



**HAL**  
open science

## A Virtual Queuing based Algorithm for Delays Evaluation in Networked Control Systems

Boussad Addad, Saïd Amari, Jean-Jacques Lesage

► **To cite this version:**

Boussad Addad, Saïd Amari, Jean-Jacques Lesage. A Virtual Queuing based Algorithm for Delays Evaluation in Networked Control Systems. IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics, 2010, pp.9. 10.1109/TIE.2010.2098358 . hal-00546532

**HAL Id: hal-00546532**

**<https://hal.science/hal-00546532>**

Submitted on 14 Dec 2010

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# A Virtual Queuing based Algorithm for Delays Evaluation in Networked Control Systems

Boussad Addad, Saïd Amari and Jean-Jacques Lesage, *Member, IEEE*

**Abstract** — In this paper, an approach to evaluate time performances of networked control systems (NCS) is presented. Switched-Ethernet with Client/Server protocol is considered for communication. As a result, the reactivity of these NCS is not only affected by the network delays but also by the field devices due delays. Obviously, all of them have to be taken into account to evaluate efficiently the NCS reactivity. So, by including some preliminary results, we propose an overall study in an effort to achieve this aim. First, we model the traffic of the NCS and provide formal proofs to characterize the scenarios leading to the worst delays. Subsequently, we develop a virtual queuing based algorithm (VQA) to search these scenarios and deduce the corresponding delays. Through a practical case study, it is shown how VQA fits experimental observations both quantitatively and qualitatively.

**Key words**— Networked Control Systems, Client/Server Protocol, Switched Ethernet, Delays Evaluation, Virtual Queue

## I. INTRODUCTION

NOWADAYS, the industrial organizations are more and more sophisticated, consisting of many intelligent devices connected through communication networks. The widespread of networked control systems (NCS) was in essence motivated by reducing the volume of the wiring systems which are technically and economically a real issue. The bigger they are, the more difficult is their maintenance and the bigger is the bill of the consumed power (especially with embedded systems in vehicles). Beside NCS benefits however, some challenges have emerged too. The network due delays, which are often not constant or even random, affect dramatically the control loops. To deal with this tricky problem, many solutions have been developed according to the context and the application of the NCS. Approaching this problem can be achieved through two different ways. The control is synthesized by ignoring the delays while a network scheduling is performed so as to minimize the delays. Many communication protocols were developed for this purpose [1], [2], [3], [4]. The other approach is to firstly assess the network induced delays and subsequently look for an adequate control

strategy to compensate the negative effect of the delays. During the last years, this topic has been actively investigated and many advanced control strategies have been proposed [5], [6], [7], [8]. In the majority of these studies however, only the network due delays have been considered [9], [10], [11] i.e. the network delays affecting a packet when traveling from a sensor to a controller and from a controller to an actuator. With Client/Server protocols like Modbus TCP [12], one of the most widespread protocols in industry, this assumption is actually no longer viable. Indeed, two different issues are to be investigated at the same time: the network delays on one hand and the field devices due delays on the other hand. Moreover, the latter delays are often by far larger than the network delays. As a matter of fact, no complete investigation has been carried out so as to evaluate the real time capabilities of such NCS. The rare related works are often simulation of some scenarios [13], [14], [15] without being exhaustive. In doing so, the critical cases that correspond to the worst delays are not guaranteed to be found. When it is the case using exhaustive methods like model-checking [16], [17], only relatively simple architectures are targeted because of the classical state explosion problem of this method. Also, a trivial method that consists of adding up the worst local delays is possible but it is so pessimistic (50% overestimation) that it is not practically viable [18]. So, the aim of this paper is to avoid the state explosion while considering enough large NCS. Also, a formal proof of an accurate and exhaustive exploration is provided while taking into account both the network and the field devices delays.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: an overview of Client/Server NCS and the context of the study are discussed in Section II. Then in Section III, an analysis about the traffics interference is addressed and the worst scenarios are identified. Thereafter, a virtual queuing based algorithm (VQA), to calculate the delays corresponding to these scenarios, is proposed in Section IV. Afterwards in Section V, a practical case study is considered for validation. Finally, some concluding remarks are given in Section VI.

## II. BACKGROUND

As aforementioned, we consider an NCS that works according to Client/Server protocol. It is constituted of PLCs (programmable logic controllers), remote input output modules (RIOMs), PCs to perform high level functions and finally a switched Ethernet network for communication (Fig. 1). The PLC comprises two modules, the CPU (central processing unit) that executes the user program to perform the

Manuscript received February 23, 2010; revised September 22, 2010; accepted November 18, 2010.

