IMPERIAL

SyncWave Rapid and Adaptive Decentralized Time Synchronization for Swarm Robotic Systems

Luca Seimon Mehl Supervisors:

Second marker: Prof. Julie McCann Dr. Michael Breza Prof. William Knottenbelt

Introduction What is a Time Synchronization Algorithm?

- Given a set of machines, each with internal clock with offset and skew
- That communicate (wirelessly) in some network topology
- Goal: agreement on single time value
- All non-faulty processes must agree on the same (single) value

Introduction Uses of Time Synchronization

- Provides nodes with a global clock for:
- Coordinating future events, e.g. takeoff for drone swarm
- Correlate sensor data between nodes
- Speeding up consensus

Introduction The Problem: Scenario

Firefighters are deployed for search-and-rescue in a burning building

To assist them, a swarm of drones is immediately deployed

The inside of the building does not have GPS, and communication between drones can be fleeting as they navigate inside

When they do communicate, they want to rapidly perform consensus on search area allocation

If any drones are lost, this shouldn't jeopardize the whole swarm's mission

Crazyflie 2.0 Micro Drones navigating indoors

Imperial College London

Introduction Existing Time Synchronization Algorithms

- 1. Centralized, single-hop (e.g. PTP)
- 2. Wireless sensor network algorithms (e.g. MTS, CMTS)
- 3. Pulse-coupled oscillators (e.g. FiGo, Random Phase)
- 4. Attempts at TS for drone swarms (e.g. Swarm-Sync)

Introduction Problems with Existing Time Sync Algorithms

- 1. Slow initial synchronization time
- 2. Excessive radio usage post-synchronization
- 3. Multi-hop topologies : unreliable convergence and slow synchronization time
- 4. Dynamic topologies: slow adaptation to arbitrary node failures, cluster merging, network partitioning, and node churn
- 5. Dense topologies : excessive radio usage and packet interference

Simulation

Simulation Aims

- Aim: Environment for developing our protocol (2 s turnaround)
- Assumptions: perfect links, no packet collisions, no processing / propagation time

Simulation Example: FiGo

Here is an example of what we would get out of our simulation

FiGo (normal, with message suppression)

- Does not converge within 20 periods (1s each)
- + Low number of fires

Imperial College London

SyncWave: Rapid and Adaptive Decentralized Time Synchronization for Swarm Robotic Systems 9

Simulation Example: Randomized Phase and FiGo with no message suppression

Randomized Phase algorithm

"Bruteforce" FiGo (no message suppression)

+ staggered fire times

Imperial College London

- High number of broadcasts

SyncWave: Rapid and Adaptive Decentralized Time Synchronization for Swarm Robotic Systems **10** + Faster convergence

- High number of broadcasts

23.06.24

Simulation **Conclusion**

- FiGo:
	- - Poor convergence
	- + low broadcast
- Randomized Phase:
	- - High broadcast
	- + staggered fire times
- FiGo (no msg supression):
	- - High broadcast
	- + Fast convergence
- Next, incorporate and extend these features in our own algorithm: SyncWave

SyncWave Algorithm Phase and Epochs

- Let's build up SyncWave piece by piece
- We need some way of keeping track of time:
- Theoretical: run algorithm in busyloop
- Incrementing a "Phase" ϕ
- until period Φ , when reset
- Epoch e is number of times it has been reset

SyncWave Algorithm Randomized Firing Phase

- Want to:
	- Send current time to neighbors
- Easily scale sending frequency
- Not send at same time as neighbors
- Solution:

Imperial College London

- broadcast whenever a separate "fire" timer ψ reaches a firing time ψ_{fire}
- To avoid packet collisions, firing time ψ_{fire} sampled randomly from range $[0,I]$
- Where Firing Interval *can be scaled*

Swarm Robotic Systems

SyncWave: Rapid and Adaptive Decentralized Time Synchronization

Maximum Time Synchronization

- On message received from neighbour, want to:
- Use this information to refine our own time estimate
- Account for time in the air
- Solution:
- Use Max Time Synchronization
- Pick whichever of the msg time and our time is greater
- Account for time in the air \hat{c}

Maximum Time Synchronization (example)

SyncWave: Rapid and Adaptive Decentralized Time Synchronization for

SyncWave Algorithm Exponential Backoff

- Want to:
	- Synchronize quickly with short firing interval
- Once synchronized, free up radio with long firing interval
- Exponential Backoff on firing interval for each fire
- Start at I_{min} , double up to I_{max}
- Reset to I_{min} if "unsynchronized" msg heard that's off by $\pm \epsilon$

