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The emerging 5th generation (5G) wireless service of sensor networks involves significant challenges when dealing with the coordination of the ever-increasing number of devices accessing shared resources. This has attracted huge interest from the research community as many existing works focus on the radio access network (RAN) congestion control to efficiently manage resources in the context of device-to-device (D2D) interaction in huge sensor networks.

In this context, this paper introduces a novel grouping-assisted random access protocol by shedding the light on beneficial performance and potential limitations of our solution against tunable parameters such as group size, number of sensors and reliability of D2D links. Additionally, we leverage on the association with a Geolocation Database (GDB) capability to assist the grouping decisions by drawing parallels with recent regulatory-driven initiatives around GDBs and arguing benefits of the suggested proposal. Finally, the proposed method is approved to significantly reduce the delay over random access channels, by means of an exhaustive simulation campaign.
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I. INTRODUCTION

THE plethora of small, smart sensors becoming available and the range of interesting applications using them are changing our day-to-day life, and calling for novel technological solutions able to shake up the wireless communication landscape [1]. When such a huge number of devices need inter-connectivity and low access delay, additional technical challenges must be addressed to avoid traffic congestion and service degradation. In particular, network congestion might occur at different levels due to several reasons. The current Long-Term-Evolution (LTE) and LTE-Advanced (LTE-A) deployments might exhibit vulnerability to data congestion at i) the Radio Access Network (RAN), ii) the Mobility Management Entity (MME), and, iii) the core network Gateways (GWs), including the Serving Gateway (S-GW) and Packet Data Network Gateway (P-GW). This is illustrated in Fig. 1.

RAN congestion mostly originates from uplink random access (RA) collisions, emphasizing the sensitivity to device density. MME congestion is caused by handover signaling overloads due to nomadic users, hence is sensitive to user mobility. GW congestion has roots in a shortage of gateway capacity and heavy data traffic, showing its strict dependency on the overall user data-rate.

Compared with human-type communication (HTC), sensor networks—as a typical application of massive machine-type communications (mMTC)—exhibit different behaviors. First, the density of sensors in the deployment area can be substantially higher than handheld HTC devices (HTCDs). Second, most sensors are characterised by quasi-static mobility, compared with high mobility in the HTCDs. Additionally, human users usually exchange large amounts of data among each others or directly with the server, in each communication session. For example, a voice call usually lasts several minutes, generating megabytes of data through common Voice-over-IP codecs, such as the Enhanced Voice Services (EVS) codecs. The size of an email, as another example, typically ranges from dozens of kBs to several MBs, depending on the attachment. In contrast, sensor messages often have a small payload size of less than 1 kB [2]. Besides, a ubiquitous behavior can be observed in sensor networks: sensors are usually synchronized to the same schedule of data transmission thereby generating periodical bursts of random access (RA) requests in the RAN, which rarely happens in the context of HTC devices. Therefore, considering these peculiarities, we can argue that sensor networks are severely impaired by RAN congestion, rather than MME or core-gateway traffic congestions.
Great effort has been invested in controlling the RA collision rate in sensor networks, as detailed in [3], [4]. During recent years, encouraged by the popularity of deploying device-to-device (D2D) communications and unlicensed bands in cellular systems [5]–[7], a variety of new RAN congestion control approaches based on D2D communications and device grouping have attracted much interest from academic and industrial players, due to their advantages in energy consumption and access delay [8]. However, these methods generally assume D2D links as reliable, which can rarely be argued in practice. Besides, they generally only focus on the radio resource management of the physical layer, and lack discussion about the protocol design on the medium access control (MAC) and higher layers. In this work, we rely on the unreliability of D2D links, and thus enhance the D2D-based grouped RA methods considering both a protocol extension and an architectural solution to efficiently handle access congestion issues in 5th Generation (5G) sensor networks.