B. Addad, S. Amari and J. J. Lesage are with the Automated Production Research Laboratory LURPA, ENS-Cachan, 94235 Cachan Cedex, France (e-mail: boussad.addad@lurpa.ens-cachan.fr; said.amari@lurpa.ens-cachan.fr; Jean.Jacques.lesage@lurpa.ens-cachan.fr).



pessimistic evaluation, the quality of control in the NCS was degraded to guarantee stability [18]. Using equation (2) however, led to a satisfactory result with an overestimation of only 1%, resulting in a much better quality of control. On top of that, a thorough analysis in [19] showed that the maximum bound  $D_{MAX}$  is reached when both the  $NFD$  and the  $RTT$  are maximal. Hence, we propose an approach to assess the maximal bounds of the  $RTT$  and the  $NFD$  so as to eventually use them in (2) to evaluate efficiently  $D_{MAX}$ .

### III. TRAFFIC MODELING AND ANALYSIS

With Client/Server paradigm, the RIOMs are scanned periodically by the controllers. For instance, in Fig. 1-3, PLC2 sends five requests  $f_1^2, f_2^2, f_3^2, f_4^2$  and  $f_5^2$  to respectively RIOMs  $R_{12}, R_{13}, R_{14}, R_{15}$  and  $R_{16}$ . To assess the  $RTT$  relative to the control loop of Fig. 1, we have to find the delay that the frame  $f_2^2$  (hatched in Fig. 3) experiences when crossing the network. Since the FIFO (First in First out) scheduling is considered in the switch of the network, when the frame  $f_2^2$  enters the switch at the date denoted by  $t^*$ , it experiences a delay that depends solely on the set of frames that entered the switch before it. Let us denote this set by  $E$  as in Fig. 3.




Fig. 3. Analysis of the frames interference, (a) before shifting frames, (b) after shifting frames.

This set corresponds also to the quantity of work (backlog) waiting to be processed at date  $t^*$ . Let us denote this backlog by  $w(t^*)$ . The challenge is then to find the scenario (set  $E$ ) that corresponds to the worst delay that frame  $f_2^2$  undergoes. The next lemma does not give precisely the worst scenario but provides an important propriety to identify it.

#### A. Lemma

Let  $f_2^2$  be the frame under consideration and its arrival date into the switch be  $t^*$ . Let  $E$  be the set of frames arriving before  $f_2^2$  and the frames from the parallel controllers entering immediately before  $f_2^2$  be  $f_3^1$  and  $f_3^3$  (grayed in Fig. 3). Thus, we can formulate the following lemma:

*If the set  $E$  corresponds to the worst scenario, than the worst delay is experienced if and only if the frames  $f_3^1$  and  $f_3^3$  entered the switch immediately before  $f_2^2$ . In other words, the arrival date of  $f_3^1$  and  $f_3^3$  is  $t^* - \varepsilon$  where  $\varepsilon > 0$  tends to zero.*

*Proof (by contradiction):*

Suppose that the worst case delay noted  $\Delta$  is reached when the frames  $f_3^1$  and  $f_3^3$  enter at date  $t^* - \delta_1$  and  $t^* - \delta_3$  respectively as in Fig. 3(a) and the backlog at  $t^*$  is  $w(t^*)$ . Let us now shift the groups of requests from PLC1 and PLC3 with the lags  $\delta_1$  and  $\delta_3$  (this is possible since the PLCs generate their requests independently from each other) while keeping the frames  $f_3^1$  and  $f_3^3$  enter the switch before  $f_2^2$  as in Fig. 3(b). Thus, the set  $E$  of frames preceding  $f_2^2$  remains the same but the quantity of work is no longer  $w(t^*)$  but  $w'(t^*)$  and the corresponding delay is  $\Delta'$ . So, the frames from PLC1 enter  $\delta_1$  later than they do in the first case (case before shift) and the frames from PLC3 enter  $\delta_3$  later. Since the set  $E$  remains the same, then the backlog  $w'(t^*)$  is necessarily greater than  $w(t^*)$  and therefore the delay  $\Delta'$  is greater than  $\Delta$ . Indeed, when the same set  $E$  begins to be processed at a later date, the processing is finished later too. Obviously, stating that  $\Delta'$  is greater than  $\Delta$  is absurd since from the beginning  $\Delta$  is supposed to be the worst delay. ■

The previous lemma provides us with important information to identify the worst case scenario but the set  $E$  that corresponds to it is still unknown. All we know is that the worst delay is reached when  $f_2^2$  enters a bit after two frames ( $f_i^1, f_j^3$ ) from the parallel controllers PLC1 and PLC3. So, we can check every combination ( $f_i^1, f_j^3$ ) for  $1 \leq i \leq 4$  and  $1 \leq j \leq 4$  and then simulate the system behaviour according to the lemma.

