

Safety, Efficiency and Autonomy - Mastering Conflicting Trends in Embedded Systems Design

Rolf Ernst

► **To cite this version:**

Rolf Ernst. Safety, Efficiency and Autonomy - Mastering Conflicting Trends in Embedded Systems Design. Mike Hinchey; Bernd Kleinjohann; Lisa Kleinjohann; Peter A. Lindsay; Franz J. Rammig; Jon Timmis; Marilyn Wolf. 7th IFIP TC 10 Working Conference on Distributed, Parallel and Biologically Inspired Systems (DIPES) / 3rd IFIP TC 10 International Conference on Biologically-Inspired Collaborative Computing (BICC) / Held as Part of World Computer Congress (WCC) , Sep 2010, Brisbane, Australia. Springer, IFIP Advances in Information and Communication Technology, AICT-329, pp.5-6, 2010, Distributed, Parallel and Biologically Inspired Systems. <10.1007/978-3-642-15234-4_2>. <hal-01054489>

HAL Id: hal-01054489

<https://hal.inria.fr/hal-01054489>

Submitted on 7 Aug 2014

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.



Safety, Efficiency and Autonomy - Mastering Conflicting Trends in Embedded Systems Design

Rolf Ernst

Technische Universität Carolo-Wilhelmina zu Braunschweig
Institute of Computer and Network Engineering
Hans-Sommer-Str. 66,
38106 Braunschweig, Germany
r.ernst@tu-bs.de

Extended Abstract

Embedded systems have developed from single microcontrollers to networked systems and are moving further on to large open systems. As an example, automotive electronics started as a single microcontroller for engine control to develop into a local network of 50 and more electronic control units connected via several network standards and gateways which are found in current cars. These networks will be extended by open wireless car-to-car or car-to-infrastructure communication enabling completely new functionality, such as advanced driver assistance systems that report approaching cars that could cause an accident. Other examples are found in health-care, where patients are monitored at home connected to a hospital data base and monitoring system rather than staying in the hospital for that purpose, or in smart buildings where different control functions are integrated to minimize energy consumption and adapt consumption to the available energy, or in energy supply networks that are optimized to include renewable energy production. In all these cases we observe a transition from local closed networks with a single systems integrator controlling all design aspects (such as an automotive manufacturer) to larger open networks with many independent functions and different integrators following different design objectives. The Internet plays an important role supporting that trend. Unlike closed networks with a defined topology, such systems change over the life-time of a system.

As a consequence, there is no single design process any more that controls all components and subsystems. There is no single “product” that is replicated in production, but every open networked system is somewhat different both in implemented services and in topology. Updates and upgrades change the system over its lifetime. Lab test and maintenance become increasingly difficult as neither execution platform nor system function are fully defined at design time. Many deeply embedded nodes are hard to reach or become so large in their numbers that a centrally controlled maintenance process becomes infeasible. To handle such challenges, autonomous, self learning and evolutionary system functions have been proposed which automatically adapt to changing environments

and requirements. Unfortunately, this reduces system predictability which is a main requirement to guarantee system properties such as real-time and safety.

A second consequence is the convergence of system functions with different dependability and safety requirements. Patient monitoring at home is certainly a safety critical task that runs in a home environment that was intended for home office, entertainment and home appliances with lower safety requirements. So, if we want to use the IT environment at home for monitoring, it must be able to handle higher safety requirements. A similar requirement holds for car-to-car communication if safety critical driver assistance functions shall be implemented this way. A future traffic assistance system is likely to include pedestrians and bicyclists using their mobile devices to communicate with cars and warn of hazardous situations. This will be particularly helpful for senior persons. Now, the mobile device and its communication channels will become safety critical which is a completely new requirement.

This host of conflicting requirements is likely to become a showstopper for many advanced embedded applications if system and service providers are not able to give guarantees and assume liability. One approach is isolation of resources. Most prominently, time triggered protocols and architectures have been proposed that assign unique time slots to each application in order to minimize side effects. This is a consistent but conservative approach which has a major impact on the autonomous development and evolution of a system. Unfortunately, current hardware components have a deep state space (caches, dynamic predictions) that affects execution timing beyond even longer time slots. That makes complete isolation in time rather difficult. Multicore based systems with shared resources are a good example for the upcoming challenges.

As an alternative or complement, formal methods have been proposed that analyze system properties, such as timing and safety. Today, they are typically used in support of embedded system simulation and prototyping, but in future autonomous systems they could run automatically since test cases and evaluation are not needed. First examples have been presented in research demonstrating feasible computation requirements.

Even if the upcoming systems integration challenges can be handled with autonomy, suitable computer architectures, and formal methods, they will not be for free. Lack of cost and power efficiency could still prevent their introduction, in particular where energy resources are scarce. So, systems integration and control of autonomous embedded systems should be seen as a global optimization problem using a separate global control function, much like the control layer of a classical communication network, but requiring guarantees that are far beyond the current state.