 (UE outdoor)** | 13 |
| Antenna height | m | **1.5** | 1.5 |
| **Minimum path loss** | **dB** | **86.9** | **73.9** | **80.7** |
| **Interference distance FSL model**  | **km** | **0.21** | **0.047** | **0.10** |
| **Interference distance Hata suburban model**  | **km** | **n.a.** | **0.02** |
| **Interference distance IEEE 802 model C**  | **km** | **0.047** | **0.018** | **n.a.** |

Note 1: The chosen NFD/ACLR value is an approximation of the average value experienced by the directly-adjacent victim over its entire channel bandwidth. -25 dB was chosen to represent the LTE victim case, assuming 10 MHz channel bandwidth for LTE and ≥3 MHz channel bandwidth for the MBANS.

#### Interference from LTE DL to MBANS

The frequency separation between the LTE DL and MBANS makes it possible to disregard this scenario.

#### Interference from MBANS to LTE DL

The frequency separation between the LTE DL and MBANS makes it possible to disregard this scenario.

#### Interference from LTE UL to MBANS

The distance between MBANS and the reference Base Station (BS) was chosen as half of the LTE cell radius. The considered interference scenario is depicted in Figure 47 and the simulation settings and results are summarized in Table 67.
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Figure 47: Interference scenario – LTE UL into healthcare facility MBANS

Table 67: Interference from LTE UL to healthcare facility MBANS - Settings and results

| **Simulation input/output parameters** | **Settings / Results** |
| --- | --- |
| **Victim Link (VLK): MBANS** |
| VLK frequency | 2498.5 MHz |
| VLK bandwidth | 3 MHz |
| VLT → VLR path | FSL (user-defined radius, 3 m) |
| **Interfering Link (ILK): LTE UL (UE to BS)** |
| ILK frequency | 2505 MHz |
| ILT → VLR interfering path | Extended Hata, indoor→indoor, below roof |
| urban | suburban |
| ILT → VLR positioning mode | Correlated (interfering BS ref. cell) |
| Delta X | 0.125 km (R/2) | 0.250 km (R/2) |
| Delta Y | 0 |
| Max allowed power of UE | 23 dBm |
| Receiver noise figure (BS) | 5 dB |
| ILK system bandwidth | 10 MHz |
| Max subcarriers per BS | 51 |
| Number subcarriers per UE | 17 |
| **Simulation results** |
| Probability of interference (%) (C/I = 15 dB) | **1.7** | **0.4** |

#### Interference from MBANS to LTE UL

The considered interference scenario is depicted in Figure 48 and the simulation settings and results are summarized in Table 68.
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Figure 48: Interference scenario – healthcare facility MBANS into LTE UL

Table 68: Interference from healthcare facility MBANS to LTE UL - Settings and results

| **Simulation input/output parameters** | **Settings / Results** |
| --- | --- |
| **Victim Link (VLK): LTE UL (UE to BS)** |
| VLK frequency | 2505 MHz |
| VLT → VLR path | Extended Hata, indoor→outdoor, above roof  |
| urban | suburban |
| Receiver Noise Figure | 5 dB |
| ILK system bandwidth | 10 MHz |
| Max subcarriers per BS | 51 |
| Number subcarriers per UE | 17 |
| Max allowed power of UE | 23 dBm |
| **Interfering Link (ILK): MBANS** |
| ILK frequency | 2498.5 MHz |
| ILK bandwidth | 3 MHz |
| ILT Tx power | 0 dBm |
| ILT density | 40/km2 |
| ILT probability of transmission | 0.1 |
| ILT → VLR interfering path | Extended Hata, indoor→outdoor, above roof |
| urban  | suburban |
| ILT → VLR positioning mode | Closest interferer (origin: victim BS ref. cell) |
| **Simulation results** |
| Average bit rate degradation (%)  | **0.4** | **1.9** |

Note 1: The implementation of OFDMA uplink power control in SEAMCAT v4.0.1 sets a certain percentage of the terminals to maximum output power. This might not be representative for all network configurations and could for some configurations (especially for small cells) hide impact from external interferers.

