

Reliability Modeling for Beyond-5G Mission Critical Networks Using Effective Capacity

Anudeep Karnam, Jobish John, Kishor C. Joshi, George Exarchakos, Sonia Heemstra de Groot, Ignas Niemegeers
Center for Wireless Technology Eindhoven, Eindhoven University of Technology, The Netherlands

Abstract—Accurate reliability modeling for ultra-reliable low latency communication (URLLC) and hyper-reliable low latency communication (HURLLC) networks is challenging due to the complex interactions between network layers required to meet stringent requirements. In this paper, we propose such a model. We consider the acknowledged mode of the radio link control (RLC) layer, utilizing separate buffers for transmissions and re-transmissions, along with the behavior of physical channels. Our approach leverages the effective capacity (EC) framework, which quantifies the maximum constant arrival rate a time-varying wireless channel can support while meeting statistical quality of service (QoS) constraints. We derive a reliability model that incorporates delay violations, various latency components, and multiple transmission attempts. Our method identifies optimal operating conditions that satisfy URLLC/HURLLC constraints while maintaining near-optimal EC, ensuring the system can handle peak traffic with a guaranteed QoS. Our model reveals critical trade-offs between EC and reliability across various use cases, providing guidance for URLLC/HURLLC network design for service providers and system designers.

Index Terms—Ultra-low latency, Ultra-high reliability, Effective capacity, Delay exponent

I. INTRODUCTION

Beyond-5G/6G networks are expected to support a wide variety of applications in different verticals by offering diverse services, including URLLC/HURLLC [1]. These services are essential for emerging applications that demand high reliability and deterministic wireless data transmissions, such as industrial automation, intelligent transportation systems, holographic telepresence, and tele-surgery [2]. Achieving extreme reliability with ultra-low latency, presents significant challenges across multiple layers of the mobile network stack and calls for a highly optimised network design, accounting for the interactions between them [3].

Physical channels are crucial in enabling mission-critical applications since they deal with several environment-dependent factors such as propagation losses, multi-path and fading effects [4]. The medium access control (MAC) layer challenges include real-time resource allocations, specifically, scheduling packets from multiple radio link control (RLC) queues based on channel conditions, which can introduce variability in latency [5]. Addressing these challenges requires a reliability model that accounts for multi-layer interactions within the mobile network stack. We propose such a model that unifies

the 5G link (RLC and MAC) and physical (PHY) layers, to aid URLLC network design for mission-critical applications.

In [6], the authors provide an overview of statistical tools, including tail distribution approximations, queuing and extreme value theory, and data-driven approaches highlighting their relevance to URLLC network design. One such statistical tool is the effective capacity (EC) [7], the dual of effective bandwidth [8], which quantifies the maximum constant arrival rate a communication system can support while satisfying quality of service (QoS) requirements. The authors in [9] optimize EC by jointly adapting power and datarate while satisfying packet error rate (PER) and delay constraints. However, they do not account for automatic repeat request (ARQ) or hybrid ARQ (HARQ) mechanisms. In contrast, [10] incorporates HARQ in the EC model, revealing that retransmission overhead at high signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) can reduce EC, especially when using adaptive modulation and coding (AMC). The authors in [11] introduce mission effective capacity (MEC) and mission reliability (MR) metrics specifically for URLLC in industrial internet of things (IIoT), providing closed-form expressions for MR and mean time to first failure (MTTFF) utilizing the EC framework. [12] utilizes EC to analyze delay-sensitive systems and propose joint data rate and power allocation schemes that maximize EC.

However, existing works focus on models that consider only the unacknowledged mode (UM) of the RLC layer. This is a significant limitation because UM does not support ARQ retransmissions, whereas acknowledged mode (AM) allows feedback-based retransmissions, which are critical to meet strict reliability requirements. Existing reliability models do not account for separate physical channels for control and user plane information while accounting for unified link and physical layer characteristics in the reliability model. This is important since control plane information uses more robust modulation and coding schemes, resulting in Correct decoding of downlink control information (DCI) that leads to accurate decoding of user plane information. The major contributions of this paper are:

- 1) We extend the EC framework to a dual-buffer 5G RLC AM, deriving EC formulations for transmission (TX) and retransmission (RETX) buffers.
- 2) We develop a reliability framework that considers multiple transmission attempts, both user and control plane transmissions while accounting for deterministic and stochastic delays.

- 3) We quantify a specific range of operating conditions that satisfy URLLC constraints while ensuring EC remains close to its peak value, enabling the system to handle maximum arrival traffic while meeting QoS constraints.
- 4) We provide practical insights into optimizing URLLC network performance by analyzing the trade-offs between EC and reliability across different use cases.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Sec. II outlines the system model and problem formulation. Sec. III presents the proposed reliability framework. Sec. IV presents the delay analysis. Sec. V discusses the EC-reliability trade-offs. Sec. VI presents the results that demonstrate the optimal range of operating conditions and provide key insights for URLLC network design. Finally, Sec. VII concludes the paper.

