



# LUND UNIVERSITY

## Modelling and Implementation of a vision system for embedded systems

Andersson, Per

2003

[Link to publication](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Andersson, P. (2003). *Modelling and Implementation of a vision system for embedded systems*. [Licentiate Thesis, Department of Computer Science].

*Total number of authors:*

1

### General rights

Unless other specific re-use rights are stated the following general rights apply:

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Read more about Creative commons licenses: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

### Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

LUND UNIVERSITY

PO Box 117  
221 00 Lund  
+46 46-222 00 00

# Modelling and Implementation of a Vision System for Embedded Systems

Per Andersson



---

Licentiate Thesis, 2003

Department of Computer Science  
Lund Institute of Technology  
Lund University

ISSN 1404-1219  
Dissertation 16, 2003  
LU-CS-LIC:2003-1

Department of Computer Science  
Lund Institute of Technology  
Lund University  
Box 118  
SE-221 00 Lund  
Sweden

Email: [Per.Andersson@cs.lth.se](mailto:Per.Andersson@cs.lth.se)  
WWW: [http://www.cs.lth.se/home/Per\\_Andersson](http://www.cs.lth.se/home/Per_Andersson)

© 2003 *Per Andersson*





# ABSTRACT

---

Today more and more functionality is included in embedded systems, resulting in an increased system complexity. Existing design methodologies and design tools are not adequate to deal with this increase in complexity. To overcome these limitations application specific design solutions are more common. In this thesis we presents such solutions for real-time image processing. This work is part of the WITAS Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) project. Within this project we are developing a prototype UAV.

We introduce Image Processing Data Flow Graph (IP-DFG), a data flow based computational model that is suitable for modelling complex image processing algorithms. We also present IPAPI, a run-time system based on IP-DFG. We use IPAPI for early evaluation of image processing algorithms for the vision subsystem of the WITAS UAV prototype. This is carried out via co-simulation of IPAPI with the other subsystems, such as the reasoning subsystem and helicopter control subsystem. We also show how IPAPI can be used as a framework to derive an optimised implementation for the on-board system.

FPGAs can be used to accelerate the image processing operations. Time multiplexed FPGAs (TMFPGAs) have shown potential in both reducing the price of FPGAs and in hiding the reconfiguration time for dynamically reconfigured FPGAs. To use a TMFPGA, the operation must be temporally partitioned. We present an algorithm that does temporal partitioning on a technology mapped net-list. This makes it possible to use excising design tools when developing for TMFPGAs.



# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

---

I would like to thank my supervisor Krzysztof Kuchcinsky for his support and help with my work, especially for the advises and help with the writing of this thesis. I would also like to thank Klas Nordberg and Johan Wiklund, both from the ISY department of Linköping university, for sharing their knowledge in the area of image processing. Without your help my work would have been much harder.

This work has been carried out at the computer departments at Linköping University and at Lund University. I would like to tank the staff at both departments for creating a inspiring and relaxed working environment. A special thank to Flavius Gruian for the help with  $\LaTeX$  and comments on the writing of this thesis.

I would also like to thank my mother and late father for always wanting the best for me. My gratitude also go to my sister, her husband and their soon to be born child, it has always been a pleasure visiting you.

This work is part of the WITAS UAV project and was supported by the Wallenberg foundation.





# CONTENTS

---

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Motivation . . . . .	1
1.2	Contributions . . . . .	3
<b>2</b>	<b>Background</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1	Embedded System Design . . . . .	5
2.2	Image Processing Algorithm Development . . . . .	7
2.3	Improving the Design Process . . . . .	8
<b>3</b>	<b>Computational Models</b>	<b>11</b>
3.1	Data Flow Graphs . . . . .	11
3.1.1	Firing Rules . . . . .	12
3.1.2	Deterministic Behaviour . . . . .	13
3.1.3	Consistency . . . . .	15
3.1.4	Recursion . . . . .	16
3.2	Analysis of DFGs . . . . .	18
3.2.1	Consistency . . . . .	18
3.2.2	Static DFGs . . . . .	19
3.2.3	Boolean DFGs . . . . .	20
3.2.4	Problems with current DFG variants . . . . .	20
<b>4</b>	<b>Image Processing-Data Flow Graph</b>	<b>23</b>
4.1	The WITAS Project . . . . .	23
4.1.1	IPAPI - a run-time system for image processing . . . . .	25
4.2	IP-DFG - a computational model . . . . .	26

---

4.2.1	Hierarchy . . . . .	27
4.2.2	Iteration . . . . .	30
4.2.3	Token mapping functions . . . . .	33
<b>5</b>	<b>IPAPI</b>	<b>35</b>
5.1	The Architecture of IPAPI . . . . .	35
5.2	The AltiVec Implementation . . . . .	36
5.2.1	The AltiVec Unit in Combination With JNI . . . . .	37
5.2.2	Experimental Results . . . . .	38
<b>6</b>	<b>Partitioning for Time Multiplexing</b>	<b>41</b>
6.1	Time Multiplexed FPGAs . . . . .	41
6.2	The Partitioning Problem . . . . .	43
6.2.1	Data Dependency . . . . .	45
6.2.2	Dependency Loops . . . . .	46
6.3	The Partitioning Algorithm . . . . .	49
6.3.1	Scheduling . . . . .	49
6.3.2	The Priority Function . . . . .	51
6.3.3	Deadline Inheritance . . . . .	53
6.3.4	The Size of the Partitions . . . . .	54
6.3.5	Experimental results . . . . .	55
<b>7</b>	<b>Conclusions</b>	<b>57</b>
7.1	Summary . . . . .	57

# INTRODUCTION

---

This thesis addresses embedded system design and particularly with questions related to design of vision systems for Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs). The focus is on systems dedicated for complex image processing. We present contributions in several parts of the design process of such systems. This thesis presents a computational model suitable for complex image processing algorithms, a framework based on this computational model which supports the engineers when deriving an optimised implementation and an algorithm for automating design when targeting time multiplexed FPGAs. The thesis addresses tool support and design automation, rather than design methodology.

## 1.1 Motivation

An embedded system is a system dedicated for a particular application, as opposed to a general purpose system that is designed to run almost any application. Since an embedded system is designed for a particular application, it can be tailored for this application, resulting in a system more suitable for the task compared to a general system. For example a system with lower price and lower power consumption.

The design process of embedded systems is attaining an increasing interest. One reason for this is the increasing productivity gap. It is well known that the manufacturing capacity is expected to increase faster than the design capacity. This has been the situation for some years now. There already is a difference in system complexity of what can be manufactured compared to what can be developed. Increasing

the development productivity will be the main challenge for researchers in the near future. One approach to increase the productivity in the design process is to improve the individual design steps. This includes better design tools, i.e. faster simulators and more accurate estimators. With better design tools, a larger part of the design process can be automated. Decisions can be based on more accurate data, which will lead to fewer iterations of the design steps. This approach can give a respectable increase in productivity, but it will not give the leap in design productivity that is needed to solve the productivity gap problem. It is believed that a leap in productivity can be achieved by allowing the designer to work on a higher level of abstraction, in a computational model and language suitable for the application he is currently working on. The most suitable computational model and language will most likely be different for different parts of a system. To be able to use this approach tools that support multiple models of computation are needed. Those can be tools from different vendors cooperating through an open interface.

A consequence of the productivity gap is that the development cost is an increasing part of the total system cost. One approach to decrease the development cost of a system is to use platforms. For an application area a platform is developed and will be used for several products in that area. The development cost of the platform can be amortised over a larger number of products and units. The platform is likely to be more complex than the individual products. To manage this approach it is important that the developer can manage this complexity. Again a promising approach to this problem is to work with computational models and languages suitable for the application. Also it is important to have design tools that support platforms, encouraging for example component and architecture reuse.

Time to market is another aspect of embedded system development that also needs attention. It is important to release a product at the right time. If it is released too early, the market is not ready or the product will be too expensive. If a product is released late it cannot compete with similar products on the market. This time window can be as short as a few months. Usually it is more important to be first on the market than to have the best product so, in this situation, the development time reduction is the main challenge for the developers. Increasing the development productivity can lead to decreased development time, but there are other approaches too. Development time can be decreased by increase parallelism in the design process. Hardware/software co-

design is one approach which achieves this, co-simulation is another. The underlying idea is to work on different subsystems in parallel rather than in sequence. For maximum flexibility, design tools should be open and able to interact with other tools from different vendors. For example, it should be possible to test the implementation of one subsystem by co-simulation with an abstract model of another subsystem.

To summarise embedded systems are becoming more complex as more functionality is included in these systems. The existing design methods and tools are not adequate to deal with this increase in complexity. One promising approach for overcoming the complexity problem is to use application specific computational models. This requires heterogeneous designs and, hence, tools supporting this co-design approach. Complexity is not the only problem when designing embedded systems, other issues, such as time to market, also must be considered.

This thesis attempts to solve some of these problems by introducing a computational model and a run-time system/simulator for vision applications.

## 1.2 Contributions

In this thesis we present our work within the WITAS<sup>1</sup> Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) project. The work focuses on designing image processing systems and improving the design process of such systems. Our work covers a large part of the design process, from the early abstract modelling to generating executables. There are four main contributions:

- The development of a computational model, Image Processing Data Flow Graph (IP-DFG), tailored for modelling and implementation of complex image processing algorithms. IP-DFG is based on boolean data flow graphs which have been extended with hierarchy and explicit support for iterations.
- Integration of IP-DFG with a run-time system called Image Processing Application Program Interface (IPAPI). IPAPI is used in the WITAS project to co-simulate the vision subsystem with the other subsystems in the WITAS simulator. IPAPI and the WITAS simulator is used to evaluate different image processing algorithms. The original idea of IPAPI comes from Patrick Doherty and Klas

---

<sup>1</sup>WITAS is an acronym for the Wallenberg laboratory for research on Information Technology and Autonomous Systems

Nordberg, both at Linköping University. We have actively participated in the development of IPAPI, but the majority of the implementation of the memory management and scheduling layer has been done in the computer vision laboratory in ISY, Linköping University. Our main contribution is the underlying computational model and the data processing layer.

- IPAPI evaluation. We show that IPAPI is a good framework for developing efficient implementations of complex image processing algorithms. This involves the whole design process, from the early implementation independent model to the optimised implementation. We show that by using IPAPI the engineer can focus on the inner data processing loops and optimise this parts for the target architecture, while the memory management and scheduling is automatically managed by IPAPI.
- An algorithm for temporal partitioning. Temporal partitioning is a new design step needed when using Time Multiplexed FPGAs (TMFPGAs). The temporal partitioning is fully automated and it is fast, which makes it suitable for large designs. The method can be used to implement IP-DFG applications on TMFPGAs.

The rest of this thesis is organised as follows. In chapter 2 we give our view of embedded systems and we discuss the design process for embedded systems. An overview of existing computational models based on data flow graphs are presented in chapter 3. The computational model IP-DFG is introduced in chapter 4. In that chapter we also give a brief overview of the WITAS project. The implementation of IPAPI and its optimisation for the PowerPC processor is discussed in chapter 5. In chapter 6 the partitioning algorithm for TMFPGAs is described. Conclusions are presented in chapter 7.

