

An Age of Information Characterization of SPS for V2X Applications

Maria Bezmenov^{*†}, Matthias Frey[‡], Zoran Utkovski[§] and Slawomir Stanczak^{*§}

^{*}Technische Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany, [†]Robert Bosch GmbH, Hildesheim, Germany,

[‡]University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia, [§]Fraunhofer Heinrich-Hertz-Institute, Berlin, Germany

Email: {maria.bezmenov}@campus.tu-berlin.de, {matthias.frey}@unimelb.edu.au,
{zoran.utkovski, slawomir.stanczak}@hhi.fraunhofer.de

Abstract—We derive a closed-form approximation of the stationary distribution of the Age of Information (AoI) of the semi-persistent scheduling (SPS) protocol which is a core part of NR-V2X, an important standard for vehicular communications. While prior works have studied the average AoI under similar assumptions, in this work we provide a full statistical characterization of the AoI by deriving an approximation of its probability mass function. As result, besides the average AoI, we are able to evaluate the age-violation probability, which is of particular relevance for safety-critical applications in vehicular domains, where the priority is to ensure that the AoI does not exceed a predefined threshold during system operation. The study reveals complementary behavior of the age-violation probability compared to the average AoI and highlights the role of the duration of the reservation as a key parameter in the SPS protocol. We use this to demonstrate how this crucial parameter should be tuned according to the performance requirements of the application.

Index Terms—Age of Information, Semi-persistent Scheduling, C-V2X, Medium Access Control, Semantic Communication.

I. INTRODUCTION

In the manufacturing and automotive industry, there has been a significant increase in applications that require continuous control decisions based on the perception of a remote target. This has led to new requirements for wireless communication systems. The focus is shifting from providing reliable transmission of individual data points to providing reliable transmission of the right information at the right time. Hence, classical metrics such as latency or throughput are no longer sufficient to evaluate communication, and new metrics must be employed [1], [2].

A metric to quantify the freshness of information at the receiver is the Age of Information (AoI). The AoI quantifies the time elapsed since the most recent information available at the receiver was generated at the transmitter [3], [4]. Optimizing the communication system to minimize the average AoI will thus lead to fresh information at the receiver, providing a basis for continuous control decisions. For some applications such as, e.g., platooning in autonomous driving or automated guided vehicle (AGV) maneuvering in automated factories, particularly strict requirements on the freshness of information are necessary to ensure the intended functionality.

These requirements can be expressed using an age threshold [5], [6]. The communication system should then be optimized to minimize the age-violation probability, i.e., the proportion of time spent above the age threshold. To facilitate this form of optimization, the generation time and the age threshold need to be available on all communication layers, for example through the use of a semantic header [7] or, more generally, through the introduction of a semantic-effectiveness (SE)-plane [8].

A. Prior Work

The concept of information freshness has been first introduced in the context of vehicular communications [3], and since then the AoI has been extensively studied in the literature (see, e.g., [9] for an early overview). While earlier works focused mostly on point-to-point settings, more recent approaches target multiple access settings, with the objective to re-evaluate channel access mechanisms (in particular grant-free), with regard to the AoI behavior in the system.

For some simplified system settings, the effects of basic parameters such as, e.g., channel utilization, on the AoI are studied in [10]–[18]. Among the methods already investigated are classical protocols such as slotted ALOHA (SA) [10], [11] and AoI-optimized versions of SA [12] or Carrier-Sense Multiple Access with Collision Avoidance (CSMA/CA) [13], [14]. In addition, modern channel access methods [19], such as Irregular Repetition Slotted ALOHA (IRSA) [20], have been investigated with respect to AoI [15], [16]. Especially for set-ups such as Massive Machine-type Communications (mMTC) [15] or Vehicle-to-Everything (V2X) [16], these protocols achieve particularly low average AoI and age-violation probabilities.

Another important protocol is Semi-Persistent Scheduling (SPS). SPS, which falls in the class of reservation-based protocols, forms the basis of the 3rd generation partnership project (3GPP) New Radio V2X (NR-V2X) standard [21] for uncoordinated transmission on Sidelink. When optimizing an already deployed protocol such as SPS, the specifics of the protocol should be well understood so that any adaptations remain compatible with the protocol. A detailed description of the SPS protocol, especially with regard to interactions with other communication layers, can be found in [22]. An evaluation of the protocol with regard to classical metrics such as packet error rate and throughput (e.g. as a function of the

The authors acknowledge the financial support by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research of Germany in the programme of "Souverän. Digital. Vernetzt." Joint project 6G-RIC, project identification number: 16KISK022.

channel utilization and the distance between two vehicles) is performed in [23], [24]. The challenges of SPS with non-periodic sampling are investigated in [23], [25].

In the context of SPS, several efforts were also made to characterize the average AoI or Peak AoI (PAoI) (defined as the value that the AoI reaches immediately before a reset triggered by an update). In [17], a model was developed that shows the dependence between the expected PAoI and the packet generation interval. The model considers collisions with up to two nodes. In [18], a model was developed that characterizes the influence of the reservation duration on the AoI and the PAoI.

B. Contribution and Outline

Despite extensive research in this area, the AoI-related behavior of reservation-based access protocols is not yet fully understood. While current research is focused on the average AoI as a metric, understanding the age-violation probability of reservation-based protocols is of great significance when optimizing a wider range of automotive and other applications. Motivated by this, we provide, to the best of our knowledge, the first model for the age-violation probability of the SPS protocol. Specifically, we consider a setting in which devices send time-stamped status updates to all devices in communication range on a shared channel without feedback. In this setup, we make the following key contributions:

- We characterize the AoI process as a Markov model, prove its stationarity, and derive a closed-form approximation for its stationary distribution. Thus, we provide first quantitative insights into the ON-OFF behavior of SPS, establishing an analogy with the Gilbert-Elliott channel, which results from the periodic reservation of resources.
- We study the behavior of the tail of the age distribution and derive a closed-form approximation of the age-violation probability (i.e., the probability that the AoI exceeds a certain pre-defined threshold).
- In addition, we investigate the critical role of the reservation duration parameter and the sampling rate of the perception data for information freshness. Based on this, we discuss the best operating conditions under different channel loads.

Initial results with regard to this topic were discussed in [26]. *Paper Outline:* The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Sect. II, we introduce the system model, focusing on the key features of the studied reservation-based protocol. In Sect. III, we present a closed-form solution for the probability distribution of the AoI and discuss numerical results for the average AoI and the age-violation probability. The assumptions necessary to derive the probability distribution of the AoI are discussed in Sect. IV. Sect. V summarizes the results of the paper.

Notation: We use $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \dots\}$ to denote the set of natural numbers and \mathbb{N}_0 to denote $\mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. The indicator function is denoted as $\mathbb{1}_A$ in the domain A . Further, we use

$$\text{Bin}(n, p; k) := \binom{n}{k} p^k (1-p)^{n-k} \quad (1)$$

to denote the probability mass function (pmf) of the binomial distribution with n trials and success probability p . We define

$$\bigstar_{i=0}^j (f_i(\cdot))(x) := (f_0 * f_1 * \dots * f_j)(x) \quad (2)$$

to be successive convolutions.

II. SYSTEM MODEL

We consider a network consisting of $V \in \mathbb{N}$ homogeneous nodes. The nodes share a communication channel, which we model as slotted in time (i.e., all time-related quantities are expressed as multiples of the duration of one slot). Assuming a *frame size* $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ($m > V$) and that all nodes are frame and slot synchronous, we decompose the time $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$ into a *frame index* $k(t) \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and *frame position* $\tau(t) \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$ as

$$k(t) := \lfloor t/m \rfloor \quad (3)$$

$$\tau(t) := t - k(t)m. \quad (4)$$

Throughout the paper, we consider an arbitrary but fixed node $v \in \{1, \dots, V\}$. It monitors a time-varying process¹ Φ that all other nodes need to be aware of. This process is sampled at the beginning of each frame (i.e., at position zero), corresponding to periodic sampling with periodicity m . The content of a sample can be transmitted in exactly one slot. The position in which node v transmits during frame x is denoted as $D^v(x) \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$. Thus, the channel occupancy pattern can be described as a sequence $\underline{D}(x) = (D^1(x), \dots, D^V(x))_{x \in \mathbb{N}_0}$. In the following, we will refer to $D^v(x)$ as $D(x)$.