II. SYSTEM MODEL AND PROBLEM FORMULATION

A. System Model

We consider a system model comprising a single gNB and UE, focusing on the downlink scenario¹. Our analysis focuses on a single QoS flow at the RLC layer, utilizing AM, leveraging ARQ retransmissions to meet the URLLC requirements. In AM mode, each QoS flow has a dedicated TX buffer and RETX buffer. Once the packets arrive at the RLC layer, they are first stored in the TX buffer, undergo RLC procedures [13] and are sent to the RETX buffer before forwarding to the MAC layer. After MAC and PHY layer processing, packets are transmitted over the air interface through physical channels; physical downlink share channel (PDSCH) for user/shared data transmissions, and physical downlink control channel (PDCCH) for downlink control information.

Once UE receives a downlink packet, it decodes DCI, which is further used to decode the user data on the PDSCH channel. Following this decoding process, UE sends an acknowledgement (ACK) or no-acknowledgement (NACK) to gNB through physical uplink control channel (PUCCH). When the gNB does not receive a timely acknowledgement, it initiates a retransmission after a predefined timeout interval $\mathcal{D}_{\text{timeout}}$. Fig. 1a shows the PHY layer interactions between the gNB and UE, highlighting the control/data flows, and retransmissions triggered by NACK or timeout.

B. System Assumptions

- 1) *Retransmissions within the coherence time*: Retransmissions occur within the coherence time, ensuring static channel conditions. Coherence time T_C in seconds, can be approximated using the formula given in [14], $T_C \approx \sqrt{\frac{9}{16\pi} \frac{c}{v f_c}}$, where c is the velocity of light, v is the relative velocity between the transmitter and receiver, and f_c is the carrier frequency. For low-mobility applications with constant speed of $v = 3m/s$ and $f_c = 2.4GHz$, the coherence time is approximately $T_C = 17.6ms$. In high-mobility cases the coherence time significantly

¹The methodology can be applied to uplink transmissions by replacing the respective successful transmission probabilities, as per the chosen uplink transmission scheme—whether grant-free or scheduling request-based.




Fig. 1. System model and the exponential approximation of tail regions.

reduces, making the assumption less applicable. While the assumption is reasonable for URLLC scenarios with limited mobility, high-mobility environments may require additional modeling to account for Doppler effects and rapid channel variations.

- 2) *Excludes soft-combining*: We focus on ARQ mechanisms at the RLC layer and excludes lower layer soft-combining techniques. This simplification avoids the complexity of combining procedures and provides a conservative reliability estimate, acknowledging a slight underestimation compared to real-world scenarios.

C. Problem Formulation

We utilize the large deviations principle (LDP) [15] to characterize the probability of rare events in any probability density function (PDF). The tail behavior of any PDF of a random variable (RV) X exceeding a given threshold x , can be approximated as $P(X > x) \approx e^{-\theta x}$, where θ is the decay rate as shown in Fig. 1b, the area under the curve defined by $P(X > x)$ quantifies the violation probability. A larger θ corresponds to a steeper decay (shown in red), indicating a smaller area and lower violation probability, while a smaller θ implies a slower decay (shown in blue), resulting in higher violation probability.

In delay-sensitive communications, θ corresponds to the delay exponent, where higher values of θ represent a system with stricter delay constraints, and lower values indicate a system with longer delay tolerance. We derive EC and reliability, denoted as $R(\theta, N)$ as functions of θ , and number of transmission attempts N . To ensure that the system can handle peak arrival traffic, meeting the QoS constraints such as reliability and latency requirements, we define an optimization problem as the maximization of $EC(\theta, N)$ subject to the constraint that $R(\theta, N)$ exceeds a threshold R_{th} as given in (1).

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{\theta} EC(\theta, N) \\ & \text{s.t. } R(\theta, N) \geq R_{\text{th}}. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

III. PROPOSED RELIABILITY FRAMEWORK

Our reliability framework captures physical channel transmissions and retransmissions due to timeouts/NACK, while accounting for delay violations. The delay violation probability

(DVP) is defined as the likelihood that the total delay \mathcal{D} (from the RLC ingress at the gNB to the RLC egress at the UE), which includes both stochastic and deterministic delays \mathcal{D}_{det} , exceeds a specified bound \mathcal{D}_{max} that is application dependent. If the queuing delay remains below $\mathcal{D}_{\text{max}} - \mathcal{D}_{\text{det}}$, the total latency \mathcal{D} is within acceptable bound \mathcal{D}_{max} which is used in our reliability formulations.

