

TTW: A Time-Triggered-Wireless Design for CPS

[Extended version]

Romain Jacob* Licong Zhang[†] Marco Zimmerling[‡] Jan Beutel* Samarjit Chakraborty[†] Lothar Thiele*
 *ETH Zurich, Switzerland †TU Munchen, Germany ‡TU Dresden, Germany
 firstname.lastname@tik.ee.ethz.ch firstname.lastname@rcs.ei.tum.de marco.zimmerling@tu-dresden.de

Abstract

Wired field buses have proved their effectiveness to support Cyber-Physical Systems (CPS). However, in avionics, for ease of deployment, or for new functionality featuring mobile devices, there is a strong interest for wireless solutions. Low-power wireless protocols have been proposed, but requirements of a large class of CPS applications can still not be satisfied. This paper presents Time-Triggered-Wireless (TTW), a distributed low-power wireless system design that minimizes energy consumption and offers end-to-end timing predictability, adaptability, reliability, low latency. Our evaluation shows a reduction of communication latency by a factor 2x and of energy consumption by 33-40% compared to state-of-the-art approaches. This validates the suitability of TTW for wireless CPS applications and opens the way for implementation and real-world experience with industry partners.

I. INTRODUCTION

Commonly, CPS are understood as systems where “*physical and software components are deeply intertwined, each operating on different spatial and temporal scales, exhibiting multiple and distinct behavioral modalities, and interacting with each other in a myriad of ways that change with context*” [1]. Application domains include robotics, distributed monitoring, process control, and power-grid management. CPS combine physical processes, sensing, online computation, communication, and actuation in a single distributed control system.

To support CPS, industry has been widely relying on wired field buses – CAN, FlexRay, ARINC 429, AFDX in automotive and avionics – with good reasons. They combine functional and non-functional predictability with appropriate bandwidth, message delay, and fault-tolerance. Yet, several of the above application domains would benefit from wireless communication for its ease of installation, logical and spatial reconfigurability, and flexibility. In other cases, wireless is the only option, due to the presence of mobile devices for example.

Challenges. One major obstacle in wireless communication has been the reliability of packet transmission. Recently, several low-power protocols featuring very low packet loss rate have been proposed and partly standardized, based on the principles of time-division-multiplex and time-slotted access, see TSCH [2], WirelessHART [3], and LWB [4]. Dependability competitions where such protocols have been tested in high-interference environments [5] provide additional evidence.

Despite these achievements, the available protocols do not yet satisfy all requirements of typical CPS applications, *i.e.*, reliability, timing predictability, low end-to-end latency at the application level, energy efficiency, and quick runtime adaptability to different modes of operation [6].

To understand the challenges of wireless CPS, it is helpful to realize the fundamental difference between a field bus and a wireless network. In a field bus, whenever a node is not transmitting, it can idly listen for incoming messages. Upon request from a central host, each node can *wake-up and react quickly*. For a low-power wireless node, the major part of the energy is consumed in its radio. Therefore, energy efficiency requires to turn the radio off whenever possible to enable long autonomous operation without an external power source. A node is then *unreachable until it wakes up*. Thus, two nodes require overlapping wake-up time intervals to communicate.

This observation often results in wireless system designs that minimize energy consumption by using *rounds*, *i.e.*, time intervals where all nodes wake-up, exchange messages, then turn off their radio, see [2]–[4]. Scheduling policies define when the rounds take place – *i.e.*, when to wake up – and which nodes are allowed to send messages during the round. However, CPS also execute tasks, *e.g.*, sensing or actuation. Oftentimes, the system requirements are specified end-to-end, *i.e.*, between distributed tasks exchanging messages. Meeting such requirements calls for co-scheduling the execution of tasks and the transmission of messages, as proposed in the literature for wired architectures, see [7]–[9].

Following the above discussion, we focus on round-based wireless designs. Three challenges arise. First, state-of-the-art scheduling methods for wired buses *are not directly applicable*. They assume that communication can be scheduled at any point in time, which does not conform to the concept of rounds in a wireless setting. Second, the optimization problem for co-scheduling tasks and messages *cannot be solved online* in a low-power setting; pre-computed schedules are highly desirable in hard real-time systems. Finally, CPS often *require runtime adaptability* while the systems must remain safe when considering packet loss and mode changes.

Contributions. To address those challenges, we propose models and methods enabling low-power wireless communication suited to CPS, based on communication rounds, and aiming for end-to-end guarantees and adaptability properties comparable




Fig. 1. (a) General system model and (b) time-slotted execution of TTW. As in LWB [4], communication rounds are divided into time slots, in which Glossy floods are executed. Each color shows one flooding step. In TTW, the first slot of each round contains a beacon sent by the host, followed by (up to) B slots, allocated to application messages. The beacons announce the identification number of the round (round id) and trigger mode changes.

to a wired bus. We partition the co-scheduling problem into offline and online phases. All schedules are synthesized offline and distributed to the network at compile time. At runtime, the current mode of operation and the schedule phase are broadcast to all participating nodes (see Sec. II for details).

This approach induces very little protocol communication overhead, which is of importance in low-power settings. Moreover, a beacon at the beginning of each round enables reliable execution of the protocol, even under packet loss and mode changes. In summary, we make the following contributions.

- 1) We present Time-Triggered-Wireless (TTW), a novel low-power wireless system design that meets common requirements of distributed CPS applications such as reliability, timing predictability, low end-to-end latency at the application level, energy efficiency, and quick runtime adaptability to different modes of operation.
- 2) We formally specify the joint optimization problem of co-scheduling distributed tasks, messages, and communication rounds which guarantees timing, minimizes end-to-end latency between application tasks, minimizes energy, and ensures safety in terms of conflict-free communication even under packet loss. We provide a methodology that solves this (NP-hard [10]) optimization problem efficiently.
- 3) Using time and energy models, we validate the benefits of rounds in a wireless design to minimize energy, and we derive the minimum end-to-end latency achievable.

II. TTW SYSTEM DESIGN

Before delving into technical details, this section presents the underlying concepts of Time-Triggered-Wireless (TTW) with some details on the overall system design. Then Sec. III and Sec. IV will introduce the formal application model and our solution to the corresponding scheduling problem.