 $1'$ 18

21

Exponential Backoff on Firing Interval (example)

Imperial College London

SyncWave: Rapid and Adaptive Decentralized Time Synchronization for Swarm Robotic Systems 18

Message Suppression

- Want:
	- Fewer broadcasts in dense networks (+better scaling)
- If you receive a message, your neighbours probably did too (so be quiet)
- Solution:

Imperial College London

- Suppress next broadcast if k unique neighbours have broadcast a similar time, since our last fire
- And override message suppression if "unsynchronized" message heard

SyncWave: Rapid and Adaptive Decentralized Time Synchronization Swarm Robotic Systems

Algorithm 1 SyncWave algorithm			
	1: $\phi \leftarrow 0$	32:	if $\phi > \Phi$ then
	2: $e \leftarrow 0$	33:	$\phi \leftarrow 0$
	$3: I \leftarrow I_{min}$	34:	$e \leftarrow e + 1$
	4: $\psi \leftarrow 0$	35:	end if
	5: $\psi_{\text{fire}} \leftarrow randint(0, I)$		
	6: $c \leftarrow 0$	36:	if $\psi > \psi$ _{fire} then
	7: heard ids $\leftarrow \{\}$	37:	if $c < k$ then
	$8:$ while $True$ do	38:	$\mathrm{Tx}(id, e, \phi)$
9:	if $receive_message(id_{msg}, e'_{msg}, \phi'_{msg})$ then	39:	end if
10:	$t_{msg} \leftarrow e'_{msg} \cdot \Phi + \phi'_{msg} + \hat{c}$	40:	$c \leftarrow 0$
11:	$t \leftarrow e \cdot \Phi + \phi$	41:	heard ids $\leftarrow \{\}$
12:	$e_{msq} \leftarrow t_{msq} \div \Phi $	42:	$I \leftarrow min(\beta \cdot I, I_{min})$
13:	$\phi_{msg} \leftarrow t_{msg} \mod \Phi$	43:	$\psi_{\text{fire}} \leftarrow randint(0, I)$
14:	if $t_{msg} > t$ then	44:	$\psi \leftarrow 0$
15:	$e \leftarrow e_{msq}$	45:	end if
16:	$\phi \leftarrow \phi_{msg}$	46:	$\phi \leftarrow \phi + 1$
17:	if $t_{msg} > t + \epsilon$ then	47:	$\psi \leftarrow \psi + 1$
18:	ResetFiringInterval()		48: end while
19:	else if $c < k \wedge id_{msg} \notin \text{ heard_ids}$ then		
20:	heard ids \leftarrow heard ids \cup id _{msq}		49: function RESETFIRINGINTERVAL()
21:	$c \leftarrow c + 1$	50:	$c \leftarrow 0$
22:	end if	51:	heard ids $\leftarrow \{\}$
23:	else	52:	$I \leftarrow I_{min}$
24:	if $t_{msg} < t + \epsilon$ then	53:	if $I < \psi_{\text{fire}} - \psi$ then
25:	ResetFiringInterval()	54:	$\psi_{\text{fire}} \leftarrow randint(0, I)$
26:	else if $c < k \wedge id_{msg} \notin \text{head_ids}$ then	55:	$\psi \leftarrow 0$
27:	heard ids \leftarrow heard ids \cup id _{msq}	56:	end if
	$c \leftarrow c + 1$		57: end function
28: 29:	end if		
30:	end if		
	end if		
31:			

Conclusion

To summarise, this is how SyncWave meets our original requirements:

- 1. Slow initial synchronization time
	- Exp. Backoff: \blacksquare Algorithm starts with firing interval I_{min} , so network rapidly converges

2. Excessive radio usage post-synchronization

Exp. Backoff: Firing interval increases up to I_{max} as network is synchronized

3. For multi-hop topologies : unreliable convergence and slow synchronization time

- Max Time Sync: Guaranteed convergence, impossible to form local time maxima
- Exp. Backoff: "Bridge" node to next hop will reset firing interval on hearing diff time

4. For dynamic topologies: slow adaptation to arbitrary node failures, cluster merging, network partitioning, and node churn

- Exp. Backoff: Firing interval reset to I_{min} when new cluster detected
- Max Time Sync: Invariant to arb. node failures, network partitioning, and churn by default