To formulate the reliability model for N transmission attempts, we analyze the reliability for $N = 1, 2$, denoted as $R(N = 1)$, and $R(N = 2)$ respectively, followed by extending it to a generic model, denoted by $R(N)$. Let the probability of successful transmissions for PDCCH, PDSCH, and PUCCH be p_1, p_2 , and p_3 , respectively. The probability that a packet is successfully decoded in the first attempt, $P(N = 1)$, is given by $p_1 \times p_2$. Considering only processing delays at the UE and gNB, since no timeouts or feedback delays are involved when $N = 1$, DVP can be captured as $P(\mathcal{D} > \mathcal{D}_{\text{max}} - \mathcal{D}_{\text{det}})$ and hence,

$$R(N = 1) = (1 - P(\mathcal{D} > \mathcal{D}_{\text{max}} - \mathcal{D}_{\text{det}})) \times P(N = 1) \quad (2)$$

Multiple transmission scenarios can arise either due to a timeout event or the reception of a NACK. A timeout triggered retransmission event occurs if; (1) PDCCH fails, leading to no feedback; or (2) PDCCH succeeds, PDSCH fails, and NACK is lost. Thus the probability of timeout is $P(\text{timeout}) = (1 - p_1) + p_1(1 - p_2)(1 - p_3)$. Retransmission due to NACK occurs, when PDCCH is successfully decoded, but PDSCH data decoding fails, and the gNB receives a NACK. This probability is given by $P(\text{feed}) = p_1(1 - p_2)p_3$. The DVPs for the second transmission attempt, triggered by either timeout or NACK are $P(\mathcal{D} > \mathcal{D}_{\text{max}} - 2\mathcal{D}_{\text{det}} - \mathcal{D}_{\text{timeout}})$ and $P(\mathcal{D} > \mathcal{D}_{\text{max}} - 2\mathcal{D}_{\text{det}} - \mathcal{D}_{\text{feed}})$ respectively, where $\mathcal{D}_{\text{feed}}$ is the feedback delay. The overall reliability for $N = 2$ is:

$$\begin{aligned} R(N = 2) = & R(N = 1) + \\ & (1 - P(\mathcal{D} > \mathcal{D}_{\text{max}} - 2\mathcal{D}_{\text{det}} - \mathcal{D}_{\text{timeout}})) P(\text{timeout}) \cdot p_1 p_2 \\ & + (1 - P(\mathcal{D} > \mathcal{D}_{\text{max}} - 2\mathcal{D}_{\text{det}} - \mathcal{D}_{\text{feed}})) P(\text{feed}) \cdot p_1 p_2 \quad (3) \end{aligned}$$

We extend the above approach used to obtain (2) and (3) by considering the cumulative effects of both NACK feedback and timeout triggered multiple transmission attempts. The total deterministic delay, \mathcal{D}_{det} , increases linearly with the number of transmission attempts, and the delays due to feedback and timeout events also finds its position in the reliability model. For the N^{th} transmission attempt, we consider all the possible combinations of feedback and timeout events that could occur during the previous transmission attempts. We use the binomial coefficient $\binom{N-1}{k}$ to represent the number of ways k timeout events and $N - 1 - k$ feedback events can occur. Each term in the summation (refer (4)) corresponds to the probability of having exactly k timeouts and $N - 1 - k$ feedback events, along with their respective delay contributions. Thus the precise reliability model that accommodates N

transmission attempts incorporating latency constraints, NACK feedback and timeout-triggered transmissions, is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} R(N) = & R(N - 1) + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \left[\left(1 - P(\mathcal{D} > \mathcal{D}_{\text{max}} - N\mathcal{D}_{\text{det}} \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. - k\mathcal{D}_{\text{timeout}} - (N - 1 - k)\mathcal{D}_{\text{feed}} \right) \right] \\ & \times \binom{N-1}{k} P(\text{feed})^{N-1-k} P(\text{timeout})^k \times p_1 p_2 \quad (4) \end{aligned}$$

IV. DELAYS AND DELAY VIOLATIONS

This section analyses user plane latency, which includes deterministic and stochastic delays as shown in Fig. 2.

A. Deterministic Delays

1) *Processing Delays*: Processing delays occur at both gNB and UE due to tasks such as encoding, modulation, equalizing, and decoding [16]. The processing delay at the gNB, assumed constant for both transmission and retransmissions, is denoted as \mathcal{D}_{gNB} while the processing delay at the UE, from reception to the ACK/NACK decision, is denoted as \mathcal{D}_{UE} .

2) *Feedback and Timeout Delays*: Feedback delay ($\mathcal{D}_{\text{feed}}$) includes the transmission time of feedback from the UE to the gNB and the processing time at the gNB to interpret it. Timeout delay ($\mathcal{D}_{\text{timeout}}$) occurs when the gNB does not receive an ACK/NACK within the expected time, including the waiting period before confirming feedback failure. For URLLC/HURLLC applications, typically, propagation distances are small. Hence, we do not account propagation delays in our analysis.