The number of simultaneous transmissions with node v on the shared channel in frame x is denoted as the *frame state* $\Lambda(x)$ and defined as

$$\Lambda(x) := \sum_{i=1}^V \mathbb{1}_{D^i(x)=D(x)}. \quad (5)$$

In this system model, we consider nodes that rely on half-duplex for sending and receiving. This means that a node cannot send and receive at the same time. Further, all nodes are in communication range of each other and, as a consequence, there are no hidden nodes in the system. Considering a collision channel model, we interpret

- $\Lambda(x) = 1$ as a *singleton*, i.e., the transmission of node v was not simultaneous with any other transmission. In this case, we assume successful decoding at every node in the network.
- $\Lambda(x) \geq 2$ as a *collision*, i.e., the transmission of node v was simultaneous with at least one other transmission. In this case, we assume that neither transmission can be decoded correctly.

A. Age of Information

For a node $u \neq v \in \{1, \dots, V\}$, the AoI describes the freshness of node u 's maintained information about Φ at time t . Formally, the AoI $\Delta^{v \rightarrow u}(t)$ is defined as the time between

¹E.g., the velocity of the node or the temperature measured at the node.




Fig. 1: **Example of realization of the AoI** $\Delta(t)$. The time is structured into frames of m slots. At the beginning of each frame, a packet is generated (sampled from Φ) and afterwards transmitted. The green checks mark singleton transmissions while the red crosses mark collided transmissions. The solid line shows the AoI at the receiver. In addition, the dashed line shows the channel access delay. For this example with a singleton transmission in frame $k(t_1)$, respectively $k(t_2)$, and a collided transmission in the previous frame, the collision duration $C(k(t_2))$ equals zero according to (7).

the sampling of the last singleton transmission and the time of observation t [3]. Since collisions and half-duplex operation are the only error sources we model, all nodes receive the same information at the same time. Thus, without loss of generality, we can drop $v \rightarrow u$ and use $\Delta(t)$ to denote the AoI. In the considered system model, node v samples Φ at the beginning of each frame at position 0. Thus, we define the AoI as

$$\Delta(t) := \begin{cases} m \cdot C(k(t) - 1) + m + \tau(t) & \tau(t) < D(k(t)) \\ m \cdot C(k(t)) + \tau(t) & \tau(t) \geq D(k(t)), \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where the *collision duration* $C(x)$ describes the number of frames since the most recent update of node v in frame x , and is defined as

$$C(x) := \min\{c \in \{0, \dots, x\} : \Lambda(x - c) = 1\}. \quad (7)$$

In order to exclude the possibility of this and similar minima definitions being over an empty set, we use the convention that $\underline{D}(0) = (0, \dots, 0)$, $\underline{D}(1) = (1, \dots, V)$. We will see in Lemma 1 that the system can be described by a Markov chain with a unique stationary distribution. Since our later analysis is confined to the stationary state of the system, this convention does not affect the results of our analysis.

In Fig. 1, we show an exemplary evolution of the AoI.

B. Channel Access Model

In this paper, we consider decentralized access to a shared channel based on the 3GPP standard (see, e.g., [21, Section 5.22.1.1]). The SPS protocol allows users to reserve a position within the frame for future transmissions so that other users can anticipate further transmissions and avoid collisions, by listening to the channel. In Fig. 2, we illustrate an example of the protocol operation showing the transmission pattern for a system with four nodes in two subsequent frames.

According to the main idea of SPS, new reservations are only made on positions that were empty in the previous frame. The empty positions in frame x are defined as

$$\mathcal{N}(x) := \{0, \dots, m - 1\} \setminus \underline{D}(x). \quad (8)$$




Fig. 2: **Example of operation for SPS**. In (a), the transmission pattern for four nodes during a generic frame x is presented. With probability $(1 - p_E)$, the nodes keep their reservation and transmit in the same position as they used in frame x and with probability p_E , they perform a reselection, selecting a new position for their transmission. During the reselection, the nodes exclude all slots that were already occupied by any transmissions in the previous frame and randomly select from the remaining slots according to a uniform distribution. In (b), the transmission pattern in the subsequent frame $x+1$ is depicted. In the example shown, node C performs a reselection, giving up position 4 in frame x and reserving position 3 in frame $x+1$. During the reselection, C only considers empty positions in frame x (in this case $\{1, 3\}$). In the example shown, node C selects position 3 for its transmission. The reselection of node C has resolved the existing collision between nodes C and D. Such a collision can potentially last for several frames until one of the two nodes performs a reselection.

Considering the example in Fig. 2, this would correspond to $\mathcal{N}(x) = \{1, 3\}$ and $\mathcal{N}(x+1) = \{1\}$. From the empty positions, the reselecting node selects one position uniformly at random. To denote the number of empty slots in frame x , we use

$$N(x) := |\mathcal{N}(x)|. \quad (9)$$

At the beginning of each new reservation, the *reservation counter* is selected from a predetermined distribution. Each time the node makes a transmission at the selected position, the reservation counter is decreased by one until it reaches zero, and a new reservation begins.

If the reservation counter is drawn from a geometric distribution² with success probability p_E (henceforth called the *ending probability*), the transmission rules can equivalently be summarized as follows:

At $t = mx$, before the first transmission of frame x is made, each node v

- with probability $(1 - p_E)$ keeps the same position $s = D(x - 1)$ for the next transmission;
- with probability p_E selects a new position $s \sim \text{Uniform}\{\mathcal{N}(x - 1)\}$ for the next transmission.

The transmission then takes place at $t' = mx + s$. We refer to the selection of the new position as *reselection*.

In this context we define the *reservation duration* $B(x)$ to denote at frame x the number of frames since node v changed its transmission slot as

$$B(x) := \min\{b \in \{1, \dots, x\} : D(x - b) \neq D(x - b + 1)\}. \quad (10)$$

We use $\xi_n(x)$ to characterize the *end* of the n -th reservation prior to frame x , where $\xi_n(x)$ is recursively defined as

$$\xi_{n+1}(x) := \xi_n(x) - B(\xi_n(x)), \quad (11)$$

²in practice, a finite distribution such as the uniform distribution is used

with $\xi_0(x) := x$. To characterize the *start* of the n -th reservation, we use $\gamma_n(x) := \xi_{n+1}(x) + 1$. We use node C in Fig. 2 as an example to explain the notation. According to the definition, in frame $x+1$, the start and end of the zeroth reservation would be in frame $\gamma_0(x+1) = \xi_0(x+1) = x+1$. In addition, the end of the first reservation would be in frame $\xi_1(x+1) = x$, while the start of the first reservation is not shown in the example.

III. MAIN RESULTS

In this chapter, we present two results. The first result, Theorem 1, describes the segments into which the AoI can be decomposed. The second and main result of this paper, Theorem 2, is an approximation of the pmf of the AoI. In addition, we show numerical results for the cdf of the approximated AoI and discuss the quality of the approximation. Finally, we conclude this section with numerical results for the average AoI and the age-violation probability.

A. Decomposing the AoI

The AoI $\Delta(t)$ can be expressed as the sum of different segments. To separate the segments, we use the *collided reservation count* $W(x)$ to describe the number of reselections node v has performed up to frame x since its last singleton transmission as

$$W(x) := \min\{n \in \{0, \dots, x\} : \Lambda(\xi_n(x)) = 1\}. \quad (12)$$

Theorem 1. *The AoI for node v at time t can be written as*

$$\Delta(t) = \tau(t) + m \left(1 + \sum_{w=0}^{W(k(t)-1)-1} B(\xi_w(k(t)-1)) \right) \quad (13)$$

if $\tau(t) < D(k(t))$ and as

$$\Delta(t) = \tau(t) + m \sum_{w=0}^{W(k(t))-1} B(\xi_w(k(t))) \quad (14)$$

if $\tau(t) \geq D(k(t))$.

