

# Challenges of Deadline-Aware Configurations for Hybrid TSN Networks

### by Luxi Zhao

Email: zhaoluxi@buaa.edu.cn Beihang University

### Real-time performance of TSN networks

**Functional logic correctness** 



• A key issue of focus

Short-Range Ra

Sensor Perception

Correctness in real-time communications

ong-Range Radar

Ultra So

- Task functional logic
- Latency within defined upper bounds



### Real-time performance of TSN networks



#### Does TSN Automatically Guarantee Real-Time Transmission? NO

- Flow control related sub-protocols
  - Provides a basic paradigm for network design
- Require algorithms and tools for achieving real-time communications



3

### Real-time performance of TSN networks



#### **Real-time Guarantees for TIME-Triggered (TT) Communication**

- Configuration goals: offsets, time slots, queue usage, etc.
- Configuration characteristic:
  - Real-Time Guarantees: at scheduling phase
  - Scope: periodic traffic flows

- Algorithm Complexity: high
- Global Clock Synchronization: yes

 $\left[ ES_{1}, SW_{1} \right] + 2T_{1}$ 



#### Luxi Zhao, Sep. 2024

## **Real-Time Guarantees for EVENT-Triggered (ET) Communication**

- Configuration characteristic:
  - Real-Time Guarantees: dedicated performance analysis

Real-time performance of TSN networks

Scope: periodic/sporadic traffic flows 



- Algorithm Complexity: low
- Global Clock Synchronization: no



## Challenges of deadline-aware configuration in TSN



- Performance analysis methods:
  - event-triggered sub-protocols, hybrid TT and ET communication
  - network calculus, response timing analysis, ....

#### Beyond Just Analyzing the Real-Time Performance of a Fully Configured System

Design and configure a system to meet performance requirements

#### **Traditional Configuration Framework -- Post-Schedulability Verification**



### Challenges of deadline-aware configuration in TSN



#### **Traditional Configuration Framework -- Post-Schedulability Verification**

- Verification stage:
  - Takes only a few seconds per configuration
- Configuration stage:
  - Repeated real-time verification with each configuration change
  - Consumes over 90% overall configuration time



### Challenges of deadline-aware configuration in TSN



#### What Comes Next? → Online Reconfiguration Scenario [1]

- Develop more efficient performance analysis framework to support network configuration
- Reduce verification overhead



[1] Boyer, M., and Henia, R. (2024). Industrial challenge: Embedded reconfiguration of TSN. *technical report*.

### **Insights from Two Perspectives**

#### (1) Incremental Performance Analysis [2]

Principal idea

**Network Calculus Theory** 

- Analyze only the changed portions of the network
- Avoid full re-analysis of entire network traffic every time



#### **Incremental Analysis Rules**

[2] Zhao, L., Zhang, X., He, F., et al. (2024). Incremental Performance Analysis for Accelerating Verification of TSN Network Reconfigurations. IEEE Transactions on Network and Service Management.

#### Luxi Zhao, Sep. 2024





#### Core Methods (TSN/TAS+CBS)

- Classify network node ports: directly affected, indirectly affected, unaffected
- Establish incremental rules to maximize reuse of existing analysis components
  - TT arrival curve
  - TAS service curve
  - AVB arrival curve
  - CBS service curve
  - CBS shaping curve
  - Delay bounds

**Network Calculus Performance Model** for TSN/TAS+CBS



[2] Zhao, L., Zhang, X., He, F., et al. (2024). Incremental Performance Analysis for Accelerating Verification of TSN Network Reconfigurations. IEEE Transactions on Network and Service Management. Luxi Zhao, Sep. 2024

### **Incremental Performance Analysis** [2]

#### **Comparison with Traditional Performance Analysis**

- Speed Improvement
  - 75% to 95% faster (simultaneous changing flows within 10%)
  - More effective with large-scale networks
- Limitations
  - Analysis time increases with more changing flows
  - More concurrent changing flows bring it closer to traditional performance analysis

tt6.10 b13.2 TTASCA a24 tt2,4,6; a16,24; b13 SW2 A S C A I a12; b19 SW5 tt1,2,3; a11,12; ATTASCA TTASCAI BTTASCAT tt1,2,4,6; TTASCAD b13,22 SW1 tt1; tt1 ASCA a11,12; b14,22 b13.14.2 TASCA TTASCAD A S C A I B TTAS C tt8; b14,22 tt3,5; a15 TTASICIAI ES2 TA S C AD Ta S C AD BTTASCA tt4,5,6; a15,16; b14 tt8; a17; SW3 tt5; a15,18 b19 SW6 ITA S C A D tt7,8; a17,18; b19 TTA S C A TTA S C A TTASCA tt3,7 TASCA **ASCAD** TASCA A TTA S CAL 

[2] Zhao, L., Zhang, X., He, F., et al. (2024). Incremental Performance Analysis for Accelerating Verification of TSN Network Reconfigurations. IEEE Transactions on Network and Service Management.