3) *Transmission Delays in the Finite Blocklength Regime*: To model the time and frequency resources required for URLLC in the short blocklength regime, we use the normal approximation from [17] given by (5), as Shannon's limit is not suitable for URLLC's shorter blocks. In this regime, with r channel uses (Hz·s) and L information bits, the achievable channel service rate S is $S = L/r$ (bits per channel use (bpcu) or bits/Hz/s). For an AWGN channel with decoding error probability ϵ , SNR, and L bits in r channel uses, the achievable rate is:

$$S = \frac{L}{r} \approx C - Q^{-1}(\epsilon) \sqrt{\frac{V}{r}} \quad (5)$$

where $C = \log_2(1 + \text{SNR})$ is the Shannon capacity limit, $V = (\log_2 e)^2 \left(1 - \frac{1}{(1 + \text{SNR})^2}\right)$ is the channel dispersion, and $Q^{-1}(\cdot)$ is the inverse Q-function. Using (5), the number of channel uses r needed to transmit L bits with decoding error probability ϵ can be approximated as:

$$r \approx \frac{L}{C} + \frac{(Q^{-1}(\epsilon))^2 V}{2(C)^2} \left(1 + \sqrt{1 + \frac{4LC}{V(Q^{-1}(\epsilon))^2}}\right) \quad (6)$$

Let B be the bandwidth allocated to the UE and T be the corresponding time resources. Then, r can be calculated as $r = B \times T$. Assuming fixed bandwidth B , the transmission time T needed to transmit L bits are given by $T = \frac{r}{B}$. This T




Fig. 2. Delay components between gNB and UE

is deterministic under constant SNR assumption, which holds in high coherence time scenarios typical of URLLC with low mobility. The total deterministic latency, \mathcal{D}_{Det} , accounts for multiple transmissions, including processing, feedback, and timeout delays. For N transmission attempts with a_1 feedback events and a_2 timeout events, the total deterministic delay is:

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{Det}} = N(\mathcal{D}_{\text{gNB}} + \mathcal{D}_{\text{UE}} + T) + a_1 \mathcal{D}_{\text{feed}} + a_2 \mathcal{D}_{\text{timeout}} \quad (7)$$

B. Stochastic delay analysis in 5G RLC buffers

Here we discuss the dynamics of TX and RETX buffers and establish conditions that prevent indefinite queue growth, which leads to excessive delays. We also derive the EC for these buffers, and provide the queuing DVP by leveraging LDP. The queue dynamics of TX buffer can be captured as:

$$Q_{\text{TX}}(t) = Q_{\text{TX}}(0) + A_{\text{TX}}(t) - S_{\text{TX}}(t) \quad (8)$$

where $A_{\text{TX}}(t)$ and $S_{\text{TX}}(t)$ denote the packet arrival and service process, respectively, and $Q_{\text{TX}}(t)$ represents queue length at time t . Stability is achieved if $A_{\text{TX}}(t)$ and $S_{\text{TX}}(t)$ are stationary and ergodic [7] with average arrival rate λ_{TX} , less than average service rate μ_{TX} , preventing indefinite queue growth. Similarly, the queue dynamics for the RETX buffer is given by:

$$Q_{\text{RETX}}(t) = Q_{\text{RETX}}(0) + A_{\text{TX}}(t) - S_{\text{RETX}}(t) \quad (9)$$

Since all packets arrive at RETX buffer in the RLC AM mode, we have $\lambda_{\text{RETX}} = \lambda_{\text{TX}}$. Packets are removed from the RETX buffer upon ACK reception (denoted by the event $\mathcal{E}(\text{ACK})$), or when the retransmission limit is reached (N_{max}), or if delay constraint \mathcal{D}_{max} is violated. If NACK is received, packets are scheduled for retransmission. Thus, the effective service rate of the RETX buffer considering multiple attempts is given by: $\mu_{\text{RETX}} = \alpha \cdot \mathbb{E}[S_{\text{RETX}}(t)]$ where, $\alpha = P(\mathcal{E}(\text{ACK}) \cup N = N_{\text{max}} \cup \mathcal{D} > \mathcal{D}_{\text{max}})$. The stability of the RETX buffer requires that the rate at which packets are retained due to NACKs does not exceed the effective service rate; $\lambda_{\text{RETX}} < \mu_{\text{RETX}}$ ensuring that the buffer maintains a bounded queue length over time. In 5G RLC, the TX and RETX buffers form a unified system, and θ serves as a delay exponent that captures the effect of packet transmissions from both the TX and RETX buffers.

1) *EC for TX Buffer*: The EC is defined as $EC(\theta) = -\frac{1}{\theta} \log \mathbb{E}[e^{-\theta S}]$ [7], where S is the cumulative service rate given in (5). For the TX buffer, the service process depends on two outcomes. First, with probability $p_1 p_2$, representing the successful decoding of both control and user plane data, the service rate is S . Alternatively, if transmission fails with probability $1 - p_1 p_2$, the service rate is zero. Thus, the expected value of the moment generating function (MGF) is $\mathbb{E}[e^{-\theta S}] = (1 - p_1 p_2) + p_1 p_2 e^{-\theta S}$. Therefore, the EC for TX Buffer can be represented as:

$$EC(\theta, N = 1) = -\frac{1}{\theta} \log [(1 - p_1 p_2) + p_1 p_2 e^{-\theta S}] \quad (10)$$