Actually, such a method would not be viable in general since it is not easy to identify discrete dates in systems that display uncertainties and complex configurations. So, instead of looking for these discrete dates, we rather search for the set  $E$ . As we saw before however, the knowledge of this set is not sufficient since case (a) and case (b) correspond to the same set  $E$  but not the same delay. Fortunately, the next theorem will prove that if the set  $E$  remains the same but we know how much the parallel frames are shifted with (at least the maximum shift), then the discrepancy of the corresponding delay from the worst one is known as well.

### B. Theorem

Let the start-sending dates from PLC1 and PLC3 be  $(t^* - \tau_1)$  and  $(t^* - \tau_3)$  respectively. In other words,  $(t^* - \tau_1)$  is the arrival date of  $f_1^1$  and  $(t^* - \tau_3)$  is the arrival date of  $f_1^3$ . Looking for the worst scenario is obviously equivalent to looking for the corresponding lags  $\tau_1$  and  $\tau_3$ .

If a step  $\delta_e$ , smaller than the minimal inter-arrival time, is used to vary the lags  $\tau_1$  and  $\tau_3$  in a combinatorial scheme, then we have the following:

i) An exhaustive exploration is achieved and the set  $E$  that corresponds to the worst case is surely swept.

ii) The accuracy of the assessed worst delay  $\Delta$  is worth  $\delta_e$ .

In other words  $(\Delta_{worst} - \Delta) \leq \delta_e$ .

*Proof:* i) the first result is straightforward. Indeed, the date  $t^*$  varies with a step  $\delta_e$  smaller than any inter-arrival period of two consecutive frames from PLC1 ( $f_i^1$  and  $f_{i+1}^1$ ). As a consequence, when varying the lags,  $t^*$  is surely between the dates of arrival of two consecutive frames  $f_i^1$  and  $f_{i+1}^1$ . In the case of Fig. 3, when  $\tau_1$  varies with a step  $\delta_e$ , we are sure to obtain  $t^*$  between the arrival dates of  $f_3^1$  and  $f_4^1$ . Thus, the subset of  $E$  from PLC1 is found. The subset from PLC3 is obtained in exactly the same way.

ii) The set  $E$  is found but we obtain a configuration as on Fig. 3(a), not the worst case of Fig. 3(b). Indeed, we obtain arrival dates of  $f_3^1$  and  $f_3^3$  to be  $t^* - \delta_1$  and  $t^* - \delta_3$  where  $\delta_1 \leq \delta_e$  and  $\delta_3 \leq \delta_e$ . The worst drift from case (b) is when  $\delta_1 = \delta_3 = \delta_e$ . This means that the frames from PLC1 and PLC3 enter the switch  $\delta_e$  units of time earlier. Consequently, the frame  $f_2^2$  will be forwarded at best  $\delta_e$  earlier. So, the frame  $f_2^2$  experiences a delay  $\Delta$  with  $\Delta \geq \Delta_{worst} - \delta_e$ . This can be written equivalently as:  $(\Delta_{worst} - \Delta) \leq \delta_e$ . ■

#### Remarks III.1:

- Since an overestimation of the worst delay is sought, it is enough to add  $\delta_e$  to the assessed delay to obtain  $\Delta + \delta_e \geq \Delta_{worst}$  (consequence of result (ii)).

- Once the set  $E$  corresponding to the worst case is found, we can tighten the step  $\delta_e$  so as to improve the precision of the worst delay assessment (see the case study of Section V).

The issue now is to determine how the system behaves for a given set of lags  $\tau_i$ . Then, by performing an exhaustive exploration, according to the previous theorem, the maximal bound of a delay is deduced. To the best of our knowledge, no suitable discrete event simulator is available to achieve this purpose. The features of Client/Server protocol along with the presence of the RIOMs are the main obstacles to that. In an effort to solve this problem, an investigation has already been carried out in [15]. Unfortunately, the proposed method is not

an exhaustive one as aforementioned in the introduction. So, the bounds of the delays are not guaranteed to be found. Basically, this was the main incentive behind the introduction of VQA (virtual queuing based algorithm) though it can be used in other contexts other than Client/Server NCS [20].

## IV. VIRTUAL QUEUING BASED ALGORITHM

The algorithm we are going to present is based on some concepts we need to explain: Virtual Queuing (VQ) and Free Access Date (FAD).

### A. Definitions

#### 1) Virtual queuing

*Virtual FIFO queue (VFQ):* a virtual queue (VQ) is a concept we associate to a real queue (input port in a switch). At a given time, a VQ not only contains all the frames that have been already received by the real one but also all the frames that will be received in the future, provided that the dates of their arrivals be known. More formally, it is a set  $\langle f, \theta \rangle$  where  $f = \{A_{SCR}, A_{DST}, L\}$  is a frame of length  $L$ , issued from a device (e.g. PLC) with address  $A_{SCR}$  and going to the destination address  $A_{DST}$ . Component  $\theta$  is the date of arrival of the frame to the switch. At given date  $t$ , some of the waiting frames have already quitted the VQ (black on Fig. 4) and others are still waiting (gray on Fig. 4). So, to know at each time the frame that is waiting to be forwarded first, we associate to each VQ a counter as in Fig. 4. Since there are multiple ports in a switch, we associate to each port a VQ. So, we note  $\langle f_q^p, \theta_q^p \rangle$  the  $q^{th}$  frame of the VQ relative to the  $p^{th}$  port. Its counter is noted  $n_p$ .