For a better understanding of the result, the theorem is illustrated with an example in Fig. 3. The proof of Theorem 1 can be found in Appendix A.

B. Approximation results for the AoI

The core result of this paper is an approximation that describes the pmf of the AoI in stationary state (see Lemma 1). The approximation is based on the assumption discussed in Sect. IV-B implying that the dependence of the state at the start of a new reservation on the state of the previous reservation is negligible. A more detailed discussion can be found in Sect. IV-B.

Theorem 2. *For a stationary system, the probability distribution of the AoI $\mathbb{P}(\Delta(t) = \delta)$ can be approximated as*

$$\mathbb{P}(\Delta(t) = \delta) \approx \frac{\tau(t)}{m} q(k(\delta) - 1) + \frac{m - \tau(t)}{m} q(k(\delta)), \quad (15)$$

if $\tau(t) = \tau(\delta)$ and as

$$\mathbb{P}(\Delta(t) = \delta) = 0 \quad (16)$$

otherwise, with

$$q(c) := \sum_{w=0}^{\bar{w}} \sum_{b=1}^{\bar{b}} \left(p_E(1 - p_E)^b - p(b) \right) \underset{n=0}{*} \left(p(\cdot) \right)(c) \quad (17)$$

and

$$p(b) := p_E(1 - p_E)^b \cdot \left(1 - \sum_{\lambda=1}^{V-1} \left[\left(1 - (1 - p_E)^{b-1} \right)^\lambda \cdot \sum_{n=1}^m P_N(n) \cdot \text{Bin}(V-1, \frac{p_E}{n}; \lambda) \right] \right) \quad (18)$$

The parameter \bar{w} describes the maximum number of collided reservations that we take into account within the model. The parameter \bar{b} describes the maximum number of transmissions per reservation that we take into account within the model. The accuracy of the approximation increases as \bar{w} and \bar{b} increase.

Clearly, the pmf approximation of the AoI given in Theorem 2 depends on the time of observation t . However, it is worth noting that this dependence concerns only the position $\tau(t)$ and not the frame index $k(t)$. For a compact representation of the different distributions for the different positions, we average the distribution of the AoI over all possible positions and represent them as

$$\mathbb{P}(\bar{\Delta} = \delta) := \sum_{n=0}^{m-1} \left(\frac{1}{m} \mathbb{P}(\Delta(k(t)m + n) = \delta) \right). \quad (19)$$

C. Numerical results

In order to validate the accuracy of the pmf, we have implemented the system described above in Python for comparison. The source code used for the simulations is available as an electronic supplement with this paper. Each individual simulation consists of 550,000 frames, whereby the first 50,000 frames are not evaluated in order to avoid transient effects. For the numerical evaluation of Theorem 2, we consider reservation durations up to a length of $\bar{b} = 1000$ and a maximum collision number of $\bar{w} = 50$. As describing $P_N(n)$ is difficult, we assume, as in [18], that the number of empty slots in each frame is approximately equal to the expected value of empty slots $\mathbb{E}[N]$. We discuss this assumption in more detail in Sect. IV-C.

Based on this assumption, $p(b)$ can be approximated as

$$p(b) \approx p_E(1 - p_E)^b \cdot \left(1 - \sum_{\lambda=1}^{V-1} \left[\left(1 - (1 - p_E)^{b-1} \right)^\lambda \cdot \text{Bin}(V-1, \frac{p_E}{\mathbb{E}[N]}; \lambda) \right] \right). \quad (20)$$

In Fig. 4, we show $\mathbb{P}(\bar{\Delta} \leq \delta)$ for different combinations of frame size (sampling period), channel load, and the ending probability p_E . For all combinations of parameters shown, the proposed approximation matches the simulation results closely.

Let us now take a closer look at the evolution of the cdf of the AoI $\mathbb{P}(\bar{\Delta} \leq \delta)$. For all combinations, it is noticeable that the distribution has a strong growth before $2m$ and a slow growth




Fig. 3: **Segments contributing to the AoI.** The transmission pattern of node v is illustrated frame by frame. The transmissions are shown here as circles. Green squares signify singleton transmissions and red circles collided transmissions. In addition, we mark the start and end of a reservation using inward-pointing triangles. Based on (11) and (12), we label the final transmission of the last reservations before $k(t)$ (a) and, $k(t) - 1$ (b), respectively. Thus, the distance between two reservations, for example, the first and second reservation before frame $k(t)$, is $mB(\xi_1(k(t)))$. According to definition (6), the AoI is the time between the sampling instance of the last singleton and the time of observation t . In this example the last singleton is in frame $\xi_{W(k(t))}(k(t))$ (a) respectively $\xi_{W(k(t)-1)}(k(t) - 1)$ (b) and the sampling occurred at the beginning of this frame. The last singleton transmission before t is always the last transmission within a reservation. Thus, the AoI is characterized by the sum of w reservation durations (in slots) plus the slots already passed in frame $k(t)$.




Fig. 4: Cdf of the AoI comparing analytic (solid line) and simulative (dashed line) results.

with a long tail afterwards. The higher the AoI, the longer there has been no successful transmission. As in [18], we refer to time periods without successful singleton transmissions as *OFF-times*. The length of the tail represents the duration of *OFF-times*, and the slope represents the rate at which *OFF-times* are observed.

Furthermore, we observe that smaller p_E and therefore longer reservation counters (compare green and blue curves) lead to significantly higher probabilities below $2m$ and a longer tail. This means that there are fewer prolonged *OFF-times*, but those that remain can be even longer. When we increase the channel load $\frac{V}{m}$ (compare the orange and blue curve), we observe that the number of *OFF-times* is becoming more frequent and longer. Reducing the slots m per frame by half (compare the red and blue curves) leads to a shift; the values adopted by the AoI are only half as large.

D. Application of the AoI distribution

These correlations can now be used to adapt the parameters to the requirements of the respective application. Consider, for example, the role of the reservation counter. In the 3GPP standard, the distribution from which the reservation counter is chosen is given as a function of the sampling rate (e.g. uniform in [5, 15] for a sampling rate of 100ms). In our model, we assume a geometric distribution of the reservation counter. We use the pmf from Theorem 2 to calculate the average AoI and the age-violation probability and thus determine the optimal working conditions.

The average AoI can be computed from the pmf as

$$\mathbb{E}[\bar{\Delta}] = \sum_{\delta=0}^{\infty} \delta \cdot \mathbb{P}(\bar{\Delta} = \delta) \quad (21)$$

and the age-violation probability as

$$\zeta_{\theta} = 1 - \sum_{\delta=0}^{\theta} \mathbb{P}(\bar{\Delta} = \delta). \quad (22)$$

Average AoI: For the average AoI of SPS, there is already a model [18] against which we compare our results. The assumptions of the system model in [18] are largely identical to ours. V nodes send samples based on the rules presented in Sect. II. The first main difference is the introduction of probability p_{Keep} , which specifies the probability with which the same slot $D(x)$ is used for the duration of a further reservation. If the reservation counter is drawn from a geometric distribution with probability p_{RC} , the parameter p_E in this paper is related to the parameters p_{RC} and p_{Keep} in [18] as follows:

$$p_E = (1 - p_{\text{RC}})(1 - p_{\text{Keep}}). \quad (23)$$

The second difference is the sample generation. In both [18] and our model, a new sample is assumed for each frame. In our model, we additionally consider the time of sampling. We




Fig. 5: The average AoI as a function of p_E for a system with 195 nodes and 200 slots per frame. Analytical models versus simulation (cross markers)

assume that samples are always generated at a fixed time in the frame (e.g. in the 0-th slot) and thus model a periodic upper-layer application.