2) *EC for RETX Buffer*: The RETX buffer EC formulation captures the impact of retransmissions as shown in (12). The MGF of the service process depends on each transmission attempt's success. Unlike the TX buffer, if a packet fails in its first transmission attempt, it is retransmitted until it succeeds or reaches the maximum number of allowed transmission attempts. Thus, the summation term in (12) represents the cumulative contribution of the service process over all N retransmission attempts. The term $(1 - p_1 p_2)^N$ captures the scenario where the packet has undergone N attempts and is discarded after reaching the maximum transmission limit without success. Therefore, the expected value of the MGF over N transmission attempts is:

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{-\theta S_{\text{RETX}}}] = (1 - p_1 p_2)^N + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (1 - p_1 p_2)^k p_1 p_2 e^{-\theta(N-k)S} \quad (11)$$

The EC for the RETX buffer is given by:

$$EC(\theta, N) = -\frac{1}{N\theta} \log \left[(1 - p_1 p_2)^N + p_1 p_2 e^{-\theta S} + \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} (1 - p_1 p_2)^k p_1 p_2 e^{-\theta(N-k)S} \right] \quad (12)$$

3) *Queueing Delay Violation Probability*: The DVP is crucial in determining whether the total system delay \mathcal{D} exceeds the maximum allowable delay \mathcal{D}_{max} . Using the LDP, the queueing DVP can be approximated as $P(\mathcal{D} > \mathcal{D}_{\text{max}}) \approx \eta e^{-\theta S}$ [7], where η is the probability of the buffer being non-empty, ≈ 1 [12]. To extend this model for multiple transmission attempts and incorporate deterministic delays, we refine the DVP expression using the total deterministic delay \mathcal{D}_{det} derived in (7). For the total latency \mathcal{D} to remain within acceptable bounds \mathcal{D}_{max} , the queueing delay must satisfy $\mathcal{D}_{\text{stoch}} < \mathcal{D}_{\text{max}} - \mathcal{D}_{\text{det}}$. Thus, the refined DVP accounting for both stochastic delays and deterministic delays is:

$$P(\mathcal{D} > \mathcal{D}_{\text{max}} - \mathcal{D}_{\text{det}}) \approx e^{-\theta(\mathcal{D}_{\text{max}} - \mathcal{D}_{\text{det}})}, \quad (13)$$

V. EFFECTIVE CAPACITY-RELIABILITY TRADEOFF

We aim to solve the optimization problem formulated in (1), to outline the trade-off between EC and reliability.

We aim to maximize $EC(\theta, N)$ (1), to outline the trade-off between EC and reliability. We consider $h(\theta) = \log(g(\theta))$,

where $g(\theta)$ is the expression within the logarithm in (12) and examine the nature of $h(\theta)$ by computing its second derivative, given as: $h''(\theta) = \frac{g''(\theta)g(\theta) - (g'(\theta))^2}{(g(\theta))^2}$. Applying Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we obtain $(g'(\theta))^2 \leq g''(\theta)g(\theta)$, confirming that $h''(\theta) \geq 0$, hence $h(\theta) = \log(g(\theta))$ is convex.

To maximize $\text{EC}(\theta)$, it is essential that the function is concave. We consider $\Phi(\theta) = -N \cdot \text{EC}(\theta, N) = \frac{h(\theta)}{\theta}$, where $h(\theta)$ is convex. To prove $\Phi(\theta)$ is concave, we verify that for any $\theta_1, \theta_2 > 0$ and $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, the following inequality holds:

$$\Phi(\lambda\theta_1 + (1-\lambda)\theta_2) \leq \lambda\Phi(\theta_1) + (1-\lambda)\Phi(\theta_2) \quad (14)$$

Since $\Phi(\theta) = \frac{h(\theta)}{\theta}$ and $h(\theta)$ is convex, we employ Jensen's inequality to $h(\theta)$ and dividing both sides by $\lambda\theta_1 + (1-\lambda)\theta_2$,

$$\frac{h(\lambda\theta_1 + (1-\lambda)\theta_2)}{\lambda\theta_1 + (1-\lambda)\theta_2} \leq \frac{\lambda h(\theta_1) + (1-\lambda)h(\theta_2)}{\lambda\theta_1 + (1-\lambda)\theta_2}. \quad (15)$$

Using the property that the weighted average of fractions is less than or equal to the fraction of weighted averages,

$$\frac{\lambda h(\theta_1) + (1-\lambda)h(\theta_2)}{\lambda\theta_1 + (1-\lambda)\theta_2} \leq \lambda \frac{h(\theta_1)}{\theta_1} + (1-\lambda) \frac{h(\theta_2)}{\theta_2}. \quad (16)$$

This inequality proves that Φ is concave in θ and hence $\text{EC}(\theta) = -\frac{\Phi(\theta)}{N}$ is concave.