# BACKGROUND

---

In this chapter we discuss our view of embedded systems. We discuss the design process and different ways to improve it. We also relate our contributions presented in this thesis to the design process.

## 2.1 Embedded System Design

An embedded system is a system specially designed for a particular application. This is different from a general purpose system that is designed to run any application. Since an embedded system is designed for a particular application it can be tailored for this application. This allows more aggressive optimisations and specialisation, resulting in a system more suitable for the task. This can lead to systems with lower price and lower power consumption, which is important for mobile applications.

Over the years, people have proposed different definitions of what an embedded system is. Instead of giving an exact definition, which is hard, we give two characteristics that all embedded systems have in common. An embedded system is a dedicated system and it is of moderate complexity. For example a mobile phone has moderate complexity and is designed to make phone calls, thus an embedded system. A nuclear power plant is a dedicated system, but it is a complex system and we do not consider it to be an embedded system even though it has several characteristics in common with embedded systems. In this thesis we focus on digital embedded system, that is embedded systems build from digital components such as CPUs, memories, and ASICs.



Since an embedded system is a dedicated system of moderate complexity, people might be mistaken and think that the design of embedded systems is an easy task, the designer is supposed to implement a specified functionality in a device. However, in reality the situation is much more complicated. There are many other factors, besides the functionality, that must be considered. For example, for a mobile phone the size, price and the standby time are the main selling factors, not only the ability to use it as a phone. The main problem is finding the implementation with the best trade-off between the selling factors.

In the beginning of the design process, the functionality of an embedded system can be very abstract, for example to “make a phone call”. In the early design phases, the behaviour of the embedded system are made more concrete. This is referred to as *behavioural modelling*.

The main purpose of the behavioural modelling is to extract properties, such as computation and memory requirements, to base the architecture selection on. During *design space exploration*, the space of different architectures is searched for the architecture with the smallest *cost*. Here cost does not only mean money, but all beneficial aspects, such as power consumption and time to market, can be included in the cost. During design space exploration the system architecture is decided, that is which CPUs, ASICs, FPGAs and memory components will be used and how they are communicating. The functions of the behavioural model is mapped to the different components and it is decided how these components are communicating. (point to point links, busses or networks)

After the architecture selection, the functionality that was mapped to the different components needs to be implemented. The implementations are much more detailed than the behavioural model, and usually contains parts that are specific for a particular processor or ASIC. For example software code can use accelerators only present on the target CPU, such as the AltiVec unit on the PowerPC processor or the SSE unit on an Pentium4 processor, or an ASIC implementation can use a hard IP block only usable in a certain fabrication process.

The design process is shown in figure 2.1. The different activities are overlapping. For example it can happen that during implementation some estimates that was done during the design space exploration turn out to be incorrect. In this situation the designer might be forced to go back and modify the architecture by adding more memory, processing power, or do a different function mapping.

To simplify the designer’s work and to improve their productivity, it




Figure 2.1: Embedded system design process.

is important to have a good tool support for the different design steps. During the behavioural modelling, a simulator is needed to test the behavioural model. For the design space exploration, estimates from the behavioural models are needed. Tool support for searching the design space is also needed. In some situations the implementation can be automatically derived from the behavioural model using code generation. Compilers and logic synthesis tools are of course also used during the implementation step.

## 2.2 Image Processing Algorithm Development

By far the most common way to develop image processing algorithms is using Matlab. Matlab is a tool for numerical computations on matrices and vectors. The implementation of the matrix and vector operations is very efficient for a desktop computers, which allows fast and easy fine tuning of the image processing algorithms. Matlab gives much support to the developer of the image processing algorithm. However, it does not give much support for the system developer. It is hard to extract certain properties of the algorithm, such as computational and memory requirements, from its Matlab implementation. Further, to get an efficient implementation for the final system, the image processing algorithm usually have to be reimplemented from scratch in either C/C++ or VHDL, depending on whether it is mapped to software or hardware.

## 2.3 Improving the Design Process

Within the research community and among tool vendors, much effort is put into improving the the design process of embedded systems. One way to do this is to improve the quality of existing tools. For example, if better estimates could be derived from the behavioural model an architecture with lower cost, that matches the actual design requirements more closely can be derived during design space exploration.

Another approach is to increase the productivity of the engineers. This can be achieved by allowing the engineers to work on a higher level of abstraction or in a computational model and language more suitable for the functionality they are describing. IP-DFG presented in chapter 4 is an example of a computational model specially designed for the application area of complex image processing. Image processing algorithms are commonly built from well known operations, such as convolution, and a few algorithm specific operations. Using IP-DFG, an engineer can create a behavioural model of an algorithm using library actors for the well known functions and only implement the algorithm specific actors.

IPAPI, which is presented in chapter 5, is a framework for image processing tasks meant to be used during the whole design process. IPAPI simplifies the transition from the behavioural model to an optimised implementation. During behavioural modelling, it can execute the image processing algorithms. Its open design makes it easy to use for co-simulation with other simulators modelling other parts of the system. The data processing layer of IPAPI can be stepwise refined to an optimised implementation fully utilising all features of the target architecture. The memory management and scheduling layer maintain the structure and behaviour of the the image processing tasks, allowing the engineers to focus on the computational intensive data processing loops. The process of optimising the image processing algorithms within the WITAS project for the AltiVec unit in the PowerPC processor are described in chapter 5. The memory and scheduling layers of IPAPI can be replaced. This makes it possible to optimise scheduling and memory usage for the particular set of image processing algorithms used within a system.

When new hardware technology is introduced, new design automation algorithms are needed for tools that make it possible to tailor the new technology in existing design flows. TMFPGA is a new technology and in chapter 6 we present an algorithm for temporal partitioning

of technology mapped net-lists. Temporal partitioning is needed when when targeting TMFPGAs using a traditional FPGA synthesis chain.



# COMPUTATIONAL MODELS

---

In this chapter, data flow oriented models of computation are presented. Data flow graphs (DFGs) are suitable for modelling many functions in the area of signal analysis. We discuss the expression power of different variants of DFGs. We also show pitfalls and problems with the general DFG model and how this is reduced with more restrictive variants. A method to analyse data flow graphs is also presented.

## 3.1 Data Flow Graphs

Data Flow Graph is a model of computation suitable for modelling operations on streams of data. It has a widespread use in the signal processing community, both in academy and in industry. A DFG is a special case of a Khan process network, a computational model where concurrent processes are communicating through unidirectional FIFO channels. Reads from a channel are blocking and writes are non-blocking. For a theoretical description of DFGs see [LP95]. A process in a DFG is called an *actor*. Actors communicate through unidirectional unbounded FIFO channels. Each actor is executed by repeated *firings*, during which the actor reads *tokens* from its input channels and produces tokens on its output channels. A token represents a quantum of data. A DFG is usually visualised by a graph, where the actors are represented by nodes and communication channels by arcs.

The DFG model captures the inter-behaviour of actors. It models the communication between actors and decides when actors can fire. The DFG model ensures the synchronisation enforced by data dependencies

among the actors. A DFG actor is specified by two parts, a *firing rule* and a *firing function*. The firing of an actor is data driven and the firing rule specifies which tokens must be present for an actor to fire. In the general DFG model a firing rule is only a trigger for the firing of an actor. More refined DFG models also include constraints on the token production of the actor in the firing rule, see section 3.2.2 and 3.2.3. The firing function of an actor defines the function called when an actor fires. The firing function is usually not described using the DFG model of computation, instead the function is commonly implemented in an imperative language like C or Java.

### 3.1.1 Firing Rules

The firing of actors are data driven. Each actor has a set of *firing rules* that decides when an actor can fire. A firing rule is a pre-fire condition and does not cover the effect of a firing, i.e. tokens production on outputs. Later in this chapter firing rules will be extended also to cover post-fire conditions. A firing rule specifies a token pattern for the head of the actors input channels. A token pattern is a sequence of values and a wildcards. A wildcard is written  $*$  and is matched by any token. The empty sequence is called *bottom* and is written  $\perp$ . Observe that a pattern is matched against the leading tokens in a FIFO queue, so  $\perp$  is satisfied by a queue containing zero or more tokens and not just the empty queue. For example the pattern  $[true, 5, *]$  is matched by a queue containing at least three tokens, the first token has the value *true* and the second has the value 5. The third token can have any value, the pattern only requests that it is present. In this thesis  $[$  and  $]$  are used to represent a token sequence while  $\{$  and  $\}$  are used for representing a set of sequences.

It is possible to create complex control structures by using several firing rules for the actors in a DFG. For example the DFG in figure 3.1 models an *if...then...else* structure. There are two inputs to the graph, one with control tokens and one with data tokens. Depending on whether the control token is *true* or *false* the *switch* actor will forward the corresponding data token to either the actor *foo*( $\cdot$ ) or the actor *bar*( $\cdot$ ). The actor *select* will merge the token flows from *foo*( $\cdot$ ) and *bar*( $\cdot$ ) in the correct order. The firing rules of *select* are  $\{[true], [*], \perp\}$  and  $\{[false], \perp, [*]\}$ , the order of the inputs are  $\{control, T, F\}$

The firing of an actor is only limited by the presence of tokens. Hence the actors of an DFG can fire in parallel. In the example from figure 3.1




Figure 3.1: A DFG implementation of an *if...then...else* structure.

the actors  $foo(\cdot)$  and  $bar(\cdot)$  can work in parallel. Even though the processing of the tokens can be done in parallel the tokens are guaranteed to leave the DFG in correct order. The DFG model of computation has an implicit synchronisation mechanism that guarantees a deterministic order of tokens in this graph. However this is not true for all graphs.

### 3.1.2 Deterministic Behaviour and Sequential Firing Rules

As stated in the beginning of this chapter, DFGs are a special case of Khan process networks. Consequently a DFG is nondeterministic *iff* the corresponding Khan process network is nondeterministic. There are five ways to make a Khan process network nondeterministic, namely:

1. Allowing more than one process to write to the same channel,
2. Allowing more than one process to consume data from the same channel,
3. Allowing processes to be internally nondeterministic,
4. Allowing processes to share variables,
5. Allowing processes to test inputs for emptiness.



In a DFG an arc is always connected to two actors, one reading from it and one writing to it. When a DFG is visualised, it is common that arcs fork, as the *control* arc in figure 3.1. The semantic meaning of this is that there are two channels after the fork and in the fork tokens are copied to both channels. Therefore 1 and 2 cannot occur in a DFG.

It is common that the actors of a DFG are implemented using languages that allow both nondeterministic behaviour and sharing of variables, for example C or Java. To get a deterministic behaviour for a DFG, it is important that variables are not shared between actors and that the implementation of the actors are deterministic.

According to 5, checking an input channel for emptiness can lead to nondeterministic behaviour. This constraints the firing rules that can be used in an actor in a deterministic DFG. For example an actor with the firing rules  $\{[*], \perp\}$  and  $\{\perp, [*]\}$  should fire if there is a token on either of its inputs. Since reads are blocking, any implementation must check for emptiness to decide which firing rule to apply. When there are tokens on both inputs, it is ambiguous which firing rule to chose. This actor is therefore a nondeterministic merge.