It was regarded as unnecessary to consider the placement of the LTE UE outside, since it the impact of MBAN would be equal or lower.

### Home MBANS

The MCL calculations for worst-case minimum interference distances are presented in Table 69.

Table 69: MCL calculation in 2483.5-2500 MHz band between home MBANS and LTE UL

| **Victim characteristics** | **Units** | MBANS | LTE UL |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Receiver bandwidth | MHz | 3 | 10 |
| Receiver noise figure | dB | 10 | 5 |
| Receiver antenna height | m | 1.5 | 30 |
| Receiver antenna gain | dBi | 0 | 14 |
| Operating frequency | MHz | 2498.5 | 2505 |
| N, receiver thermal noise  | dBm | -99.1 | -98.8 |
| I/N objective | dB | 0 | -6 |
| **Interferer’s characteristics** |  | LTE UL | MBANS |
| e.i.r.p | dBm | 23 | 13 |
| Bandwidth | MHz | 10 | 3 |
| BW correction factor  | dB | -5.2 | 0 |
| NFD (adjacent band interf) | dB | -30 | -25 (Note 2) |
| Wall attenuation  | dB | 0 dB (Note 1)  | 13 dB | 0 dB | 13 dB (complementary case) |
| Antenna height | m | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| **Minimum path loss** | **dB** | **86.9** | **73.9** | **106.8** | **93.8** |
| **Interference distance FSL model**  | **km** | **0.21** | **0.047** | **2.1** | **0.47** |
| **Interference distance Hata suburban model**  | **km** | **n.a.** | **n.a.** | **0.106** | **0.045** |
| **Interference distance IEEE 802 model C**  | **km** | **0.047** | **0.018** | **n.a.** | **n.a.** |

Note 1: Worst case configuration assumed, in which both MBANS patient and LTE UE are outdoors.

Note 2: The chosen NFD/ACLR value is an approximation of the average value experienced by the directly-adjacent victim over its entire channel bandwidth. -25 dB was chosen to represent the LTE victim case, assuming 10 MHz channel bandwidth for LTE and ≥3 MHz channel bandwidth for the MBANS.

#### Interference from LTE DL to MBANS

The frequency separation between the LTE DL and MBANS makes it possible to disregard this scenario.

#### Interference from MBANS to LTE DL

The frequency separation between the LTE DL and MBANS makes it possible to disregard this scenario.

#### Interference from LTE UL to MBANS

Scenario is depicted in Figure 49 and simulation settings are in Table 70.
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Figure 49: Interference scenario – LTE UL into home MBANS

Table 70: Interference from LTE UL to home MBANS - Settings and results

| **Simulation input/output parameters** | **Settings / Results** |
| --- | --- |
| **Victim Link (VLK): MBANS** |
| VLK frequency | 2498.5 MHz |
| VLK bandwidth | 3 MHz |
| VLT → VLR path | FSL (user-defined radius, 10 m) |
| **Interfering Link (ILK): LTE UL (UE to BS)** |
| ILK frequency | 2505 MHz |
| ILT → VLR interfering path | Extended Hata, indoor→indoor, below roof |
| urban | suburban |
| ILT → VLR positioning mode | Correlated (interfering BS ref. cell) |
| Delta X | 0.125 km (R/2) | 0.250 km (R/2) |
| Delta Y | 0 |
| Max allowed power of UE | 23 dBm |
| Receiver noise figure (BS) | 5 dB |
| ILK system bandwidth | 10 MHz |
| Max subcarriers per BS | 51 |
| Number subcarriers per UE | 17 |
| **Simulation results** |
| Probability of interference (%) (C/I = 15 dB) | **0.7** | **0.1** |

#### Interference from MBANS to LTE UL

For this scenario it was considered necessary to study two cases, with the home MBANS located both indoors and outdoors. Figure 50 and Figure 51 depict these cases. The simulation settings and the results are shown in Table 71.
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Figure 50: Interference scenario – home MBANS (indoors) into LTE UL
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Figure 51: Interference scenario – home MBANS (outdoors) into LTE UL

