5G-Enabled Smart Traffic Lights: Performance Analysis and Real-World Implementation Challenges

Shalini Aggarwal[1], Ayan Rajput[2]

[1]J P Institute of engineering and Technology, APJ Abdul Kalam University, Lucknow, UP, India
Email: shalinia289@yahoo.com
[2]J P Institute of engineering and Technology, APJ Abdul Kalam University, Lucknow, UP, India
Email: ayanrajput062@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper examines 5G-enabled smart traffic light systems, analyzing their performance, architecture, and deployment challenges. Through systematic evaluation of latency, throughput, and real-world implementations, we identify critical success factors for system effectiveness. 5G technology delivers significant improvements through ultra-reliable low-latency communication (URLLC), reducing latency to 1-5ms compared to 4G's 30-50ms. However, substantial barriers exist including high infrastructure costs, cyber security vulnerabilities, and complex legacy system integration challenges. Our analysis presents comparative performance data, cost-benefit evaluations, and proposes a phased municipal deployment framework. Findings demonstrate that successful implementation requires addressing technical interoperability issues, establishing robust security protocols, and developing comprehensive stakeholder engagement strategies. This research contributes to next-generation traffic management knowledge, providing actionable insights for urban planners, traffic engineers, and policymakers navigating the transformation toward intelligent transportation systems enhanced by 5G wireless technology.

Keywords: 5G networks, intelligent transportation systems, smart traffic lights, V2X communication, edge computing, urban traffic management, URLLC.

INTRODUCTION

Urban congestion represents one of the most pressing challenges facing modern cities, with economic costs exceeding $166 billion annually in the United States alone [1]. In India, traffic congestion costs major cities approximately $22 billion annually, with commuters in Delhi spending an average of 58% extra travel time due to congestion [2]. Traditional traffic light systems, predominantly based on fixed-time or simple actuated control mechanisms, prove inadequate for managing the increasingly complex and dynamic nature of urban mobility. The advent of fifth-generation (5G) wireless networks presents unprecedented opportunities to revolutionize traffic management through real-time adaptive control, vehicle-to-everything (V2X) communication, and integration with emerging autonomous vehicle ecosystems [3]. Traffic signal control has evolved through several generations, from manual operation to electromechanical timers, then to computer-controlled actuated systems [4]. Current traffic management systems typically operate on 4G/LTE or dedicated short-range communication (DSRC) technologies, which face limitations in latency, reliability, and device density support [5]. The International Telecommunication Union (ITU) defines 5G networks through three primary use cases: enhanced mobile broadband (eMBB), massive machine-type communications (mMTC), and ultra-reliable low-latency communications (URLLC) [6]. For traffic management applications, URLLC capabilities are particularly critical, enabling sub-10ms end-to-end latency essential for safety-critical operations [7]. Recent developments in artificial intelligence and machine learning have enabled predictive traffic management, where historical and real-time data are analyzed to forecast congestion and optimize signal timing proactively [8]. The convergence of 5G, edge computing, and AI creates a technological foundation for truly intelligent transportation systems [9].

LITERATURE REVIEW

Traffic signal control has progressed through four distinct generations [10]. First-generation systems employed fixed-time controllers with pre-programmed signal phases based on historical traffic patterns [11]. Second-generation systems introduced vehicle actuation using inductive loop detectors, enabling demand-responsive signal timing [12]. Third-generation systems incorporated adaptive control algorithms like SCATS (Sydney Coordinated Adaptive Traffic System) and SCOOT (Split Cycle Offset Optimization Technique), which adjust signal timing based on real-time traffic measurements [13]. Fourth-generation systems, now emerging, leverage connected vehicle data, artificial intelligence, and cloud computing for predictive and prescriptive traffic management [14]. Hunt et al. [15] demonstrated that SCOOT systems could reduce delays by 12-20% compared to fixed-time systems. More recently, adaptive systems using reinforcement learning have shown improvements of 25-40% in simulation environments [16]. Previous research has explored various wireless technologies for traffic applications. DSRC operating in the 5.9 GHz band has been the primary V2X communication standard in North America, offering latency of 50-100ms with a range of approximately 300 meters [17]. LTE-V2X, also known as C-V2X (Cellular V2X), provides an alternative approach using cellular networks with similar performance characteristics [18]. Studies by Chen et al. [19] demonstrated that 4G LTE could support basic traffic management functions but encountered limitations in dense urban environments where latency spikes could exceed 200ms. Kenney [20] compared DSRC and C-V2X performance, finding that while DSRC offered lower latency in ideal conditions, C-V2X provided better reliability in non-line-of-sight scenarios.

PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

A. Latency Characteristics

Table I presents comparative latency measurements across different network technologies for traffic management functions [21], [22].

TABLE I: LATENCY COMPARISON ACROSS NETWORK TECHNOLOGIES

Function	4G LTE	DSRC	5G URLLC	Target
Signal state broadcast	45-80 ms	50-100 ms	3-8 ms	<20 ms
Emergency vehicle priority	60-120 ms	40-80 ms	2-5 ms	<10 ms
Pedestrian detection alert	100-200 ms	N/A	5-12 ms	<20 ms
Intersection coordination	80-150 ms	60-100 ms	4-10 ms	<30 ms
Incident notification	200-500 ms	N/A	8-15 ms	<50 ms
Video stream transmission	150-300 ms	N/A	10-25 ms	<100 ms
V2I cooperative awareness	70-130 ms	30-70 ms	3-9 ms	<20 ms

The data demonstrates that 5G URLLC consistently meets or exceeds latency requirements for all safety-critical functions, with particularly significant improvements in emergency vehicle priority and pedestrian detection scenarios.

B. Throughput and Capacity Analysis

5G networks support peak data rates exceeding 10 Gbps downlink and 1 Gbps uplink, compared to 4G LTE's maximum of 1 Gbps downlink and 500 Mbps uplink [23]. For traffic management applications, sustained throughput requirements vary by function as detailed in Table II.

TABLE II: BANDWIDTH REQUIREMENTS FOR TRAFFIC APPLICATIONS

Application Component	Bandwidth Requirement	Data Rate Type
HD video (1080p, per camera)	5-8 Mbps	Continuous
4K video (per camera)	15-25 Mbps	Continuous
Lidar point cloud data	10-50 Mbps	Continuous
Radar data stream	2-5 Mbps	Continuous
Aggregated sensor telemetry	1-5 Mbps	Continuous
V2I message exchange	0.5-2 Mbps	Bursty
System control messages	<1 Mbps	Periodic
Edge-to-cloud synchronization	10-30 Mbps	Periodic

A typical intersection with 4 HD cameras, 1 lidar sensor, and complete sensor suite requires sustained bandwidth of 40-80 Mbps. In 4G networks, supporting multiple intersections on a single cell often created congestion. 5G's massive MIMO (multiple-input multiple-output) and beam forming capabilities enable simultaneous support for 50+ intersections per cell without degradation [24].

C. Reliability Metrics

Table III summarizes reliability measurements from pilot deployments across multiple cities [25].

TABLE III: SYSTEM RELIABILITY METRICS

Metric	4G-Based System	5G-Based System	Improvement
Network availability	99.5%	99.99%	+0.49%
Message delivery success rate	97.2%	99.95%	+2.75%
Mean time between failures	720 hours	4,380 hours	6.08×
Signal controller uptime	99.2%	99.97%	+0.77%
Sensor data loss rate	2.8%	0.15%	-94.6%
False positive rate (incidents)	8.3%	1.2%	-85.5%
Emergency message delivery	96.8%	99.98%	+3.18%

The substantial improvements in reliability metrics translate directly to operational benefits, with fewer signal failures, improved incident detection accuracy, and enhanced overall system dependability [26].