Of course it is possible to interpret the nondeterministic merge mentioned above as applying the firing rules every second time. This interpretation makes it possible to implement the actor without checking inputs channels for emptiness. However this is a deviation from the DFG semantics. An actor should be able to fire at any time when any of its firing rules is matched.

Since checking for emptiness on an input can lead to nondeterminism and reads are blocking, it is important to ensure that the firing rules of an actor can be matched against the actor inputs only using blocking reads. Such set of firing rules is said to be *sequential*. It is easy to check if the set of firing rules for an actor is sequential:

1. Chose one input where all firing rules require at least one token. That is, find an input which does not have the pattern  $\perp$  in any firing rule. If no such input exists the firing rules are not sequential.
2. Divide the firing rules into subsets. In each subset all firing rules have the same leading token for the pattern of the input chosen in 1. If a firing rule has a wildcard,  $*$ , as the leading token it should belong to all sets.
3. For the input chosen in 1 remove the first token in the pattern of all firing rules.

4. If all subsets only have  $\perp$  as pattern for all inputs then the firing rules are sequential. Otherwise repeat step 1 to 4 for every subset that containing a pattern not equal to  $\perp$ .

It is not sufficient for an actor to have sequential firing rules for it to have deterministic behaviour. Even though the firing rules can be matched using blocking reads, it is possible that several firing rules match the same input. For example, consider the two patterns  $\{\{true, *\}\}$  and  $\{\{*, false\}\}$ . together they form a sequential firing rule, but both match the input sequence  $[true, false, \dots]$ . It is ambiguous which to chose. A set of firing rules is said to be *un-ambiguous* iff an input sequence matches at most one firing rule.

It is also important that the firing rules of an actor is *complete*. This means that an input sequence of sufficient length matches at least one firing rule. For example the firing rules  $\{\{true, false\}\}$  and  $\{\{false\}\}$  are not complete since the input sequence  $[true, true, \dots]$  does not match any of the firing rules.

In this sub-section we have discussed problems at the actor level of a DFG. Even if one only uses deterministic actors with complete and un-ambiguous firing rules there can still be problems at the graph level. This will be discussed in the next sub-section.

### 3.1.3 Consistency

A DFG is *consistent* if in the long run the same number of tokens are consumed as produced on each channel [Lee91]. In [GGP92] Gao et al. calls the same property *well-behaved*. If a DFG is not consistent then at least one of two problems will arise. On some channels more tokens are produced than consumed resulting in *token accumulation*. On other channels more tokens are consumed than produced, resulting in *deadlock*.

Consider the DFG in figure 3.2(a). The problem here is that tokens will accumulate on the arc  $a$ . Since the *switch* actor discards some tokens (forward them to the F output) the number of tokens passing on the arcs  $a$  and  $b$  will be different. The size of the FIFO queue on arc  $a$  will increase each time *switch* forwards a token to its F output. Because of this the DFG is not consistent and will suffer from token accumulation.

Figure 3.2(b) shows an attempt to implement an accumulator. The diamond on the arc from *switch* to the adder is an initial token with the value 0. The token is placed on the arc before the DFG is executed.




Figure 3.2: Some problematic DFGs. Execution results in deadlock or token accumulation.

This DFG works fine until the accumulated value is read, that is until a token on the control input to *switch* is *false*. When this happens there is no feedback token from *switch* to the adder and hence the adder cannot fire. The DFG *deadlocks*. The DFG becomes consistent if the *switch* actor is replaced by an actor that forwards the input token to *T* when the control input is *true*. When the control input is *false* the replacement actor generates a new token with the value 0 on *T* and forward the input token to *F*.

Even if a DFG is consistent it can still deadlock. This happens if the DFG starts in a state where it is deadlocked. Consider the accumulator in 3.2(b). If the initial token is removed the DFG deadlocks. The adder waits for a token from *switch* and *switch* waits for a token from the adder, so neither of the actors can fire. This illustrates the importance of a proper initialisation. If a DFG is consistent and properly initialised, it will not deadlock.

### 3.1.4 Recursion

In DFGs, tail recursion is implemented using cycles in the graph. Figure 3.3(a) shows an attempt to implement the factorial function. When the *guarded counter* fires it consumes one token. This token should con-




Figure 3.3: The factorial function implemented using DFG. The core functionality is captured in (a), but this is not a working DFG. A correct implementation is shown in (b).

tain an integer,  $N$ . The actor then produces  $N$  tokens with the values  $N, N - 1, \dots, 1$ . *Last of N* does the reverse. It consume an integer token, with value  $N$ , from its upper input. It then consumes  $N$  tokens from the input on the left side, discarding all but the last, which it outputs. It is easy to see the intended function in figure 3.3(a). A sequence  $n = [N, N - 1, \dots]$  is generated and the product of the sequence is calculated. The multiplication actor will have the function  $p_i = p_{i-1} * n_i$  and *last of N* will discard all but the last of this tokens, so the result is  $N!$ . This DFG has the same problem as the accumulator in figure 3.2(b). It will deadlock because there is no initial token on the feedback arc for the multiplication actor. Even if an initial token is placed on this arc, the DFG will only work once. When the DFG starts a new factorial calculation the token on the feed back arc must be reset to 1. This is done in figure 3.3(b). The *mux* consume one token on each input and depending on the value on the control input (right side) it forward either the token from input T or F. *Last of N* now also generates this control signal, which is a sequence of  $N - 1$  *true* tokens followed by one *false* token. From this example it is clear that it can be hard both to implement and to understand recursive functions implemented using

DFGs. This is because the graphs contain actors and arcs whose only purposes are to generate initial tokens and to remove remaining tokens after the end of the calculation. These components are mixed with the body of the recursive function.

## 3.2 Analysis of DFGs

In the previous section several problems with DFGs were presented. In this section we present a method to analyse DFGs. This makes it possible to detect some of these problems at compile time. The general principle is that all tokens produced should be consumed. This leads to one equation for each channel in the DFG [LM87]. This equation involves the average token production and consumption rates of the actors. For general DFGs this values are hard to derive. We first present a method for DFG analysis followed two variants of DFGs more suitable for this kind of analysis.

### 3.2.1 Consistency

To avoid token accumulation all tokens produced must be consumed within finite time. This constrains the relative firing rates of actors connected through a channel. For an actor  $a$  communicating with another actor  $b$  the following must hold:

$$\gamma_a q_a = \gamma_b q_b \quad (3.1)$$

where  $\gamma_a$  is the average number of tokens produced on the channel, for each firing, by actor  $a$ . If actor  $a$  consumes tokens from the channel then  $\gamma_a$  is negative.  $q_a$  is the relative firing rate of actor  $a$ , i.e. the number of firings of  $a$  divided by the total number of firings in the graph. The sum of  $q$  for all actors in the DFG is 1. Collecting one such equation for each channel results in a system of equations which can be compactly written using matrix notation

$$\Gamma q = 0 \quad (3.2)$$

$q$  is a vector with the relative firing rates of the actors and should be normalised,

$$1^T q = 1 \quad (3.3)$$

If equation 3.2 and 3.3 have a solution, the DFG is consistent.  $\Gamma$  can be data dependent. For example in figure 3.1,  $\gamma$  for the T input of the *select*

actor is equal to the probability that a *true* token arrives at the control input. If 3.2 and 3.3 have a solution for all possible token sequences, the DFG is *strongly consistent*.

### 3.2.2 Static DFGs

Static DFGs are sometimes called regular DFGs. In a static DFG an actor consumes a fixed number of tokens from its inputs and produces a fixed number of tokens to its outputs each time it fires [LM87]. To make the firing rule complete, the patterns must be sequences of wild-cards. This implies that an actor can only have one firing rule. With this limitations, it does not make sense to talk about firing rules and token patterns. Instead a static DFG actor is usually represented by the transfer function and the number of tokens consumed/produced for each input/output.

The static DFG model is quite limited compared to the general DFG model. There can be no data dependent structures, such as the *if ... then ... else* structure in figure 3.1. However, static DFGs are sufficient for many applications, especially in the area of signal analysis. If data dependent decisions are needed, they can be implemented using conditional assignment instead of conditional execution. With conditional assignment, both possible result are calculated and a *mux* actor is used to select the correct result. A *mux* is an actor with two data inputs and one control input. It consume one token for each input as it fires and depending of the value of the control token forwards either of the data token to its output. Static DFGs are used in many signal analysis and image processing applications. For this application domain one only needs up-sampling, mathematical calculations, and down-sampling.

For static DFGs, the analysis introduced in section 3.2.1 becomes simple. The token consumptions/productions are constants, thus  $\gamma$  in equation 3.1 is a constant.  $\Gamma$  is a constant matrix and equation 3.2 can be solved. If there exists a solution, then there will be no token accumulation and the DFG will not deadlock. One still has to ensure a proper initialisation, so the DFG does not start in a deadlocked state. The solution to equation 3.2 can also be used to derive a static schedule and exact memory bounds of the FIFO queues [LM87].

### 3.2.3 Boolean DFGs

Static DFGs are very convenient from the analysis and scheduling points of view. However, they are limited to static behaviours. It is not possible to model data dependent decisions. To overcome this limitation, while still preserve some possibility of analysis, *boolean DFGs* were introduced [Buc93]. In boolean DFGs an actor can have a *control* input. As an actor fires, it consume one token from the control input. This token must contain a boolean value. The number of tokens consumed/produced for the other inputs/outputs are a function of the boolean value of the control token. In other words, an actor can have two firing rules: one with the pattern  $[true]$  and one with the pattern  $[false]$  for the control input. The pattern for the other inputs must be a sequence of  $*$  or  $\perp$ . *Select* and *switch* are examples of boolean DFG actors. Using boolean DFGs it is possible to model data dependent decisions and iterations.

Boolean DFGs can be analysed with the method presented in section 3.2.1. The control input is modelled by a probability function.  $\gamma$  in equation 3.1 then becomes a probability variable and if equation 3.2 has a solution for any probability then the DFG is strongly consistent. Consistency for boolean DFGs is discussed in [Lee91, Buc93].

### 3.2.4 Problems with current DFG variants

There are several limitations and problems with the DFG variants that have been presented in this chapter. The main problem is the lack of support for modularisation, both at fine and coarse level of granularity. The DFGs have a flat structure. It is not possible to create functions, subgraphs, or divide a graph into components. This was addressed in the Ptolemy and the Ptolemy II projects [Lee01]. Both projects emphasise a component based aspects of modeling and design. In Ptolemy and Ptolemy II a design is made of components, which can use different computational models. The components can be combined in a hierarchical way. There are computational models for both static and boolean DFGs [Lee01].

There are also problems at a finer level of granularity. To preserve consistency, special care must be taken when implementing dynamic decisions and recursive functions. It is common that actors which create initial tokens or remove remaining tokens are added to the DFG. These actors are mixed with the actors that perform the modelled function.

This leads to graphs where control and data dependencies are mixed. Such graphs are usually hard to understand and debug.

To overcome the mentioned limitations we have developed Image Processing DFG (IP-DFG). IP-DFG is a DFG based model, aimed at modelling and implementation of complex image processing algorithms. IP-DFG is presented in more detail in chapter 4.