Table 71: Interference from home MBANS to LTE UL - Settings and results

| **Simulation input/output parameters** | **Settings / Results** |
| --- | --- |
| **Victim Link (VLK): LTE UL (UE to BS)** |
| VLK frequency | 2505 MHz |
| VLT → VLR path | Extended Hata, indoor→outdoor, above roof  |
| urban | suburban |
| Receiver Noise Figure | 5 dB |
| ILK system bandwidth | 10 MHz |
| Max subcarriers per BS | 51 |
| Number subcarriers per UE | 17 |
| Max allowed power of UE | 23 dBm |
| **Interfering Link (ILK): MBANS** |
| ILK frequency | 2498.5 MHz |
| ILK bandwidth | 3 MHz |
| ILT Tx power | 13 dBm |
| ILT density | 10/km2 |
| ILT probability of transmission | 0.02 |
| ILT → VLR interfering path | Extended Hata, indoor/outdoor →outdoor, above roof |
| urban | suburban |
| ILT → VLR positioning mode | Uniform density (origin: victim BS ref. cell) |
| **Simulation results** |
| Average bit rate degradation (%) (MBANS indoor, most cases) | **0.6** | **1.7** |
| Average bit rate degradation (%)(MBANS outdoor, occassionally) | **1.7** | **5.4** |

Note 1: The implementation of OFDMA uplink power control in SEAMCAT v4.0.1 sets a certain percentage of the terminals to maximum output power. This might not be representative for all network configurations and could for some configurations (especially for small cells) hide impact from external interferers.

#### Interference for an apartment scenario

In this subsection the compatibility situation in the case the MBANS and LTE are operated in an apartment building is investigated. The scenario when MBANS are applied to a person living in an apartment is quite similar to the case when the person is living in a house. The possible interference scenarios internal to the apartment (house) and to and from the outside are considered the same as in the case of a house. The difference, having neighbours above and below, was investigated using MCL calculations. The propagation model used for an apartment building was ITU-R P.1238-7 [24].

The MCL calculations indicate that a MBANS which is 1 level away need 21 meters distance from the UE in order to function properly. This indicates possible interference from the UE towards MBANS for the adjacent channel case.

Table 72: Interference from LTE UL into home MBANS in an apartment building – MCL calculations

| **Victim characteristics** | **Units** | MBANS |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Receiver bandwidth | MHz | 3 |
| Receiver noise figure | dB | 10 |
| Receiver antenna height | m | 1.5 |
| Receiver antenna gain | dBi | 0 |
| Operating frequency | MHz | 2498.5 |
| N, receiver thermal noise  | dBm | -99.1 |
| I/N objective | dB | 0 |
| **Interferer’s characteristics** | **Units** | LTE UL |
| e.i.r.p | dBm | 23 |
| Bandwidth | MHz | 10 |
| BW correction factor  | dB | -5.2 |
| NFD (adjacent band interf) | dB | -30 |
| Antenna height | m | 1.5 |
| **Minimum path loss**  | **dB** | **86.9** |
| **Interference Distance ITU-R P.1238-7 (km)****N (number of floors) = 1**  | **km** | **0.021** |
| **Interference Distance ITU-R P.1238-7 (km)****N (number of floors) = 2**  | **km** | **0.009** |
| **Interference Distance ITU-R P.1238-7 (km)****N (number of floors) = 3**  | **km** | **0.004** |