A. TTW Foundations

We consider a set of *nodes* connected by a *wireless multi-hop network*, as illustrated in Fig. 1(a). Distributed *applications*, composed of multiple *tasks*, are executed on the network. Tasks are mapped to nodes and exchange *messages* wirelessly. To minimize the energy consumed for wireless communication, we *group message transmissions into communication rounds*, *i.e.*, time intervals where all nodes turn their radio on and communicate. Rounds are composed of (up to) B *contention-free slots* – each slot is allocated to a node, which is the only one allowed to start transmitting during this time slot. The network is controlled centrally by a node called the *host*. Commands are sent by the host at the beginning of each round in an additional slot, called *beacon*. Within each slot, communication is realized by *network-wide Glossy floods* [11]. Rounds, slots and floods are illustrated in Fig. 1(b).

Those concepts were taken from the Low-power Wireless Bus (LWB) [4], another protocol that inspired the design of TTW. LWB has a number of benefits. It is based on Glossy, which has been proven to be highly reliable, energy efficient (see [5]) and provides sub-microsecond time synchronization accuracy [11]. As flooding in Glossy is independent of the network state, it creates a *virtual single-hop network*, where every node can directly communicate with every other node. This enables to schedule LWB as a *shared bus*. Finally, as each message is received by all nodes, LWB seamlessly supports unicast, multicast and broadcast transmissions. For a given payload, the transmission time only depends on the network diameter, *i.e.*, the maximal hop distance between two nodes.

However despite those benefits, LWB is unable to solve the wireless CPS challenge. It does not account for the scheduling of distributed tasks and it does not provide any timing guarantees. This motivates the design of TTW, a novel wireless system design which co-schedules tasks and messages.

B. Building-up TTW

Building on those foundations, we present the concepts that create TTW, a solution satisfying the requirements of CPS applications formulated in the introduction.




Fig. 2. Example of mode change from M_i to M_k . The dashed lines show the start of the mode hyperperiods. Each numbered box represents a communication round with its id. The content of some of the host beacons is showed next to the corresponding rounds. Steady-state rounds are showed in white, e.g., r_6 . In r_3 , the host sends the first signal to change to mode M_k . During this transition phase, the rounds are lightly colored. In the dark colored round, the host sets $SB = 1$. This is the second signal – directly after this round, mode M_k starts executing. Dashed rounds are not executed.

Low end-to-end latency. To achieve low end-to-end latency¹, TTW *co-schedules task executions and message transmissions*², together with the communication rounds.

Such scheduling problem is a complex optimization that cannot be solved on-line, even less in a low-power setting. Therefore, TTW *statically synthesize the schedule* of all tasks, messages, and rounds to meet real-time constraints, minimize end-to-end latency, and minimize the energy consumed for communication. However, because of the dependencies between messages and rounds, conventional methods cannot be applied directly. A novel modeling approach is required (further detailed in Sec. IV).

Adaptability. TTW satisfies the runtime adaptability requirement of CPS applications by *switching between multiple pre-configured operation modes*, similar to [13].

The beacons, sent by the host at the beginning of each round, contain the current round id , as well as a mode id and a trigger bit SB used in the mode change procedure as described below.

A mode change happens in two phases. First, all running applications finish their execution but new application instances don't start. Afterwards, the new mode starts with its first round. The host triggers mode changes using its beacons as illustrated in Fig. 2. In the first phase, the host sends the ids of rounds from the current mode together with the id of the new mode. This allows the nodes to prepare and to not start new applications. The host statically knows when there is no application running in the system anymore. Then, at the next communication round, the host sends the round id , the id of the new mode, and set the trigger bit $SB = 1$. The new mode starts directly after this communication round ends.

Energy efficiency. As TTW uses static scheduling, one can *distribute the schedules* at compile time to limit the protocol communication overhead at runtime, thus optimizing energy efficiency. At compile time, the node's task and communication schedule is loaded into its memory. It contains, for each mode, the relative starting times for the mode's communication rounds, the mode's hyperperiod, the slots allocated to node n for each round, *i.e.*, pairs (slot id ; message id), and the number of slots allocated in each round³.

Predictability and Reliability. Thanks to the distributed schedule information, it is sufficient for any node to receive a single beacon to retrieve the overall system state – *i.e.*, the phase of the schedule given by the round id – thus which message to send in which slot and when to wake up for the next communication round. Modes and rounds have unique ids . Let us denote the beacon by b . If $b = \{j, k, 1\}$, then the next round is the *first round scheduled in mode with $id = k$* . Otherwise, if $b = \{j, k, 0\}$ then the next round is the next one after $id = j$ in the cyclic sequence of rounds associated to the mode $id = k$. If round with $id = j$ is not part of mode with $id = k$, then no new applications are started.

If a node does not receive the beacon, it does not participate in the current communication round. This way it is guaranteed that a packet loss does not lead to message collisions⁴.

Altogether, those concepts guarantee that TTW executes predictably and reliably. In contrast to LWB [4], the above system design allows for fast mode switches, guarantees safe operation in terms of non-overlapping communication, combines task- and communication scheduling, and combines offline with on-line scheduling decisions.

III. SYSTEM MODEL AND SCHEDULING PROBLEM

Each distributed *application* is composed of *tasks* and *messages* connected by precedence constraints described by a directed acyclic graph, where vertices and edges represent tasks and messages, respectively. We denote by $a.G$ the *precedence graph* of application a . Each application executes at a periodic interval $a.p$, called the *period*. An application execution is completed when all tasks in G have been executed. All tasks and messages in $a.G$ share the same period, $a.p$. Applications are subject

¹*e.g.*, 10-500 ms delay for a distributed closed-loop control system [6]

²similar to the state of the art for wired protocols [8], [12]

³This enables to save energy if less than B slots are allocated.

⁴Assuming conflict-free schedules, see Sec. IV for the schedule synthesis.