# IMAGE PROCESSING-DATA FLOW GRAPH

---

In this chapter we present Image Processing DFG (IP-DFG), a model of computation developed for complex image processing algorithms. IP-DFG was developed as part of the WITAS Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) project. In this chapter we first give a brief outline of the WITAS project, and then present IP-DFG.

## 4.1 The WITAS Project

Substantial research has recently been devoted to the development of Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) [DGK<sup>+</sup>00, AUV, BWR01, EIY<sup>+</sup>01]. An UAV is a complex and challenging system to develop. It operates autonomously in unknown and dynamically changing environments. This requires different types of subsystems to cooperate. For example, the subsystem responsible for planning and plan execution bases its decisions on information derived from the surroundings in the vision subsystem. The vision system, on the other hand, decides which image processing algorithms to run, based on expectations of the surroundings, information derived by the planning and plan execution subsystem.

We currently develop an UAV in the WITAS UAV project [DGK<sup>+</sup>00, NFW<sup>+</sup>02]. This is a long term research project covering many areas relevant for UAV development. Within this project, both basic research and applied research is carried out. As part of the project, a proto-



Figure 4.1: The WITAS prototype helicopter.

type UAV is developed. The UAV platform is a mini helicopter. We are looking at scenarios involving traffic supervision and surveillance missions. The helicopter currently used in the project for experimentation is depicted in figure 4.1. On the side of the helicopter is mounted the on-board computer system while the camera gimbal is mounted beneath the helicopter. The project is a cooperation between several universities in Europe, the USA, and South America. The research groups participating in the WITAS UAV project are actively researching topics including, but not limited to, knowledge representation, planning, reasoning, computer vision, sensor fusion, helicopter modelling, helicopter control, human interaction by dialog. See [DGK<sup>+</sup>00] for a more complete description of the activities within the WITAS UAV project.

One of the most important information sources for the WITAS UAV is vision. In this subsystem, symbolic information is derived from a stream of images. There exists a large set of different image processing algorithms that are suited for different purposes and different conditions. It is desirable for an UAV to be able to combine different algorithms as its surrounding and goal changes. To allow this, one needs a flexible model for the image processing algorithms together with a run-time system that manages the combination and execution of these algorithms. Further more a run-time system needs to represent image processing algorithms in a model with a clear semantic definition. This would make it possible to do both static (off-line) and dynamic (run-time) optimisations. Optimisations make it possible to utilise the available processing power optimally by varying the quality and the size of the regions an algorithm is applied to, as the number of image processing tasks varies.

### 4.1.1 IPAPI - a run-time system for image processing

Early in the WITAS UAV project it was clear that the planning and plan execution subsystem would need to access and guide the image processing subsystem. For this purpose, an Image Processing Application Program Interface (IPAPI) was defined. IPAPI has evolved from a simple run-time system with static behaviour to a run-time system with dynamic behaviour, where the planning and plan execution subsystem configure the set of algorithms to be executed based on what symbolic information it needs to extract from its surroundings.

IPAPI has a library with implementations of different algorithms. An algorithm is executed as long as its results are needed. The creation, execution, and removal of algorithms is managed by IPAPI. IPAPI also updates the Visual Object data Base (VOB) with the result of the algorithms. The VOB contains one entry for each dynamic object the UAV keeps track of in its surrounding, The VOB is the UAV's view of the world. Other subsystem access image processing result from the VOB.

Internally the image processing algorithms are represented using a DFG based model. This representation is described later in this chapter. IPAPI has functionality for dynamic creation and removal of graphs. It dynamically manages the size of temporary data in the algorithms i.e. buffers for images. The planning and plan execution subsystem sets the size of the region of either the input or the output of a graph. IPAPI then propagates the size through the graph and allocates memory for buffers needed during execution. When the size of the regions propagates through the graph, operations that affect the size, i.e. the result is the intersection of the input regions, are accounted for. IPAPI also manages the execution of the graphs.

IPAPI has a type system. For each input and output of an actor, a type is specified. The types are checked when inputs are connected to outputs during the creation of graphs. The typing of inputs and outputs of actors makes it possible for the run-time system to automatically add conversion between different algorithms of the graphs, for example an image with pixels encoded as integers can be converted to an image with pixels encoded as floating points. See [NFW<sup>+</sup>02] for a more detailed description of IPAPI and its part in the WITAS on-board system.

## 4.2 IP-DFG - a computational model

We had two goals when developing the computational model to be used in IPAPI. First, the model should be simple for humans to work with yet it should have sufficient expression power to allow seamless modelling of complex image processing algorithms. The second goal was to find a model that is suitable for integration with a flexible run-time system such as IPAPI. The model should simplify dynamic combinations of different algorithms. It should allow dynamic change of region sizes and the parallelism of an algorithm should be preserved. Since there is no need to describe non-determinism in image processing algorithms the model should only allow deterministic behaviour. We call the representation Image Processing Data Flow Graph (IP-DFG) [AKND02].

IP-DFG is based on boolean DFG, but has been extended with hierarchy and new rules for token consumption when an actor fires. This makes the model more flexible. IP-DFG implements conditional actors using a formalism similar to boolean DFG. An actor can have one control input and, if it does, it has two firing rules. The value of the control token decides which firing rule is used and the firing rule determines the number of tokens consumed and produced, i.e. the number of tokens consumed and produced is a function of the control token. Actors without a control input consume and produce a fixed number of tokens each time they fire.

As in general DFGs, tokens are stored on the arcs in FIFO queues. When an actor fires, it consumes tokens from its inputs and produces tokens at its outputs. The number of tokens produced and consumed depends on which firing rule that is matched. In a traditional DFG all tokens matched by the firing rule are consumed. This is not the case in an IP-DFG. An IP-DFG actor does not need to remove all tokens matching the firing rule from its inputs. In an IP-DFG a firing rule contains a tuple,  $\langle m, n \rangle_i$ , for each input,  $i$ . The number,  $m$ , indicates how many tokens need to be present on the input  $i$  for the actor to fire. This is equivalent to a pattern with  $m$  wildcards. The number,  $n$ , indicate how many tokens to remove from the input queues when the firing rule is matched. If an actor has a pattern with  $m$  tokens and  $n$  tokens are removed when it fires, the actor is said to read  $m$  tokens and consume  $n$ . This simplifies the implementation of functions that use the same token in several firings, for example the sliding average function. The sliding average function over  $m$  tokens reads  $m$  tokens but consumes only 1.  $m - 1$  tokens remain in the FIFO-queue of the

input and will be read the next time the actor fires. This behaviour is common for image processing algorithms that extract dynamic features in an image sequence, for example optical flow algorithm.

### 4.2.1 Hierarchy

An IP-DFG is composed of boolean DFGs in a hierarchical way. An actor can encapsulate an acyclic boolean DFG. Such an actor is called a hierarchical actor. Since the internal graph of a hierarchical actor is acyclic, it cannot model iterations. Instead, in IP-DFG iterations are explicitly defined, see section 4.2.2. This makes the model more suitable for human interaction. In an IP-DFG a hierarchical actor is no different from any other boolean DFG actor. It has two firing rules and when it fires, it consumes and produces tokens according to the matching firing rule. Internally the firing is divided into three steps. The three steps perform *initialisation*, *execution* and *result transmission*. For initialisation and result transmission a *token mapping function* is used. A token mapping function maps a set of token sequences to another set of token sequences,  $\{S_1, \dots, S_n\} \rightarrow \{S'_1, \dots, S'_m\}$ . A token mapping function is usually simple, i.e. a result sequence is identical to a source sequence. However, it is possible to perform more complex operations in a token mapping function. For example, to split one sequence or concatenate two sequences. The token sequences in a token mapping function always have a finite length, by contrast to DFGs which are working on infinite token sequences. Token mapping functions are discussed in section 4.2.3.

A hierarchical actor is stateless. To guarantee this, the first step of the firing of a hierarchical actor is to generate the initial state of all internal arcs. The contents of the arcs are created from the tokens read by the hierarchical actor as it is fired. This is done according to a token mapping function. When a hierarchical actor with  $n$  inputs and  $m$  internal arcs fires, a sequence of tokens,  $S_i$ , are read from each input,  $i$ . The token mapping function maps the set of all input sequences,  $\{S_1, \dots, S_n\}$ , to a set of sequences  $\{S'_1, \dots, S'_m\}$ , where a sequence,  $S'_k$ , is used as the initial state of the FIFO queue of the internal arc  $k$ . There is one token sequence for each of the internal arcs. Each firing rule has a token mapping function.

The second step is the execution of the internal boolean DFG. This is done according to the firing rules of the actors in the internal boolean DFG. When no internal firing rules are matched, the boolean DFG is




Figure 4.2: A hierarchical actor for tracking a fix-point. If the fix-point is not visible a new fix-point is selected.

blocked and the second step ends.

In the third and final step, the result tokens are mapped to the outputs of the hierarchical actor. This is done according to a token mapping function. When the internal boolean DFG is blocked, there is a sequence of tokens,  $S_i$ , on each internal arc  $i$ . The token mapping function maps the set of all the sequences of the internal arcs,  $\{S_1, \dots, S_m\}$ , to a set of sequences  $\{S'_1, \dots, S'_o\}$ . For each output,  $o_i$ , of the hierarchical actor a sequence,  $S'_i$ , in the result set is transmitted. After the token mapping function is performed all tokens remaining in the internal boolean DFG are dead. The initialisation mapping guarantees that they will not be used in the next firing of the hierarchical actor and the run-time system can reclaim the memory used by these tokens. This also prevents token accumulation.

To illustrate, consider a camera control algorithm for an UAV. The camera is to be pointed at an area of interest. The camera should point to this area independent of the helicopter movement. This can be done by tracking a number of fix-points in the image [For00]. A fix-point is a point that is easy to track. If one fix-point is out of sight, i.e. hidden, the camera control algorithm should find another fix-point. Figure 4.2

shows a sub-function in the algorithm. The sub-function is called *pointLocator* and finds one fix-point with a given signature in a given image, or if the fix-point is not found selects a new one. The result of *pointLocator* is an updated or new fix-point signature and corresponding parameters used in the camera control loop. *PointLocator* consume/produce one token on each input/output when it fires. The internal actors has the following firing rules (inputs are ordered counter clockwise starting with the the upper-most left-most one):

find:  $\{[*], [*]\}$

select new:  $\{[*], [true]\}, \{\perp, [false]\}$

merge:  $\{[*], [true], \perp\}, \{\perp, [false], [*]\}$

The firing of *pointLocator* starts with the initialisation step. There are two token sequences,  $S_{fixpoint}$  and  $S_{image}$ , both containing one token initially. According to the token mapping function, the sequence  $S_{fixpoint}$  is placed in the FIFO queue of the internal arc  $f$ , while the sequence  $S_{image}$  is placed in the FIFO queue of  $i$ . After this, the internal boolean DFG is executed. The actor *find* fires first, since it is the only actor with a matched firing rule. It generates one token on each of its outputs. The gray arc is connected to the control input of *select new* and *merge*. The generated control token is true if the fix-point was found or else false. If the token is true both *select new* and *merge* can fire. In this case *select new* does not generate any token and *merge* forwards the fix-point token from *find*. If the fix-point was not found, only *select new* can fire. *Select new* now picks a new fix-point and send it to its output. *Merge* forwards this token to the  $f'$  arc. At this moment, the boolean DFG is blocked and the result mapping starts. The tokens on the internal arcs  $f'$  and  $p$  are transferred to the outputs *fix-point'* and *pos*. In this example the actor *select new* fired independent of whether a new fix-point needs to be selected. It is important to understand that it is only in one of these firings that the actor does any work. The purpose of the second firing rule is only to remove tokens from the control input. If the run-time system knows that the actor is stateless, it can chose not to fire an actor that does not produce any output. Instead, the tokens matching the firing rule are discarded. Also note that if the fix-point was not found, the fix-point token from *find* to *merge* will not be consumed. This is not a problem because the next time *pointLocator* fires, the token will be removed during initialisation. In fact a run-time system should reclaim this token directly when *pointLocator* is blocked.