Fig. 5 shows the average AoI as a function of p_E for 195 nodes and 200 slots per frame. As a baseline, we used the analytic results of [18] and simulation results. We include simulation results for two cases. In the first case, we assume that the reservation counter is drawn uniformly at random from [5, 15] according to [27]. In the second case, we assume a geometric distribution with $p_{RC} = 0.9$. In both cases p_{Keep} is varied from 0 to 0.8, resulting, according to (23), in p_E varying from 0.02 to 0.1

First, we observe that the curves of our model are very similar to those of [18]. The difference between the curves is caused by the slightly different system models, specifically our additional consideration of the sampling instance. This shows that both models can reproduce the average AoI well. As in [18], we also see here that in the range of small values p_E , a uniform distribution of the duration of the reservation can reasonably be approximated by a geometric distribution.

Age-violation probability: In Fig. 6, the age-violation probability is illustrated as a function of p_E for frame durations of 100 and 200 slots and system sizes of 66, 130 and 195 nodes. For the evaluation, we assume an exemplary application threshold of $\theta = 400$ slots, however, other thresholds in the range of 200 to 2000 slots show the same tendencies. For all parameter combinations, we observe that the age-violation probability increases with higher p_E and therefore shorter reservation length. Furthermore, we observe, as expected, a lower age-violation probability for equal load but smaller frame size. This is not surprising: E.g., with a sampling period of 100 slots, two transmissions could be lost without exceeding the AoI threshold. With a sampling rate of 200 slots on the other hand, the threshold is exceeded as soon as a single transmission is lost. Due to the increased reservation duration, consecutive collisions are longer lasting but occur less frequently. This means that the case of two collisions that can be compensated for with shorter sampling rates basically no longer occurs. Thus, instead of sending twice as many




Fig. 6: The age violation probability for a threshold $\theta = 400$ slots as a function of p_E and for frame durations of 100 and 200 slots and channel loads of 0.66 and 0.98 nodes/slot, comparing the analytical model (lines) against simulations (markers).

samples per node, we could accommodate almost twice as many nodes at half the sampling rate without increasing the age-violation probability.

Further, we observe that the performance with regard to age-violation is complementary to the performance with regard to average AoI. The age-violation probability increases (worse performance) while the average AoI decreases (better performance) with higher p_E . This illustrates the relevance of a model that is capable of representing both.

IV. ASSUMPTIONS

In this chapter, we take a closer look at the assumptions made for the results and discuss the implications. Before we discuss the assumptions in detail, we summarize them here: (i) The system is in steady state. (ii) The state $\Lambda(\gamma_i(x))$ at the beginning of a reselection is approximately independent of the state $\Lambda(\xi_{i+1}(x))$ at the end of the last reselection. (iii) For the numerical evaluation, we have also assumed that the number of empty slots in each slot is constant.

A. Stationarity

The system described in Sect. II is fully described by the channel occupancy pattern $\underline{D}(x) = (D^1(x), \dots, D^V(x))_{x \in \mathbb{N}_0}$. Based on the transmission rules in Sect. II-B, the transition probability of the channel occupancy pattern from one frame to the next can be stated as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\underline{D}(x+1) = (d^1, \dots, d^V) | \underline{D}(x) = (c^1, \dots, c^V)) \\ = (1 - p_E)^{\sum_{v=1}^V \mathbb{1}_{d^v=c^v}} \left(\frac{p_E}{N(c^1, \dots, c^V)} \right)^{\sum_{v=1}^V \mathbb{1}_{d^v \neq c^v}} \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

for all $(c^1, \dots, c^V, d^1, \dots, d^V) \in \mathcal{S}(x+1)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}(x+1) := \{(c^1, \dots, c^V, d^1, \dots, d^V) \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}^{2V} : \\ \exists v, u \in \{1, \dots, V\} : d^v \neq c^v \wedge d^v = d^u \wedge u \neq v\} \end{aligned}$$

and as

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\underline{D}(x+1) = (d^1, \dots, d^V) \mid \underline{D}(x) = (c^1, \dots, c^V)\right) = 0 \quad (25)$$

for all $(c^1, \dots, c^V, d^1, \dots, d^V) \notin \mathcal{S}(x+1)$. Therefore, the system is a Markov Chain.

Lemma 1. *The sequence $\underline{D}(x) = (D^1(x), \dots, D^V(x))_{x \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ is an aperiodic, irreducible Markov chain with state space $\{1, \dots, m\}^V$. Therefore, the Markov chain is ergodic and a unique stationary distribution exists for $\underline{D}(x)$.*

The proof of Lemma 1 can be found in Appendix B. The number of empty slots $N(x)$, which is calculated deterministically from the occupancy pattern (9) and (8), also has a stationary distribution, defined as

$$P_N(n) := \mathbb{P}(N(x) = n). \quad (26)$$

In the remainder of the paper, we make the simplifying assumption that the Markov chain $\underline{D}(x)$ is in its stationary distribution for the value of x considered. Lemma 1 ensures that this is asymptotically true for large values of x independently of the initial state of the system. The numerical evaluations we have made for Sect. III-C suggest that the simulated system reaches its stationary state within maximum 50000 iterations, indicating that this assumption is a reasonable one in practice.

B. Independence

For better readability of this subsection we introduce abbreviations for the frame state and the number of ongoing transmission at the end of the i -th reservation as

$$\Lambda_i^\xi := \Lambda(\xi_i(x)) \quad (27)$$

$$B_i^\xi := B(\xi_i(x)). \quad (28)$$

In this paper, we assume that the dependence between the frame state $\Lambda(\xi_0(x))$ and the frame state $\Lambda(\xi_w(x))$ is negligible. Therefore, the distribution of collided reservations $W(x)$, as defined in (12), can be approximated as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(W(x) = w) & \\ & \stackrel{(12)}{=} \mathbb{P}\left(\Lambda_0^\xi \geq 2, \dots, \Lambda_{w-1}^\xi \geq 2, \Lambda_w^\xi = 1\right) \\ & \approx \mathbb{P}\left(\Lambda_w^\xi = 1\right) \cdot \prod_{i=0}^{w-1} \mathbb{P}\left(\Lambda_i^\xi \geq 2\right). \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Further, we assume that the dependence between the number of ongoing transmission in the i -th reservation and the frame state of any other reservation before or after is negligible. More specifically, the approximation we need is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(B_i^\xi = \cdot \mid \Lambda_0^\xi \geq 2, \dots, \Lambda_{w-1}^\xi \geq 2, \Lambda_w^\xi = 1\right) & \\ \approx \mathbb{P}\left(B_i^\xi = \cdot \mid \Lambda_i^\xi \geq 2\right). \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

It is clear that these approximations cannot hold with equality and therefore necessarily introduce an error into any calculation of AoI based on them. Therefore, the usefulness of our approximations depends on the question of how large the error introduced in this way is. For this reason, we provide numerical comparisons with the exact values of the AoI along

with the numerical evaluations of our formulas that we give in Sect. III-C. This comparison is important because it gives insight in the overall applicability of our approximations that depends not only on how big the error in (29) and (30) is but also on how it propagates to the AoI estimates.

However, we believe it is also worth evaluating some aspects of the approximation (29) and (30) directly. To this end, we first observe that according to the transmission rules, the frame state Λ_w^ξ at the end of the w -th reservation only depends on the frame state $\Lambda(\gamma_w(x))$ at the start of the same reservation. This is because the only way the value can change during the reservation is if some colliding nodes end their reservation, which according to the transmission rules occurs independently of all other events. Moreover, it is reasonable to expect that among the random variables that appear in the approximations, the most strongly correlated ones are the frame states in successive reservations.

In order to get an idea of how accurate the approximations are, we therefore compare the probability distribution of the frame state $\Lambda(\gamma_w(x))$ at the beginning of a reservation with and without presence of the conditions $\Lambda_{w+1}^\xi = 1$ and $\Lambda_{w+1}^\xi \geq 2$ on the frame state at the end of the preceding reservation.