The remainder of the article is organized as follows. In Section II, we briefly discuss the concept of sensor-networking RAN congestion control, reviewing existing approaches, and discussing the advantages and theoretical drawbacks of D2D-based grouped RA methods. In Section III, we study the impact of D2D link reliability on the performance of D2D-based grouped RA by presenting both qualitative analysis and numerical results. We then propose our enhancement of the grouped RA protocol in Section IV and an architectural innovation of connecting sensor group management with the geolocation database (GDB), in Section V. The proposed method is evaluated in comparison to the benchmark performance Extended Access Class Barring (EAB) through numerical simulations in Section VI. Finally, concluding remarks are provided in Section VII.

II. MMTC RAN Congestion Control: State-of-the-Art

A number of approaches have been explored and designed to properly control RAN congestions in mobile networks, as they might severely impair the overall network efficiency. Surveys with a deep comparative study on these approaches have been conducted in [3], [4]. We have analyzed and briefly summarized in the following the main findings highlighting the differences with our novel approach.

- **Access Class Barring (ACB):** ACB check is performed to accept or reject every sensor device. Upon a rejection, the device waits for a given timeout before re-attempting. Admission probability and timeout length depend on the access class of the device. However, advanced methods for ACB have been suggested to improve such a solution.

- **Prioritized RA:** Applications and Random Access Channels (RACHs) are divided into different classes in order to optimize the RACH resource allocation with respect to required Quality-of-Service (QoS).

- **MTC-Specified Backoff:** A backoff mechanism is implemented to prevent a user equipment (UE) from colliding with other contending UEs.

- **RACH Resource Separation:** RACH resources are optimally assigned beforehand to HTC and MTC applications.

- **Dynamic RACH Allocation:** A RACH resource allocation is dynamically performed at base station (BS) based on instantaneous congestion levels.

- **Pull-Based RA:** Base stations proactively grant sensor devices to access without waiting for sensor RA requests. This solution comprises different schemes: i) Pull-Based Individual Paging, ii) Pull-Based Group Paging and iii) Pull-Based Group Access.

- **Self-Optimization Overload Control RA:** A combination of RACH resource separation, dynamic RACH allocation and ACB is realized.

- **Code-Expanded RA:** A preamble set is issued instead of a single preamble for any RA request.

- **Spatial-Grouping:** Spatial diversity is introduced to reduce collisions and increase the RA preamble reuse.

- **Guaranteed RA:** RA load is estimated during the RA procedure to boost the control scheme optimization.

- **Non-Aloha-Based RA:** Multiple-access is combined with resource allocation based on analog fountain code.

However, above-mentioned solutions present limitations when the number of sensor devices dramatically increases. A plausible solution brings into play the clustering concept, where sensor devices are promptly grouped while exploiting D2D transmissions for intra-cluster data exchange. We call such solutions collectively as D2D-based grouped RA.

Differing from the other methods, the concept of D2D-based grouped RA was not originally motivated to control RAN congestion, but to reduce power consumption [9]. Therefore, this kind of solution drives the system to energy-efficient states, which makes them especially attractive for battery-life-critical mMTC applications, such as sensor networks. Interestingly, such solutions are proved to also be efficient in RA collision-rate reduction [10]. When combined with device classification, this class of techniques also benefits from guaranteeing a very low access delay for periodical devices of certain classes, which is valuable in duty-cycle-critical use cases such as time-constrained wireless sensor networks. A known drawback of these methods is that the cluster management can be complex for devices with high mobility, which is again not critical for most sensor networks where the devices (sensors) are quasi-static or with very-low mobility.

Despite of all these advantages, there is still a fundamental question to answer before entitling D2D-based grouped RA as the most promising solution for RAN congestion control in sensor networks: Is the D2D link reliability an essential feature while enabling the intra-group data aggregation and distribution? All existing methods are developed based on the same assumption, i.e., intra-group D2D links are fully available and reliable. This might bias the performance evaluation of real deployments as such an assumption is not always feasible in D2D transmissions are usually performed by means of short-range communications, such as Bluetooth, WiFi-Direct and ZigBee. Recently, mm-waves radio technologies are being explored to realize interference-less communications, such as WiGig D2D. However, they still present technological limitations and are not considered in this work.
practice. Our proposal relies on this key-assumption proposing a novel protocol to deal with D2D exceptions.