Fig. 3. An example control application and its precedence graph \mathcal{G} . The execution starts with sensor readings – either τ_1 or τ_2 . After both have been received by the controller, actuation values are computed (τ_3), multicast to the actuators (m_3), and applied (τ_5 and τ_6).

to real-time constraints. The application *relative deadline*, denoted by $a.d$ with $a.d \leq a.p$, represents the maximum tolerable *end-to-end delay* to complete the execution. In summary, an application a is characterized by

$$a = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} a.p \quad - \quad \text{period} \\ a.d \quad - \quad \text{end-to-end deadline} \\ a.\mathcal{G} \quad - \quad \text{precedence graph} \end{array} \right\}$$

We denote with \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{M} the sets of tasks and messages, respectively. A node executes at most one task at any point in time and we consider *non-preemptive task scheduling*. Each task τ is mapped to a given node $\tau.map$, on which it executes within a WCET $\tau.e^5$. The *task offset* $\tau.o$ represents the start of the task execution, relative to the beginning of the application execution. A task can have an arbitrary number of preceding messages, *i.e.*, messages that must be received before it can start. $\tau.prec$ denotes the set of preceding message *ids*. In summary, a task τ is characterized by

$$\tau = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tau.o \quad - \quad \text{offset} \\ \tau.map \quad - \quad \text{mapping} \\ \tau.e \quad - \quad \text{WCET} \\ \tau.prec \quad - \quad \text{preceding message set} \\ \tau.p \quad - \quad \text{period} \end{array} \right\}$$

Every message m has at least one preceding task, *i.e.*, tasks that need to finish before the message can be transmitted. The set of preceding task *ids* is denoted by $m.prec$. All preceding tasks must be mapped to the same node. The *message offset* $m.o$, relative to the beginning of the application execution, represents the earliest time message the m can be allocated to a round for transmission, *i.e.*, after all preceding tasks are completed. The *message deadline* $m.d$, relative to the message offset, represents the latest time when the message transmission must be completed, *i.e.*, the earliest offset of successor tasks. All messages have the same payload. In summary, a message m is characterized by

$$m = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} m.o \quad - \quad \text{offset} \\ m.d \quad - \quad \text{deadline} \\ m.prec \quad - \quad \text{preceding task set} \\ m.p \quad - \quad \text{period} \end{array} \right\}$$

Within one application a , each task is unique. Messages are not necessarily unique, *i.e.*, multiple edges of $a.\mathcal{G}$ can be labeled with the same message m , which captures the case of multicast/broadcast. If a task τ or a message m belongs to two different applications a_i and a_j , the two applications have the same period, *i.e.*, $a_i.p = a_j.p$. Fig. 3 shows a control application and its precedence graph as an example.

Operation modes represent mutually exclusive phases of the system, *e.g.*, *bootstrapping*, *normal*, and *emergency* modes, each executing a specific schedule. A mode M is a set of applications a that are concurrently executed, that is

$$M = \left\{ a_i, a_j, \dots \quad - \quad \text{applications to execute} \right\}$$

The mode *hyperperiod* is the least common multiple of the mode's applications. In this paper, we assume *no intersection between the modes*⁶, *i.e.*, $M_i \cap M_j = \emptyset$ if $i \neq j$.

Finally, the schedule of a mode M contains R_M *communication rounds* r . Rounds are *atomic*, that is, they cannot be interrupted. Each round is composed of (up to) B slots, each allocated to a unique message m . This results in a maximum round length T_r . The *round starting time* $r.t$ is the start of the round relative to the beginning of the mode hyperperiod.

⁵Nodes are assumed capable of performing one task execution and one message transmission simultaneously, as supported by several state-of-the-art wireless CPS platforms featuring two cores, *e.g.*, [14].

⁶Supporting more general models induces additional constraints, studied *e.g.*, in [13]. Tackling those is beyond the scope of this paper.

The *allocation vector* $r.[B]$ is a vector of size B containing the *ids* of the messages allocated to the slots. $r.B_s$ denotes the allocation of the s -th slot. In summary, a round r is characterized by

$$r = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} r.t \quad - \quad \text{starting time} \\ r.[B] \quad - \quad \text{allocation vector} \end{array} \right\}$$

We consider that all modes, applications, task mappings and WCETs are given. For a given mode M , the remaining variables define the mode schedule, denoted by $Sched(M)$:

$$Sched(M) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tau.o, m.o, m.d \quad \left| \quad a \in M, (\tau, m) \in a.\mathcal{G} \right. \\ r_k.t, r_k.[B] \quad \left| \quad k \in [1, R_M] \right. \end{array} \right\}$$

Scheduling Problem. Design a scheduling scheme that, given a mode M , returns an optimized mode schedule $Sched(M)$ s.t. (i) application executions always meet their deadline, and (ii) the number R_M of communication rounds is minimized.

IV. TTW SCHEDULING

As introduced in Sec. II, TTW statically synthesizes the schedule of all tasks, messages, and communication rounds to meet real-time constraints, minimize end-to-end latency, and minimize the energy consumed for communication. This section presents the ILP formulation used and how to solve the scheduling problem, known to be NP-hard [10], efficiently.

The schedule of a mode M is computed for one hyperperiod, after which it repeat itself. To minimize the number of rounds used while handling complexity, we solve the problem sequentially, as described in Alg. 1. Each ILP formulation considers a fixed number of rounds R_M to be scheduled, starting with $R_M = 0$. The number of rounds is incremented until a feasible solution is found, or until the maximum number of rounds R_{max} – the number of rounds that “fit” into one hyperperiod – is reached. Thus, Alg. 1 guarantees by construction that if the problem is feasible, the synthesized schedule is optimal in terms of number of rounds used. The end-to-end latency is minimized by setting the sum of all application’s latency as objective function.

Algorithm 1 Pseudo-code of the schedule synthesis

Require: mode M , applications $a \in M$, task mappings $\tau.map$ and WCETs $\tau.e$, round duration T_r – **Output:** $Sched(M)$

$LCM \leftarrow hyperperiod(M)$

$R_{max} = floor(LCM/T_r)$

$R_M = 0$

while $R_M \leq R_{max}$ **do**

 formulate the ILP for mode M using R_M rounds

 [$Sched(M), feasible$] = solve(ILP)

if $feasible$ **then return** $Sched(M)$

end if

$R_M \leftarrow R_M + 1$

end while

return ‘Problem unfeasible’

The ILP formulation contains a set of classical scheduling constraints. *Precedence constraints* between tasks and messages must be respected; *end-to-end deadlines* must be satisfied; nodes process *at most one task* simultaneously; rounds must *not overlap*; rounds cannot be allocated more messages than the maximal number of slots available. Those constraints can be easily formulated using our system model (see Appendix for the full formulation). However, one must also guarantee that the allocation of messages to rounds is valid, *i.e.*, *every message must be served in a round that starts after its release time (C1) and finishes before its deadline (C2)*. This creates a non-linear coupling between the variables and makes the problem not trivial. *This is the key difference with the existing approaches for wired architectures, like [8].*