### Ambulance MBANS

Table 73: MCL calculation in 2483.5-2500 MHz band between ambulance MBANS and LTE

| **Victim characteristics** | **Units** | LTE UL | MBANS |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Receiver bandwidth | MHz | 10 | 3 |
| Receiver noise figure | dB | 5 | 10 |
| Receiver antenna height | m | 30 | 1.5 |
| Receiver antenna gain | dBi | 14 | 0 |
| Operating frequency | MHz | 2505 | 2498.5 |
| N, receiver thermal noise | dBm | -98.8 | -99.1 |
| I/N objective | dB | -6 | 0 |
| **Interferer’s characteristics** | **Units** | MBANS | LTE UL |
| e.i.r.p | dBm | 0 | 23 |
| Bandwidth | MHz | 3 | 10 |
| BW correction factor  | dB | 0 | -5.2 |
| NFD (adjacent band interf) | dB | -25 (Note 1) | -30 |
| Wall attenuation | dB | 7 | 7 |
| Antenna height | m | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| **Minimum path loss**  | **dB** | **86.8** | **79.9** |
| **Interference distance FSL model**  | **km** | **0.21** | **0.093** |
| **Interference distance Hata suburban model**  | **km** | **0.003** | **n.a.** |
| **Interference distance IEEE 802 model C**  | **km** | **n.a.** | **0.026** |

Note 1: The chosen NFD/ACLR value is an approximation of the average value experienced by the directly-adjacent victim over its entire channel bandwidth. -25 dB was chosen to represent the LTE victim case, assuming 10 MHz channel bandwidth for LTE and ≥3 MHz channel bandwidth for the MBANS.

#### Interference from LTE DL to MBANS

The frequency separation between the LTE DL and MBANS makes it possible to disregard this scenario.

#### Interference from MBANS to LTE DL

The frequency separation between the LTE DL and MBANS makes it possible to disregard this scenario.

#### Interference from LTE UL to MBANS

Due to low density of MBANS and the way SEAMCAT work, an area as small as an ambulance is expected to have no active LTE transmitters inside the ambulance. This is reasonable, since in any case this can be controlled by the personnel of the ambulance. As for the interference coming from LTE UE outside the ambulance, the scenario is shown in Figure 52 and the parameters and results in Table 74.
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Figure 52: Interference scenario – LTE UL into ambulance MBANS

Table 74: Interference from LTE UL to ambulance MBANS - Settings and results

| **Simulation input/output parameters** | **Settings / Results** |
| --- | --- |
| **Victim Link (VLK): MBANS** |
| VLK frequency | 2498.5 MHz |
| VLK bandwidth | 3 MHz |
| VLT → VLR path | FSL (user-defined radius, 3 m) |
| **Interfering Link (ILK): LTE UL (UE to BS)** |
| ILK frequency | 2505 MHz |
| ILT → VLR interfering path | Extended Hata, outdoor→indoor, below roof |
| Urban | suburban |
| ILT → VLR positioning mode | Correlated (interfering BS ref. cell) |
| Delta X | 0.125 km (R/2) | 0.250 km (R/2) |
| Delta Y | 0 |
| Max allowed power of UE | 23 dBm |
| Receiver noise figure (BS) | 5 dB |
| ILK system bandwidth | 10 MHz |
| Max subcarriers per BS | 51 |
| Number subcarriers per UE | 17 |
| **Simulation results** |
| Probability of interference (%) (C/I = 15 dB) | **2.8** | **0.9** |

#### Interference from MBANS to LTE UL

The scenario is depicted in Figure 53 and the parameters and results in Table 75.
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Figure 53: Interference scenario – ambulance MBANS into LTE UL

Table 75: Interference from ambulance MBANS to LTE UL - Settings and results

| **Simulation input/output parameters** | **Settings / Results** |
| --- | --- |
| **Victim Link (VLK): LTE UL (UE to BS)** |
| VLK frequency | 2505 MHz |
| VLT → VLR path | Extended Hata, outdoor→outdoor, above roof  |
| urban | suburban |
| Receiver Noise Figure | 5 dB |
| ILK system bandwidth | 10 MHz |
| Max subcarriers per BS | 51 |
| Number subcarriers per UE | 17 |
| Max allowed power of UE | 23 dBm |
| **Interfering Link (ILK): MBANS** |
| ILK frequency | 2498.5 MHz |
| ILK bandwidth | 3 MHz |
| ILT Tx power | 0 dBm |
| ILT density | 5/km2 |
| ILT probability of transmission | 0.1 |
| ILT → VLR interfering path | Extended Hata, indoor →outdoor, above roof |
| Urban | suburban |
| ILT → VLR positioning mode | Uniform density (origin: victim BS ref. cell) |
| **Simulation results** |
| Average bit rate degradation (%)(MBANS indoor) | **0.1** | **0.3** |

Note 1: The implementation of OFDMA uplink power control in SEAMCAT v4.0.1 sets a certain percentage of the terminals to maximum output power. This might not be representative for all network configurations and could for some configurations (especially for small cells) hide impact from external interferers.