From this example it seems unnecessary to have a token mapping function for initialisation and transferring the result to the outputs. It would be simpler to directly connect the internal arcs with the FIFO queues of the surrounding arcs. However, this separation allows an actor to create constant tokens during the initialisation step and it simplifies modelling of iterative functions as described in the next section.

#### 4.2.2 Iteration


For our purpose we distinguish between iteration and tail recursion. In iteration over data, the same function is applied on independent data, while in tail recursion, one invocation takes the result of an earlier invocation as input. In a computational model based on the token flow model iteration over data is achieved by placing several tokens, each containing one quantum of data, in the graph. The actors will fire appropriate number of times. To use the *pointLocator* shown in figure 4.2 for tracking ten fix-points, one simply places ten tokens containing the signature on the *fix-point* arc and ten images on the *image* arc, *pointLocator* will then fire ten times. This implementation tracks different fix-points in different images. For tracking several fix-points in the same image, a more suitable approach is to change the firing rules. By setting the firing rule of *pointLocator* to consume ten tokens on the *fix-point* input and one on the *image* input, the proper tokens are placed on the *f* and *i* internal arcs during the initialisation mapping. The behaviour of *find* should be changed, it should not generate a fix-point token if the fix-point was not found. The firing rule of the actors *find* and *select new* must also be changed. They should read one token and consume none from the *i* arc. The image token on the internal arc *i* will be removed after the result mapping, making *pointLocator* to behave correctly the next time it fires.

Tail recursion is an important type of iteration commonly used for iterative approximations. In tail recursion the result of one invocation of a function is used as argument for the next invocation of the same function. Tail recursion is equivalent to iteration and in the rest of this thesis we will use the term iteration. In IP-DFGs iteration is implemented using hierarchical actors. When a hierarchical actor fires, the internal graph can be executed several times. For modelling iterations, we have extend hierarchical actors with a *termination arc* and an *iteration mapping function*. Such actors are called iterative actors.

When an iterative actor fires, it is initialised and the internal boolean

DFG is executed once as a hierarchical actor. As part of the execution a termination condition is evaluated, resulting in a boolean token on the *terminate arc*. The *terminate arc* is a special arc in the internal boolean DFG of an iterative actor. If the last token on the *terminate arc* is false when the internal boolean DFG is blocked, the internal boolean DFG is to be executed again. Before the repeated execution starts, the internal boolean DFG must be transformed from its blocked state, where no firing rules are satisfied, to the initial state of the next iteration. This is done according to the *iteration mapping function*. The *iteration mapping function* generates a token sequence for each arc in the internal graph from the token sequences in the blocked graph. This mapping is defined by a token mapping function. Tokens not explicitly declared to remain in the boolean DFG will be removed, in order to avoid token accumulation. The internal boolean DFG is executed until the termination condition is satisfied. When this happens, result tokens are generated according to the output mapping as described in 4.2.1

The separation of the iteration body and token mapping functions allows a cleaner implementation of iterative functions. Consider the camera control algorithm from section 4.2.1. The core of the algorithm is to find the camera's position and heading in the 3D world. This can be done by using the Geographical Position System (GPS) and anchoring objects in an image from the camera with a geographical information system. This is very computationally intensive, so it is preferable not to do this often. A less computationally intensive approach is to use an iterative algorithm that estimates the movement of the camera in the 3D world. This can be done by tracking a set of points in the sequence of 2D images from the camera [For00]. The calculations assume that all points are located on the ground plane. However, this is not the case for all points in the world, i.e. points at the top of a building. An algorithm based on this approach should ignore points not behaving as if they were on the ground plane. An iterative actor which does this is shown in figure 4.3. All actors consume/produce one token on each input/output, except the *plane* input of the *new plane* actor, which reads one token, but the token is not consumed. In each iteration one estimate of the ground plane is calculated. Also the distance between the estimated plane and the fix-points are calculated. If there is one fix-point with a distance larger than a threshold, then the fix-point with the largest distance is removed and a new iteration is to be done. The actor *new plane* calculates a new estimate of the ground plane from an earlier ground plane estimate and a set of current and earlier fix-



init mapping:	iteration mapping:	result mapping:
$\text{plane} = \text{oldPlane}$	$\text{plane} = \text{plane}$	$\text{newPlane} = \text{last}(\text{plane}', 0)$
$\text{FPPair} = \text{fixpoints}$	$\text{FPPair} = \text{FPPair}'$	

Figure 4.3: A recursive algorithm which estimates a plane in the 3D world from a set of fix-points.

points positions. The set of fix-points is stored in one token. The actor *residual* finds the fix-point with the largest distance from the estimated ground plane. If this distance is larger than a threshold, then this point is removed and a token with the remaining fix-points are sent to the *FPPair'* arc and a false token is sent to the *terminate* arc, otherwise true are sent to the *terminate* arc. The firing of the iterative actor is simple to follow. First, in the initialisation mapping function an earlier ground plane and a set of tracked fix-points are mapped to the internal boolean DFG. Next the internal boolean DFG is executed. The actor *new plane* fires first followed by *residual*, resulting in a blocked boolean DFG. If the estimate of the ground plane was based on fix-points not behaving as if being on a plane, then the last token generated on the *terminate* arc is false, and the set of fix-points now believed to be on the ground plane is in the token on the *FPPair'* arc. The internal boolean DFG is to be executed again and the iteration mapping function generates the initial state for the next iteration. The token on the *plane* arc is to stay on the arc and the token with the set of fix-points on the *PFPair'* arc is mapped to the *FPPair* arc. Now the internal boolean DFG is executed again. This repeats until all fix-points are sufficiently close to the estimate




Figure 4.4: A hierarchical actor that calculates the distance from a set of points, wrapped into one token, to a plane. The result is the set of distances wrapped into one token.

of the ground plane, resulting in a true token on the *terminate* arc. The result mapping function then maps the last estimated plane to the *newPlane* output.

### 4.2.3 Token mapping functions

Token mapping functions are used in hierarchical and iterative actors to transfer tokens between the internal arcs and the external arcs. They are also used in iterative actors to change the internal state between iterations. This can be seen as a mapping from one set of token sequences of final length to another set of token sequences of finite length,  $\{S_0, \dots, S_n\} \rightarrow \{S'_0, \dots, S'_m\}$ . Each sequence is associated to one arc and the token sequence is the contents of the arcs FIFO queue. In a token mapping function a result sequence is created from concatenations of sequences. The sequences can be original sequences, new sequences or an empty sequence ( $\perp$ ). New sequences are created from individual tokens from the source sequences and new tokens created from constants.

In a token mapping function a new token can also be created by wrapping a token sequence. The original token sequence can be recreated by unwrapping token created by a wrapping. This makes it possible to work at different levels of abstraction in different parts of a model. For example consider the plane estimate actor for the camera control algorithm in figure 4.4. In the iterative plane estimation actor in figure 4.3 the fix-points are treated as a set, encapsulated in one to-

ken. However, as part of the algorithm, the distance for each fix-point to a plane is to be calculated. This is done by the hierarchical actor in figure 4.4. During the initialisation mapping the set of fix-points is unwrapped and placed as a sequence of tokens on the *fp* arc. The *distance* actor will fire once for each fix point and the result mapping will later wrap the sequence of distances to one token.

To preserve properties of a graph a token mapping function is said to be monotonic if it preserves the relative precedence of all tokens. If token  $t_k$  precedes token  $t_l$  in any of the input sequences  $t_k$  precedes  $t_l$  for all result sequences in which both tokens appear.

# IPAPI

---

In this chapter we explain how we use IPAPI when developing image processing algorithms within the WITAS project. We detail how the implementation evolves from a prototype used in the WITAS simulator to an optimised implementation for the on board platform.

## 5.1 The Architecture of IPAPI

IPAPI was developed to manage the execution of the image processing tasks in the WITAS on-board system. The on-board system is to operate in a dynamic environment, where the number of image processing tasks varies over time. As explained in section 4.1.1, IPAPI must adapt the image processing tasks to cope with the limited on-board resources, both processing power and memory. For this purpose, IPAPI's architecture captures these three aspects, *data processing*, *memory management* and *scheduling*.

IPAPI uses IP-DFG as the internal computational model. For each image processing task IPAPI creates a graph structure, i.e. actor objects connected by arc objects. During the creation of new image processing tasks, IPAPI chooses an implementation for each actor from a library of actor implementations. The selection is based on the name of the actor and the available hardware. This makes it possible to use different implementations for different architectures. Currently there exist a platform independent implementation in Java, an ANSI C implementation, and an implementation for the PowerPC processor, which takes advantage of the PowerPC processors vector unit, the AltiVec unit.

The actor library contains aspects needed for data processing and memory management. For each actor, it contains an implementation of the actors firing function, a function that takes tokens as input and returns tokens. It does not provide functionality for memory management, however it provides the information needed for the memory management. For each actor, information of the size relation between the input images and the output images are provided. For example the output can be the intersection of the inputs or, for convolution, the output is the input with the border effect removed. Based on this information, a graph wide memory manager allocates memory for the internal buffers needed on the arcs between the actors, i.e. the storage for temporary data in the image processing tasks.

The main parts of the IPAPI run-time system are the *scheduler* and the *memory manager*. The scheduler handles the execution of the actor implementations, while the memory manager handles the allocation of all memory buffers needed by an image processing task. Both the memory manager and the scheduler use the same underlying graph structure.

## 5.2 The AltiVec Implementation

Initially IPAPI was implemented in Java. This was used as a platform-independent implementation of the vision sub-system in the WITAS simulator. This implementation is suitable for use in a simulated environment, but for the on-board system it does not provide sufficient performance. To overcome this, an implementation optimised for the on-board hardware has been developed. The on-board system has one MPC7400 processor, a processor in the PowerPC family with AltiVec support, dedicated for the image processing sub-system.

To achieve good performance it is not necessary to reimplement the whole IPAPI system. It is sufficient to reimplement the data processing layer, while keeping the Java implementation of the scheduler and memory manager. This saves development time and does not affect the run time performance very much.

To accelerate the data processing layer of IPAPI the actor firing function was reimplemented in C with Motorola's AltiVec extensions [PIM]. To interface with the memory manager and the scheduler Java Native Interface (JNI) [Lia99] was used.

### 5.2.1 The AltiVec Unit in Combination With JNI

The PowerPC processor has become popular for use in high performance embedded systems in the area of telecommunication and signal processing. This is to a large extent due to the AltiVec unit, which provides a high performance processing unit. Motorola has also extended the C/C++ language to allow quick and easy development of highly optimised implementations.