To address this challenge, we first formulate the constraints (C1) and (C2) using *arrival*, *demand*, and *service* functions, af , df and sf , using network calculus [15]. Those functions count the number of message instances released, served, and due since the beginning of the hyperperiod, respectively. Those three functions are illustrated in Fig. 4. It must hold that

$$\forall m_i \in \mathcal{M}, \forall t, \quad df_i(t) \leq sf_i(t) \leq af_i(t) \quad (1)$$

with,

$$af_i : t \mapsto \left\lfloor \frac{t - m_i.o}{m_i.p} \right\rfloor + 1 \quad (2)$$

and,

$$df_i : t \mapsto \left\lceil \frac{t - m_i.o - m_i.d}{m_i.p} \right\rceil \quad (3)$$

However, as the service function stays constant between the rounds, we can formulate (C4.1) and (C4.2) as follows

$$\forall m_i \in \mathcal{M}, \forall j \in [1..R_M],$$

$$(C1) : \quad sf_i(r_j.t + T_r) \leq af_i(r_j.t) \quad (4)$$

$$(C2) : \quad sf_i(r_j.t) \geq df_i(r_j.t + T_r) \quad (5)$$




Fig. 4. Representation of arrival, demand, and service functions of message m_i . The lower part shows the five rounds, r_1 to r_5 , scheduled for the hyperperiod. m_i is allocated a slot in the colored rounds, i.e., r_1 , r_2 , and r_4 . The allocation of m_i to r_3 instead of r_2 would be invalid, as r_3 does not finish before the message deadline, i.e., it violates (C4.2). However, the allocation of m_i to r_5 instead of r_1 would be valid and result in $r_0.B_i = 0$.

The arrival and demand functions are step functions. They cannot be used directly in an ILP formulation, however

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad af_i(t) = k \Leftrightarrow 0 \leq t - m_i.o - (k-1)m_i.p < m_i.p \quad (6)$$

$$\text{and} \quad df_i(t) = k \Leftrightarrow 0 < t - m_i.o - m_i.d - (k-1)m_i.p \leq m_i.p \quad (7)$$

For each message $m_i \in \mathcal{M}$ and each round r_j , $j \in [1..R_M]$, we introduce two integer variables k_{ij}^a and k_{ij}^d that we constraint to take the values of af and df at the time points of interest, i.e., $r_j.t$ and $r_j.t + T_r$ respectively. That is,

$$0 \leq r_j.t - m_i.o - (k_{ij}^a - 1)m_i.p < m_i.p \quad (8)$$

$$0 < r_j.t + T_r - m_i.o - m_i.d - (k_{ij}^d - 1)m_i.p \leq m_i.p \quad (9)$$

$$\text{Thus, (8)} \Leftrightarrow af_i(r_j.t) = k_{ij}^a$$

$$(9) \Leftrightarrow df_i(r_j.t + T_r) = k_{ij}^d$$

Finally, we must express the service function sf , which counts the number of message instances served at the end of each round. Remember that $r_k.B_s$ denotes the allocation of the s -th slot of r_k . For any time $t \in [r_j + T_r; r_{j+1} + T_r[$, the number of instances of message m_i served is

$$\sum_{k=1}^j \sum_{s=1}^B r_k.B_s \quad \text{s.t. } B_s = i$$

It may be that $m.o + m.d > m.p$, resulting in $df(0) = -1$ (see (3)), like e.g., in Fig. 4. This “means” that a message released at the each of one hyperperiod will have its deadline in the next hyperperiod. To consider this situation, we introduce, for each message m_i , a variable $r_0.B_i$ set to the number of such “leftover” message instances at $t = 0$. Finally, for each message $m_i \in \mathcal{M}$, and $t \in [r_j + T_r; r_{j+1} + T_r[$,

$$sf_i : t \mapsto \sum_{k=1}^j \sum_{s=1}^B r_k.B_s - r_0.B_i \quad (10)$$

s.t. $r_k + T_r < t$ s.t. $B_s = i$

Ultimately, (C1) and (C1) can be formulated as ILP constraints using (8), (9), and the following two equations:

$$\text{Eq. (4)} \Leftrightarrow \sum_{k=1}^j \sum_{s=1}^B r_k.B_s - r_0.B_i \leq k_{ij}^a \quad (11)$$

s.t. $B_s = i$

$$\text{Eq. (5)} \Leftrightarrow \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \sum_{s=1}^B r_k.B_s - r_0.B_i \geq k_{ij}^d \quad (12)$$

s.t. $B_s = i$

V. EVALUATION

We evaluate the performance of TTW regarding two criteria: the minimal achievable latency for an application, and the energy savings from the use of communication rounds.

Let $a.\delta$ denote the latency of an application a . It represents the delay for a complete execution of a , i.e., the completion of all tasks in $a.\mathcal{G}$. Let $a.c$ be a chain in $a.\mathcal{G}$. A chain is a path of $a.\mathcal{G}$ starting and ending with a task without predecessor




Fig. 5. Break-down of a communication round. At the slot level, the colored boxes identify phases where the radio is on. In the “idle” phase, the radio is turned off in practice, but this idle time of each node depends on its distance to the initiator. To evaluate the energy benefits of rounds (see Fig. 7), we assume the radio stays on for the whole T_{flood} time (18).




Fig. 6. Sample values of the round length T_r for different network diameters and numbers of slot per round. Payload is $l = 10 B$ and $N = 2$.

and successor, respectively. For example, (τ_2, m_2, τ_4) is a path of \mathcal{G} in Fig. 3. The minimum achievable latency for a single message in TTW is T_r . Thus $a.\delta$ is lower-bounded by

$$a.\delta \geq \max_{a.c \in a.g} \left(\sum_{\tau \in a.c} \tau.e + \sum_{m \in a.c} T_r \right) \quad (13)$$

As discussed in Sec. VI, to the best of our knowledge, [16] is the only approach that provides timing guarantees similar to TTW. However, the best possible guarantee for a single message is of the order of $2 * T_r$ [16], due to the loose coupling between the task and message schedules. Hence, our approach improves the message latency by (at least) a factor 2.