Fig. 4. The virtual queue  $n^5$  (input port 5).

The VQ is said to be FIFO or VFQ if  $\theta_{(q+1)}^p \geq \theta_q^p, \forall p, q \geq 1$  i.e. the frames are ordered according to their arrivals into the real queue. The first arrived is the first to be forwarded. When a frame is forwarded, the counter is increased so as to point the potential following frame to depart in the future. That way, we know all the pending frames in all the VFQs at any time.

#### 2) Free access date

As aforementioned, no global scheduling of the resources is available in the NCS. So, considerable and variable delays due to waiting for access to the shared resources are experienced. The date at which access is possible to a shared resource is called "Free Access Date" (FAD). Thus, we associate a FAD to each shared resource of the NCS. Naturally, the shared resources depend on the models used in the study. In our case (Fig. 5), we use the same switch model considered in [2]. It




Fig. 7. Flowchart of VQA.

involves a central dispatcher that forwards the frames according to FIFO scheduling, at a speed (bits/s) noted  $C$ . In considering a "store & forward" switch, a frame is completely received before being forwarded by the dispatcher to the appropriate egress port. The data are exchanged with the end stations (PLC or RIOMs) at a bitrate (bits/s) corresponding to physical links capacity, noted  $C_{in}^k$  or  $C_{out}^k$  for port  $k$  (Fig. 5). When a RIOM receives a request, at the bitrate of the switch port  $C_{out}^k$ , it buffers it in a FIFO queue until all the waiting frames are processed. Then, it processes it during a time

$T_{RIOM}^s$  before to return an answer at a bitrate  $C_{in}^s$ .

According to the models of Fig. 5, we can easily identify the following shared resources and their FAD:

- $F_{sw}^u$ : FAD to the dispatcher of the switch number  $u$  (the dispatcher can forward only one frame at a time).
- $F_{HOL}^s$ : FAD to the HOL (head-of-line) of the output port  $s$  (leaving an output port is possible only after all the frames in the head of the queue are retransmitted out of the switch).
- $F_{RIOM}^s$ : FAD to the processor of the RIOM connected to the

port  $s$  (a RIOM can process only one request at a time).

The main notions we handle being defined, we will explain step by step the algorithm VQA.




Fig. 5. Devices modeling using queues and shared resources

### B. Virtual queuing based algorithm (VQA)

The flowchart drawn in Fig.7 displays all the steps to achieve delays evaluation using VQA. The variables  $\mathcal{G}_i$  in the flowchart are only introduced for a better structuring of the algorithm and improving its clarity.

The idea behind VQA is to look at every step, among all the competing VFQs, which one will have access to the shared resources. When a VFQ is selected, its leading frame is forwarded until it reaches another VFQ or simply quit the system. Meanwhile, the FADs are updated and the contents of the competing VFQs as well. The mechanism is repeated until all the VFQs are empty.

To explain as clearly as possible the method, a relatively simple system shown in Fig. 6(a) is used. The corresponding scanning mechanism is in Fig. 6(b):




Fig. 6. (a) Example of NCS, (b) Scanning mechanism.

- PLC1 sends a burst of two requests periodically with a period  $T_1$  to modules R12 and R13.

- PLC2 sends a request periodically with a period  $T_2$  to module R11.

We can note from Fig. 6(a) that all the ports of the switches are numbered differently (Sw1: 1, 2, 3; Sw2: 4, 5, 6, 7). So, we talk about the  $k^{\text{th}}$  port of the system ascribed the  $k^{\text{th}}$  virtual FIFO queue. In such a way, we can use as an address of each station only the number of the port that connects it to the network. Thus we adopt the following notations:

- $\kappa_{PLC}$  is the address of the controller of the loop in question. In Fig. 6(a), it is PLC1, so  $\kappa_{PLC} = 2$ .
- $\kappa_{sen}$  is the address of the sensor. In Fig. 6(a), the sensor is connected to R12 and therefore  $\kappa_{sen} = 6$ .
- $\kappa_{act}$  is the address of the actuator. In Fig. 6(a), the actuator is connected to R13 and therefore  $\kappa_{act} = 7$ .