III. D2D LINK RELIABILITY IN GROUPED RA

The principle of D2D-based grouped RA is illustrated in Fig. 2. Sensors are clustered into groups, generally according to their spatial locations, but context information such as device class can also be counted. Each group has a group coordinator (GC), which relays data for the rest group members (GMs). To achieve this relaying, a D2D link must be established between the GC and every GM, such that the GC can aggregate uplink data from the GMs, and distribute downlink data to them. Thus, in each group, only the GC needs to execute the RA procedure to visit the BS, so that the density of RA requests—which is inversely proportional to the average group size—is reduced. While an extra overhead may be generated by the essential intra-group signaling messages, its impact on the macro cell RAN can be minimized or even removed by exploiting unlicensed spectrum technologies, namely D2D outbound communication, by means of for e.g. bluetooth or WiFi Direct. To achieve an optimal energy efficiency performance, the process of clustering and GC selection is usually carried out at the BS, where cell-wide Channel Status Information (CSI) is available to support a global optimization. Besides, as the energy consumption of the GC might be unbalanced due to additional coordination activities, the GC selection process relies on the history of previous GC assignments so as to provide fairness guarantees. An example of such history-based GC selection scheme has been reported earlier in [9], where a D2D-based clustered uplink transmission solution is proposed for Internet-of-Things deployments.

![Fig. 2: RAN topology in D2D-based grouped RA.](image)

However, as we pointed out in the previous section, the intra-group D2D links are not guaranteed to be always available or reliable. Due to interference and channel attenuation, some GMs may fail to connect to their GCs as assigned by the BS. Moreover, even established D2D links might vanish due to device mobility and channel fading. When such a D2D link exception occurs, the involved GM will be unable to communicate with the BS. Since 5G networks are expected to deliver ultra-reliable and low latency (URLLC) services, which require an average end-to-end latency below 1ms and a reliability over 99.999%, the impact of D2D link exceptions becomes critical and challenging in the D2D-based grouped RA design.

The occurrence of exceptions can increase along with the group size, mainly due to a two-fold reason. The former is that, under the same spatial distribution of sensors, the geographical diameter of the group increases with the group size, leading to a larger average distance between the GC and its GMs, and hence a lower average signal-to-noise ratio (SNR). The latter, given a fixed amount of radio resources for the GC to aggregate/distribute data to/from its GMs, for each link both the average channel capacity and the opportunities for retransmission will sink while the group size grows. Our simulations of Bluetooth Low Energy (BLE) clusters present a logistic increase of packet error rate and a logistic decrease of D2D link reliability with respect to the group size, as Fig. 3 shows.

So far, we can assert that the intra-group D2D connections are not always reliable, especially for large groups. Furthermore, there is a critical mass of the group size that dramatically reduces the D2D link reliability to a poor level. On the one hand, as Fig. 3 suggests, if D2D devices are clustered into groups of limited sizes, an ultra-high reliability can still be achieved. On the other hand, an unnecessarily small group size will reduce the efficiency of grouped RA. The optimal size can be identified as a trade-off that depends on various factors including the context information of the sensors, especially the D2D channel states, which must be obtained through device measurements. During the group initialization phase, due to the lack of D2D CSI, an optimal clustering is usually hard to achieve. To demonstrate the impact of CSI estimation error on initial clustering performance, we conducted numerical simulations under the reference scenario of urban coverage for massive connection [11], with over 8000 synchronized sensors organized in 50 clusters connected through BLE links for grouped RA.