To minimize the application latency, one can minimize the round length T_r , down to a certain limit that we investigate now. A round is composed of $(B + 1)$ slots (see Fig. 1) taking each a time $T_{slot}(l)$ to complete, where l the payload size in Bytes. The composition of each slot is detailed in Fig. 5. First, all nodes wake up (it takes $T_{wake-up}$) and switch on their radio (T_{start}). Then the message flood starts (see Fig. 1(b)). We denote by T_{hop} the time required for one protocol step, *i.e.*, a one-hop transmission. The total length of the flood is

$$T_{flood} = (H + 2N - 1)T_{hop} \quad (14)$$

with H the network diameter and N the number of times each node transmits each packet⁷. T_{hop} is itself divided into

$$T_{hop} = T_d + T_{cal} + T_{header} + T_{payload} \quad (15)$$

where T_d is a radio delay, and T_{cal} , T_{header} and $T_{payload}$ are the transmission times of the clock calibration message, the protocol header and the message payload, respectively. With a bit rate of R_{bit} , the transmission of l Bytes takes time

$$T(l) = 8l/R_{bit} \quad (16)$$

Once the message flood is completed, some time T_{gap} is necessary to process the received packet. We split T_{slot} into T^{on} and T^{off} , the time spent with radio on and off. $T_{slot}(l) = T^{off} + T^{on}(l)$ with

$$T^{off} = T_{wake-up} + T_{gap} \quad (17)$$

$$T^{on}(l) = T_{start} + (H + 2N - 1) * (T_d + 8(L_{cal} + L_{header} + l)/R_{bit}) \quad (18)$$

$$\text{and } T_r(l) = T_{slot}(L_{beacon}) + B * T_{slot}(l) \quad (19)$$

With our implementation, a beacon size of $L_{beacon} = 3$ Bytes is sufficient. We use the values from Table I to derive T_r as function of the network diameter H and the number of slots per round B (see Fig. 6). It shows *e.g.*, a minimum message latency of 50 ms in a 4-hop network using 5-slot rounds. The complete numerical model is available as supplementary material.

We now consider the benefits of using rounds in terms of energy, using the radio-on time as metric. Beacons are necessary to reliably prevent message collisions (see Sec. II). In a design *without* round, each message transmission is preceded by its own beacon, such that the transmission time for B messages of size l , denoted $T_{wo/r}(l)$, takes

$$T_{wo/r}(l) = B * (T_{slot}(L_{beacon}) + T_{slot}(l)) \quad (20)$$

⁷Glossy achieves more than 99.9% packet reception rate using $N = 2$ [11].




Fig. 7. Relative radio-on time benefit of using rounds compared to single messages. $H = 4$, $N = 2$. As each round requires only one beacon from the host, the benefit of using rounds grows with the number of number of slots per round (X-axis). Conversely, those savings become less significant as the payload size increases (lighter colors).

$T_{wake-up}$	T_{start}	T_d	L_{cal}	L_{header}	T_{gap}	R_{bit}
750 μ s	164 μ s	68 μ s	3 B	6 B	3 ms	250 kbps

TABLE I
CONSTANTS OF A PUBLICLY AVAILABLE GLOSSY IMPLEMENTATION [17]

Using (18), we compute the relative energy saving $E = (T_{wo/r}^{on} - T_r^{on})/T_{wo/r}^{on}$ as a function of the payload size l and the number of slots B . As shown in Fig. 7, 5-slot rounds already induce 33% energy savings for 10 Bytes of payload.

Will a physical implementation yield comparable energy and delay results? Models of Glossy and LWB show very close correlations to the measured performance of the physical system [4], [11]. Based on this fact and the high similarity with our model, we can expect that yes, an implementation of TTW will match the results of the performance modeling with high accuracy, thus validating TTW's design for CPS applications.

VI. RELATED WORK

Various high reliability protocols have been proposed for low-power multi-hop wireless network, like TSCH [2], WirelessHART [3] or LWB [4]. Despite their respective benefits, all those protocols consider only network resources. They do not take into account the scheduling of distributed tasks on the computation resources, and therefore they hardly support end-to-end deadlines as commonly required for CPS applications [6]. In [16], a protocol that provides such end-to-end guarantees is proposed, but it couples tasks and messages as loosely as possible, aiming for efficient support of sporadic or event-triggered applications. This results in high worst-case latency and is thus not suitable for demanding CPS applications [6]. This observation points toward a fully time-triggered system where tasks and messages are co-scheduled.

In the wired domain, much work has been done on time-triggered architecture, like TTP [18], the static-segment of FlexRay [19], or TTEthernet [20]. Many recent works use SMT- of ILP-based methods to synthesize and/or analyze static (co-)schedules for those architectures [8], [9], [12], [21], [22]. However, these approaches assume that a message can be scheduled at anytime. While being a perfectly valid hypothesis for a wired system, this assumption is not compatible with the use of communication rounds in a wireless setting.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

This paper presented Time-Triggered-Wireless (TTW), a distributed low-power wireless system design, motivated by the need for a wireless solution providing low latency, energy efficiency and high reliability for time critical applications, *e.g.*, industrial closed-loop control systems. This paper presented the design concepts that enable TTW to meet those requirements. The performance evaluation of TTW, based on low-level system models, shows a reduction of communication latency by a factor 2x and of energy consumption by 33-40% compared to the closest related work [16]. This validates the suitability of TTW for wireless CPS applications and opens the way for implementation and real-world experience with industry partners.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work is supported by Nano-Tera.ch, with Swiss Confederation financing, and by the German Research Foundation (DFG) within cfaed and SPP 1914, project EcoCPS.