Since the controller may send a burst of several requests to the RIOMs (e.g. PLC1 in Fig. 6(b)), we have to identify the frames that are involved in the loop in question; the request sent to the sensor and the one sent to the actuator. Therefore, we identify them by their rank in the burst:

- $\eta_{sen}$  is the rank of the frame sent to the sensor ( $\eta_{sen} = 1$  in the example of Fig. 6).
- $\eta_{act}$  is the rank of the frame sent to the actuator ( $\eta_{act} = 2$  in the example of Fig. 6).

The notations being defined, we can explain VQA:

- *Step0 (initialization of VQA)*: First of all, we generate the dates of start sending the frames from the PLCs;  $\theta_1^1$  and  $\theta_2^1$ .

We put the date of start sending of one of them as a reference and the others are generated with lags from it. In Fig. 6(b), the reference is PLC1 and the start-sending date of PLC2 is generated with a lag  $\tau$  from it.

The start-sending dates of the leading requests in each burst being known, the arrival dates to the switch Sw1 of the following frames are deduced. In the example,  $\theta_2^1$  is deduced using the length of frame  $f_2^1$ , the inter-frame gap  $L_{IFG}$ , and the bitrate of port 1.

So, we can already feed the VFQs number 1 and 2 (of the ports linking the PLCs to Sw1). The counters of the VFQs are all set to zero since no frame has already been forwarded ( $n_k = 0, \forall k$ ).

- *Step1*: among all the non empty VFQs (#1 and #2 at this step), we select the one whose the HOL (leading frame that waits to be forwarded first) has the minimal date. If it is the  $k^{\text{th}}$  VFQ of the switch number  $u$ , then it must verify:

$$\theta_{(n_k+1)}^k = \min_p (\theta_{(n_p+1)}^p).$$

The frame to be forwarded is supposed to be  $f = \{A_{SCR}, A_{DST}, L\}$  and the egress port that will receive it is the  $s^{\text{th}}$  port (to be determined using a look-up table). If we look at the scenario drawn in Fig. 6(b), the selected frame is  $f_1^1$  since  $\theta_1^1 = \min\{\theta_1^1, \theta_2^1, \theta_1^2\}$ . The egress port is  $s = 3$ .

- *Step2*: the frame is selected but the forwarding is possible only at date  $\mathcal{G}_2 = \max(\mathcal{G}_1, F_{sw}^u)$  with  $\mathcal{G}_1 = \theta_{(n_k+1)}^k + L/C_{in}^k$  i.e. the frame is completely received (store & forward switch) and the dispatcher  $u$  is free.

- *Step3*: the frame is received completely at the egress line at date  $\mathcal{G}_3 = \mathcal{G}_2 + L/C$  but once again, the frame can exit the switch only after the HOL of egress port  $s$  is free i.e. at date  $\mathcal{G}_4 = \max(\mathcal{G}_3, F_{HOL}^s)$ . Hence, the frame exits completely the switch at date  $\mathcal{G}_5 = \mathcal{G}_4 + L/C_{out}^s$ . The FAD of the HOL of egress port  $s$  is updated using this date and the inter frame gap  $L_{IFG}$ :  $F_{HOL}^s = \mathcal{G}_5 + L_{IFG}/C_{out}^s$ .

- *Step4*: at this point, four cases can be analyzed depending on the type of the receiver of the previous frame; a switch, a RIOM, a PLC or another station (e.g. a PC that does not return answers).

a) Switch (e.g. a frame that exits from port 3 to enter port 4): if the port of this receiving switch is ascribed the number  $r$ , then the  $r^{th}$  VFQ is fed with the previous frame. Go to *Step1*.

b) RIOM: in this case, the frame will wait in the FIFO buffer of requests until the access is free to the RIOM processor:  $\mathcal{G}_6 = \max(\mathcal{G}_5, F_{RIOM}^s)$ . Then, it is processed and a response is returned. This answer is received at the input port  $s$  (which was an output port previously). So, the VFQ  $s$  is fed with the response frame and the FAD of the RIOM is updated. Hence, we make a test if this RIOM is the control signal destination R13 and the source address of the frame is PLC2. If it is the case, the NFD can be calculated. Go to *Step1*.

c) PLC: Here also, we make a test if this PLC is the sender of the control signal (PLC2) and the RIOM that returned the answer is R12. If it is the case, the *RTT* can be calculated. Go to step 4(d).

d) A station without answer (including PLCs): in this case, we only check if there are waiting frames in the different VFQs of the NCS. If it is the case, then go to *Step1*, else the algorithm is terminated.