The AltiVec unit is a vector processing unit present in the recent PowerPC processors from Motorola, i.e. the MPC74xx family. The AltiVec unit follows the RISC paradigm, i.e. register to register operations. There is one register file with 32 entries and all operations take their operands from the register file and write the result to the register file. The register to register operations can be arithmetic operations (+, - and \*), logic operations (bitwise and, or), comparison operations or element rearrangement within a vector. There is also support for division and square root. In addition to the register to register operations, there are operations for moving data between the register file and memory and operations for cache prefetch. All operations work on 128 bit wide vectors. A 128 bit vector is arranged to 16, 8 or 4 elements of 8, 16 or 32 bit each, processed in parallel. An element is a signed or unsigned integer, or a 32 bit floating point value. For a detailed description of AltiVec, see Motorola's documentation [PIM, PEM]

The Java Native Interface (JNI) is an interface allowing a mix of Java and implementations compiled to native executables, i.e. C and C++ implementations. This makes it possible to implement in C some methods in a Java class. The methods are compiled using a native compiler to a dynamically loaded library. JNI also provides a mechanism for the native code to access other methods and attributes from Java objects. This mechanism follows Java's scope and access rules, i.e. all attributes in the the own object and all public attributes in the current scope can be accessed. JNI is described in detail in [Lia99].

A simple way to accelerate the data processing layer would be to implement the actors firing function in native methods. The tokens are stored in Java objects and the native implementations can access them through JNI. This makes it possible to mix actors with Java and native implementations in the same graph. This is the approach we are using for the ANSI C implementation of actors. However, there is a problem with AltiVec optimised implementations, Javas memory alignment. The read and store operations of the AltiVec unit need the 128 bit vector to be 16 byte aligned in memory. Java allocated objects only



Table 5.1: Execution times in milliseconds for different implementations of two IP-DFGs.

	edge	polytest4
interpreted Java	2030	24174
ANSI C	50	619
AltiVec C	20	188

provide alignment according to the requirement of the scalar part of the processor, that is 4 byte alignment of floating points and 1 byte alignment of bytes. To solve this we have modified the memory manager. Tokens used in AltiVec optimised actors are allocated at native level, with the correct memory alignment. These tokens cannot be accessed directly from Java. To make it possible to mix AltiVec and Java implemented actors we have implemented conversion actors that copy data between the two types of tokens.

### 5.2.2 Experimental Results

Most of the image processing algorithms we are considering to use within the WITAS project are under development. Some are evaluated using matlab and others have been implemented in Java for evaluation in the WITAS simulator. At this time it is not clear which algorithms will be optimised for AltiVec and used in the final WITAS on-board system.

To show that it is sufficient to optimise the data processing layer of IPAPI we have optimised a few sample IP-DFGs. We have done timing analysis of two typical IP-DFGs, edge and polytest4. Edge is a simple graph, consisting of a single convolution node, which performs edge detection. Figure 5.1 shows the result of applying edge to a benchmark image, well known in the image processing community. Polytest4 detects high level features in an image of a road network. Figure 5.2(b) is the result after applying polytest4 to the image in figure 5.2(a). Road intersections, curves and road ends are highlighted. Polytest4 also performs sub-sampling and apply this operation to several scales of the original image.

The execution time for different implementations of the two IP-DFGs are shown in table 5.1. The execution times are measured on an Apple PowerMac with a 450 MHz G4 processor and 256 MB memory. All



Figure 5.1: The output of the edge IP-DFG.




Figure 5.2: The output of the polytest4 IP-DFG. (a) the input image with a road network and (b) the output with intersections and curves highlighted.

experiments were carried out under Linux PPC using Blackdown Java VM 1.3.0beta-b02, configured for native threads and nojit. This is a similar setup as the WITAS on-board system. The only difference is that the on-board system is based on a cPCI board from Motorola instead of a motherboard from Apple. At the moment we do not have access to any Java hotspot for the Linux PPC environment. A Java hotspot does just-in-time compilation of the Java bytecode and can reduce the execution times for the Java implementation significantly. Running the IP-DFGs under Mac OS X, using Apples JVM with hotspot reduced the execution time for edge to 148 ms and for polytest4 to 1272 ms.

Our experiments show that the AltiVec optimised implementations runs more than 100 times faster than the Java implementation and 2.5 to 3 times faster than the C implementation on the target platform. This is a significant improvement in performance and we are confident that it is sufficient to optimise the data processing layer of IPAPI to achieve the required processing power.

# PARTITIONING FOR TIME MULTIPLEXING

---

In chapter 5 a run-time system for IP-DFGs was presented. Using a PowerPC processor and optimising the implementations of the firing functions for the AltiVec unit resulted in good performance. It is possible to improve the performance even more by using an FPGA to accelerate some firing functions. Since some functions require a large number of logic gates to implement we have investigated partitioning techniques for such applications. In this chapter we present an algorithm for partitioning a design for time multiplexing. The algorithm is tailored for use with Time Multiplexed FPGAs (TMFPGAs). We first give an overview of TMFPGAs and then we present our algorithm.

The partitioning problem is treated at logic level. This is much lower level of abstraction compared to the earlier chapter in this thesis. In an IP-DFG a node performs a function on an image, for example convolution. In this chapter a node performs a simple logic function. Several hundred nodes are needed to build a floating point adder.

## 6.1 Time Multiplexed FPGAs

FPGAs are often considered to be expensive compared to the gate count they provide. To reduce this price Time Multiplexed FPGAs (TMFPGAs) were introduced. In a TMFPGA the cost is reduced by increasing the equivalent gate count per silicon area. This is achieved by divid-




Figure 6.1: In a TMFPGA a pipeline is divided to micro-cycles. The micro-cycles are executed in sequence using the same LUTs and interconnects.

ing the logic circuit into *micro-cycles* which are execute in sequence using the same FPGA resources. This is illustrated in figure 6.1. The logic between the flip-flops(FFs) is divided into three micro-cycles. The micro-cycles are to be executed in sequence with a reconfiguration of the FPGA between each micro-cycle. This makes it possible to share the FPGA resources in a time multiplexed way. Today, commercial FPGAs allow dynamic reconfiguration. However, the time for reconfiguration is long, usually several milliseconds. The bottleneck is the loading of the new configuration from the off-chip memory. The reconfiguration time can be reduced by storing several configurations on the FPGA die. Several architectures based on this idea have been suggested [EEC+95, FFM+99, SV98, TCJW97].

We have based our work [AK00] on a generic architecture, depicted in figure 6.2. We assume that the TMFPGA can store several contexts on chip. The TMFPGA consists of an array of Processing Elements (PEs). The interconnections between the PEs allow multiple levels of logic in one partition. Each PE can perform one combinatorial operation in each context, i.e. the PE has one Look Up Table (LUT). During technology mapping the logic in a circuit is mapped into LUTs, so each combinatorial node in the net-list corresponds to one LUT.

Each PE contains a register file, is used to store values generated in one partition so they can be used later. This is useful in two situations.




Figure 6.2: Our generic TMFPGA architecture.

The first situation is when a node and any of its successor nodes are placed in different partitions. Since the nodes are executed at different times, the output from the predecessor node cannot be directly routed to the input of the successor nodes. Therefore the output of the predecessor node is stored in a register. The second situation where the register file is useful is for sequential circuits. If a value generated in one iteration is used in the next iteration it must be stored in a register. This corresponds to an originally defined flip-flop in the net-list. Several of the recently announced time multiplexed architectures fulfil our assumptions, for instance Trimbergs architecture [TCJW97].

## 6.2 The Partitioning Problem

When a TMFPGA is to be used, the net-list must be divided into micro-steps. This is referred to as the partitioning problem. The net-list is to be divided into disjoint sets. Since the partitions are executed in sequence, the partitioning step also decides the execution order of the nodes. A consequence of this is that data dependency must be considered during partitioning.

In figure 6.3, two possible partitions of a net-list are shown. In (a) the nodes  $\{A, B, C, D\}$  are placed in,  $p_1$ , the first partition. The




Figure 6.3: Two possible partitions of a net-list.




Figure 6.4: Data dependency. (a) the net-list, (b) the dependency graph.

nodes  $\{E, F, G, H\}$  goes to,  $p_2$ , the second partition. In (b) the partitions are  $\{A, B, E, F\}$  and  $\{C, D, G, H\}$ . Both in (a) and (b) the size of each partition is 4 nodes, so they use the same amount of resources. However, the time to execute one iteration, corresponding to one clock cycle in the net-list, is different. In (a), the data has to propagate through 4 nodes in each partition. The total time for one iteration is  $T = 8T_{node} + 2T_{reconfigure}$ . For the other case, (b), some nodes can be evaluated in parallel within the partitions. The time for one iteration is  $T = 4T_{node} + 2T_{reconfigure}$ .

The critical path in the net-list is the longest path of nodes that cannot execute in parallel. Partitioning does not increase parallelism, so executing all partitions in sequence cannot be faster than the propagation delay of the critical path of the non-partitioned net-list. Thus the critical path in the non-partitioned net-list is a lower bound of the sum of the critical paths in the partitions. The only time overhead of using a TMFPGA with a partitioning with minimal timing is the reconfiguration time. This is the case for the partitioning in figure 6.3(b). We have developed a partitioning algorithm that aims at finding a partitioning with minimal time overhead.

### 6.2.1 Data Dependency

As mentioned above, data dependencies must be considered during partitioning. To handle this, we do not partition the net-list directly. Instead we first create a *dependency graph* from the net-list and then we partition this dependency graph. The dependency graph represents the partial order imposed on the nodes by data dependencies. There exist two kinds of data dependencies, *direct data dependency* and *forward data dependency*. This is illustrated in figure 6.4. Node  $B$  uses the result of node  $A$  to produce its output. This is a *direct data dependency*.



Obviously, node  $A$  must be evaluated before node  $B$ . This is represented with a solid arc in figure 6.4(b). *Forward data dependency* is illustrated by nodes  $B$  and  $C$  in figure 6.4. In the net-list, the flip-flop is used to delay the output of  $B$  so it will be the input to node  $C$  in the next clock cycle. In a time-multiplexed FPGA, each clock cycle is divided to micro-steps. At the end of the micro-step where node  $B$  is executed, the value of the flip-flop will be updated, i.e. the value is written to a register in the register file where node  $B$  is placed. The old value of the flip-flop is overwritten. The overwritten value is the value node  $C$  must use in this iteration. Therefore node  $C$  must have already been executed. This is illustrated in the dependency graph by a dashed arc.

The dependency graph represents a partial order between nodes and since the partitions are executed in sequence the dependency graph constrains the relative placement of nodes to partitions. If there is an arc from node  $A$  to node  $B$  in the dependency graph, node  $A$  may not be placed in a later partition than node  $B$ . Placing two nodes in the same partition is always possible. However, it might influence the performance. If there is a direct data dependency between two nodes placed in the same partition, the duration of that partition will be longer. This is because the signal has to propagate through two nodes before all outputs are stable. If the critical path is longer than the number of partitions, this is unavoidable. Forward data dependencies represent the read and write order of registers. Those do not introduce delays in a partition, since reading from and writing to registers are part of the reconfiguration.