REFERENCES

- [1] NSF, "Cyber physical systems – nsf10515," <https://www.nsf.gov/pubs/2010/nsf10515/nsf10515.htm>, 2010.
- [2] I. W. Group *et al.*, "Ieee standard for local and metropolitan area networkspart 15.4: Low-rate wireless personal area networks (lr-wpans)," *IEEE Std.*, vol. 802, pp. 4–2011, 2011.
- [3] WirelessHART, "Wirelesshart," 2007. [Online]. Available: <https://fieldcommgroup.org/technologies/hart/>
- [4] F. Ferrari, M. Zimmerling, L. Mottola, and L. Thiele, "Low-power wireless bus," in *Proc. of ACM SenSys*, 2012.
- [5] "Ewsn dependability competition," 2017. [Online]. Available: www.ewsn2017.org/dependability-competition1
- [6] J. Åkerberg, M. Gidlund, and M. Björkman, "Future research challenges in wireless sensor and actuator networks targeting industrial automation," in *Proc. of the IEEE INDIN*, 2011.
- [7] T. F. Abdelzaher and K. G. Shin, "Combined task and message scheduling in distributed real-time systems," *IEEE Transactions on parallel and distributed systems*, vol. 10, no. 11, pp. 1179–1191, 1999.
- [8] S. S. Craciunas and R. S. Oliver, "Combined task- and network-level scheduling for distributed time-triggered systems," *Real-Time Systems*, 2016.
- [9] M. Ashjaei, N. Khalilzad, S. Mubeen, M. Behnam, I. Sander, L. Almeida, and T. Nolte, "Designing end-to-end resource reservations in predictable distributed embedded systems," *Real-Time Systems*, 2017.
- [10] K. Jeffay, D. F. Stanat, and C. U. Martel, "On non-preemptive scheduling of period and sporadic tasks," in *Real-Time Systems Symposium, 1991. Proceedings., Twelfth.* IEEE, 1991, pp. 129–139.
- [11] F. Ferrari, M. Zimmerling, L. Thiele, and O. Saukh, "Efficient network flooding and time synchronization with Glossy," in *Proc. of the ACM/IEEE IPSN*, 2011.
- [12] L. Zhang, D. Goswami, R. Schneider, and S. Chakraborty, "Task-and network-level schedule co-synthesis of ethernet-based time-triggered systems," in *Proc. of the ASP-DAC*, 2014.
- [13] G. Fohler, "Changing operational modes in the context of pre run-time scheduling," *IEICE transactions on information and systems*, vol. 76, no. 11, pp. 1333–1340, 1993.
- [14] Freescale, "Vf3xxr and mkw2xdx series," 2017. [Online]. Available: www.freescale.com
- [15] J.-Y. Le Boudec and P. Thiran, *Network calculus: a theory of deterministic queuing systems for the internet.* Springer Science & Business Media, 2001, vol. 2050.
- [16] R. Jacob, M. Zimmerling, P. Huang, J. Beutel, and L. Thiele, "End-to-end real-time guarantees in wireless cyber-physical systems," in *Proc. of the IEEE RTSS*, 2016.
- [17] "Low-power wireless bus (lwb)," 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/ETHZ-TEC/LWB>
- [18] H. Kopetz and G. Grunsteidl, "Ttp - a time-triggered protocol for fault-tolerant real-time systems," in *Proc. of FTCS-23*, 1993.
- [19] FlexRay, "ISO 17458-1:2013–Road vehicles–FlexRay communications system–Part 1: General information and use case definition," International Organization for Standardization (ISO), Geneva, Switzerland, Standard, 2013.
- [20] H. Kopetz, A. Ademaj, P. Grillinger, and K. Steinhammer, "The time-triggered ethernet (tte) design," *Proc. of the IEEE ISORC*, 2005.
- [21] W. Steiner, "An evaluation of smt-based schedule synthesis for time-triggered multi-hop networks," in *Proc. of the RTSS*, 2010.
- [22] D. Tamas-Selicean, P. Pop, and W. Steiner, "Synthesis of communication schedules for ttethernet-based mixed-criticality systems," in *Proc. of the IEEE/ACM/IFIP CODES+ISSS*, 2012.

APPENDIX

This appendix presents the complete description of the ILP formulation, used to synthesize the schedule $Sched(M)$ of a given operation mode M , *i.e.*,

$$Sched(M) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l|l} \tau.o, m.o, m.d & a \in M, (\tau, m) \in a.\mathcal{G} \\ r_k.t, r_k.[B] & k \in [1, R_M] \end{array} \right\}$$

The system model is described in Sec. III. All the variables and parameters involved in the ILP formulation used to solve the single-mode schedule synthesis problem are listed at the end in Table II for reference. This appendix details all the formulated constraints and how they are implemented in practice. The last subsection details the formulation of the objective function used to minimize the end-to-end application latency.

The ILP formulation to be solved by Alg. 1 (see Sec. III) contains the following constraints, which can be classified into four categories.

1. Application constraints.

(C1.1) Precedence constraints between tasks and messages must be respected.

(C1.2) End-to-end deadlines must be satisfied.

2. Round constraints.

(C2.1) The rounds must not be overlapping.

(C2.2) The time interval between two rounds is upper-bounded.

3. Validity of the tasks mapping.

(C3) The same node cannot process more than one task simultaneously.

4. Validity of the messages allocation.

(C4.1) Every message must be served after its release time.

(C4.2) Every message must be served before its deadline.

(C4.3) A round cannot be allocated more messages than the number of slots available in one round.

(C4.4) Within one hyperperiod, the same number of messages are released and served.

The validity of the message allocation constraints, in particular constraints (C4.1) and (C4.2), induce a non-linear coupling between the message and round variables. This peculiar aspect makes the scheduling problem non-trivial and prevents the use of conventional ILP-based schedule synthesis approaches reported thus far in the literature. Our approach to solve this problem is detailed in Sec. A.

Application constraints

(C1.1) Precedence constraints between tasks and messages must be respected.