The previous algorithm is run for a particular set of start-sending dates. The algorithm is repeated as many times as necessary according to the theorem of section II so as to find the critical scenario. This is represented using the exploration loop (index  $l$ ) on the flowchart which finishes by the calculus of the maxima of the delays *RTT* and *NFD*:

$$D_{RTT}^{MAX} = \max_l(D_{RTT}^l) \text{ and } D_{NFD}^{MAX} = \max_l(D_{NFD}^l).$$

#### Remarks IV.1:

While Client/Server protocol (e.g. Modbus TCP [12]) displays many advantages, that justify its widespread in industry automation, the continuous periodic scanning of the remote modules would be a disadvantage in some cases. Indeed, when a client asks continuously for a sensor data while this latter do not change during many cycles, it results unnecessarily in an overcrowded network. Other protocols like Producer/Consumer (e.g. ProfiNet [3]) bypass this

problem by constraining the data emission; a sensor does send a message only if its state changes.

Fortunately, the concepts of VFQ and FAD are enough generic to be extended easily to these protocols without changing the core of VQA. This can be achieved quite straightforwardly by inverting the roles of the controllers and the sensors. A sensor can be considered as client that sends requests whereas a controller as a server that returns answers. The necessary time to a request to be processed by a controller is the time to execute the user program, noted  $d_4$  previously in Section II. Nevertheless, in considering such protocols, one has to take care about the information broadcast by a sensor. In event there are many consumers of this information, multicast has to be taken into account in the models of the NCS components and VQA has to be adapted accordingly.

## V. CASE STUDY: APPLICATION AND VALIDATION

The system is represented in Fig. 8 and includes two parts: *PART I* and *PART II*. *PART I* works as follows: Three controllers, PLC1, PLC2, and PLC3 scan respectively the ordered sets of RIOMs:  $\{R_{12}, R_{13}, R_{14}\}$ ,  $\{R_{14}, R_{15}, R_{16}\}$  and  $\{R_{16}, R_{17}\}$ . Minimal length Ethernet frames of 64bytes are used for scanning the RIOMs in a first case and 89bytes frames in a second case. The two cases are considered so as to figure out the influence of the frames length on the delays. *PART I* is the automation part as the one we used for explanation in Section II but as stated previously, the studied system presents the advantage of easiness of high level functions integration (since standard Ethernet is used for communication). So, a second part *PART II* with such a role is connected to this sub-network; PC1 sends long frames of 1000Bytes length to the stations PC3 and PC4. PC2 has the role of a supervisor of *PART I*. It scans all the RIOMs every 300ms so as to check the good functioning of the NCS. All the links of the switches are configured to work at a full duplex mode with a speed of 10Mbps. The processing times  $T_{RIOM}^s$  in the different RIOMs are very slightly variable in practice. Indeed, experimental measures performed on a RIOM [21], led to a maximal value of 0.5471ms and a minimal one of 0.5428ms i.e. less than 0.8% jitter. So, rounded up values are

TABLE I  
REQUESTS PROCESSING DURATIONS IN THE RIOMS (in ms)

R12	R13	R14	R15	R16	R17
0.50	0.60	0.70	0.55	0.60	0.50

used in our study as given in Table I.

Now, the aim is to evaluate upper bounds of the delays *RTT* and *NFD* relative to the control loop represented in Fig. 8; PLC2 is the controller, R14 the source of information (sensor) and R16 the destination of the control signal (actuator). The evaluation was performed with different conditions of load so as to analyze the influence of the parallel traffic on this loop. Many cases were considered by removing one or more

stations from the system. In each case, the removed components are mentioned in Table II. Case 0 where no load is present (all the flows affecting the loop are removed) was the reference of our analysis. Hence, VQA was applied by taking into consideration the previous theorem conditions. With Ethernet, we can easily calculate the minimal inter-arrival time as:  $\delta = (64 + preamble + L_{IFG}) / (10Mbps) = 67.2\mu s$ . So, the exploration step  $\delta_e$  must be smaller than this value. A progressive narrowing of the step  $\delta_e$  is performed with the condition checked:  $\delta_e = 50\mu s$  then  $10\mu s$  and finally  $1\mu s$ . The final results are reported in Table II.




Fig. 8. Client/server NCS: Case study.

As expected, whatever is the length of the frames, the delays *RTT* and *NFD* had their smallest values in Case 0. Depending on the removed traffic, either *RTT* or *NFD* changed while the following observations were noticed:

1) *RTT*: as we can notice, PLC3 had no influence on *RTT* since no effect was observed when it was added from Case 0 to Case 1. This is simply due to the fact that no intersection exists between the *RTT* path and PLC3 requests path. When PLC1 or PC2 was added however (Case 2 and Case 3), an additional delay of about 0.7ms was noticed. When they were present at the same time, twice this value was added (Case 4) and a variation of the *RTT* of about 130% from Case 0 to Case 4 was observed. The little difference between Case 2 and Case 3 is due to the effect of sharing the resource Sw2. As a matter of fact, the value of 0.7ms is the necessary delay to process a request in R14 (see Table I). So, the more it is shared by clients the more the request from PLC2 suffers when waiting for the module R14 processor availability.