ES13



ES8

a24

TTASCAD

TAS CAD

ASCA

tt9,10; a20,21; b23

TASCAI

ΓT<sub>A</sub> S C A D



#### **Advantages**

- Significant improvement when networks have small changes
- Just constructs incremental analysis rules on top of the traditional analysis model
- Easily extends to other TSN flow control sub-protocols

#### **Disadvantages**

- Complexity can approach traditional analysis when there are large network changes
- Still relies on the real-time verification feedback loop

### Insights from Two Perspectives



### (2) Performance-Driven Configuration Optimization [3] [4]

- Principal idea
  - Can we automatically ensure real-time performance while configuration optimization, like TT scheduling?
  - Avoid the traditional real-time verification feedback loop



(a) Conventional framework based on ex-post verification

Performance-Driven Configuration Optimization [3] [4]

- Problem Motivation
  - CBS, DRR, TAS+CBS: optimize bandwidth to optimize residual bandwidth utilization while guarantees deadlines
  - Over-allocation
    - Leads to resource waste
    - Decreases service quality for lower-priority
- Overall framework
  - Network level
  - Node level



Risks missing deadlines for time-critical applications



(b) New framework based on prior QoS guarantees



### Performance-Driven Configuration Optimization [3] [4]



#### **Network Level -- Deadline Decomposition Technique**

- Problem
  - Upstream bandwidth changes impact downstream delays
  - Need to decouple traffic between nodes
- Solution
  - Decompose end-to-end deadlines into local deadlines at each node
  - Ensures end-to-end deadlines are met when all local deadlines are satisfied





#### **Node Level – Optimize Configuration Parameters**

- Coupled models
  - Integrate NC-based performance analysis model with bandwidth optimization problem
- Challenge
  - Derive closed-form or fast optimal solutions

**Objective function:** maximize residual bandwidth **Decision variables:** idle slope  $idSl_i^h$ **Constraints:** deadline guarantees – NC-based CBS performance analysis model

$$\mathbb{P}: \max_{idSl_1^h, \dots, idSl_{N_{\text{CBS}}}^h > 0} \mu^h(idSl_1^h, \dots, idSl_{N_{\text{CBS}}}^h) = C - \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\text{CBS}}} idSl_i^h$$
  
s.t.  $\mathbb{C}_1: D_i^h \ge hDev(\alpha_i^h, \beta_{i,\text{CBS}}^h), \quad \forall i \in [1, N_{\text{CBS}}]$   
 $\mathbb{C}_2: idSl_i^h \ge \sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}_i^h} \rho_f, \qquad \forall i \in [1, N_{\text{CBS}}]$ 

#### Scheduling Policy: Credit-Based Shaping (CBS) [3]

**Objective function:** maximize residual bandwidth **Decision variables:** quantum  $q_i^h$ ,  $Q^h$ **Constraints:** deadline guarantees – NC-based DRR performance analysis model

$$\mathbb{P}: \max_{Q^h, q_1^h, \dots, q_{N_{\text{cDRR}}}^h > 0} \mu^h(Q^h, q_1^h, \dots, q_{N_{\text{cDRR}}}^h) = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\text{cDRR}}} \frac{q_i^h}{Q^h} = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{\text{cDRR}} \eta_i^h$$
  
s.t.  $\mathbb{C}_1: D_i^h \ge h Dev(\alpha_i^h, \beta_{i,\text{DRR}}^h), \quad \forall i \in [1, N_{\text{cDRR}}]$   
 $\mathbb{C}_2: q_i^h \ge l_i^{h, \max}, \quad \forall i \in [1, N_{\text{cDRR}}]$ 