For any application a , let $a.c$ be a *chain* in $a.\mathcal{G}$. A chain is a path of $a.\mathcal{G}$ starting and ending with a task without predecessor and successor, respectively. $a.c(\text{first})$ and $a.c(\text{last})$ denote the first and last task of the chain $a.c$.

$$\forall a, \forall a.c \in a.\mathcal{G}, \forall \tau_j \in (a.c \setminus a.c(\text{last})), \forall m_i \in \tau_j.\text{prec},$$

$$m_i.o + m_i.d \leq a.p * \sigma_{i,j} + \tau_j.o \quad (21)$$

$$\forall a, \forall a.c \in a.\mathcal{G}, \forall m_j \in a.c, \forall \tau_i \in m_j.\text{prec},$$

$$\tau_i.o + \tau_i.e \leq a.p * \sigma_{i,j} + m_j.o \quad (22)$$

(C1.2) End-to-end deadlines must be satisfied.

$$\forall a, \forall a.c \in a.\mathcal{G}, \tau_{\text{first}} = a.c(\text{first}), \tau_{\text{last}} = a.c(\text{last}), C = |a.c|,$$

$$\tau_{\text{last}.o} + \tau_{\text{last}.e} - \tau_{\text{first}.o} + \sum_{j=1}^{C-1} a.p * \sigma_{i,j} \leq a.d \quad (23)$$

Round constraints

(C2.1) The rounds must not be overlapping.

$$\forall j \in [1..R_M - 1], \quad r_j.t + T_r \leq r_{j+1}.t \quad (24)$$

(C2.2) The time interval between two rounds is upper-bounded.

$$\forall j \in [1..R_M - 1], \quad r_{j+1}.t - r_j.t \leq T_{\text{max}} \quad (25)$$

Validity of the task mappings

(C3) The same node cannot process more than one task simultaneously.

$$\forall \tau_i, \tau_j, \tau_i.map == \tau_j.map, \forall k_i \in [1..LCM/\tau_i.p], \forall k_j \in [1..LCM/\tau_j.p]$$

$$\tau_i.o + \tau_i.e + \tau_i.p * k_i \leq \tau_j.o + \tau_j.p * k_j \quad (26)$$

$$\text{or } \tau_j.o + \tau_j.e + \tau_j.p * k_j \leq \tau_i.o + \tau_i.p * k_i \quad (27)$$

However, an ILP formulation cannot directly support that only one-out-of-two constraints must be satisfied. To resolve this, we use a classical trick using (i) a binary variable λ representing which of the two constraints (26) or (27) must be enforced and (ii) a “big” time constant M , used to satisfied the other constraint by default, *i.e.*, regardless of the values of the variables. For example, $M = 10 * LCM$.

$$\tau_i.o + \tau_i.e + \tau_i.p * k_i \leq \tau_j.o + \tau_j.p * k_j + MM * (1 - \lambda_{i,j}^{k_i,k_j}) \quad (28)$$

$$\tau_j.o + \tau_j.e + \tau_j.p * k_j \leq \tau_i.o + \tau_i.p * k_i + MM * \lambda_{i,j}^{k_i,k_j} \quad (29)$$

With this implementation of the constraints, it follows that

$$\lambda_{i,j}^{k_i,k_j} = 1 \Leftrightarrow (28) \equiv (26) \wedge (29) \text{ is always satisfied.}$$

$$\lambda_{i,j}^{k_i,k_j} = 0 \Leftrightarrow (29) \equiv (27) \wedge (28) \text{ is always satisfied.}$$

Validity of the messages allocation

As mentioned earlier, the validity of the message allocation constraints, in particular constraints (C4.1) and (C4.2), induce a non-linear coupling between the message and round variables. This peculiar aspect makes the scheduling problem non-trivial and prevents the use of conventional ILP-based schedule synthesis approaches reported thus far in the literature. The following subsection repeats and deepens the arguments from Sec. IV.

To address problem of variable coupling, we first formulate the constraints (C4.1) and (C4.2) using *arrival*, *demand*, and *service* functions, af , df and sf , using network calculus. Those functions count the number of message instances released, served, and due since the beginning of the hyperperiod, respectively. Those three functions are illustrated in Fig. 8. It must hold that

$$\forall m_i \in \mathcal{M}, \forall t, \quad df_i(t) \leq sf_i(t) \leq af_i(t) \quad (30)$$

$$\text{with,} \quad af_i : t \mapsto \left\lfloor \frac{t - m_i.o}{m_i.p} \right\rfloor + 1 \quad (31)$$

$$\text{and,} \quad df_i : t \mapsto \left\lceil \frac{t - m_i.o - m_i.d}{m_i.p} \right\rceil \quad (32)$$

However, as the service function stays constant between the rounds, we can formulate (C4.1) and (C4.2) as follows

$$\forall m_i \in \mathcal{M}, \forall j \in [1..R_M],$$

$$(C4.1) : \quad sf_i(r_j.t + T_r) \leq af_i(r_j.t) \quad (33)$$

$$(C4.2) : \quad sf_i(r_j.t) \geq df_i(r_j.t + T_r) \quad (34)$$




Fig. 8. Representation of arrival, demand, and service functions of message m_i . The lower part shows the five round, r_1 to r_5 , scheduled for the hyperperiod. m_i is allocated a slot in the colored rounds, *i.e.*, r_1 , r_2 , and r_4 . The allocation of m_i to r_3 instead of r_2 would be invalid, as r_3 does not finish before the message deadline, *i.e.*, it violates (C4.2). However, the allocation of m_i to r_5 instead of r_1 would be valid and result in $r_{0.B_i} = 0$.

The arrival and demand functions are step functions. They cannot be used directly in an ILP formulation, however

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad af_i(t) = k \Leftrightarrow 0 \leq t - m_i.o - (k-1)m_i.p < m_i.p \quad (35)$$

$$\text{and} \quad df_i(t) = k \Leftrightarrow 0 < t - m_i.o - m_i.d - (k-1)m_i.p \leq m_i.p \quad (36)$$

For each message $m_i \in \mathcal{M}$ and each round r_j , $j \in [1..R_M]$, we introduce two integer variables k_{ij}^a and k_{ij}^d that we constraint to take the values of af and df at the time points of interest, *i.e.*, $r_j.t$ and $r_j.t + T_r$ respectively. That is,

$$0 \leq r_j.t - m_i.o - (k_{ij}^a - 1)m_i.p < m_i.p \quad (37)$$

$$0 < r_j.t + T_r - m_i.o - m_i.d - (k_{ij}^d - 1)m_i.p \leq m_i.p \quad (38)$$

$$\text{Thus, (37) } \Leftrightarrow af_i(r_j.t) = k_{ij}^a$$

$$(38) \Leftrightarrow df_i(r_j.t + T_r) = k_{ij}^d$$

Finally, we must express the service function sf , which counts the number of message instances served *at the end* of each round. Remember that $r_k.B_s$ denotes the allocation of the s -th slot of r_k . For any time $t \in [r_j + T_r; r_{j+1} + T_r[$, the number of instances of message m_i served is