### 6.2.2 Dependency Loops

As described above, partitioning is similar to scheduling. Indeed, the partitioning problem can be formulated as a scheduling problem. Partitioning a net-list to  $n$  partitions is the same as scheduling the combinatorial nodes in the corresponding dependency graph such that at times  $t_0, \dots, t_{n-1}$  no nodes are executing. The times  $t_0, \dots, t_{n-1}$  are the reconfiguration times. All nodes executed in the time interval  $[t_{k-1}, t_k]$  are placed in partition  $k$ . The schedules for the partitions in figure 6.3 are shown in figure 6.5. For partition (a) the reconfiguration takes place at times 0 and 4 and for partition (b) at times 0 and 2. When treating partitioning as a scheduling problem, timing aspects can be handled by enforcing a deadline for the schedule.

Scheduling is a well known problem in many areas. For example




Figure 6.5: Two possible partitions of a net-list. A thick line indicates the reconfiguration of the FPGA.

several scheduling algorithms have been developed for high-level synthesis. The conditions for this partitioning problem are, however, different. During high-level synthesis, an acyclic task graph is scheduled. For the TMFPGA partitioning problem, the dependency graph is not acyclic. Figure 6.6(a) shows one of several possible net-lists with cyclic data-dependency. Figure 6.6(b) shows the corresponding dependency graph. There is a direct data dependency from *B* to *A* and a forward data dependency from *A* to *B*, thus giving a cyclic dependency. The scheduling algorithms from high-level synthesis cannot be applied directly to this partitioning problem. If the dependency graph could be transformed such that the resulting graph is acyclic, any scheduling algorithm could be used.

Assuming that the net-list does not have any combinatorial loops, the direct data dependencies form an acyclic graph. Therefore any loop in a data dependency graph must contain at least one forward data dependency. A forward dependency enforces the order of reading from and writing to a flip-flop. The old value must be read before the new one is written. Adding one register to temporarily store the new value until




Figure 6.6: Cyclic dependency. (a) the net-list, (b) the dependency graph, (c) the transformed net-list, (d) the transformed dependency graph.

the flip-flop can be updated, will remove this dependency. We assume that in a TMFPGA a register can only be updated from the output of a LUT, i.e. there is no direct register to register transfer. To move the value from the temporal register to the flip-flop, it has to pass through a LUT. This dummy LUT is created by adding one node to the net-list. This process is depicted in figure 6.6. A dummy node  $C$  is added to the net-list in 6.6(a). The added node is placed between the node updating the flip-flop,  $B$ , and the flip-flop. The resulting net-list is shown in 6.6(c) and its corresponding dependency graph in 6.6(d). The arc from  $A$  to  $B$  in the dependency graph is replaced by one from  $B$  to  $C$  and one from  $A$  to  $C$ . Since there are no paths from  $A$  to  $B$  after the transformation, the original loop is broken. There is no outgoing arc from the added node  $C$ , so  $C$  cannot be involved in any loop. This ensures that no new loops are created during the transformation.

Breaking all loops in the dependency graph using the transformation described above gives an unnecessary overhead. If all nodes in a loop are placed in the same partition no dependencies are violated and no additional nodes are needed. Our approach is to ignore some of the forward data dependencies. This is further explained in section 6.3.1. Ignoring some arcs in the dependency graph results in an acyclic graph, called the *scheduling graph*. This graph is scheduled and if any of the ignored dependencies is violated, we remove the violated dependency

by the transformation described above. In order to remove the dependency, a node is added to the net-list.

## 6.3 The Partitioning Algorithm

The main part of our algorithm is the scheduler. The scheduler takes a net-list, a deadline, and a maximum size for the partitions as input, and generates a schedule as an output. The scheduling function is explained in section 6.3.1. Scheduling might fail for two reasons. The generated schedule might not meet the deadline or, during scheduling, nodes were added, resulting in a net-list exceeding the partition size. When the scheduling fails, we relax the size constraint and try to schedule again. During the new scheduling attempt we use the net-list that was generated during the previous failed scheduling, i.e. the original net-list with some additional nodes. We repeat this until a schedule that meets all constraints is found. The partitioning algorithm is depicted in figure 6.7.

### 6.3.1 Scheduling

For performance reasons we are using *list scheduling* to schedule the net-list nodes. The start time of a node in the derived schedule decides which partition it is placed in. The scheduling step uses three graph representations of the design: the net-list, the *dependency graph*, and the *scheduling graph*. The net-list is the LUT equivalent net that is generated during logic synthesis. The net-list is used to derive timing information of the nodes. The *dependency graph* is created from the net-list, as described in section 6.2.1. From the *dependency graph* some arcs are removed to create *the scheduling graph*. This is an acyclic graph that is scheduled using list scheduling. The arcs removed during the creation of the scheduling graph are ignored during scheduling. If any of the dependencies corresponding to the removed arcs are violated, the net-list is transformed to remove the dependencies from the design. The scheduling is depicted in the lower part of figure 6.7.

To create the *scheduling graph* we first find all nodes that belong to a loop in the *dependency graph*. This is the problem of finding all strongly connected components, which can be done in linear time by two depth-first traversals of the graph [CLR90].

From the *dependency graph*, all *forward data dependency* arcs ending in a node from a loop are removed. After removing these arcs, the

```
PARTITION(net_list){
  size = net_list.size/nr_partitions
  while(schedule_fails){
    net_list = SCHEDULE(net_list, size, deadline)
    size=max(size+1, net-list.size/nr_partitions)
  }
}

SCHEDULE(net_list, size, deadline){
  create_scheduling_graph
  for partition = 1 to number_of_partitions{
    calculate_ASAP
    calculate_ALAP
    while(not_full(partition) and all_nodes_are_not_scheduled){
      possible = get_all_possible_nodes
      node = get_highest_priority(possible)
      add(node, partition)
    }
    check_violations_and_modify_net_list
  }
  if(unscheduled_nodes_exist OR deadline_missed)
    signal failure
  return the modified net_list
}
```

Figure 6.7: The partitioning algorithm.

resulting graph is acyclic. This is the *scheduling graph*. At this point only the arcs in the *dependency graph* are removed, the net-list is unchanged. The dependencies represented by the removed arcs will be ignored during scheduling. In figure 6.6(b) the arc from  $A$  to  $B$  will be removed and in figure 6.6(d) no arcs will be removed since there are no loops.

When the *scheduling graph* has been created, it is scheduled using list scheduling. List scheduling is an iterative process. In each iteration, one node is selected. The selected node is scheduled, i.e. placed in a partition. To choose which node to select, a set of possible nodes is created. A node is eligible for selection if it is not already scheduled and all its predecessors in the scheduling graph are scheduled. From the set of possible nodes, the node with the highest priority is selected. The way of assigning priorities is described in section 6.3.2. The scheduling loop is repeated until all nodes are scheduled.

The first  $n_1$  selected nodes are placed in partition 1, the following  $n_2$  nodes are placed in partition 2 and so on. How we decide about the sizes of the partitions is explained in section 6.3.4.

During scheduling, when a partition is filled, the unscheduled nodes will be scheduled in a later partition than the scheduled nodes. At this time it is easy to check if there are any dependencies that cannot be fulfilled. Only the removed forward data dependencies need to be checked. A dependency cannot be fulfilled if the corresponding arc goes from an unscheduled node to a scheduled node. After filling one partition, if we detect that an ignored dependency will be violated, it is removed from the net-list. This is done by the transformation shown in figure 6.6. All three graphs are transformed. The added dummy node is treated in the same way as any other nodes. When all its predecessors in the scheduling graph are scheduled, it will be placed in the set of possible nodes and it will eventually be selected for scheduling.

### 6.3.2 The Priority Function

Due to the nature of list scheduling, there is no problem to distribute the nodes evenly among the partitions. We do not think that the number of nodes added due to violated data dependencies is a problem either. The major concern is to find a schedule that meets the deadline. The priority function was designed to address this issue.

One way to find a tight schedule is to minimise the critical paths, i.e. the depths, of the partitions. The priority function does this by giving




Figure 6.8: A node can have different ASAP values for different partitions. (a) before recalculation of the ASAP values and (b) after recalculation.

higher priorities to nodes that will not increase the critical path of the current partition, and a lower priorities to nodes that will increase it.

When nodes are added to a partition, the inverse of the depth of the nodes in the net-list can be used as a priority. Nodes with depth one have the highest priority, followed by nodes with depth two and so on. The depth of a node can be found by doing ASAP scheduling of the net-list. Observe that it is not the *scheduling graph* that is used to calculate the ASAP value. It contains both direct and forward data dependencies, since a forward data dependency does not correspond to a propagation delay, but only to the read and write order of the registers.

The procedure described above is used for the first partition. For later partitions, the use of the original ASAP as priority is not optimal. In figure 6.8(a) node *A* and *B* have  $ASAP = n$ . Node *A* is scheduled in partition 1 while there is no space for node *B*. Now if both node *B* and *C* are scheduled in partition 2 both nodes will have a depth of 1 in that partition. Therefore both nodes should have the same priority for partition 2. To solve this, we recalculate the ASAP value for all unscheduled nodes when one partition is full. When the ASAP value is recalculated all nodes must have an ASAP that is larger than the ASAP of any scheduled nodes. A consequence of this is that a node can have different priorities for different partitions.

The purpose of the priority function is to order the nodes. The  $n_1$

nodes with the highest priority are scheduled in the first partition, the next,  $n_2$ , nodes in partition 2 and so on. When a partition is full it is likely that some unscheduled nodes have the same ASAP as some scheduled nodes. In figure 6.8(a) node  $A$  is scheduled, but not node  $B$ . The overall schedule is influenced by the selection criterion for nodes to be scheduled and nodes to be saved for later partitions. Using only the inverse ASAP as a priority function is not sufficient. For nodes with the same ASAP we give a higher priority to nodes with smaller mobility. The mobility of a node is defined as the length of the time interval it can be scheduled in without violating the deadline. The mobility can be calculated by doing ALAP and ALAP scheduling of the net-list and then for each node  $mobility = ALAP - ASAP$ .

We do not define a mathematical function for the priority. Instead we define an ordering of the nodes in a net-list. For two nodes  $A, B$

$$A \prec B \text{ iff } (A.ASAP < B.ASAP) \vee ((A.ASAP = B.ASAP) \wedge (A.ALAP < B.ALAP)) \quad (6.1)$$

If two nodes have the same ASAP the node with the smallest ALAP will have the highest priority. Since the ASAP values are the same, this is the node with the smallest mobility. For nodes with different ASAP the node with the smallest ASAP has the highest priority.

