

A Graceful Degradation Framework for Distributed Embedded Systems

William Nace Philip Koopman





RoSES Project



- Robust Self-configuring Embedded Systems (RoSES)
- Robustness gained with automatic graceful degradation
 - Must not require human intervention to specify or guide
- ◆ First shot → automated reconfiguration when fault detected

Domain -- Distributed Embedded Systems

- Distributed functionality remains after most failures
- Smart sensors general compute capability
- Most functionality is optimization

Examples: elevators, autos, copiers, plant control, ...

• Not Internet toasters

Overview



System-level customization

• "Customize a system to maximize the functionality of given H/W"

◆ 3 step, iterative framework for algorithm

- Feature selection find features to implement
- S/W selection determine which software components necessary
- Allocation fit the software to the hardware

The Framework: Mission Statement



Customize a system so as to maximize the functionality of given H/W"

- Isn't this just like:
 - Hardware-software co-design? I'm given H/W, not given functionality
 - Reconfigurable computing? I'm not using special purpose H/W, different time constraints
 - Load balancing? I select/allocate S/W for robustness/functionality, not performance

♦ Example Scenario: Automotive

- Not run-time (yet)
 - Exploit ground states
- May require external assistance
 - Or fault tolerant subsystem (using standard techniques)



The Algorithm from 30,000 feet





Hardware Specification

List of Processing Elements (PEs)

- Vector of available resources
 - CPU cycles, Flash, RAM, ...
- Operational sensors and actuators (attached to PEs)

Network

- Scalar resource (bandwidth)
- Broadcast, real-time
- Archetype: Control Area Network



CPU ROMRAMDIO AIO PIO



Software Specification



- ♦ Adapter RoSES terminology for a software object
- Configuration collection of adapters
- Configurations form data flow graphs (DFGs)
 - Vertices are adapters and transducers
 - Adapter requirements specified as a vector, same terms as PEs
 - Transducers are merely sources/sinks of data (don't consume PE resources)
 - Edges are communications
 - Labeled with dataflow requirement
 - Flow
 - from Sensor(s)
 - through 1+ adapters
 - to Actuator(s)



PFA Specification



Product Family Architecture (PFA)

• Structured view of all possible configurations

PFA graph – specifies capability of entire product/model line

- Merge DFGs for all configurations
 - Last year's models
 - High to low end models
 - Etc....
- PFA Graph is a supergraph of all configuration DFGs

PFA Graph



Merge DFGs with choice elements

• Data can flow from any one of the inputs

Specialization: data element

• Network message type

Ex: Conveyer belt part identification



What's a Feature?



Required as a means to make optimization choices

- I tried "Data path through PFA graph"
 - Rejected: Too restrictive

"Use of a particular adapter"

- Dependencies communicated via PFA graph
 - Other adapters automatically selected as "glue"

Feature is given utility value

Similar features require organization

• Class-based Feature Model



Collect similar features into *classes*

Only one feature from each class useful

• Do you want multiple transmission control algorithms running concurrently?

• Some classes may be *critical*

• A valid feature set includes a feature from all critical classes

$$Utility_{FeatureSet} = \sum_{c}^{Classes} Utility(Feature_{c})$$

Phase 1: Feature Selection



◆ Goal: Choose a *Feature Set*

- Maximize utility
 - Try highest utility feature set first
 - (In general case it won't fit in H/W)

Use a combinatorial algorithm

- Start with highest utility feature from each feature class
- Number of feature classes/features is small

Phase 2: Adapter Selection



Goal: Choose adapter set to implement the feature set

- Prune PFA graph of "dead" adapters
- Discover paths through features of interest
- Select paths based on what policies?
 - Heuristic analysis experiment
- Adapters from selected paths form Adapter Set

Phase 3: Adapter Allocation

RoSES

◆ Goal: Map adapter set to PEs, network

- Well-worn research area
- Bin-packing problem (NP complete)
 - Attack as list processing heuristic
 - » Sort adapters into list (by what criteria?)
 - » Start with largest, packing onto a PE (chosen how?)
 - » Success if list gets emptied



A Pretty Picture of the Algorithm





Backtracking/Failure Feedback



- ◆ When Phase n+1 fails, Phase n tries again
- What info does Phase n need to make intelligent choices for next attempt?
 - Type of allocation failure (network or PE overflow)
 - How far processing proceeded
 - State of algorithm at failure point
 - . . .
- Phase 2 failures provide info for phase 1 to make larger moves in search space

Tar Pits I Want to Avoid Future Work



Universal Feature Model

- Composability of features, with complex interaction, without combinatorial explosion
- Class based model is sufficiently expressive for most real systems

Validity Checks

- System dependent
- User supplied validity check of resulting allocation

Scheduling

- Tough. Would obscure proposed work
- Hack: oversize system and apply RMA, or treat as validity failure

Conclusions



System-level customization

• "Customize a system to maximize the functionality of given H/W"

◆ 3 step, iterative framework for algorithm

- Feature selection find features to implement
- Adapter selection determine which adapters necessary
- Adapter allocation fit the adapters to the hardware