2) *NFD*: almost the same phenomenon was observed with *NFD*. Indeed, when a client of the module R16 was added (Case 1 and Case 2), an extra delay of about 0.6ms was

TABLE II  
RESULTS OF EVALUATION USING VQA

	Case 0	Case 1	Case 2	Case 3	Case 4	
<i>Removed components</i>	PC2, PLC1, PLC3	PC2, PLC1	PLC1	PC2		
<i>RTT (ms)</i>	<b>64B</b>	1.10	1.10	1.86	1.80	2.56
	<b>89B</b>	1.23	1.23	1.99	1.90	2.72
<i>NFD (ms)</i>	<b>64B</b>	0.91	1.51	1.51	2.11	2.11
	<b>89B</b>	0.96	1.53	1.53	2.19	2.19

noticed and twice this value when two clients were present (Case 3 and Case 4). It followed a variation of about 128% from Case 0 to Case 4. The time to process a request in R16 is also equal to 0.6ms.

3) *The network delay* (experienced exclusively in the switches): when all the flows were present and therefore the network maximally crowded (Case 4), the pure network delay-to-*RTT* ratio was less than 20%. The same proportion can be estimated with respect to *NFD*. Hence, we get to the same conclusion stated previously in Section II; the sole pure network delay is not enough to carry out an efficient evaluation of this NCS time performances. The whole architecture is to be considered in the study.

4) *The frames length*: the effect of changing the length of the frames was maximal in Case 0 with a ratio of about 5% for *NFD* and 10% for *RTT*. Hence, we can conclude that the impact of the frames length and the parallel traffic (affecting the pure network delays) are much smaller than the effect of sharing the RIOMs.

5) *The response time*: by setting the scanning period of PLC2 to 10 ms and the CPU period to 5 ms, the use of formula (2) led to an upper bound of the response time of about 22.6ms in Case 0 and 23.7 ms in Case 4 (both cases using 89bytes frames). This means a tight overestimation of the experimental value (22.3ms [22]) with only 1.5%. So, both overestimation and accuracy were achieved at the same time. We can also point out that the effect, on the response time, of sharing the RIOMs was of about 6% (calculated as:  $(2.19 - 0.96) / 22.3$ ). So, all the conclusions of this study fit the experimental ones of [22] where it was stated that the effect of the network components and the frames length are not striking whereas sharing the RIOMs causes less than 10% effect.

## VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we proposed a method to assess switched-packets delivery delays in the context of Client/Server networked control systems. A virtual queuing based

algorithm (VQA), taking into account both the field devices and the switches, was developed for this purpose. Moreover, a formal proof was provided about the capacity of VQA to achieve exhaustive exploration and sweep the worst delays. Thereafter, it was showed that VQA fits different experimental observations and provides satisfactory results. Thus, instead of making thousands of onerous experimental measures, VQA is a satisfactory alternative with efficient delays evaluation.