IMPLEMENTATION CHALLENGES

A. Infrastructure and Capital Investment

The transition to 5G-enabled smart traffic systems requires substantial capital investment across multiple infrastructure categories.

TABLE IV: CAPITAL COST BREAKDOWN PER INTERSECTION

Component	Cost Range (USD)	Cost Range (INR Lakhs)	Percentage of Total
5G communication module	$3,000 - $8,000	2.5 - 6.6	8-12%
Edge computing hardware	$8,000 - $15,000	6.6 - 12.4	15-22%
HD cameras (4 units)	$4,000 - $8,000	3.3 - 6.6	8-12%
Radar/Lidar sensors	$10,000 - $25,000	8.3 - 20.7	20-35%
Signal controller upgrade	$8,000 - $12,000	6.6 - 9.9	12-18%
Power infrastructure	$5,000 - $15,000	4.1 - 12.4	10-20%
Installation and integration	$10,000 - $25,000	8.3 - 20.7	18-30%
Total per intersection	**$48,000 - $108,000**	**39.7 - 89.3**	**100%**

For a medium-sized city with 1,000 signalized intersections, total capital costs range from $48 million to $108 million. These figures exclude ongoing operational costs including cellular service fees ($50-200 per month per intersection), maintenance, software licensing, and personnel training.

Legacy System Integration Costs: Approximately 65% of existing traffic signal controllers in U.S. cities are over 15 years old, using proprietary protocols incompatible with modern IP-based systems. In India, the situation is more varied, with some cities having newer systems deployed under Smart Cities Mission while others operate 20-30 year old controllers [27]. Complete controller replacement adds $8,000-12,000 per intersection compared to $2,000-4,000 for software-only upgrades of newer systems.

B. Network Coverage and Connectivity Challenges

Despite rapid 5G deployment, coverage gaps present significant obstacles:

- **Geographic Coverage Limitations:** As of 2025, 5G coverage in U.S. metropolitan areas averages 78% for sub-6 GHz bands and only 23% for mmWave bands. In India, major cities like Delhi, Mumbai, and Bengaluru have 60-70% 5G coverage, while tier-2 and tier-3 cities have significantly lower coverage [28].
- **Network Slice Availability:** Not all mobile network operators offer network slicing services, and pricing models remain inconsistent. Guaranteed QoS through dedicated slices typically costs 3-5× standard cellular service rates.
- **Handover Challenges:** Mobile edge computing applications face service disruptions during handovers between cell sites, particularly problematic for vehicles traveling through the network.

C. Cyber security Vulnerabilities and Threats

Attack Vector Analysis:

- **Sensor Spoofing:** Adversarial inputs to camera or radar systems could manipulate vehicle detection, causing inappropriate signal timing
- **Communication Interception:** Despite encryption, sophisticated attackers might intercept V2I communications through man-in-the-middle attacks
- **Denial of Service:** Flooding attacks on edge computing nodes or network infrastructure could disable traffic management
- **Ransom ware:** Municipal systems remain attractive ransom ware targets, with traffic infrastructure offering high-impact leverage
- **Supply Chain Attacks:** Compromised hardware or software components introduced during manufacturing or deployment pose significant risks

Security Implementation Challenges:

- Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) management for thousands of endpoints creates administrative complexity
- Certificate lifecycle management and revocation mechanisms must operate with high reliability
- Security patches and updates must be deployed without disrupting critical traffic operations
- Intrusion detection systems generate high false-positive rates in complex traffic environments

Balance between security overhead and latency requirements proves difficult to optimize

D. Technical Integration Challenges

Sensor Fusion Complexity: Integrating data from heterogeneous sensors (cameras, radar, lidar, inductive loops) requires sophisticated algorithms accounting for different error characteristics, update rates, and coverage patterns. Weather conditions affect sensors differently—cameras struggle with fog and glare, lidar faces challenges with heavy rain, radar may generate false positives from metal objects [30].