5. For dense topologies : excessive radio usage and packet interference

- Msg. Sup: Number of messages capped at k per hop per I_{max}
- Random Firing Phase: Broadcasts uniformly distributed in time

Implementation

Implementation Hardware & Embedded OS

- Developed for nrf52840 SoC
- ARM M4 CPU
- BLE, Bluetooth Mesh, 2.4GHz ESB
- RIOT embedded operating system
	- Level of abstraction and portability
	- Built-in timing tools
- Implemented at Network layer
- - Lower possible accuracy and timing
- + Ease of development
- Compatibility with both nrf52840dk and iotlab - m 3

Implementation

Challenges from Theoretical Algorithm

- **Timers**
- Division into threads
	- Thread scheduling priority
- Inter-process communication
- Thread sleeping and wakeups
- Shared state

Implementation

Algorithm Implementation

Evaluation

Evaluation Testbed Setup

- FIT IoT-LAB used as a testbed
- Used most widely available deployment target:
- Iotlab-M3 (STM32 MCU, 802.15.4 (LR-WPAN) links, 2.4GHz radio)
- Large scale deployment size (300+)

Evaluation

Testbed Measurement Error Bug

- Bug discovered in Iotlab-M3 nodes
- Causes measurement error of 8-16 ms
- Unpredictable oscillation in error for each node
- So, we measured maximum accuracy in lab

Evaluation Synchronization Accuracy

Using a digital oscilloscope, avg. synchronization accuracy of 488 μs (0.4 ms) for 4 nodes

Evaluation Results: Dense Topologies

Evaluation Results: Dense Topologies

Imperial College London

- Time to Synchronization is lowest found in literature
	- 2004 ms for 161 nodes over 7 hops
- Prev. best on equiv. topo: 48s (CMTS)
- Num. broadcasts in same range
	- 700 for 40 nodes to sync (CCTS)

Evaluation Results: Dense Topologies

Imperial College London

SyncWave: Rapid and Adaptive Decentralized Time Synchronization for Swarm Robotic Systems 31 and 31 and 32 and 32 and 32 and 33 and 33 and 34 and 35 a

Evaluation

Results: Dense Topologies

- Time to sync linear w.r.t. num. nodes
- Num. broadcasts linear w.r.t num. nodes

SyncWave Scaling in Dense Topologies on IoTLAB-M3 Nodes

Evaluation

Results: Highly Multi-Hop Topologies

SyncWave: Rapid and Adaptive Decentralized Time Synchronization for

Evaluation Results: Highly Multi-Hop Topologies

[•] Performs well on low connectivity, highly multi-hop

- Fewer broadcasts
- Better final accuracy

Evaluation

Results: Highly Multi-Hop Topologies

- Time to sync potentially exponential w.r.t. num. hops
- Common in time sync. algorithms, since propagation error accumulated with each hop
- Num. broadcasts linear w.r.t num. hops

SyncWave Scaling in Multi-hop Topologies on IoTLAB-M3 Nodes

Evaluation

Results: Comparison with State of the Art Multi-Hop Time Sync. Algorithms

*Note: The re-sync interval is analogous to the period in PCO algorithms and is chosen based on the convergence time vs. radio usage trade-off.

We remove this coupling, enabling faster convergence with a low synchronized broadcast rate.

Conclusion

Conclusion

- Discussed and simulated drawbacks of existing algorithms
- Designed the SyncWave algorithm
- Implemented and adapted algorithm for real hardware
- Tested SyncWave implementation on large-scale testbed
- Finding state-of-the-art results for our requirements
- Should help accelerate development of more intelligent and responsive swarm robotic systems

Future Work

Mac-layer implementation

A lower-level implementation of SyncWave (e.g. at the MAC layer) could massively improve accuracy and convergence time

And a more sophisticated estimation of propogation time

Deep Sleep for WSNs

Our protocol is intended for drone swarms, which have different power requirements from WSNs

Radio kept listening even once synchronized

For use on WSNs would want to enter deep sleep for some percentage of the firing interval or agree to all sleep at same time

Secure Swarms

Potential as building block for encryption, authentication, and resiliency, thanks to "epoch"

E.g. Channel hopping:

- Synchronized for free
- Hop according to epochs
- Completely de-centralized

IMPERIAL

Thanks for coming!

IMPERIAL

Questions?