The results in Fig. 4 indicate that a CSI estimation error can lead to a significant degrade of D2D links reliability. More specifically, the worst-case performance is much more sensitive than the average reliability to such errors. When the mean absolute error exceeds 6 dB, at least one sensor suffers from a packet error rate (PER) over 20%, although the average PER is still negligible. When further raising this error to 10 dB, the average PER increases to around 1%, while the worst clustered device fails in almost every packet transmission. Although a non-optimal grouping result can be recursively improved through global or local group updating processes, e.g. the methods proposed in [12], the convergence process can be slow and showing a significant amount of link exceptions. Besides, an inappropriate initialization may lead to a local convergence instead of global optimal state. Moreover, once a link exception occurs, the BS shall be informed to update its clusters list, and the sensors in D2D link exception should reattempt to access the BS. One straightforward solution is to
let the sensor send an extra RA request directly to the BS as an unclustered device. However, when under a high D2D link exception rate, a huge amount of extra RA requests can be generated, which may even eradicate the gain brought about by D2D-based grouped RA, as demonstrated in [12].

Therefore, two challenges shall be handled to better exploit the gain of D2D-based grouped RA in 5G sensor networks: 1) Designing a more efficient RAN resource assignment approach to detect and handle D2D link exceptions; 2) Leveraging on external data sources, such as the geolocation databases (GDBs), to get an a-priori knowledge about the CSIs thereby assisting the initial sensor grouping phase.

IV. ENHANCED GROUPED RA PROTOCOL

Generally, to construct sensor groups and update them efficiently, three kinds of operations are essential in the grouped RA procedure:

- **Global group update**, which reclusters all sensors in the cell and selects a group coordinator for every group. This operation is executed for initial clustering, and occasionally repeated to guarantee a low collision rate.

- **Group joining**, which allows a new device to join an existing sensor group, and eventually reselects the coordinator of the updated group, if necessary. This operation can be triggered by either handover or initial attachment of a device.

- **Group leaving**, which removes a device from its group, and eventually reselects the coordinator of the updated group, if the leaving device is the current GC. This operation can be triggered by i) handover or detachment of a device, ii) D2D connection collapse of a GM and, iii) macro cell link collapse of the GC.

Clearly, besides the user data, extra signaling traffic is generated through this procedure, including requests for group leaving and reports of D2D link status in uplink, as well as request acknowledgments and commands for group updating and group joining in downlink. As discussed above, the performance of D2D-based grouped RA seriously decreases, if all these messages, especially the uplink ones, are transmitted in extra sessions. To avoid this, we have designed an enhanced transmission frame structure, which integrates the signaling overhead with the user data payload, as illustrated in Fig. 5 (bottom-right). In this method, each complete transmission cycle of a sensor group consists of six time slots:

- **Data Aggregation (DA)**, wherein the GC aggregates uplink user data from its GMs through the intra-group D2D uplink channels. Upon the applied D2D technology, D2D channel measurements are also executed during this phase.

- **Random Access (RA)**, wherein the GC attempts to access the BS via the Physical Random Access Channel (PRACH).

- **Aggregated Uplink Transmission (AUT)**, wherein the aggregated uplink user data are packaged together with user requests and reports into one uplink packet, and sent by the GC to the BS over the RAN uplink channel. The uplink packet format is also depicted in Fig. 5. Depending on the system complexity requirement, the length of each segment in the aggregated packet can be either fixed or floating.

- **Guard (G)**, which is used for a guarding interval. It also reserves processing time for the group management algorithm running at the BS. Uplink and downlink pilots for channel measurement of the GC are also transmitted during this phase.

- **Aggregated Downlink Transmission (ADT)**, wherein the aggregated downlink user data are packaged together with request acknowledgments and controlling commands into one downlink packet, and sent by the BS to the GC over the RAN downlink channel. The downlink packets have a very similar format to the uplink packet, as shown in Fig. 5.

- **Data Distribution (DD)**, wherein the GC distributes the received downlink user data to its GMs through the intra-group D2D downlink channels.

Signaling overhead for the D2D-based grouped RA procedure is then carried along the user plane (UP), without incurring in extra RA requests. However, the integrated signaling
overhead extends the length of aggregated data packets and increases the overall data traffic in the RAN. Nevertheless, as discussed in Section I, sensor network applications generally generate very limited data traffic, and the risk of RAN congestion is much more critical than GW congestions. Therefore, a reasonable increase of data traffic can be accepted as a trade-off for the improvement in collision rate.