### Summary ADJACENT BWS

#### MCL calculations

Below are compiled tables for the MCL calculations with MBANS as an interferer to LTE UL. It can be seen that for the UL, MBANS in the patient’s home used out door require 2.1 km distance in order not to interfere using the free space model. MBANS in the health care facilities or in an ambulance require in the order of 100-200 meters.

Table 76: Summary of MCL values for MBANS interfering LTE UL

| **Victim**  | **LTE UL** |
| --- | --- |
| **Interferer** | **MBANS (healthcare)** | **MBANS (patient home, MBANS out door)** | **MBANS (patient in apartment)** | **MBANS (ambulance)** |
| Interference Distance based on FSL model (km) | 0.10 | 2.1 | N/A\* | 0.21 |
| Interference Distance based on Extended sub-urban Hata model (km) | 0.02 | 0.11 | N/A\* | 0.03 |
| Document section  | 5.8.1 | 5.8.2 | 5.8.2.5 | 5.8.3 |

\* Considered similar to MBANS in patient’s home

In the LTE UL to MBANS cases, MBANS in the health care unit, MBANS in the home used outdoors and MBANS in the ambulance, 100-200 meters are needed. For the adjacent apartment case, the distance is 20 meters, which is larger than the distance between adjacent floors.

Table 77: Summary of MCL values for LTE UL interfering MBANS

| **Victim**  | **MBANS** |
| --- | --- |
| **Interferer** | **LTE UL (healthcare)** | **LTE UL (patient home, MBANS and LTE UE outdoors)** | **LTE UL (patient in apartment)** | **LTE UL (ambulance)** |
| Interference Distance based on FSL model (km) | 0.21 | 0.21 | N/A | 0.09 |
| Interference Distance based on Extended sub-urban Hata model (km) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Interference Distance based on IEEE802 (model C) model (km) | 0.05 | 0.05 | N/A | 0.03 |
| ITU-R P.1238-7 (km)\* | N/A | N/A | 0.02 | N/A |
| Document section  | 5.8.1 | 5.8.2 | 5.8.2.5 | 5.8.3 |

\* All these calculations are based on two adjacent floors. By increasing the number of floors, the interference impact decreases.

#### Simulations

The table below shows the compiled results from the simulations performed previously in this subsection for the different cases. In this case the LTE victim system was modelled using the OFDMA mode in SEAMCAT, and the BS is the victim. The simulator does not in this case control how far MBANs will be dropped from the BS victim.

In the OFDMA mode simulations, the distance between the MBANS interferer and the LTE victim may be considerably larger than the reference cell size. This setting represents a larger geographical area, where the interference in the reference cell is the sum from all the interfering devices. However, since the probability of being in close range is small, the results represent an average of the interference situation for the BS.

By simulating the victim LTE system with the SEAMCAT simulation mode GENERIC (instead of OFDMA), it is possible to obtain the probability of a specific BS being interfered when a MBANS in the same cell is transmitting, since the distance between the interferer and the victim can be controlled. Also, for the healthcare facility case, the expected higher density of MBANS was taken into account. On the other hand, the use of generic model underestimates the robustness against interference of victim OFDMA-based systems, such as LTE. The exact parameters for these simulations are given in Annex 1. The distance between MBANS and a BS is assumed between 6m and 500 m.

The presented OFDMA mode results represent the interference from MBANS to LTE BS, from an area considerably larger than one cell, whereas the generic mode results consider interference from MBANS to a specific LTE BS when MBANS is situated in the cell. This explains the differences in results presented in the table below.