We define the Lagrangian function: $\mathcal{L}(\theta, \lambda) = \text{EC}(\theta) - \lambda(R_{\text{th}} - R(\theta))$, where $\lambda \geq 0$ is the Lagrange multiplier and solve the optimizing problem using the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions. The first condition is stationarity, requiring that the gradient of the Lagrangian with respect to θ is zero: $\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \theta} = \frac{\partial \text{EC}(\theta)}{\partial \theta} + \lambda \frac{\partial R(\theta)}{\partial \theta} = 0$, which balances the gradients of the Effective Capacity and Reliability function, scaled by λ . The primal feasibility condition ensures that the reliability constraint $R(\theta) \geq R_{\text{th}}$ is satisfied, while dual feasibility condition imposes that $\lambda \geq 0$. Complementary slackness requires $\lambda(R_{\text{th}} - R(\theta)) = 0$, indicating the constraint is either active or inactive. If the constraint is inactive ($R(\theta) > R_{\text{th}}$), then $\lambda = 0$, allowing unconstrained maximization of $\text{EC}(\theta)$. Conversely, when the constraint is active ($R(\theta) = R_{\text{th}}$), $\lambda > 0$, signifying that the reliability requirement directly impacts the optimization. Therefore, the optimal value of θ , denoted as θ_{\min} , occurs when the reliability constraint is tight, i.e., $R(\theta_{\min}) = R_{\text{th}}$, $\theta_{\min} = R^{-1}(R_{\text{th}})$. For all $\theta > \theta_{\min}$, $R > R_{\text{th}}$ is met. However, as θ increases EC will decrease since EC is monotonically decreasing with θ . Hence, an upper bound on θ is required. We seek such a point $\theta = \theta_{\max}$ in the domain of $\text{EC}(\theta, N)$ that is near its supremum, $\mathcal{M} = \sup_{\theta_{\max} > 0} \text{EC}(\theta_{\max})$. Specifically, we aim to find $\theta_{\max} \in (0, \infty)$ such that $\text{EC}(\theta_{\max})$ is close to $\mathcal{M} - \rho$, where $\rho > 0$ is a small positive constant that defines allowable degradation in EC. This proximity is characterized by minimizing the logarithmic distance:

$$\theta_{\max} = \arg \min_{\theta > 0} \log(|\text{EC}(\theta) - (\mathcal{M} - \rho)|) \quad (17)$$

The logarithmic transformation compresses variations, emphasizing points near the threshold $\mathcal{M} - \rho$. The gradient of

the objective function $\Psi(\theta) = \log|\text{EC}(\theta) - (\mathcal{M} - \rho)|$ is approximated using central finite differences:

$$\nabla \Psi(\theta) \approx \frac{\Psi(\theta + \delta) - \Psi(\theta - \delta)}{2\delta}, \quad (18)$$

where δ is a small perturbation ensuring stable numerical estimation. The operating region $[\theta_{\min}, \theta_{\max}]$ is derived to balance EC and reliability. θ_{\min} is determined by optimizing $\text{EC}(\theta, N)$ subject to the reliability constraint $R(\theta, N) \geq R_{\text{th}}$, and θ_{\max} is obtained using standard gradient-descent, minimizing the distance to the EC supremum $(\mathcal{M} - \rho)$ —beyond which EC starts to decay—ensuring that EC is within acceptable bounds.

VI. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section discusses how the proposed reliability model is used to optimize the trade-offs between the EC, and reliability for URLLC/HURLLC applications. The proposed reliability model is independent of the methods used to obtain the probabilities p_1, p_2 , and p_3 . In our case, 5G PHY layer simulations are conducted under AWGN channel conditions, focusing on the finite blocklength regime to obtain these values. We consider a downlink scenario with 20 MHz bandwidth and 30 kHz subcarrier spacing, allocating 51 PRBs for both control and user data. Control traffic utilizes BPSK modulation and polar codes with list decoding, while data traffic uses 16QAM with LDPC coding, consistent with 3GPP standards. The deterministic latency \mathcal{D}_{Det} is calculated by considering processing delays at the gNB. For numerology 1 (30 kHz subcarrier spacing), this delay amounts to 7 OFDM symbol duration (OS) [16]. The transmission delay T for short packets is given by $T = \frac{r}{B}$, where r is computed using the finite blocklength approximation in (6), assuming a 20 MHz bandwidth and a packet size of 32 bytes. At the UE, the PDSCH processing duration until ACK/NACK decision is considered as 4.5 OS duration [16].