V. GEOLOCATION DATABASE (GDB)-ASSISTED GROUPING

A final important aspect of our proposed solution is the use of geolocation and advanced context information (e.g., propagation mapping). This is to manage the grouping of sensors through centralized management and decision making. The use of a Geolocation Database (GDB) in this context, along with appropriate messaging built into the proposed protocol, serves a number of purposes and benefits. Particularly, it facilitates:

1) The optimal and more efficient grouping of sensors based on the channel conditions between them, taking into account locations, propagation, the requirements in terms of communication characteristics and data rate, among others. It also achieves a system-level viewpoint considering, e.g., interactions among the transmissions of different groups.

2) The collection of information from the sensors to enhance the performance of the GDB in serving the above purpose, as well as others.

Indeed, although an initial locus in the use of geolocation as a wireless communication facilitator has been location-based spectrum sharing and policy/regulatory considerations, there are numerous other potential benefits and justification of the use of the concept in 5G communication contexts. This is for reasons such as:

1) 5G technologies will require spectrum sharing to achieve sufficient spectrum availability in some scenarios, e.g., at lower frequencies for coverage/reliability and signaling/control purposes to realize URLLC. Such spectrum sharing will often be between very different services and owners of the spectrum, such that the spectrum sharing must usually be approved by the regulator—typically through automated regulatory-driven or certified GDBs. A number of regulatory initiatives/trials are being undertaken or have been completed showing such GDB concepts in action, including TV

Fig. 5: Our proposed solution with an advanced MAC frame structure of grouped mMTC transmission and a GDB signaling approach. The terms R/R, UDT, A/C and DDT denote request/report, uplink data, acknowledgment/command and downlink data, respectively.
white space (TVWS) \[13\]. Licensed-Shared Access \[14\], and the Citizens Broadband Radio Service \[15\]—for which an LTE band is already designated.

2) One key aspect of 5G is heterogeneity; moreover, common management among the heterogeneous systems/elements in 5G will likely not preexist. A GDB can assist in managing connectivity, QoS, and other aspects in heterogeneous scenarios. Furthermore, spectrum sharing/management at higher levels can also be integrated through combination with of regulatory-run or approved GDBs. This is inherently possible because the GDB or GDBs will (at least partially) operate at higher (e.g., regulatory—transcending spectrum services and owners) levels for above-mentioned reasons.

Such databases (e.g., TVWS databases) under regulatory approval often incorporate aspects that can be reused for other management purposes. These include advanced propagation and context (e.g., transmitter and receiver locations and characteristics) knowledge, facilitating the management of QoS and associated allocation, connectivity, and other aspects in heterogeneous networking scenarios.

3) In many 5G and future communications contexts, it will be necessary to consider the precise locations of equipment in resource management. This applies not only to spectrum resources, but also to computational resources achieving network functions through virtualization. One example here is the context of latency reduction for URLLC, where careful geographical/location placing/instantiation of virtualized equipment is required by network management in order to minimize propagation delay, achieving a direct as possible propagation path between the communication endpoints.

Fig. 5 provides a GDB signaling example derived from a regulatory spectrum sharing GDB such as in TVWS or CBRS. Such a signaling begins with a registration and initial resource allocation procedure, which might include the transfer of technical characteristics, location and resource requirements, as illustrated in the top-right of Fig. 5. This GDB signaling is conceptually transferable and integrable to a RA procedure in wireless sensor networks scenario, in which the “parent” entities are the BSs and their dedicated GDBs whereas the “child” nodes are sensors that communicate directly with the BS for resources (and capabilities such as in a TVWS context). More specifically, integrated with the grouped RA concept, the sensors will be eventually designated as GCs and GMs, or in case of necessity also subordinates in further level(s). This provisions for the option of a GC (a MASTER device) acting on behalf of its GMs, if, e.g., those GM sensors (SLAVE devices) are not able to achieve a connection directly back to the BS/GDB \[13\], as shown on the left of Fig. 5.