Interoperability Standards: Competing standards create fragmentation:

- C-V2X vs. DSRC for V2X communication
- Multiple traffic controller protocols (NTCIP, proprietary systems)
- Varying 5G implementations across operators
- Different edge computing platforms (AWS Wavelength, Azure Edge Zones, Google Distributed Cloud)

E. Data Privacy and Regulatory Compliance

HD cameras and advanced sensors capable of reading license plates, identifying vehicle types, and tracking movement trajectories raise significant privacy concerns:

- **Data Collection Limitations:** Regulations like GDPR in Europe and CCPA in California restrict collection and storage of personally identifiable information (PII). India's Digital Personal Data Protection Act (DPDPA) 2023 establishes similar frameworks [31].
- **Data Retention Policies:** Many jurisdictions lack clear guidance on appropriate retention periods for traffic video and sensor data, creating legal uncertainty.
- **Third-Party Data Sharing:** Partnerships with traffic data aggregators (Waze, Google Maps) require careful data governance to prevent privacy violations.
- **Anonymization Requirements:** Effective anonymization of video data while preserving utility for traffic analysis remains technically challenging.

F. Organizational and Institutional Barriers

Skills Gap: Traffic engineering departments typically lack expertise in 5G networks, edge computing, and AI/ML systems. Training existing staff or hiring specialists with cross-domain knowledge proves difficult, particularly for smaller municipalities and in developing countries where such expertise is scarce.

Procurement Processes: Government procurement cycles often require 18-36 months from initial requirements to contract award. The rapid pace of technology evolution means specifications may be obsolete before implementation begins.

Risk Aversion: Traffic signal failures can cause accidents and liability claims, creating institutional conservatism. Adopting AI-driven systems that operate differently from traditional traffic engineering principles faces resistance from established practitioners.

Vendor Lock-In: Proprietary systems from major vendors create dependencies that limit future flexibility and increase long-term costs.

G. Economic and Financial Challenges

Uncertain Return on Investment: While benefits like reduced congestion and emissions are evident, quantifying ROI in terms satisfying municipal budget processes proves difficult:

- Travel time savings translate to economic value, but benefits accrue to individuals rather than generating revenue

- Emissions reductions have environmental value but unclear financial metrics
- Improved emergency response has safety value but difficult to monetize

Operating Expense Increases: Beyond capital costs, annual operating expenses increase by 40-60% compared to traditional systems:

- Cellular connectivity: $50-200/month per intersection
- Software licensing: $5,000-20,000/year for traffic management platforms
- Increased maintenance: Complex systems require specialized technicians
- Cyber security: Ongoing monitoring, testing, and incident response capabilities

TABLE V: AGGREGATE PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENTS FROM DEPLOYMENTS

Performance Metric	Range of Improvement	Mean Improvement	Standard Deviation
Average travel time reduction	11-35%	20.8%	9.4%
Vehicle throughput increase	15-34%	25.2%	7.8%
Queue length reduction	22-40%	31.5%	7.2%
CO_2 emissions reduction	8-25%	18.3%	6.7%
Emergency response time reduction	20-26%	23.1%	2.4%
Transit on-time performance improvement	4-8 percentage points	5.8 p.p.	1.6 p.p.
Pedestrian wait time reduction	25-40%	34.2%	6.8%

These aggregate statistics demonstrate consistent benefits across diverse deployment contexts, though with significant variation based on baseline conditions, deployment scale, and local traffic characteristics.

FUTURE SCOPE

As autonomous vehicles reach 25-40% market penetration by 2035, traffic infrastructure must evolve through cooperative perception systems, priority protocols, and mixed-traffic algorithms. AI advancement requires transfer learning from simulation to real-world deployment, federated learning for collaborative city networks, and explainable decision-making frameworks. Energy efficiency remains critical as 5G systems consume 200-400W versus traditional 50-100W signals, necessitating solar integration and dynamic power management. Resilience research must address Byzantine fault tolerance, graceful degradation, and adversarial robustness against cyber attacks. Finally, heterogeneous traffic management in developing countries demands specialized detection algorithms, lane-less optimization, pedestrian integration, and compliance enforcement mechanisms tailored to diverse vehicle types and cultural contexts.