Table 78: Summary of SEAMCAT simulation results

| **Interferer** | **Victim** | **Average bit rate loss [%]****(victim uses OFDMA mode)** | **Probability of interf. [%] (victim uses generic mode)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Healthcare facility MBANS | LTE UL | 0.4 – 1.9 | 27.6(I/N = -6 dB) |
| Home MBANS (indoors) | 0.6 – 1.7 | 52.7(I/N = -6 dB) |
| Home MBANS (outdoors) | 1.7 – 5.4 | 83.7(I/N = -6 dB) |
| Ambulance MBANS | 0.1 – 0.3 | - |
| LTE UL | Healthcare facility MBANS | n.a. | 0.4 – 1.7(C/I = 15 dB) |
| Home MBANS (indoors) | n.a. | 0.1 – 0.7(C/I = 15 dB) |
| Ambulance MBANS | n.a. | 0.9 – 2.8(C/I = 15 dB) |

Note 1: OFDMA mode simulations consider an unrestricted interfering MBANS deployment. Generic mode mode simulations consider a distance-restricted interfering MBANS deployment.

#### Conclusions

Healthcare facility MBANS:

The MCL calculations suggest that in order to co-exist some separation distances are needed. One of the simulation methods used showed tolerable levels of interference, with an average LTE bit rate loss below 2%. The other simulation method showed 28% probability of interference, which suggest that interference from MBANS cannot be discarded. The coexistence with MBANS within healthcare facilities appears possible, and mitigation techniques would further improve the situation.

Home MBANS:

Since home MBANS may be used also in the vicinity of the home, the outdoor case was used. The MCL calculations suggest that a 2 km distance is needed in order to separate the LTE BS from the home MBANS. Simulation results confirmed that interference levels can be above tolerable levels. MBANS could consider the possibility of preventing outdoor usage. Co-existence without interference issues would otherwise not be expected.

When MBANS operation is restricted to indoor cases, the coexistence with MBANS within homes appears possible in most situations. In the MCL analysis specific to apartment scenarios indicated that devices on adjacent floors may experience interference. As discussed in Section 4.6, considering a MBANS emission mask with lower spurious emission levels would further improve the coexistence situation with home MBANS.

Ambulance MBANS:

Just as in the previous cases, MCL calculations suggest that some distances are needed in order to separate especially the LTE BS from the ambulance MBANS. The conclusion from the simulation-based study is the same as for healthcare facility MBANS—i.e. coexistence appears possible, although interference cannot be discarded in all cases.

In addition, it should be noted that the mobility of ambulance MBANS would lead to short periods of potential interference for most LTE BS, whereas a higher interference likelihood would be expectable for those LTE BS that are installed in the proximity of a healthcare facility. Also, an interference which follows the ambulance through the LTE cell grid, jumping from cell to cell, might raise undetermined LTE network effects.

# Conclusions

The ETSI system reference document TR 101 557 [1] suggested ECC to consider three sub bands within the 2360-2500 MHz range for use by Medical Body Area Network Systems (MBANS): 2360-2400 MHz, 2400-2483.5 MHz and 2483.5-2500 MHz. The study of co-existence of MBANS with other systems has been carried out in these three sub-bands. Towards the finalisation of the studies, ECC WG FM decided to exclude the 2360-2400 MHz band from the co-existence studies. Therefore, the focus was given to the other two bands only.

Three MBANS categories are considered by the studies: Healthcare facility, ambulance, and home MBANS. Healthcare facility MBANS are restricted to indoors by means of suitable mechanism to prevent outdoor usage. Ambulance MBANS is for use only inside the vehicle. Home MBANS are intended for indoor use (inside the patient’s home), however they can be occasionally outdoors (few meters away from home).

For MBANS transmitters, operating within the healthcare facility (indoor) and ambulance, the maximum transmitted power over the emission bandwidth is 1 mW (e.i.r.p.), while it is 20 mW (e.i.r.p.) for home MBANS.