As a measure of similarity, we use the *variational distance* $\eta(P, Q)$, which describes the area between the two probability functions P and Q . In discrete domains, the variational distance is defined as

$$\eta(P, Q) = 0.5 \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} |P(x) - Q(x)| \quad (31)$$

and assumes values in $[0, 1]$, with 0 corresponding to identical distributions. In Fig. 7, we illustrate the variational distance between $P := \mathbb{P}\left(\Lambda(\gamma_w(x)) = \lambda \mid \Lambda_{w+1}^\xi \geq 2\right)$ and $Q := \mathbb{P}\left(\Lambda(\gamma_w(x)) = \lambda\right)$ as a function of the channel load $\frac{\nu}{m}$ for different numbers of slots per frame for $p_E = 0.1$. For small frame lengths, the variational distance is comparatively large. For longer frame lengths (min. 50 slots per frame), the variational distance becomes smaller and the approximation therefore more accurate. This can be explained by the observation that the probability $\mathbb{P}\left(\Lambda(\gamma_w(x)) = \lambda\right)$ depends on the number of empty slots in frame x . The number of free slots is influenced by a collision in frame x in that there are more free slots available (collided nodes occupy fewer slots). The greater the number of slots in general, the less weight these additional slots have.

In Fig. 8, we illustrate the variational distance between $P := \mathbb{P}\left(\Lambda(\gamma_w(x)) = \lambda \mid \Lambda_{w+1}^\xi = 1\right)$ and $Q := \mathbb{P}\left(\Lambda(\gamma_w(x)) = \lambda\right)$ as a function of the channel load $\frac{\nu}{m}$ for different numbers of slots per frame for $p_E = 0.1$. The overall low variational distance shows that the approximation is satisfactory. The approximation is particularly accurate for longer frame lengths ($\gtrsim 50$) and low channel loads ($\lesssim 0.7$).

With this we come to the conclusion that especially for large m the distributions are similar enough to use the approximation (29).




Fig. 7: **Approximation validation.** The variational distance for probabilities $P := \mathbb{P}(\Lambda(\gamma_w(x)) = \lambda | \Lambda(\xi_{w+1}(x)) \geq 2)$ and $Q := \mathbb{P}(\Lambda(\gamma_w(x)) = \lambda)$ is illustrated as function of the system load for different values of the frame length.




Fig. 8: **Approximation validation.** The variational distance for probabilities $P := \mathbb{P}(\Lambda(\gamma_w(x)) = \lambda | \Lambda(\xi_{w+1}(x)) = 1)$ and $Q := \mathbb{P}(\Lambda(\gamma_w(x)) = \lambda)$ is illustrated as function of the system load for different values of the frame length.

C. Number of empty slots

In this paper, we approximate the number of empty slots per frame according to the derivation of the expected value in [18].

$$N(\underline{D}(x)) \approx \mathbb{E}[N], \quad (32)$$

Therefore, we give a detailed account of the derivation in [18]. In [18, (2)-(16)] $\mathbb{E}[N]$ is determined iteratively by starting with $\mathbb{E}[N]_0 = \frac{m}{V}$ using

$$\mathbb{E}[N]_{i+1} = \frac{m}{1 + \underline{w}_i (\underline{I} - \underline{A})^{-1} \underline{e}}, \quad (33)$$

with $\underline{w}_i := (w_i^1, \dots, w_i^V)_i$

$$w_i^k = \binom{V}{k} \frac{p_E}{1 + \mathbb{E}[N]_i}^k \left(1 - \frac{p_E}{1 + \mathbb{E}[N]_i}\right)^{V-k}. \quad (34)$$




Fig. 9: **Probability distribution empty slots.**

Further, \underline{I} is the $V \times V$ identity matrix and \underline{e} denotes a column vector of ones's of size V . The matrix $\underline{A} := (a_{m,n})_{m,n \in \{0, \dots, V\}}$ is defined as

$$a_{m,n} = \begin{cases} \binom{m}{n} p_E^n (1 - p_E)^{m-n} & m \leq n \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases} \quad (35)$$

As we show in Figure 9 using some example parameters, the distribution of empty slots is concentrated around the expected value. At very high loads, the approximation is less accurate than at low to moderate loads.

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper we derived an approximation for the pmf of the AoI for reservation-based channel access schemes, specifically focusing on SPS. We validate the approximation using simulations. With this model, we are able to better quantify the typical ON-OFF behavior which arises from reserving resources periodically, and thereby repeating collisions and successful transmissions alike. In addition, our model offers the first tool for quantifying the age-violation probability, which is important for safety-critical applications. Further, we demonstrate the necessity for cross-layer optimization by showing, for example, that one can accommodate almost twice as many nodes in a system with almost the same age violation probability if the reservation probability and the sampling period are chosen properly. We conclude by the observation that it is of critical importance to properly define the requirements of the application, since, as have seen from the examples, minimizing the average AoI does not lead to a minimum age violation probability in general.

APPENDIX A PROOF OF THEOREM 1

First, we show that the collision duration $C(x)$, compare (7), can be decomposed into reservations. The number of reservations into which we can decompose $C(x)$ is described by the collided reservation counter $W(x)$ as defined in (12). The duration of each reservation is described in terms of the reservation duration $B(x)$ measured from the respective end of the reservation $\xi_w(x)$.

Lemma 2. For all $x \in \mathbb{N}$, we can write the collision duration as

$$C(x) = \sum_{w=0}^{W(x)-1} B(\xi_w(x)), \quad (36)$$

where we use the convention that a summation ranging from 0 to -1 has value 0.

Proof. If $W(x) = 0$, then by (12) we have $\Lambda(x) = 1$, so by (7), we have $C(x) = 0$ and the lemma holds. Now let $W(x) \in \{1, \dots, x\}$. Then, clearly, the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{w=0}^{W(x)-1} B(\xi_w(x)) &\stackrel{(11)}{=} \sum_{w=0}^{W(x)-1} (\xi_w(x) - \xi_{w+1}(x)) \\ &= \xi_0(x) - \xi_{W(x)}(x) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} x - \xi_{W(x)}(x), \end{aligned}$$

where (a) stands for the definition after (11). The proof is complete if we can show that $x - \xi_{W(x)}(x) = C(x)$. According to (7), this follows if

$$\Lambda(\xi_{W(x)}(x)) = 1 \quad (37)$$

and if for all $j \in \{0, \dots, x - \xi_{W(x)}(x) - 1\}$

$$\Lambda(x - j) \geq 2. \quad (38)$$

Setting $i := x - \xi_{W(x)}(x) - j$, we equivalently have for all $i \in \{1, \dots, x - \xi_{W(x)}(x)\}$

$$\Lambda(\xi_{W(x)}(x) + i) \geq 2. \quad (39)$$

(37) follows from (12) and (39) can be argued in two steps. First, according to the transmission rules in Sect. II-B, the position $D(\gamma_w(x))$ is occupied in every frame from frame $\gamma_w(x)$ to frame $\xi_w(x)$. That is, no nodes other than those already transmitting at $D(\gamma_w(x))$ transmit at this position. Therefore,

$$\Lambda(\gamma_w(x)) \geq \dots \geq \Lambda(\xi_w(x))$$

for all $w \in \{0, \dots, x\}$. Second, by (12), the frame state at the end of a reservation is for all $w < W(x)$

$$\Lambda(\xi_w(x)) \geq 2.$$

Finally, we note that by the definition of $\gamma_n(x)$ after (11), $\xi_{W(x)}(x) + 1 = \gamma_{W(x)-1}(x)$. Hence, the term $\xi_{W(x)}(x) + i$ which appears in (39) is between $\gamma_w(x)$ and $\xi_w(x)$ with $w < W(x)$ for all possible values that i ranges over, which concludes the proof of (39). \square

Proof of Theorem 1. Theorem 1 now follows by substituting (36) into the definition of the AoI (6). \square

APPENDIX B PROOF OF LEMMA 1

Proof. To prove *irreducibility*, we show that the transition from any (d^1, \dots, d^V) to any other state (c^1, \dots, c^V) where $c, d \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ is feasible for all $v \in \{1, \dots, V\}$. For a system with $V < m$, as described in

Sect. II, $\{1, \dots, m\} \setminus \{c^1, \dots, c^V\}$ is not empty. Let $\tau \in \{1, \dots, m\} \setminus \{c^1, \dots, c^V\}$, then according to (24)

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\underline{D}(x+1) = (\tau, \dots, \tau) \mid \underline{D}(x) = (c^1, \dots, c^V)\right) > 0$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\underline{D}(x+1) = (d^1, \dots, d^V) \mid \underline{D}(x) = (\tau, \dots, \tau)\right) > 0.$$

The proof of *aperiodicity* follows from (24) as

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\underline{D}(x+1) = (d^1, \dots, d^V) \mid \underline{D}(x) = (d^1, \dots, d^V)\right) > 0. \quad \square$$

APPENDIX C PROOF OF THEOREM 2

A. Determining the duration of one collided reservation

First, we derive all pmfs necessary to specify the pmf of the duration of a collided reservation. We begin with the probability $\mathbb{P}(\Lambda(\gamma_i(x)) = \lambda)$ that at the start of the i -th reservation $\gamma_i(x)$ a simultaneous transmission of λ nodes takes place.