#### Scheduling Policy: Deficit Round Robin (DRR) [4]



#### **Node Level – Optimize Configuration Parameters**

Closed-form solution

#### CBS Scheduler: [3]

- Established equation linking idle slope *idSl<sup>h</sup><sub>i</sub>* to worstcase delay;
- By gradient information, derived closed-form expression for minimal bandwidth reservation *idSl<sup>h</sup><sub>i</sub>* required to meet local deadlines;
- TAS+CBS hybrid architecture [under review]

#### **DRR Scheduler:** [4]

- Established equation linking quantum q<sub>i</sub><sup>h</sup>, Q<sup>h</sup> to worstcase delay;
- Derived closed-form solution for local optimal bandwidth with fixed Q<sup>h</sup>;
- Used gradient ascent to find optimal total quantum Q<sup>h</sup> for maximizing residual bandwidth;
- Formally proved gradient ascent avoids local optima





#### Comparison with Default idSI (75%) -- CBS

- Bandwidth Savings
  - Saves an average of 91.1% and up to 99.0% compared to default idSI (e.g., 75%)
- Correctness Validation
  - NC-based analysis confirms that all flows meet deadline requirements configured with optimized bandwidth
- Runtime Efficiency
  - Configuring optimal bandwidth reservations for all traffic classes across all ports takes just seconds

#### TABLE II VALIDITY OF OUR PROPOSED APPROACH IDSLMIN/NC

SR Class	Port	idSlMin/NC	idSlMin/Std	idSl/Default
Class M <sub>1</sub>	[ES1,SW1]	12.77%	4%	
	[ES2,SW1]	4.94%	1.6%	
	[ES3,SW1]	2.47%	0.8%	
	[SW1,ES4]	9.84%	3.2%	
	[SW1,ES5]	9.56%	3.2%	$M_1 + M_0 - 75\%$
Class M <sub>2</sub>	[ES1,SW1]	7.93%	1.6%	1/11+1/12=7570
	[ES2,SW1]	0.72%	0.16%	
	[ES3,SW1]	5.11%	1.12%	
	[SW1,ES4]	8.74%	1.92%	
	[SW1,ES5]	4.42%	0.96%	
Average SR Class		13.3%	3.72%	75%

#### TABLE III

#### CORRECTNESS OF OUR PROPOSED APPROACH IDSLMIN/NC

SR Class	Flow	WCD ( $\mu s$ )	WCD ( $\mu s$ )	WCD ( $\mu s$ )	Deadline
		idSlMin/NC	idSlMin/Std	idSl/Default	Deudime
Class M <sub>1</sub>	f1	533.8	2038	129.8	1000
	f2	443.1	1740	106.1	500
	f3	499.8	1930	89.8	500
	f4	669.8	2438	97.8	1000
Class M <sub>2</sub>	f5	1640.1	9316.4	122.8	5000
	f6	666.4	3882.5	221.3	1000
	f7	925.3	5017.3	245.3	5000
	f8	998.4	6459.2	186.8	1000



#### **Comparison with Traditional Optimization -- DRR**

- Bandwidth Efficiency
  - Saves over 85% residual bandwidth.
  - Traditional schedulability feedback-based method: Saves around 60% residual bandwidth.
- Runtime Improvement
  - At least 2-3 orders of magnitude faster

# Improvements in both Objective Performance and Optimization Speed !





#### **Advantages**

- Ensures QoS during optimization
- Removes real-time verification feedback-loop

### Disadvantages

- Requires specific coupling models for different schedulers and optimization objectives
- Identifying suitable optimization methods can be challenging

### References



- [1] M. Boyer, and R. Henia, "Industrial challenge: Embedded reconfiguration of TSN." technical report, 2024.
- [2] L. Zhao, X. Zhang, F. He, et al., "Incremental Performance Analysis for Accelerating Verification of TSN Network Reconfigurations." *IEEE Transactions on Network and Service Management*, early access, 2024.
- [3] L. Zhao, Y. Yan, and X. Zhou, "Minimum Bandwidth Reservation for CBS in TSN With Real-Time QoS Guarantees." *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, 20(4), 2023.
- [4] A. Xie, F. He, and L. Zhao, "Optimizing Quantum Assignment for DRR in TSN: A Network Calculus-Based Method." *IEEE Real-Time Systems Symposium (RTSS)*, accepted, 2024.



# Happy to answer questions zhaoluxi@buaa.edu.cn