Based on this initial exchange, whether or not it involves a sensor acting on behalf of others in a MASTER/SLAVE arrangement, the GDB will already have detailed information on sensors’ locations. GDBs, for a range of purposes (e.g., TVWS, CBRS, etc.) also typically have advanced information on propagation/loss and other radio characteristics on a per-location basis, able to ascertain far better detail on the channel sets between the sensors than a BS could otherwise do—in this latter case, only having information on the channels between it (the BS) and each of the sensors. The GC can therefore be efficiently chosen at first shot, and the GC and GMs respectively thereafter assume the parallels of MASTER and SLAVE sensors using the TVWS comparison/analogue—nominating that the choice of MASTER (GC) in this later phase might be different from the choice where a MASTER is used to attain initial connectivity back to the GDB for sensors in the registration and resource allocation phase.

As noted on the left and bottom-right of Fig. 5 there is a direct mapping of the phases of GDB operation to information exchanges in the MAC for mMTD grouping. Here, the GDB signaling directly parallels concepts such as TVWS and CBRS, where the question of whether the exchange with the GDB is at the MAC as in this case, or at higher layers as would be conventionally the case in TVWS/CBRS, is somewhat academic. There is therefore a good argument for the broad GDB concept being extended to serve such purposes as grouping control in mMTD, as well as others that might be applicable in a 5G context such as rendezvous, spectrum/resource management and dynamic spectrum access, among others.

In some cases where the GC does not have an initial Internet/network connection, the BS might be seen as a MASTER, the GC a slave, and GMs might be seen as a third level in the hierarchy—also depicted in Fig. 5.

VI. NUMERICAL EVALUATION

To verify the effectiveness of the proposed method, we carry out an exhaustive numerical simulation campaign. The test scenario contains one base station serving a 200 x 200 m² area. We consider a mixture of UEs with three different uplink transmission modes: 50% aperiodic, 25% with 1 s period and 25% with 10 s period. All UEs are randomly assigned to 16 different Access Classes (ACs) defined in LTE-A with even probabilities, where the UEs in ACs between 11 and 15 are considered as ultra-low-latency (ULL) devices. Additionally, we assume 50% of the UEs to be static, and the remaining ones random walking at low mobility with a zero-mean speed and 2 m²/s² variance. The assignments of uplink transmission mode, AC and mobility are independent from each other. We configure the RACH to a 5 ms slot length with 54 available preambles per slot.

In the context of our grouped RA approach, we consider a BLE implementation with 20 dBm transmitter antenna gain, −90 dBm as noise level, a maximal initial group size of 50 UEs and an uplink package size of 64 Bytes for periodic UEs. As a benchmark, we also consider the EAB approach with an ACB barring factor of 0.1, a maximal back-off time of 0.5 s and a System Information Block (SIB) broadcasting period of 320 ms. Both approaches are evaluated through 10 times of Monte-Carlo test, each one simulating a 30 s period.

As shown in Fig. 6 the EAB approach fails to fulfill the ULL delay requirements when the UE number exceeds 10⁴, while our proposed method still remains effective even under a
three-fold UE density. This empowers our solution and makes it ready for a real implementation.

VII. CONCLUSION

The recently flourishing approaches of D2D-based grouped RA are known to be attractive in sensor network environments with huge amount of devices, for their effective depression of data congestions and outstanding power efficiency. However, they have been generally developed only for environments with fully reliable D2D links. To cope with this issue, in this paper we have thoroughly investigated their performance deeply evaluating the D2D link reliability. Through both analytical discussion and numerical simulations, we have shown that unreliable D2D links can significantly hurt the performance of existing approaches in this category. Therefore, we have proposed an enhanced protocol that embeds extra signaling overhead into the UP data packets in order to reduce the increase in RA requests caused by D2D link exceptions and, in turn, to alleviate RAN data congestions. Finally, we have proposed a novel architectural concept: sensor grouping management through geolocation databases (GDBs), yielding benefits in both grouping optimization and geolocation data collection.
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