

# **Integrated Control and Real-Time Scheduling**

Anton Cervin

Department of Automatic Control Lund Institute of Technology

Supervisor: Karl-Erik Årzén Research project sponsored by ARTES/SSF



- 1. Background
- 2. Overview of contributions
- 3. Subtask scheduling
- 4. Feedback scheduling
- 5. The Control Server
- 6. Analysis using Jitterbug
- 7. Simulation using TrueTime
- 8. Summary



Control Department

Software Department





- The control engineer does not know what happens in the implementation
- The software engineer does not understand the timing requirements of the controller
- Control theory and real-time scheduling theory have evolved as separate subjects during the past 30 years





**Process:** Continuous dynamics

**Controller:** Continuous dynamics



## Controller:

- Discrete dynamics (control-theoretical view)
- Piece of code executing in an operating system, together with other tasks (computer science view)



Many controllers are embedded in mass-market products.

**Characteristics:** 

- Cheap, slow CPUs
- Limited memory
- Limited network bandwidth

Problems:

- CPU and network are shared resources which must be scheduled
- Delay and jitter in the computer system degrade the control performance



More detailed controller scheduling analysis:

- Subtask scheduling of Calculate and Update
- Delay reduction gives better control performance

Introduction of feedback in the computing system:

- Cope with varying workload using feedback
- Control the CPU utilization using period rescaling
- Simulation case studies



A novel computational model:

- The Control Server creates the abstraction of a *real-time control component* with predictable performance
- Control components may be composed into more complex components
- Implemented in the STORK public domain RTOS

#### New analysis tools:

- Understanding of what happens when a controller is implemented and scheduled as a real-time task
- Jitterbug performance analysis with varying delays
- TrueTime co-simulation of real-time control systems



Typical implementation of a control task:

```
LOOP
Read input;
Calculate output;
Write output;
Update state;
Wait until next period;
END
```

Basic idea: Schedule Calculate and Update as separate tasks to reduce the input-output latency.





- The deadline for Update equals the period
- The deadline for Calculate should be minimized
- Analysis under FP and EDF scheduling given



The analysis results in different priorities for Calculate and Update:

```
SetPriority(P_CO);
LOOP
Read input;
Calculate output;
Write output;
SetPriority(P_US); // lower the priority
Update state;
SetPriority(P_CO); // raise the priority
Wait until next period;
END
```



Idea: Perform the scheduling design on-line to cope with varying or unknown workloads

### Control examples:

- Hybrid controllers
- Model-predictive controllers

#### Two problems:

- Control the CPU utilization
- Distribute the resources to optimize QoS



#### Control system analogy:

- Setpoint: desired CPU utilization
- Measurement signal: execution time of control tasks
- Control signal: sampling period of control tasks
- Feedforward from controller mode changes



Combination of two ideas:

- Reserve a given fraction of the CPU to each control task
- Let the kernel handle all I/O ( $\Rightarrow$  no jitter)

CPU reservation can be performed by Constant Bandwidth Servers (CBSs) [Abeni and Buttazzo, 1998]:





#### The Control Server provides

- isolation between unrelated tasks
- minimal jitter
- short and predictable input-output latency
- a simple interface between control design and real-time design – the task utilization factor U
- a possibility to combine several tasks (components) into a new task (component) with predictable control and realtime behavior



A Control Server task is described by

- a CPU utilization factor,  $\boldsymbol{U}$
- a period, T
- a number of code segments,  $S^i$



- Static scheduling of inputs and outputs
- Dynamic scheduling of computations in-between









- MATLAB-based tool
- Analysis of mixed continuous/discrete-time linear systems with jitter
- Timing model with random delays describes the execution of the discrete systems
  - models scheduling/network delays, lost samples, etc.
- The systems are driven by white noise
- A quadratic cost function is computed, e.g.,

$$J = \lim_{T o \infty} rac{1}{T} \int_0^T x^T(t) Q x(t) dt$$



Distributed control system:



 $\tau_1$ ,  $\tau_2$  random delays with given probability density functions



Cost as a function of delay and jitter:







- MATLAB/Simulink-based tool
- Offers a Kernel and a Network block
  - Simulink S-functions written in C++



- Simulates a full, event-based real-time kernel
- Executes user-defined tasks and interrupt handlers
- Arbitrary user-defined scheduling policy
- Supports external interrupts
- Supports common real-time primitives (sleepUntil, wait/notify, setPriority, etc.)
- More features: context switches, overrun handlers





- Execution modeled by a sequence of segments
- The execution time of each segment is returned by the code function (may be data-dependent, random, etc.)



Choices:

- C++ function (fast)
- Matlab function (medium)
- Simulink block diagram (slow)









Scheduling techniques tailored to control tasks:

- Subtask scheduling reduce latency
- Feedback scheduling handle CPU load variations
- The Control Server real-time control components

Tools for analysis of control performance:

- Analysis using Jitterbug linear systems
- Simulation using TrueTime general systems



## Jitterbug:

http://www.control.lth.se/~lincoln

TrueTime:

http://www.control.lth.se/~dan