### 6.3.3 Deadline Inheritance

If all nodes were scheduled in decreasing priority order, a close to optimal timing is likely to be found. This is not always possible since the nodes are scheduled in the partial order represented by the scheduling graph. During scheduling, one node can be blocked by another node with lower priority. This happens if there is a forward data dependency from a low priority node to a high priority node, see figure 6.9. Only considering the net-list in figure 6.9(a) node  $D$  has a high mobility, it can be scheduled between 1 and 3. However there is a forward data dependency from  $D$  to  $A$ , so the low priority node  $D$  precedes the high priority node  $A$  in the scheduling graph, shown in figure 6.9(b). We address this by what we call *deadline inheritance*. For all nodes, the ALAP value must be smaller or equal to the ALAP value of all its successors in the *scheduling graph*. This property is not automatically fulfilled since the ALAP values are calculated in the net-list, which does not contain the forward data dependencies in the scheduling graph. With deadline inheritance ALAP of node  $D$  will change from 3 to 1, and  $D$  becomes a






Figure 6.9: A net-list (a) and the corresponding scheduling graph (b). With deadline inheritance the ALAP of node  $D$  will change from 3 to 1.

high priority node. The ALAP value for the nodes is calculated by first doing ALAP scheduling of the net-list followed by *deadline inheritance* during a depth-first traverse of the scheduling graph.

### 6.3.4 The Size of the Partitions

The list scheduler adds one node at a time to the current partition. The question is “how many nodes should be placed in each partition”? One way is to divide the nodes evenly among the partitions. Our experiments showed that this works for some net-lists, but for others it does not generate a minimal schedule length.

When a node with ASAP equal to  $n$  is added to a partition, it means that all nodes with ALAP smaller or equal to  $n$  must also be scheduled in that partition, or the deadline will be missed. To avoid missing the deadline, before adding node to a partition we check that all other nodes with ALAP less or equal to the ASAP of this node will also fit in this partition. If there is not enough space in the partition for all these nodes we consider the partition to be full. This check only needs to be done when the critical path of a partition is extended.

Our criteria for a partition to be full is either that a maximum num-

Table 6.1: MCNC Partitioning93 benchmarks characteristics.

net-list	nodes	ff	depth	strongly connected components
c5315	606	0	14	-
c6288	1199	0	45	-
c7552	643	0	13	-
s9234	373	138	16	1
s13207	1006	450	18	10
s15850	1256	540	22	9
s38417	3361	1464	15	10
s38584	4082	1300	20	41

ber of nodes has been added or adding one more node will lead to a missed deadline. That is adding one more node will increase the critical path in the partition and there is not enough space left in the partition to add all nodes that must be scheduled in the same partition.

### 6.3.5 Experimental results

We have implemented our algorithm in Java and run it on the MCNC Partitioning93 benchmark circuits. We used the largest circuits with a critical path of at least 8 nodes. The experiments were run on a SUN Ultra-1 SPARC with 192 MB memory. The Java Virtual Machine used was Solaris VM, Java version 1.2.1. In all our experiments we divided the net-list to 8 partitions. The benchmark characteristics are shown in table 6.1.

In our experiments we focused on minimal timing. The deadline for the schedule was set to the depth of the net-list, i.e. the critical path. With this timing constraint, the partitioning algorithm was run, both with and without *deadline inheritance*. The results are shown in table 6.2.

The column labelled 'nodes added' shows the number of nodes added to the net-list by the partitioning algorithm. For the combinatorial circuits no nodes are added since all direct data dependencies are respected during scheduling.

The size increase of the partitions is shown both in number of nodes and in percentage. For some circuits the space added to the partitions is smaller than the number of nodes added to the net-list. This is pos-

Table 6.2: Partitioning results.

net-list	no deadline inheritance				with deadline inheritance			
	nodes added	increase of partition size		cpu (s)	nodes added	increase of partition size		cpu (s)
		nr	%			nr	%	
c5315	0	0	0	0.26	0	0	0	0.26
c6288	0	0	0	0.36	0	0	0	0.39
c7552	0	0	0	0.38	0	0	0	0.42
s9234	0	0	0	0.19	0	0	0	0.21
s13207	33	4	3.2	0.98	22	3	2.4	1.06
s15850	39	5	3.2	0.99	36	5	3.2	1.01
s38417	14	17	4.0	23.5	11	1	0.2	2.76
s38584	60	7	1.4	3.19	61	7	1.4	3.38

sible because there is some free space even for a minimal size of the partitions. i.e.  $free\ space = netList.size \text{ modulo } nrPartitions$ .

The experiments show that *deadline inheritance* can decrease the number of nodes added during partitioning. It also improves timing. This is clear for the circuit s38417. Without *deadline inheritance* the partition size is increased by 17 before the deadline is met. This made space for  $8*17=136$  nodes, but only 14 were used. With *deadline inheritance* the deadline was met after increasing the size of the partitions by one.

Our experiments showed that the algorithm can partition net-lists with up to 4000 nodes in less than 4 seconds. This was done without any timing overhead and with a space overhead of up to 3.2%.

# CONCLUSIONS

---

## 7.1 Summary

Improving the productivity in the design of embedded systems is an important research topic. We have presented several contributions that can improve the productivity in the development of image processing systems. As part of the WITAS UAV project we are developing a prototype UAV. The material presented here consists of our experiences from the development of the vision sub-system for the WITAS UAV prototype.

We have developed a computational model, IP-DFG, which is suitable for modelling of complex image processing algorithms. IP-DFG is based on boolean DFGs which have been extended with hierarchy and better support for token consumptions and iterations.

We have been using IP-DFG as the computational model in a framework for complex image processing modelling and implementation. The framework is called IPAPI and covers the design process from system level modelling to optimised implementation. IPAPI is suitable for co-simulation with other parts of a large system.

Seen as a run time system IPAPI provides three functional aspects, data processing, memory management and scheduling. Data processing corresponds to the firing functions in an IP-DFG. The firing of the actors are captured in the scheduler and the memory manager handles the tokens. To create an IPAPI model of an algorithm, the designer captures the semantic in a IP-DFG graph, and provides an implementation of the algorithm specific firing functions, that is, the image operations

that are unique for this algorithm.

IPAPI provides more flexibility compared to a traditional task based run time system. It is possible for IPAPI to dynamically combine different algorithms and adapt the size of the image regions they are applied to. This flexibility does not introduce more complexity during the implementation. Instead the memory manager and scheduler in IPAPI manages the dependencies introduced by the flexibility.

We have been using IPAPI to optimise a few typical image processing algorithms within the WITAS project for the PowerPC processor. The optimised implementations take full advantage of the AltiVec unit, a vector unit in the PowerPC processor. With this optimised implementation we achieved sufficient computational power in the WITAS on board system.

We also present an algorithm for temporal partitioning. This algorithm is tailored to be used for time multiplexed FPGAs and makes it possible to use existing FPGA tools for time multiplexed FPGAs. This can be used to increase the performance for some actors by using a FPGA accelerator.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

- [AK00] P. Andersson and K. Kuchcinski. Performance Oriented Partitioning for Time-Multiplexed FPGAs. In *the Proceedings of the Euromicro Symposium on Digital System Design*, September 2000.
- [AKND02] P. Andersson, K. Kuchcinski, K. Nordberg, and P. Doherty. Integrating a Computational Model and a Run Time System for Image Processing on a UAV. In *the Proceedings of the Euromicro Symposium on Digital System Design*, September 2002.
- [AUV] AUVSI - The Association for Unmanned Vehicle Systems International. <http://www.auvsi.org/>.
- [Buc93] J. T. Buck. *Scheduling Dynamic Dataflow Graphs With Bounded Memory Using the Token Flow Model*. PhD thesis, University of California at Berkeley, 1993.
- [BWR01] G. Buskey, G. Wyeth, and J. Roberts. Autonomous Helicopter Hover Using an Artificial Neural Network. In *the Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, volume 2, 2001.
- [CLR90] T. H. Cormen, C. E. Leiserson, and R. L. Rivest. *Introduction to Algorithms*. MIT Press/McGraw-Hill, 1990.
- [DGK<sup>+</sup>00] P. Doherty, G. Granlund, K. Kuchcinski, E. Sanderwall, K. Nordberg, E. Skarman, and J. Wiklund. The WITAS Un-

- manned Aerial Vehicle Project. In *the Proceedings of the 14th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2000.
- [EEC<sup>+</sup>95] T. Edward, I. Eslick, D. Chen, J. Brown, and A. DeHon. A First Generation DPGA Implementation. In *the Proceedings of the Third Canadian Workshop on Field-Programmable Devices*, pages 138–143, May 1995.
- [EIY<sup>+</sup>01] J. Evans, G. Inalhan, Yung Soon Jang, R. Teo, and C. J. Tomlin. Dragonfly: a Versatile UAV Platform for the Advancement of Aircraft Navigation and Control. In *the Proceedings of the 20th Conference Digital Avionics Systems (DASC)*, volume 1, 2001.
- [FFM<sup>+</sup>99] T. Fujii, K. Furuta, M. Motomura, M. Nomura, M. Mizuno, K. Anjo, K. Wakabayashi, Y. Hirota, Y.-e. Nakazawa, H. Ito, and M. Yamashina. A Dynamically Reconfigurable Logic Engine With a Multi-Context/Multi-Mode Unified-Cell Architecture. In *the Proceedings of the Solid-State Circuits Conference*, pages 364–365, 1999.
- [For00] P. E. Forssén. Updating Camera Location and Heading using a Sparse Displacement Field. Technical Report LiTH-ISY-R-2318, Dept. EE, Linköping University, SE-581 83 Linköping, Sweden, November 2000.
- [GGP92] G. R. Gao, R. Govindarajan, and P. Panangaden. Well-Behaved Dataflow Programs for DSP Computation. In *the Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing (ICASSP-92)*, volume 5, pages 561–564, 1992.
- [Lee91] E. A. Lee. Consistency in Dataflow Graphs. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, 2(2):223–235, April 1991.
- [Lee01] E. A. Lee. Overview of the Ptolemy Project. Technical Report Technical Memorandum UCB/ERL M01/11, University of California, Berkeley, March 2001.
- [Lia99] S. Liang. *The Java<sup>TM</sup> Native Interface: Programmer's Guide and Specification*. Addison Wesley Longman, Inc., 1999.

- [LM87] E. A. Lee and D. G. Messerschmitt. Static Scheduling of Synchronous Data Flow Programs for Digital Signal Processing. *IEEE transactions on computers*, January 1987.
- [LP95] E. A. Lee and T. M. Parks. Data Flow Process Networks. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 83(May):773–801, May 1995.
- [NFW<sup>+</sup>02] K. Nordberg, P. E. Forsén, J. Wiklund, P. Doherty, and P. Andersson. A Flexible Runtime System for Image Processing in a Distributed Computational Environment for an Unmanned Aerial Vehicle. In *the proceedings of the 9th International Workshop on Systems, Signals and Image Processing, IWSSIP*, November 2002.
- [PEM] Motorola literature Distribution, P.O. Box 5405, Denver, Colorado 80217. *AltiVec Technology, Programming Environments Manual*.
- [PIM] Motorola literature Distribution, P.O. Box 5405, Denver, Colorado 80217. *AltiVec Technology, Programming Interface Manual*.
- [SV98] S. M. Scalera and J. R. Vazquez. The Design and Implementation of a Context Switching FPGA. In *the Proceedings of the IEEE symposium on FPGAs for Custom Computing Machines*, pages 78–85, 1998.
- [TCJW97] S. Trimberger, D. Carberry, A. Johnson, and J. Wong. A Time-Multiplexed FPGA. In *the Proceedings of the Field-Programmable Custom Computing Machines*, pages 22–28, 1997.