

Reactive Scheduling of Computational Resources in Control Systems

Hodai Goldman

Ben-Gurion University of the Negev
Department of Computer Science

January 1, 2018

1 Overview

2 Automata-based Scheduling

- Motivation
- Component-based Architecture
- Component definition

3 Simulation with Kalman

4 Experiment with real-life case-study

- Case study
- Vision Component
- Simplifying the Kalman Filter with Complementary Filter
- Test and Results

5 Conclusion

- Conclusion
- Related Work

Overview

Contributions


- Development of control and scheduling co-design framework
- **Reactive** scheduling (adaptation)
- **composable** interface (based on automata theory)
- Development of scheduling technique based on **Kalman filter**

Achievements of this thesis

- Extend the work of **RTComposer**
- Proof of concept with **simulation**
- Proof of concept with **real-life case-study**
- **Bridge** between control and software engineering

Example


A component that “plays” a game with its environment



- A sensor with two modes: **H**igh quality, **L**ow quality.
- After **H**, the estimation quality (q) is best, after **L**it may degrade.

Example



A solution of the game



- We must not schedule **H** when in s_3

Example



Simultaneous Games (composition)



Only one **H** per slot allowed

Example



Simultaneous Games (composition)



Only one **H** per slot allowed

Example



Simultaneous Games (composition)



Only one **H** per slot allowed

Example



Simultaneous Games (composition)



Only one **H** per slot allowed

Example



Simultaneous Games (composition)



Only one **H** per slot allowed

Example



Simultaneous Games (composition)



Only one **H** per slot allowed

Example



Simultaneous Games (composition)



Only one **H** per slot allowed

Example



Simultaneous Games (composition)



Only one **H** per slot allowed

Example



Simultaneous Games (composition)



Only one **H** per slot allowed

Example



Simultaneous Games (composition)



Only one **H** per slot allowed

Example


Simultaneous Games (composition)




Only one **H** per slot allowed

Example

Simultaneous Games (composition)




We cannot allow both components to be on env_2




Only one **H** per slot allowed

Example

Simultaneous Games (composition)



We cannot allow both components to be on env_2




If both components are at s_2 , at least one H must be scheduled


Only one H per slot allowed

Example

Simultaneous Games (composition)



We cannot allow both components to be on env_2




If both components are at s_2 , at least one **H** must be scheduled

Adding a third component makes the system **unschedulable!**


Only one **H** per slot allowed

The Proposed Architecture

The scheduler is part of the control loop



A Component in the System



```

High () {
  ...
}
Low () {
  ...
}
  
```

Scheduling Büchi Game

- **Alternating turns**
- Scheduler alphabet is $\Sigma_{schd} = 2^T$ (in the example $T = \{H, L\}$)
- Environment alphabet is $\Sigma_{env} = \mathbb{R}^n$ (*scheduler feedback variables*)
- There is an transition for any **possible** environmental outcome
- The **scheduler feedback variables** can be any environment-depended value
- Environment player plays first

The Proposed Architecture

Automata-Based Specification Interface

Automata advantages


- **Lite:** minimal resource consumption at run-time
- **Expressive**
- **Composable**
- **Automata theory:** allows for tools such as *GOAL*



Graphical tool for Omega-Automata and Logics


Simulation

Schedule sensing-tasks based on the estimation quality



Simulation

Schedule sensing-tasks based on the estimation quality




	High	Low	Aut. Based
%CPU	85	10	46
mean of $ x - \hat{x} $	0.97	1.24	1.08

Integration with Kalman filter




- Process & actuation noise affect the *a-priory* estimation
- Measurement error affect only the measurement
- The difference between them estimate the over-all errors

Mission Definition




Control Objectives



Control & Scheduling Objectives

- Minimize deviation in the x axis
- Minimize CPU usage of the image processing task

Controller Design



Attitude and position controller

- The **vision** component estimate the position
- Position controller output a desired angle (proportional to acceleration)
- We used a standard PID controllers

Vision Component




Image Processing Algorithm

- ① Find the window corners (brute force search)
- ② Calculate the drone position

Calculate the Drone Position

Vertical Difference




$$V_d = \frac{((y_1 - y_4) - (y_2 - y_3))}{((y_1 - y_4) + (y_2 - y_3))}$$

$$sZ = ((y_1 - y_4) - (y_2 - y_3)) + ((y_1 - y_4) + (y_2 - y_3))$$

Calculate the Drone Position


Center of Mass



$$S_x = \frac{x_1+x_2+x_3+x_4}{4}$$

Calculate the Drone Position

Approximate x Position



$$x = l \cdot \sin(V_d) \approx l \cdot V_d$$

The Filter


Limitations of Kalman filter

- The system is not linear
- The process and actuation noises distribution are unknown and unstable
- Kalman filter adds complexity in the code

Filtering in two steps

- ① Predicts - with a linearized model
- ② Update - with the vision and other sensors

The Linearized Model




$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & dt & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & dt \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ g \end{pmatrix}$$

Basic equations of motion on x axis

- **Position:** $\bar{r}_x[k + 1] = r_x[k] + dt \cdot v_x[k]$
- **Velocity:** $\bar{v}_x[k + 1] = v_x[k] + dt \cdot a_x[k]$
- **Acceleration:** $\bar{a}_x[k + 1] = \Sigma F_x/m \approx roll \cdot g$

The Measurement vector



$$C = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1/g \end{pmatrix}$$

Measurement vector

- **Position:** from vision algorithm
- **Velocity:** $\frac{\partial r_x}{\partial t}$
- **Acceleration:** roll angle from the AHRS of APM

The Update Step

$$x[k] = K \cdot \bar{x}[k] + (1 - K) \cdot C^{-1} \cdot y[k]$$

$$x_r = K_r \cdot \bar{x}_r[k] + (1 - K_r) \cdot y_r[k]$$

$$x_v = K_v \cdot \bar{x}_v[k] + (1 - K_v) \cdot y_v[k]$$

$$x_a = \bar{x}_a$$

Overall noise estimation

$$\tilde{y}_{k|k} = \bar{x}_r[k] - y_r[k]$$

Experiment Setup

this slide is needed?

Vision Mode




Image resolution switching

- Change camera resolution in run time adds large **delay**
- Use **hardware** (GPU resizer) for fast mode switch

Constant Vision Mode


Always low quality mode

- 240p resolution
- mean error of 30cm
- 2.1% CPU usage

Always high quality mode


- 960p resolution
- mean error of 9.5cm
- 30% CPU usage

Manual Mode flight




Reactive Schedulers


A_{err} - estimation error based



A_x - position based




Reactive Schedulers

 A_{Comp1} 

Reactive Schedulers


A_{Comp2}



Results

Schedule	% CPU	mean(x) (cm)
Only High	30.9%	9.5
Only Low	2.1%	30.0
$A_x (T_x = 10)$	16.6%	10.9
$A_x (T_x = 20)$	14.0%	14.1
$A_x (T_x = 30)$	8.9%	17.4
A_{err} $(T_l = 10, T_h = 20)$	10.3%	14.9
A_{err} $(T_l = 10, T_h = 15)$	11.7%	11.3
A_{comp1} $(T_x = 10 , T_l = 10 , T_h = 15)$	8.8%	12.9
A_{comp2} $(T_{x1} = 10 , T_{x2} = 30 , T_l = 10 , T_h = 15)$	10.4%	12.7


Adaptiveness Results



$$[T_l = 10, T_h = 15]$$

conditions	% CPU	mean($ x $) (cm)
Fan off	11.7%	11.3
Fan on	13.2%	11.8

Adaptive Results



instead of with Related Work

review of similar papers: A table with few papers