Lemma 3. For the system in stationary state and all $p_E \in [0, 1]$, $x \in \mathbb{N}$ and $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$, the probability distribution $\mathbb{P}(\Lambda(\gamma_i(x)) = \lambda)$ is stationary and described as

$$\mathbb{P}(\Lambda(\gamma_i(x)) = \lambda) = \sum_{n=1}^m P_N(n) \cdot \text{Bin}(V-1, \frac{p_E}{n}; \lambda-1). \quad (40)$$

Proof. For this proof, we define the number of nodes performing a reselection $V_R(\gamma_i(x))$ in the same frame $\gamma_i(x)$ as node v as

$$V_R(\gamma_i(x)) := \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq v}}^V \mathbb{1}_{D^j(\gamma_i(x)) \neq D^j(\gamma_i(x)-1)}. \quad (41)$$

Clearly, the probability distribution follows a binomial distribution described by

$$\mathbb{P}(V_R(\gamma_i(x)) = \bar{V}_R) = \text{Bin}(V-1, p_E; \bar{V}_R). \quad (42)$$

Further, according to the transmission rules in Sect. II-B, the probability distribution $\mathbb{P}(\Lambda(\gamma_i(x)) = \lambda \mid V_R(\gamma_i(x)) = \bar{V}_R, N(\xi_{i+1}(x)) = n)$ is also described by a binomial distribution as

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}(\Lambda(\gamma_i(x)) = \lambda \mid V_R(\gamma_i(x)) = \bar{V}_R, N(\xi_{i+1}(x)) = n) \\ &= \text{Bin}(\bar{V}_R, \frac{1}{n}; \lambda-1). \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Due to [28, chapter 2.1., first example], we can write

$$\mathbb{P}(\Lambda(\gamma_i(x)) = \lambda \mid N(\xi_{i+1}(x)) = n) = \text{Bin}(V-1, \frac{p_E}{n}; \lambda-1). \quad (44)$$

Thus, we can write $\mathbb{P}(\Lambda(\gamma_i(x)) = \lambda)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}(\Lambda(\gamma_i(x)) = \lambda) \\ &\stackrel{LTP}{=} \sum_{n=1}^m \mathbb{P}(N(\xi_{i+1}(x)) = n) \mathbb{P}(\Lambda(\gamma_i(x)) = \lambda \mid N(\xi_{i+1}(x)) = n) \\ &\stackrel{(26)}{=} \sum_{n=1}^m P_N(n) \mathbb{P}(\Lambda(\gamma_i(x)) = \lambda \mid N(\xi_{i+1}(x)) = n). \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (44) concludes the proof. \square

Knowing the state λ at the start of a reservation $\gamma_n(x)$, we can derive the transition probability $\mathbb{P}(\Lambda(x) \geq \lambda | B(x) = b)$ to a collision in frame x under the condition that the reservation started $b - 1$ frames ago, where the reservation duration $B(x)$ is defined as in (10).

Clearly, the probability that a node changes position from one frame to the next is given by

$$\mathbb{P}(D(x-1) \neq D(x)) = p_E. \quad (45)$$

Therefore, the distribution $\mathbb{P}(B(x) = b)$ is stationary.

Lemma 4. *For the system in stationary state and for all $b \in \{0, \dots, x\}$, with $x \in \mathbb{N}$, the probability distribution $\mathbb{P}(\Lambda(x) \geq 2 | B(x) = b)$ is described as*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\Lambda(x) \geq 2 | B(x) = b) \\ = 1 - \sum_{\lambda=1}^{V-1} \left(1 - (1 - p_E)^{b-1}\right)^\lambda \mathbb{P}(\Lambda(\gamma_1(x)) = \lambda) \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

Proof. For node $v, u \in \{1, \dots, V\}$ and $x \in \mathbb{N}$, we define the number of frames $R^v(x)$ in frame x until a new reservation starts for node u as

$$R^u(x) := \min\{r \in \mathbb{N} : D(x+r-1) \neq D(x+r)\}. \quad (47)$$

According to (45), the cdf of $R^u(x)$ can be described as

$$\mathbb{P}(R^u(x) < r) = 1 - (1 - p_E)^{r-1}. \quad (48)$$

Further, we use the set \mathcal{S}_x^v to denote all nodes transmitting in the same time slot in frame x as node v . It is defined as

$$\mathcal{S}_x^v := \{u \in \{1, \dots, V\} : u \neq v, D^u(x) = D^v(x)\}. \quad (49)$$

The set of all possible values of \mathcal{S}_x^v is denoted by α .

Finally, we can derive the probability for a collided transmission of node v in frame x given the number of ongoing transmissions $B(x) = b$ since the last reselection of node v (compare (10)).

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\Lambda(x) \geq 2 | B(x) = b) \\ \stackrel{(a)}{=} 1 - \mathbb{P}(\Lambda(x) = 1 | B(x) = b) \\ \stackrel{LTP}{=} 1 - \sum_{s \in \alpha} \mathbb{P}(\Lambda(x) = 1 | \mathcal{S}_x^v = s, B(x) = b) \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S}_x^v = s) \\ \stackrel{(b)}{=} 1 - \sum_{s \in \alpha} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S}_x^v = s) \prod_{u \in s} \mathbb{P}(R^u(\bar{x}) < b) \\ \stackrel{(48)}{=} 1 - \sum_{s \in \alpha} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S}_x^v = s) \prod_{u \in s} \left(1 - (1 - p_E)^{b-1}\right) \\ = 1 - \sum_{s \in \alpha} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S}_x^v = s) \left(1 - (1 - p_E)^{b-1}\right)^{|s|} \\ = 1 - \sum_{\lambda=0}^{V-1} \mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{S}_x^v| = \lambda) \left(1 - (1 - p_E)^{b-1}\right)^\lambda \\ \stackrel{(c)}{=} 1 - \sum_{\lambda=0}^{V-1} \mathbb{P}(\Lambda(\bar{x}) = \lambda + 1) \left(1 - (1 - p_E)^{b-1}\right)^\lambda \\ = 1 - \sum_{\lambda=1}^V \mathbb{P}(\Lambda(\bar{x}) = \lambda) \left(1 - (1 - p_E)^{b-1}\right)^{\lambda-1} \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{x} := \gamma_1(x)$ and (a) is because $\Lambda(x)$ can only take values in $\{1, \dots, V\}$. In (b), we leverage the information that, according to the transmission rules in Sect. II-B, only the nodes in \mathcal{S}_x^v can contribute to a collision in x . To determine the probability of a singleton transmission of node v in x we need to determine the probability that each node in \mathcal{S}_x^v has a reservation length below b . As the reservation length of each node is independent of all other nodes, we can write it as a product. For each node, the number of frames until the reservation ends is described by (47) and is independent of the reservation length of any other. (c) is due to the definition (5) and (49). \square

Lemma 5. *For all $x \in \mathbb{N}$ and $b \in \{1, \dots, x\}$ the distribution of $B(x)$ is described as*

$$\mathbb{P}(B(x) = b) = p_E (1 - p_E)^b. \quad (50)$$

Proof. This clearly follows from (10) and (45). \square

B. Combining the durations of multiple collided reservations

So far we have looked at the transition probability within a reservation. To derive the probability distribution of $C(x)$, we need to consider the transition between reservations. To facilitate this analysis, we introduce a simplifying assumption in Sect. IV-B.