A. Effective Capacity and Reliability Trade-offs

Fig. 3a illustrates the relationship between the delay exponent θ and the EC for various N . As θ increases, representing stricter DVP QoS constraints, the EC exhibits a monotonically decreasing trend. For $N = 1$, the EC remains relatively constant at around 3 bits/Hz/s for $\theta \leq 1$, indicating that under relaxed DVP constraints, the EC saturates at the service rate. However, it drops sharply as QoS becomes more stringent. Specifically, when θ approaches 10^1 , the EC declines to approximately 0.5 bits/Hz/s, which reflects an 83% reduction from its peak. This significant reduction highlights the network's diminished ability to handle incoming traffic under tighter QoS conditions. While a higher θ indicates a lower DVP for a given D_{max} , this improvement in DVP and hence reliability, comes at the expense of a notable reduction in EC. Fig. 3b illustrates the reliability performance $R(\theta, N)$ for various transmission attempts $N = 1, 2, 3$ revealing that reliability increases with retransmission attempts. For $N = 1$, the reliability saturates at approximately 99.94%, while for $N = 2$, reliability reaches nearly 99.9999%. The highlighted

region in Fig. 3b shows that reliability approaches ultra-high levels ($> 99.9999\%$), specifically for $N = 2, 3$. However, the diminishing returns with additional attempts are evident, as the reliability improvement from $N = 2$ to $N = 3$ is marginal ($\approx 0.0001\%$), suggesting that beyond a certain N , further retransmissions offer limited benefit in reliability. In such cases, employing other techniques, such as frequency or space diversity, may be beneficial compared to an increased number of retransmissions. As N increases, the EC further decreases, indicating that higher reliability comes at the cost of reduced traffic capacity that can meet the QoS requirements. This highlights the trade-off between reliability and EC, where additional retransmission attempts improve reliability but limit the amount of traffic the network can efficiently handle within the given QoS constraints.




Fig. 3. Effective capacity and Reliability trade-offs

B. Optimal Operating Region

In this section, we determine the optimal range for the delay exponent $\theta \in [\theta_{\min}, \theta_{\max}]$. We calculate θ_{\max} using the gradient descent as discussed in section V. θ_{\min} represents the minimum value of the delay exponent which ensures that the reliability requirement is met ($R = R_{\text{th}}$). Fig. 4 illustrates the optimal region of operation is defined by $[\theta_{\min}, \theta_{\max}]$ for both $N = 1$ and $N = 2$. For all $\theta \geq \theta_{\min}$, the reliability condition $R \geq R_{\text{th}}$ holds, ensuring the required system reliability. On the other hand, θ_{\max} is the point beyond which the effective capacity $EC(\theta)$ starts to degrade. This range $[\theta_{\min}, \theta_{\max}]$, provides the optimal operating region such that the reliability constraints are satisfied with minimal degradation in $EC(\theta, N)$. Beyond θ_{\max} , EC declines, indicating suboptimal network performance. Thus, balancing θ within this range ensures high system performance while maintaining the required reliability.

C. Guidelines for URLLC Network Design

This section provides practical guidelines for URLLC network design making use of the proposed reliability-EC model which can be used to analyze the trade-offs between EC, and reliability. Table I summarizes key use cases with respective reliability requirements. For ultra-low latency applications such as telepresence, with a 1 ms delay requirement, we can achieve 99.94% reliability with a single transmission based on our analysis. However, this falls short of the 99.999%




Fig. 4. Optimal range $[\theta_{\min}, \theta_{\max}]$ with $R \geq R_{\text{th}}$

reliability requirement. As clearly visible from the table, accommodating two transmissions helps to achieve a maximum of 99.9999% reliability, albeit at the cost of reduced EC (down to 1.48 bpcu). This is feasible for use cases such as remote control, energy distribution systems etc., which has a relaxed delay requirement (5ms). However if we need to satisfy strict delay requirements (for e.g., 1ms in case of telepresence use case) with ultra high reliability ($> 99.9999\%$) additional reliability enhancement techniques are essential. Higher numerology is one of the alternative techniques that helps to accommodate more retransmissions, while others include techniques such as frequency and diversity, and multi-connectivity. Conversely, applications such as navigation and flight control systems within wireless avionics intra-communications (WAIC²) that can tolerate higher latencies but demand ultra-high reliability ($\geq 99.99999\%$) benefit from multiple transmission attempts. Our results show that allowing up to three transmission attempts ($N = 3$) and operating θ within the range of [2.45, 6.80] can meet the reliability requirement of 99.99999% with an EC of 1.01 bpcu. For even more demanding applications such as flight controls requiring 99.999999% reliability, operating within the extended range [3.85, 8.65] can achieve this target with an EC of 1.0 bpcu. Notably, the reduction in EC is minimal compared to the significant improvements in reliability. Network operators must recognize that such extreme scenarios demand compromises on EC which is unavoidable.