## REFERENCES

- [1] P. Neumann, "Communication in industrial automation: what is going on?", *Control Engineering Practice*, 15(11), pp. 1332-1347, 2007.
- [2] J. Jasperneite, J. Imtiaz, M. Schumacher, and K. Weber, "A Proposal for a Generic Real-Time Ethernet Systems", *IEEE Trans. on Industrial Informatics*, 5(2), pp. 75-85, 2009.
- [3] J. Kjellson, A. E. Vallestad, R. Steigmann, and D. Dzung, "Integration of a Wireless I/O Interface for Profibus and Profinet for Factory Automation", *IEEE Trans. on Industrial Electronics*, 56(10), pp. 4279-4287, 2009.
- [4] L. Seno, S. Vitturi, and C. Zunino, "Analysis of Ethernet Powerlink Wireless Extensions Based on the IEEE 802.11 WLAN", *IEEE Trans. on Industrial Informatics*, 5(2), pp. 86-98, 2009.
- [5] K. Natori and K. Ohnishi, "A design Method of communication Disturbance Observer for Time-Delay Compensation, Taking the Dynamic Property of Network Disturbance Into Account", *IEEE Trans. on Industrial Electronics*, 55(5), pp. 2152-2168, 2008.
- [6] X. Tian, X. Wang, and Y. Cheng, "Self-tuning fuzzy controller for networked control system", *International Journal of Computer Science and Networks Security*, 7(1), pp. 97-102, 2007.
- [7] G. P. Liu, Y. Xia, J. Chen, D. Rees, and W. Hu, "Networked Predictive Control of Systems with Random Network Delays in Both Forward and Feedback channels", *IEEE Trans. on Industrial Electronics*, 54(3), pp. 1282-1297, 2007.
- [8] K. Natori, T. Tsuji, K. Ohnishi, A. Hace, and K. Jezernik, "Time Delay Compensation by Communication Disturbance Observer for Bilateral teleoperation Under Time-Varying delay", *IEEE Trans. on Industrial Electronics*, 57(3), pp. 1050-1062, 2010.
- [9] R. L. Cruz, "A calculus for network delay, Part I: network in isolation", *IEEE Trans. Information Theory*, 37(1), pp. 114-131, 1991.
- [10] J. P. Georges, E. Rondeau, and T. Divoux, "Confronting the performances of switched Ethernet network with industrial constraints by using Network Calculus", *Communication Systems*, 18(9), pp. 877-903, 2005.
- [11] K. C. Lee, S. Lee, and M. H. Lee, "Worst case communication delay of real time industrial switched Ethernet with multiple levels", *IEEE Trans. on Industrial Electronics*, 53(5), pp. 1669-1676, 2006.
- [12] MODBUS Messaging on TCP/IP Implementation Guide V1.0b, (October 2006), [Online]. Available: [www.modbus-ida.org/specs](http://www.modbus-ida.org/specs)
- [13] H. D. Witsch, B. Vogel-Heuser, J.-M. Faure, and G. Poulard-Marsal, "Performance analysis of industrial Ethernet networks by means of timed model-checking", *In Proc. of 12th IFAC INCOM*, St-Etienne, France, pp. 101-106, 2006.
- [14] D.A. Zaitsev, "Switched LAN simulation by colored Petri nets", *Mathematics and Computers in Simulation*, 65(3), pp. 245-249, 2004.
- [15] G. Marsal, B. Denis, J.-M. Faure, and G. Frey, "Evaluation of response time in Ethernet-based automation systems", *In Proc. of ETFA06*, Prague, Czech Republic, pp. 380-387, 2006.
- [16] J. Greifeneder and G. Frey "Probabilistic Timed Automata for Modeling Networked Automation Systems", *In Proc. of the 1st IFAC Workshop on Dependable Control of Discrete Systems DCDS*, pp. 143-148, Cachan, France, 2007.
- [17] S. Ruel, O. DE Smet, J.-M. Faure, "Finding the bounds of response time of networked automation systems by iterative proofs", *In Proc. of 13th IFAC INCOM*, Moscow, Russia, pp. 1365-1370, 2009.
- [18] B. Addad and S. Amari, "delay evaluation and compensation in Ethernet networked control systems", in *Proc. 16th Int. Conf. RTNS Real Time and Network Systems*, Rennes, France, pp. 139-148, 2008.

- [19] B. Addad, S. Amari, and J. J Lesage, "Analytic calculus of response time in networked automation systems", *IEEE Trans. on Automation Science and Engineering*, 7(4), pp. 858-869, 2010.
- [20] B. Addad, S. Amari and J.-J. Lesage, "Evaluation de délais dans les systèmes de communication temps réel en utilisant des files d'attente virtuelles", *MSR - Journal Européen des Systèmes Automatisé (JESA)*, 43(7-9), pp. 985-1000, 2009.
- [21] G. Marsal, Evaluation of time performances of Ethernet based automation systems by simulation of high level Petri nets. PhD thesis, ENS Cachan (France) and Kaiserslautern University (Germany), 2006.
- [22] B. Denis, S. Ruel, J.-M. Faure, and G. Marsal, "Measuring the impact of vertical integration on response times in Ethernet fieldbuses", *In Proc. of ETFA07*, Patras, Greece, pp. 532-539, 2007.



**Boussad Addad** received the Engineer degree in control systems from the National Polytechnic School of Algiers, Algiers, Algeria, in 2007, and the M.S degree in automated systems engineering from the Ecole Normale Supérieure de Cachan, Cachan, France, in 2008, and is currently working toward the Ph.D. degree at the Ecole Normale Supérieure de Cachan, Cachan.

His research interests include modeling and analysis of discrete event systems along with time performance evaluation of networked automation systems.



**Saïd Amari** received the Ph.D. degree from the Institute of Research in Communications and Cybernetic of Nantes, Nantes, France, in 2005.

He is currently an Associate Professor at the University of Paris XIII. He carries out research at the Automated Production Research Laboratory from the École Normale Supérieure de Cachan. His main research interests are performance evaluation and control of Discrete Event Systems with Petri nets and Dioid algebra.

**Jean-Jacques Lesage** (M'07) received the Ph.D. degree in 1989, and the "Habilitation à Diriger des Recherches" in 1994 from the University Nancy 1 Henri Poincaré, Nancy, France.



He is currently a Professor of Automatic Control at the École Normale Supérieure de Cachan, Cachan, France. His research topics are formal methods and models of Discrete Event Systems (DES), both for modeling synthesis and analysis. The common objective of his works is to increase the dependability of the DES control.