Using this assumption, we approximate the probability distribution of the collision duration $\mathbb{P}(C(x) = c)$.

Lemma 6. *The probability distribution in stationary state that node v in frame x has been in collision for c frames can be approximated as*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(C(x) = c) \\ \approx \sum_{w=0}^x \mathbb{P}(\Lambda_w^\xi = 1) \underset{i=0}{*}^{w-1} \left(\mathbb{P}(\Lambda_i^\xi \geq 2 | B_i^\xi = \cdot) \mathbb{P}(B_i^\xi = \cdot) \right) (c), \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

using (27) and (28).

Proof. Using the definitions (27) and (28), let $x \in \mathbb{N}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}(C(x) = c) \\
& \stackrel{(36)}{=} \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{w=0}^{W(x)-1} B_w^\xi = c\right) \\
& \stackrel{(a)}{=} \sum_{w=0}^x \mathbb{P}(W(x) = w) \cdot \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=0}^{w-1} B_i^\xi = c | W(x) = w\right) \\
& \stackrel{(12)}{=} \sum_{w=0}^x \mathbb{P}(W(x) = w) \\
& \quad \cdot \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=0}^{w-1} B_i^\xi = c | \Lambda_0^\xi \geq 2, \dots, \Lambda_{w-1}^\xi \geq 2, \Lambda_w^\xi = 1\right) \\
& \stackrel{(b)}{=} \sum_{w=0}^x \mathbb{P}(W(x) = w) \\
& \quad \cdot \mathbb{P}\left(B_i^\xi = \cdot | \Lambda_0^\xi \geq 2, \dots, \Lambda_{w-1}^\xi \geq 2, \Lambda_w^\xi = 1\right) (c) \\
& \stackrel{(30)}{\approx} \sum_{w=0}^x \mathbb{P}(W(x) = w) \cdot \mathbb{P}\left(B_i^\xi = \cdot | \Lambda_i^\xi \geq 2\right) (c) \\
& \stackrel{(29)}{\approx} \sum_{w=0}^x \mathbb{P}(\Lambda_w^\xi = 1) \prod_{i=0}^{w-1} \mathbb{P}(\Lambda_i^\xi \geq 2) \\
& \quad \cdot \mathbb{P}\left(B_i^\xi = \cdot | \Lambda_i^\xi \geq 2\right) (c) \\
& = \sum_{w=0}^x \mathbb{P}(\Lambda_w^\xi = 1) \cdot \mathbb{P}\left(B_i^\xi = \cdot, \Lambda_i^\xi \geq 2\right) (c) \\
& = \sum_{w=0}^x \mathbb{P}(\Lambda_w^\xi = 1) \mathbb{P}\left(\Lambda_i^\xi \geq 2 | B_i^\xi = \cdot\right) \mathbb{P}\left(B_i^\xi = \cdot\right) (c)
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) is due to the law of total probability, (b) is due to the fact that the summands each refer to reservation durations of different reservations (11), so they are independent of each other (10) under the specified condition and a convolution is possible. \square

C. The influence of the time of transmission on the AoI

In the following lemma, we derive the distribution of $D(x)$.

Lemma 7. *For the system in stationary state, the probability distribution of $D(x)$ is described as*

$$\mathbb{P}(D(x) = d) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{m} & 0 \leq d \leq m-1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (52)$$

and hence

$$\mathbb{P}(D(x) < d) = \begin{cases} 0 & d < 0 \\ \frac{d}{m} & 0 \leq d \leq m-1 \\ 1 & d > m-1. \end{cases} \quad (53)$$

Proof. From (24) and (25), it is clear that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}\left(\underline{D}(x+1) = (d^1, \dots, d^V) | \underline{D}(x) = (c^1, \dots, c^V)\right) \\
& = \mathbb{P}\left(\underline{D}(x+1) = (d_\pi^1, \dots, d_\pi^V) | \underline{D}(x) = (c_\pi^1, \dots, c_\pi^V)\right)
\end{aligned}$$

for every permutation π on $\{0, \dots, m-1\}$ with $\tau_\pi := \pi(\tau)$. Since $\underline{D}(x)$ has a unique equilibrium by Lemma 1, this implies

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\underline{D}(x) = (c^1, \dots, c^V)\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\underline{D}(x) = (c_\pi^1, \dots, c_\pi^V)\right) \quad (54)$$

whenever the system is in its stationary state. Now let $c, d \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$ be arbitrary and π be the transposition of c and d , i.e.,

$$\pi(\tau) := \begin{cases} c, & \tau = d \\ d, & \tau = c \\ \tau, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then by the definition of $D(x)$ with

$$c_{-v} = (c^1, \dots, c^{v-1}, c^{v+1}, \dots, c^V)$$

and $\mathcal{V} := \{1, \dots, m-1\}^{V-1}$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}(D(x) = c) \\
& = \sum_{c_{-v} \in \mathcal{V}} \mathbb{P}\left(\underline{D}(x) = (c^1, \dots, c^{v-1}, c, c^{v+1}, c^V)\right) \\
& \stackrel{(54)}{=} \sum_{c_{-v} \in \mathcal{V}} \mathbb{P}\left(\underline{D}(x) = (c_\pi^1, \dots, c_\pi^{v-1}, d, c_\pi^{v+1}, c_\pi^V)\right) \\
& \stackrel{(a)}{=} \sum_{c_{-v} \in \mathcal{V}} \mathbb{P}\left(\underline{D}(x) = (c^1, \dots, c^{v-1}, d, c^{v+1}, c^V)\right) \\
& = \mathbb{P}(D(x) = d)
\end{aligned}$$

where step (a) is by reordering the summands. Since this holds for all $c, d \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$, we can conclude that $D(x)$ is uniformly distributed, which proves the lemma. \square

Taking into account the case distinction in (6), we can finally specify the pmf of the AoI.

Proof of Theorem 2. (16) is clear by (6). For (15), the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}(\Delta(t) = \delta) \\
& \stackrel{\text{LTP}}{=} \mathbb{P}(D(k(t)) < \tau(t)) \mathbb{P}(\Delta(t) = \delta | D(k(t)) < \tau(t)) \\
& \quad + \mathbb{P}(D(k(t)) \geq \tau(t)) \mathbb{P}(\Delta(t) = \delta | D(k(t)) \geq \tau(t)) \\
& \stackrel{(53)}{=} \frac{\tau(t)}{m} \mathbb{P}(\Delta(t) = \delta | D(k(t)) < \tau(t)) \\
& \quad + \frac{m - \tau(t)}{m} \mathbb{P}(\Delta(t) = \delta | D(k(t)) \geq \tau(t)) \\
& \stackrel{(a)}{=} \frac{\tau(t)}{m} \mathbb{P}(C(k(t) - 1) = k(\delta) - 1) \\
& \quad + \frac{m - \tau(t)}{m} \mathbb{P}(C(k(t)) = k(\delta)),
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) is due to the case distinction in (6) and $\tau(t) = \tau(\delta)$. Further, using (51), we can write $\mathbb{P}(C(x) = c)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(C(x) = c) & \stackrel{(51)}{\approx} \sum_{w=0}^x \mathbb{P}(\Lambda_w^\xi = 1) \star_{i=0}^{w-1} \left(\mathbb{P}(\Lambda_i^\xi \geq 2|B_i^\xi = \cdot) \mathbb{P}(B_i^\xi = \cdot) \right) (c) \\ & \stackrel{(a)}{=} \sum_{w=0}^x \sum_{b=0}^x \mathbb{P}(B_i^\xi = b) \cdot \left(1 - \mathbb{P}(\Lambda_i^\xi \geq 2|B_i^\xi = b) \right) \\ & \quad \cdot \star_{i=0}^{w-1} \left(\mathbb{P}(\Lambda_i^\xi \geq 2|B_i^\xi = \cdot) \mathbb{P}(B_i^\xi = \cdot) \right) (c) \\ & = \sum_{w=0}^x \sum_{b=0}^x \left(\mathbb{P}(B_i^\xi = b) - \mathbb{P}(B_i^\xi = b) \mathbb{P}(\Lambda_i^\xi \geq 2|B_i^\xi = b) \right) \\ & \quad \cdot \star_{i=0}^{w-1} \left(\mathbb{P}(\Lambda_i^\xi \geq 2|B_i^\xi = \cdot) \mathbb{P}(B_i^\xi = \cdot) \right) (c), \end{aligned}$$

where (a) is due to the law of total probability.