In accordance with ETSI TR 101 557 [1], typically, the MBANS duty cycle lies around or below 10% for healthcare facility and ambulance applications, and around 2% or below for home (-healthcare) applications. Therefore, the duty cycle has been assumed 10% for healthcare facility and ambulance applications, and 2% for home MBANS throughout the studies given in this report. ETSI TR 101 557 mentions a maximum of 25% duty cycle for future applications. Due to the uncertainty of future application requirements these co-existence studies only consider the aforementioned typical maximum value of 10%. A higher duty cycle would lead to higher interference from MBANS operating in healthcare facilities.

No mitigation technique(s) has been considered for the co-existence studies given in this Report. The compatibility results presented are to be understood in such context. Mitigation measures such as adaptive frequency selection, listen-before-talk, adaptive power control and other features may improve the compatibility of MBANS with other systems and are subject to future work.

Table 79 below, summarizes the results of the compatibility studies, mainly based on average-case SEAMCAT simulations, for all scenarios and considered frequency bands.

Table 79: Overview of risk of interference for the various co-existence scenarios

|  | **Risk of interference from MBANS** |
| --- | --- |
| **MBANS category** | **Healthcare facility MBANS** | **Home****MBANS** | **Ambulance MBANS** |
| **Tx-power, DC** | **1 mW, 10% DC** | **20 mW, 2% DC** | **1 mW, 10% DC** |
| **Description of MBANS application and restriction** | **Only indoor, within healthcare facility** | **Primarily indoor, within patient home.****Occasionally outdoor, few meters from home** | **Only inside vehicle** |
| **2400 – 2483.5****MHz**  | **Wideband Data** | Very low | Very low | Very low |
| **Amateur and Amateur Satellite** | Low | Medium(Note 1)  | Low |
| **BWS****(adjacent LTE below 2400 MHz)** | Low(Note 1, Note 3) |
| **2483.5 – 2500****MHz** | **LP-AMI** | Medium (Note 2) | Low | Medium(Note 2) |
| **MSS** | Low(Note 4) | Very low | Very low(Note 5) |
| **CGC** | Low | Very low | Very low(Note 5) |
| **RNSS/RDSS** | Low | Low | Low |
| **SAP/SAB** | Low | Low | Low |
| **Wideband Data****(adjacent)** | Very low | Very low | Very low |
| **BWS****(adjacent LTE above 2500MHz)** | Low (average case)High (specific case) | MBANS indoor:Low (average case)High (specific case)  | Low (average case)High (specific case) |
| MBANS outdoor: Low/Medium (avrg.)High (specific case) |
| Risk of interference or average bitrate degradation: * very low: ≤1 %
* low: >1 %, ≤5 %
* medium: >5 %, ≤10 %
* high: >10 %
 |

Note 1: The impact of existing systems operating in accordance with Annex 1 and Annex 3 of ERC/REC 70-03, such as WLAN systems, are expected more critical than MBANS interference.

Note 2: Interference mitigation measures will be needed. The future MBANS ETSI standard may specify some means of detecting LP-AMI for improving coexistence.

Note 3: Even though it was suggested to use the entire 2400-2500 MHz band for MBANS, the 2400-2410 MHz portion of this range was excluded from the studies in order to improve adjacent band coexistence with the BWS system to be operated in the 2300-2400 MHz band.

Note 4: The impact of healthcare facility MBANS to Globalstar fixed terminals used for emergency back-up communications inside the hospital premises was not specifically studied in Section 5.3.1. Such use of Globalstar is reported in one administration. The CGC study results (Section 5.4.1) may however be applicable to such situation, leaving the conclusions unaltered.

Note 5: The impact of ambulance MBANS to Globalstar terminals used for emergency back-up communications inside the same ambulance vehicle was not studied. Such use of Globalstar is reported in one administration.