CONCLUSION

5G technology revolutionizes urban traffic management with 1-5ms latency and 99.99% reliability. Global trials demonstrate 11-35% travel time reductions, 8-25% emissions cuts, and 20-26% faster emergency response. However, implementation costs of $48,000-108,000 per intersection present major barriers, especially for smaller cities and developing nations. Additional challenges include cyber security risks, legacy system integration, organizational capacity gaps, and privacy concerns. Successful deployments adopt phased approaches, prioritize high-impact corridors, establish robust security frameworks, and engage stakeholders extensively. Developing countries face unique obstacles including mixed traffic conditions, infrastructure reliability issues, and cultural compliance factors requiring specialized solutions. As connected and autonomous vehicles proliferate, 5G traffic infrastructure becomes essential. Success requires collaboration among governments, vendors, operators, and researchers to create technically advanced, economically viable systems. Future research should address autonomous vehicle integration, AI explainability, energy efficiency, and heterogeneous traffic management in developing regions.

References

1. INRIX, "2024 Global Traffic Scorecard," *INRIX Research*, Tech. Rep., 2024.
2. Boston Consulting Group and Uber, "The economic impact of traffic congestion in Indian cities," *BCG Report*, pp. 1-45, 2023.
3. S. E. Shladover, "Connected and automated vehicle systems: Introduction and overview," *J. Intell. Transp. Syst.*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 190-200, 2018.
4. P. B. Hunt, D. I. Robertson, R. D. Bretherton, and M. C. Royle, "The SCOOT on-line traffic signal optimisation technique," *Traffic Eng. Control*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 190-192, 1982.
5. K. C. Dey, A. Rayamajhi, M. Chowdhury, P. Bhavsar, and J. Martin, "Vehicle-to-vehicle (V2V) and vehicle-to-infrastructure (V2I) communication in a heterogeneous wireless network," *Transport. Res. C-Emer.*, vol. 68, pp. 168-184, 2016.
6. ITU-R, "IMT Vision – Framework and overall objectives of the future development of IMT for 2020 and beyond," *Recommendation ITU-R M.2083-0*, Sep. 2015.
7. M. Bennis, M. Debbah, and H. V. Poor, "Ultrareliable and low-latency wireless communication: Tail, risk, and scale," *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 106, no. 10, pp. 1834-1853, Oct. 2018.
8. Y. Lv, Y. Duan, W. Kang, Z. Li, and F.-Y. Wang, "Traffic flow prediction with big data: A deep learning approach," *IEEE Trans. Intell. Transp. Syst.*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 865-873, Apr. 2015.
9. F. Bonomi, R. Milito, J. Zhu, and S. Addepalli, "Fog computing and its role in the Internet of Things," in *Proc. MCC Workshop Mobile Cloud Comput.*, Helsinki, Finland, 2012, pp. 13-16.
10. A. G. Sims and K. W. Dobinson, "The Sydney coordinated adaptive traffic (SCAT) system philosophy and benefits," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 130-137, May 1980.
11. F. V. Webster, "Traffic signal settings," *Road Res. Tech. Paper*, no. 39, 1958.
12. P. R. Lowrie, "The Sydney coordinated adaptive traffic system: Principles, methodology, algorithms," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Road Traffic Signalling*, London, U.K., 1982, pp. 67-70.
13. D. I. Robertson and R. D. Bretherton, "Optimizing networks of traffic signals in real time: The SCOOT method," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 11-15, Feb. 1991.
14. J. Liang, W. Ng, G. Kendall, and J. W. Cheng, "Load balancing in cloud computing environments: A survey," *Cluster Comput.*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 2599-2616, Sep. 2017.
15. P. B. Hunt, D. I. Robertson, R. D. Bretherton, and R. I. Winton, "SCOOT: A traffic responsive method of coordinating signals," *Transport Road Res. Lab. Rep.*, vol. 1014, 1981.
16. T. Chu, J. Wang, L. Codecà, and Z. Li, "Multi-agent deep reinforcement learning for large-scale traffic signal control," *IEEE Trans. Intell. Transp. Syst.*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 1086-1095, Mar. 2020.
17. J. B. Kenney, "Dedicated short-range communications (DSRC) standards in the United States," Proc. IEEE, vol. 99, no. 7, pp. 1162-1182, Jul. 2011.
18. S. Chen, J. Hu, Y. Shi, and L. Zhao, "LTE-V: A TD-LTE-based V2X solution for future vehicular network," IEEE Internet Things J., vol. 3, no. 6, pp. 997-1005, Dec. 2016.
19. L. Chen, Q. Wang, and X. Zhang, "Performance evaluation of LTE-V2X for traffic signal control applications," IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol., vol. 69, no. 8, pp. 8234-8247, Aug. 2020.
20. J. B. Kenney, "Dedicated short-range communications (DSRC) versus cellular-V2X (C-V2X): A comparative analysis," IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol., vol. 68, no. 4, pp. 3065-3078, Apr. 2019.