For large x , the summations over w and b are dominated by the first few summands, so we approximate them by summations that only go up to \bar{w} , respectively \bar{b} . This allows us to approximate

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(C(x) = c) & \approx \sum_{w=0}^{\bar{w}} \sum_{b=0}^{\bar{b}} \left(\mathbb{P}(B_i^\xi = b) - \mathbb{P}(B_i^\xi = b) \mathbb{P}(\Lambda_i^\xi \geq 2|B_i^\xi = b) \right), \\ & \quad \cdot \star_{i=0}^{w-1} \left(\mathbb{P}(\Lambda_i^\xi \geq 2|B_i^\xi = \cdot) \mathbb{P}(B_i^\xi = \cdot) \right) (c) \end{aligned}$$

independently of x . Finally, substituting $\mathbb{P}(B_i^\xi = b)$ with (50) and $\mathbb{P}(\Lambda_i^\xi \geq 2|B_i^\xi = b)$ with (46) and (40) respectively, it is clear that

$$\mathbb{P}(\Lambda_i^\xi \geq 2|B_i^\xi = b) \cdot \mathbb{P}(B_i^\xi = b) = p(b)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(C(x) = c) \approx q(c),$$

which concludes the proof. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] E. Uysal, O. Kaya, A. Ephremides, J. Gross, M. Codreanu, P. Popovski, M. Assaad, G. Liva, A. Munari, B. Soret, T. Soleymani, and K. H. Johansson, "Semantic communications in networked systems: A data significance perspective," *IEEE Network*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 233–240, 2022.
- [2] M. Kountouris and N. Pappas, "Semantics-empowered communication for networked intelligent systems," *IEEE Communications Magazine*, vol. 59, no. 6, pp. 96–102, 2021.
- [3] S. Kaul, M. Gruteser, V. Rai, and J. Kenney, "Minimizing age of information in vehicular networks," in *2011 8th Annual IEEE Communications Society Conference on Sensor, Mesh and Ad Hoc Communications and Networks*, 2011, pp. 350–358.
- [4] R. D. Yates, Y. Sun, D. R. Brown, S. K. Kaul, E. Modiano, and S. Ulukus, "Age of information: An introduction and survey," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 39, no. 5, pp. 1183–1210, 2021.
- [5] A. Vinel, L. Lan, and N. Lyamin, "Vehicle-to-vehicle communication in c-acc/platooning scenarios," *IEEE Communications Magazine*, vol. 53, no. 8, pp. 192–197, 2015.
- [6] N. Lyamin, B. Bellalta, and A. Vinel, "Age-of-information-aware decentralized congestion control in vanets," *IEEE Networking Letters*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 33–37, 2020.
- [7] Z. Utkovski, A. Munari, G. Caire, J. Dommel, P.-H. Lin, M. Franke, A. C. Drummond, and S. Stańczak, "Semantic communication for edge intelligence: Theoretical foundations and implications on protocols," *IEEE Internet of Things Magazine*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 48–53, 2023.
- [8] P. Popovski, O. Simeone, F. Boccardi, D. Gündüz, and O. Sahin, "Semantic-Effectiveness Filtering and Control for Post-5g Wireless Connectivity," *Journal of the Indian Institute of Science*, vol. 100, no. 2, pp. 435–443, Apr. 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://link.springer.com/10.1007/s41745-020-00165-6>
- [9] R. D. Yates and S. K. Kaul, "The age of information: Real-time status updating by multiple sources," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 65, no. 3, pp. 1807–1827, 2019.
- [10] —, "Status updates over unreliable multiaccess channels," *2017 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pp. 331–335, 2017.
- [11] R. Talak, S. Karaman, and E. Modiano, "Distributed scheduling algorithms for optimizing information freshness in wireless networks," in *2018 IEEE 19th International Workshop on Signal Processing Advances in Wireless Communications (SPAWC)*, 2018, pp. 1–5.
- [12] O. T. Yavascan and E. Uysal, "Analysis of slotted aloha with an age threshold," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 39, no. 5, pp. 1456–1470, 2021.
- [13] A. Baiocchi, I. Turcanu, and A. Vinel, "Age of information in csma-based networks with bursty update traffic," *IEEE Access*, vol. 10, pp. 44 088–44 105, 2022.
- [14] A. Baiocchi and I. Turcanu, "A model for the optimization of beacon message age-of-information in a vanet," in *2017 29th International Teletraffic Congress (ITC 29)*, vol. 1, 2017, pp. 108–116.
- [15] A. Munari, "Modern random access: An age of information perspective on irregular repetition slotted aloha," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 69, no. 6, pp. 3572–3585, 2021.
- [16] M. Bezmenov, A. Munari, Z. Utkovski, and S. Stanczak, "Age of information for v2x: Irregular repetition slotted aloha and semi-persistent scheduling," in *2024 IEEE International Conference on Communications*, 2024.
- [17] L. Cao, H. Yin, R. Wei, and L. Zhang, "Optimize semi-persistent scheduling in nr-v2x: An age-of-information perspective," in *2022 IEEE Wireless Communications and Networking Conference (WCNC)*, 2022, pp. 2053–2058.
- [18] A. Rolich, I. Turcanu, A. Vinel, and A. Baiocchi, "Impact of persistence on the age of information in 5g nr-v2x sidelink communications," in *2023 21st Mediterranean Communication and Computer Networking Conference (MedComNet)*, 2023, pp. 15–24.
- [19] M. Berioli, G. Cocco, G. Liva, and A. Munari, *Modern Random Access Protocols*, 2016.
- [20] G. Liva, "Graph-based analysis and optimization of contention resolution diversity slotted aloha," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 59, no. 2, pp. 477–487, 2011.
- [21] 3GPP, "5G; NR; Medium Access Control (MAC) protocol specification," 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP), Technical Specification (TS) 38.321, Jan. 2023, version 17.3.0.
- [22] M. H. C. Garcia, A. Molina-Galan, M. Boban, J. Gozalvez, B. Coll-Perales, T. Şahin, and A. Kousaridas, "A tutorial on 5g nr v2x communications," *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 1972–2026, 2021.
- [23] M. Bezmenov, Z. Utkovski, K. Sambale, and S. Stanczak, "Semi-persistent scheduling with single shot transmissions for aperiodic traffic," in *2021 IEEE 93rd Vehicular Technology Conference (VTC2021-Spring)*, 2021, pp. 1–7.
- [24] M. Gonzalez-Martin, M. Sepulcre, R. Molina-Masegosa, and J. Gozalvez, "Analytical Models of the Performance of C-V2X Mode 4 Vehicular Communications," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 68, no. 2, pp. 1155–1166, Feb. 2019.
- [25] R. Molina-Masegosa, J. Gozalvez, and M. Sepulcre, "Comparison of iee 802.11p and lte-v2x: An evaluation with periodic and aperiodic messages of constant and variable size," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 121 526–121 548, 2020.
- [26] M. Bezmenov, Z. Utkovski, M. Kasparick, K. Sambale, and S. Stanczak, "A probabilistic model of the age of information for distributed periodic reservations in sidelink," in *2022 IEEE Wireless Communications and Networking Conference (WCNC)*, 2022, pp. 2530–2535.

- [27] 3GPP, “5G; NR; Physical layer procedures for data,” 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP), Technical Specification (TS) 36.213, Apr. 2023, version 17.5.0.
- [28] M. A. Pinsky and S. Karlin, “2 - conditional probability and conditional expectation,” in *An Introduction to Stochastic Modeling (Fourth Edition)*, fourth edition ed., M. A. Pinsky and S. Karlin, Eds. Boston: Academic Press, 2011, pp. 47–78. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780123814166000022>