For the 2400-2483.5 MHz band the compatibility study results suggest that wideband data systems (WLAN) could significantly interfere with MBANS deployed in hospitals and patient homes. However, inside the premises of health care facilities, which are commonly operated and controlled by the facility management, there could be some possibility to coordinate the MBANS and WLAN channels. The practicality of implementing such approach is unclear, as the proponent industry observed in own hospital surveys that the 2400-2483.5 MHz band may be too crowded, unpredictable, and not easily manageable by hospitals. Additionally, there may be a medium risk of interference from home MBANS into amateur systems in the lower part of the band (2400-2450 MHz), but it should be noted the impact of existing WLAN systems is expected to be more critical than MBANS interference.

The studies conducted in the 2483.5-2500 MHz band showed that MBANS can coexist with the existing systems using the band except for

* LP-AMI: Co-channel compatibility between MBANS and LP-AMI in healthcare facilities is not given, since significant interference levels are expected, even when both systems are operated in different rooms;
* adjacent BWS systems, if MBANS are used outdoors.

However, it is assumed that mechanism(s) for MBANS and LP-AMI to detect each other when operated in close proximity, or other measures, could address the issue of compatibility between MBANS and LP-AMI. Interference effects and possible implant battery life reduction have been identified, thus reducing time frame before implant replacement surgery, especially when MBANS operates in the same room or on the same body as LP-AMI. Interference mitigation measures will be needed. The future MBANS ETSI standard may specify some means of detecting LP-AMI for improving coexistence. Other measures, such as warnings on the devices, may be considered to achieve better co-existence between LP-AMI and MBANS.

In the case of BWS, MBANS should consider the possibility of preventing outdoor usage. The restriction may be de-facto enabled by requiring MBANS sensors to periodically check that they are within operating distance of their MBANS hub. When the MBANS hub is not reachable, MBANS data transmission is stopped. That simple mechanism is part of the light licensing concept proposed in the FCC ruling for MBANs operation in the USA [3].

In the light that ECC WG FM decided not to consider the 2360-2400 MHz band for MBANS, the 2483.5- 2500 MHz band could be considered sufficient for the initial introduction of MBANS, even though the initial requirement was set to 30 MHz for healthcare facility usage.

Therefore, by considering the results of statistical simulations of realistic deployment scenarios, it may be concluded that the most promising band for MBANS applications would be 2483.5-2500 MHz, as only mitigation measures are required for the protection of BWS and coexistence with LP-AMI.

1. Parameters for simulations of generic case

This Annex contains the parameters for the simulations carried out in Section 5.8.

Table 80: Parameters for generic mode simulations in Section 5.8

| **Simulation input**  | **Settings** |
| --- | --- |
| **Victim Link (VLK):** | **LTE UL** |
| System selection | Generic |
| VLK frequency | CoCh 2,380 MHz /Adjacent Ch 2,395 MHz |
| VLT → VLR path | Extended Hata, suburban, outdoor-outdoor, above roof |
| Receiver Noise Figure | 5 dB |
| Receiver Bandwidth | 10 MHz |
| Noise Floor (dBm) | -99.43 |
| Receiver Blocking mask | Constant 46dB |
| Receiver Antenna peak gain | 17 dBi |
| Receiver Coverage Radius | 500 m |
| Receiver Antenna Heigth | 30 m |
| Receiver I/N | -6 dB |
| Max allowed power for Tx | 23 dBm |
| **Interfering Link (ILK):** | **MBANS** |
| ILK frequency | CoCh 2,380 MHz /Adjancent Ch 2,401.5 MHz |
| ILK bandwidth | 3 MHz |
| ILK Tx power | Healthcare 0dBm and Home 13dBm |
| Active Tx | 1 |
| ILK density  | Healthcare 40/Km2 and Home 10/Km2 |
| ILK probability of transmission | Healthcare 0.1 and Home 0.02 |
| Distance ILK Tx from VLK Receiver | 6-500 m |
| ILK → VLR interfering path | Extended Hata, suburban outdoor-indoor/outdoor, above roof |
| ILK → VLR positioning mode | None, relative to Victim Receiver |

Note 1: The density of MBANS in the healthcare facility case was increased by using 1 MBANS which was transmitting continuously
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