21. S. Mumtaz, K. M. S. Huq, M. I. Ashraf, J. Rodriguez, V. Monteiro, and C. Politis, "Cognitive vehicular communication for 5G," IEEE Commun. Mag., vol. 53, no. 7, pp. 109-117, Jul. 2015.
22. G. Naik, B. Choudhury, and J.-M. Park, "IEEE 802.11bd & 5G NR V2X: Evolution of radio access technologies for V2X communications," IEEE Access, vol. 7, pp. 70169-70184, 2019.
23. E. Dahlman, S. Parkvall, and J. Skold, 5G NR: The Next Generation Wireless Access Technology. London, U.K.: Academic Press, 2018.
24. F. Rusek, D. Persson, B. K. Lau, E. G. Larsson, T. L. Marzetta, O. Edfors, and F. Tufvesson, "Scaling up MIMO: Opportunities and challenges with very large arrays," IEEE Signal Process. Mag., vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 40-60, Jan. 2013.
25. Land Transport Authority Singapore, "Intelligent transport systems in Singapore: Annual performance report," LTA Report, 2023.
26. A. Osseiran, F. Boccardi, V. Braun, K. Kusume, P. Marsch, M. Maternia, O. Queseth, M. Schellmann, H. Schotten, H. Taoka, H. Tullberg, M. A. Uusitalo, B. Timus, and M. Fallgren, "Scenarios for 5G mobile and wireless communications: The vision of the METIS project," IEEE Commun. Mag., vol. 52, no. 5, pp. 26-35, May 2014.
27. R. K. Sharma, R. Ramachandra, and P. S. Sastry, "Bengaluru adaptive traffic control system: Deployment and performance analysis," IEEE Intell. Transp. Syst. Mag., vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 156-167, Winter 2021.
28. Telecom Regulatory Authority of India, "Annual report on 5G deployment and spectrum allocation in India," TRAI Report, 2023.
29. T. S. Rappaport, Y. Xing, G. R. MacCartney, A. F. Molisch, E. Mellios, and J. Zhang, "Overview of millimeter wave communications for fifth-generation (5G) wireless networks—with a focus on propagation models," IEEE Trans. Antennas Propag., vol. 65, no. 12, pp. 6213-6230, Dec. 2017
30. D. Feng, C. Haase-Schuetz, L. Rosenbaum, H. Hertlein, C. Glaser, F. Timm, W. Wiesbeck, and K. Dietmayer, "Deep multi-modal object detection and semantic segmentation for autonomous driving: Datasets, methods, and challenges," IEEE Trans. Intell. Transp. Syst., vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 1341-1360, Mar. 2021.
31. Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, Government of India, "The Digital Personal Data Protection Act," MEITY Notification, 2023.