VII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we developed a reliability model for URLLC/HRLLC networks leveraging the EC framework. The proposed model incorporates various latency components across the protocol stack, interactions between network (RLC, MAC and PHY) layers, particularly focusing on the acknowledged mode of the RLC layer with separate TX and RETX

²WAIC refers to communication systems designed exclusively for onboard data communications within an aircraft. These systems are not intended for air-to-air, air-to-ground, or ground-to-air communications. Both the transmitter and receiver are located within the aircraft, ensuring a minimal relative velocity between them. This satisfies the assumption of low mobility described in Section II-B

TABLE I
USE CASE ANALYSIS: OPERATING CONDITIONS FOR URLLC

Use Case	D_{\max} (ms)	R_{th} (%)	N	$[\theta_{\min}, \theta_{\max}]$	Achievable Reliability	EC (bpcu)
Telepresence	1	99.999	1	[1.15, 2.30]	99.94	2.98
Discrete automation User Experience	1	99.9999	1	[1.15, 2.30]	99.94	2.98
Electricity distribution high voltage	5	99.9999	2	[1.62, 5.86]	99.9999	1.48
Remote Control	5	99.999	2	[1.62, 5.86]	99.9999	1.48
Navigation systems	10	99.99999	3	[2.45, 6.80]	99.99999	1.01
Flight control systems	10	99.9999999	3	[3.85, 8.65]	99.9999999	1.0

buffers. The model provides optimal operating range for θ that satisfies URLLC constraints while maintaining EC close to its maximum value, ensuring that the system can handle peak traffic loads with guaranteed QoS. Our analysis reveals critical trade-offs between EC and reliability across different use cases offering valuable guidance for network design. This work serves as a valuable tool for system designers and network operators in optimizing the performance of mission-critical applications in Beyond-5G/6G networks. As future work, real-world implementation and validation of the proposed framework will be pursued to evaluate its practicality and effectiveness under realistic deployment scenarios.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work was funded by the Dutch "Rijksdienst voor Ondernemend Nederland – RVO" under the TSH number 21007 – RHIADA project. The authors would also like to acknowledge the project partners, GKN Fokker Aerospace and the Netherlands Aerospace Centre (NLR), for their support and collaboration.

REFERENCES

- [1] International Telecommunication Union (ITU), "Framework and overall objectives of the future development of imt for 2030 and beyond," *ITU Recommendation*, 2023.
- [2] T. Tao *et al.*, "6G hyper reliable and low-latency communication – requirement analysis and proof of concept," in *IEEE 98th Vehicular Technology Conference (VTC2023-Fall)*, 2023, pp. 1–5.
- [3] M. A. Siddiqi, H. Yu, and J. Joung, "5G ultra-reliable low-latency communication implementation challenges and operational issues with iot devices," *Electronics*, vol. 8, no. 9, 2019.
- [4] T.-K. Le, U. Salim, and F. Kaltenberger, "An overview of physical layer design for ultra-reliable low-latency communications in 3GPP releases 15, 16, and 17," *IEEE Access*, vol. 9, pp. 433–444, 2021.
- [5] M. Bennis, M. Debbah, and H. V. Poor, "Ultrareliable and low-latency wireless communication: Tail, risk, and scale," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 106, no. 10, pp. 1834–1853, 2018.
- [6] O. L. A. López *et al.*, "Statistical tools and methodologies for ultrareliable low-latency communication—a tutorial," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 111, no. 11, pp. 1502–1543, 2023.
- [7] D. Wu and R. Negi, "Effective capacity: a wireless link model for support of quality of service," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 630–643, 2003.
- [8] C.-S. Chang and J. Thomas, "Effective bandwidth in high-speed digital networks," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 13, no. 6, pp. 1091–1100, 1995.
- [9] L. Musavian and T. Le-Ngoc, "Cross-layer design for cognitive radios with joint amc and arq under delay QoS constraint," in *8th IWCMC*, 2012, pp. 419–424.
- [10] R. Sassioui, L. Szczecinski, L. Le, and M. Benjillali, "AMC and HARQ: Effective capacity analysis," in *2016 IEEE Wireless Communications and Networking Conference*, 2016, pp. 1–7.

- [11] I. Muhammad *et al.*, "Mission effective capacity—a novel dependability metric: A study case of multiconnectivity-enabled URLLC for IIoT," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, vol. 18, no. 6, pp. 4180–4188, 2022.
- [12] R. Han *et al.*, "Effective capacity analysis of delay-sensitive communications in NOMA systems," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 3665–3675, 2024.
- [13] 3GPP, "5G; NR; Radio Link Control (RLC) protocol specification," 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP), Technical Specification (TS) 38.322, 07, version 16.1.0.
- [14] T. Rappaport, *Wireless communications: Principles and practice*, 2nd ed., ser. Prentice Hall communications engineering and emerging technologies series. Prentice Hall, 2002, includes bibliographical references and index.
- [15] H. Touchette, "A basic introduction to large deviations: Theory, applications, simulations," *arXiv: Statistical Mechanics*, 2011. [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:119304474>
- [16] "Chapter 12 - NR URLLC performance," in *Cellular Internet of Things (Second Edition)*, second edition ed., O. Liberg, M. Sundberg, Y.-P. E. Wang, J. Bergman, J. Sachs, and G. Wikström, Eds. Academic Press, 2020, pp. 563–599.
- [17] Y. Polyanskiy, H. V. Poor, and S. Verdú, "Channel coding rate in the finite blocklength regime," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 56, no. 5, pp. 2307–2359, 2010.