$$\sum_{k=1}^j \sum_{s=1}^B r_k.B_s \quad \text{s.t. } B_s = i$$

It may be that $m.o + m.d > m.p$, resulting in $df(0) = -1$ (see (32)), like *e.g.*, in Fig. 8. This “means” that a message released at the each of one hyperperiod will have its deadline in the *next* hyperperiod. To consider this situation, we introduce, for each message m_i , a variable $r_0.B_i$ set to the number of such “leftover” message instances at $t = 0$. The system model makes the assumption that $a.d \leq a.p$. As $m.p = a.p$, $m.o \leq m.p$ and $m.d < a.d$, then $m.o + m.d < 2 * m.p$. Thus, there can be only one or zero of such leftover message instances, *i.e.*, $r_0.B_i \in \{0, 1\}$. Finally, for each message $m_i \in \mathcal{M}$, and $t \in [r_j + T_r; r_{j+1} + T_r[$,

$$sf_i : t \mapsto \sum_{k=1}^j \sum_{s=1}^B r_k.B_s - r_0.B_i \quad \text{s.t. } r_k + T_r < t \quad \text{s.t. } B_s = i \quad (39)$$

Ultimately, (C4.1) and (C4.2) can be formulated as ILP constraints using the following four equations:

$$\forall m_i \in \mathcal{M}, \forall j \in [1..R], \quad (37) \quad : \quad 0 \leq r_j.t - m_i.o - (k_{ij}^a - 1) * m_i.p < m_i.p$$

$$(38) \quad : \quad 0 \leq r_j.t + T_r - m_i.o - m_i.d - (k_{ij}^d - 1) * m_i.p < m_i.p$$

$$(33) \Leftrightarrow \sum_{k=1}^j \sum_{s=1}^B r_k.B_s - r_0.B_i \leq k_{ij}^a \quad \text{s.t. } B_s = i \quad (40)$$

$$(34) \Leftrightarrow \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \sum_{s=1}^B r_k.B_s - r_0.B_i \geq k_{ij}^d \quad \text{s.t. } B_s = i \quad (41)$$

To implement those constraints in practice, some slight modifications are still required. We use Gurobi to solve the ILP problem. This solver does not allow to model strict inequalities, *i.e.*, $A \cdot x < B$. Therefore, to implement the right-hand side of the constraints (8) and (38), we need to use a “small” time constant mm . Furthermore, This leads to the following implementation.

(C4.1) Every message must be served after its release time.

$$\forall m_i \in \mathcal{M}, \forall j \in [1..R_M], \quad 0 \leq r_j.t - m_i.o - (k_{ij}^a - 1) * m_i.p \leq m_i.p - mm \quad (42)$$

$$\sum_{k=1}^j \sum_{s=1}^B r_k.B_s - r_0.B_i \geq k_{ij}^d \quad \text{s.t. } B_s = i \quad (43)$$

(C4.2) Every message must be served before its deadline.

$$\forall m_i \in \mathcal{M}, \forall j \in [1..R_M], \quad mm \leq r_j.t + T_r - m_i.o - m_i.d - (k_{ij}^d - 1) * m_i.p \leq m_i.p \quad (44)$$

$$\sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \sum_{s=1}^B r_k.B_s - r_0.B_i \geq k_{ij}^d \quad \text{s.t. } B_s = i \quad (45)$$

Finally, the formulation of the last two constraints – (C4.3) and (C4.4) – is rather straightforward.
(C4.3) A round cannot be allocated more messages than the number of slots available in one round.

Satisfied by construction.

(C4.4) Within one hyperperiod, the same number of messages are released and served.

$$\forall m_i \in \mathcal{M}, \quad \sum_{k=1}^{R_M} \sum_{\substack{s=1 \\ s.t. B_s=i}}^B r_k \cdot B_s = LCM/m_i \cdot p \quad (46)$$

Objective function

To obtain a valid schedule, the ILP solver does not *need* to optimize any objective function. The primer objective is to minimize of the number of rounds R_M used in the schedule, which is achieved by incrementally increasing the number of rounds (see Algorithm 1) until a valid schedule is found.

However, from the application perspective, it is of importance to *minimize the end-to-end latency* of concurrently running applications. Therefore, we formulate as an objective function, denoted obj , the sum of all application latency, which we want to minimize. If we denote the latency of application a by $a.\delta$ and the latency of the chain $a.c$ by $a.c.\delta$,

$$\forall a, \forall a.c \in a.\mathcal{G}, \tau_{first} = a.c(first), \tau_{last} = a.c(last), C = |a.c|,$$

$$a.c.\delta = \tau_{last.o} + \tau_{last.e} - \tau_{first.o} + \sum_{j=1}^{C-1} a.p * \sigma_{i,j} \quad (47)$$

$$a.\delta = \max_{a.c \in a.\mathcal{G}} (a.c.\delta) \quad (48)$$

And finally,

$$obj = \sum_{a \in \text{mode } M} a.\delta \quad (49)$$

TABLE II
COMPLETE LIST OF VARIABLES USED IN THE ILP FORMULATION.

Name	Notation	Type	Value	
Task offset	$\tau.o$	Continuous	$0 \leq \tau.o < \tau.p$	
Message offset	$m.o$	Continuous	$0 \leq m_i.o < m.p$	
Message deadline	$m.d$	Continuous	$0 \leq m_i.d \leq m.p$	
-	σ	Binary	0 or 1	
-	λ	Binary	0 or 1	
Round starting time	$r.t$	Continuous	$0 \leq r_j.t \leq LCM - C_{net}$	
Round allocation	$r.[B]$	Integer	$0 \leq r_j.B_s \leq 1$	
-	$r_0.B_i$	Integer	$0 \leq r_0.B_i \leq 1$	
-	$k_{i,j}^a$	Integer	$0 \leq k_{i,j}^a \leq LCM/m_i.p$	
-	$k_{i,j}^d$	Integer	$-1 \leq k_{i,j}^d \leq LCM/m_i.p$	
Number of rounds	R_M	Integer	$0 \leq R_M \leq R_{max}$	unit
Round time length	T_r	Constant	1	time unit
Number of slots per round	B	Constant	5	slots
Minimal inter-round time	T_{max}	Constant	30	time unit
“Big” time constant	MM	Constant	$10 * LCM$	
“Small” time constant	mm	Constant	0.0001	time unit