





Platform-aware Model-driven Optimization of Cyber-Physical Systems

Designing image-based control systems considering workload variations* Sajid Mohamed, Dip Goswami, Twan Basten

*In CDC 2019.

S. Mohamed, et al., "Optimising QoC of multiprocessor IBC systems considering workload variations," In DSD 2018.



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Framework Programme for Research and Innovation under grant agreement no 674875.









IBC system: characteristics

- Sensing delay is relatively long
 - applicable for 30 or 1000 frames per second (fps)
- Sensing delay more than frame rate
 - dropped camera frames
- Sensing delay is variable
 - workload variations

Sensing delay









How to cope with this long, variable sensing delay to improve system performance?





Workload Variations



- Execution time of 'S' depends on workload variation
- A constant sensor-to-actuator delay τ and sampling period $h \rightarrow$ to guarantee system stability



Design vs Implementation

S

Δ

A



S

C

Α



S

The Design-Implementation Gap



- Controllers designed for worst-case workload \rightarrow rarely happens
- Idle resources for less workload \rightarrow inefficient resource utilisation



Bridging the Gap



Can we optimise Quality-of-Control using multiprocessor technology?



Vision-based Lateral Control – Results



Can we optimise Quality-of-Control using multiprocessor technology?

Yes, Scenario- and Platform-Aware Design (SPADe) approach.



Quality-of-Control (QoC) metrics

- Control performance
 - Settling time (ST)
 - vision-guided braking
 - Mean-square error (MSE)

•
$$e = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} (x[k] - r)^2$$

- Control energy/effort
 - Power spectral density (PSD)
 - Maximum control effort (MCE)



...

Scenarios based on workload



How to identify, model and characterise workload variations for IBC design?

PERT distribution, Discrete-time Markov chain



Why platform-aware?

Model-of-Computation: synchronous dataflow (SDF)



Synchronous dataflow (SDF)

- Actor, channel, tokens, rates
- state proc₂ d proc₁ proc₂ d proc₁ d

Synchronous dataflow (SDF)

• Actor, channel, tokens, rates







Why platform-aware?





Workload scenarios





Pipelining and/or parallelization

- Throughput of the dataflow graph = sampling period
- Latency of the dataflow graph = sensor-to-actuator delay





Scenario- and Platform-Aware Design flow





SPADe approach

- 1. Identify, model, and characterise workload (scenario) variations
 - PERT distribution
 - Discrete-time Markov chain
- 2. Find optimal mappings for a given platform allocation
 - SDF3 flow
- 3. Identify system scenarios
 - Implementation constraints
- 4. Design a controller
 - LQR with worst-case sampling period
 - Switched linear control (SLC) system
 - Markovian jump linear system (MJS)
 - Pipelined controller



Scenario identification



• Based on choice of mapping and choice of pipelining and/or parallelization Rol Rol P_1 (h_2, τ_2) D Rol Rol Rol RolM P_0 D P_1 P_0 P_1 S P_0

Control Design

• LQR control

$$J(u) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} z[k]^T d_s C_{aug}^T C_{aug} z[k] + d_u^2 |u[k]|^2$$

- Switched linear control (SLC)
 - Identify system scenarios (from e.g. PERT distribution)
 - Prove stability (common/switched quadratic Lyapunov function)



Control Design

- Markovian jump linear system (MJS)
 - Model workload variations as discrete-time Markov chain

$$z[k+1] = A_{aug,\theta[k]}z[k] + B_{aug,\theta[k]}u[k]$$
$$y_z[k] = C_{aug}z[k]$$

$$S_2$$
 S_3

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} p_{11} & p_{12} & p_{13} \\ p_{21} & p_{22} & p_{23} \\ p_{31} & p_{32} & p_{33} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$J(\theta[0], z[0], u[0]) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[z[k]^T C_{aug}^T C_{aug} z[k] + d_u^2 |u[k]|^2]$$





Design guidelines

	QoC metrics				
Available system knowledge		Performance		l energy	Performance
	MSE	ST	MCE	PSD	and Energy
Only worst-case workload information	LQR	LQR	LQR	LQR	LQR
Frequently occurring workloads as a PERT	SLC	SLC	LQR	LQR	SLC/ LQR
Frequently occurring workloads and their	SLC/	SLC/	MJS/	MJS/	MIS
transition probabilities as a DTMC	MJS	MJS	LQR	LQR	IVIJ 5
0.04	8×10	-3	Ŷ	1	
0.03					→SLC →MILS
	4 -		×		-LQR
		dir			
			Ъ¶.		
-VIJLS	-4				
-0.04 Reference	e _8		1	¢	
$\begin{array}{cccc} 0 & 5 & 10\\ 24 & time (s) \end{array}$	15 0		5 time	10 e (s)	

Conclusion

How to cope with long image sensing delay?

- SPADe approach
- Considering workload variations is beneficial
- Pipelining
- Parallelization

Future work:

- Develop I²C tool based on SPADe approach
 - Inputs: application and platform model, requirements and constraints
 - Output: System configurations and controller code







S.Mohamed@tue.nl



linkedin.com/in/sajidmohamed

