A Systems of Systems

perspective on

The Internet of Things

Johan Lukkien Eindhoven University



Technische Universiteit
Eindhoven
University of Technology

The second s

Where innovation starts

TU





System of systems



TU/e Technische Universiteit Eindhoven University of Technology



Intelligent Transportation Systems

- Vehicle: integrated system components
 - systems by themselves, but not independent
- V2V: system of systems (vehicles) with
 V2V applications
 - e.g. accident prevention, parking spot finding, collaborative driving
- V2I: 'slower' (higher latency) applications, global applications
- ITS is a SoS but also a typical IoT system (or Cyber Physical system)



Internet of Things

- A unified protocol and naming scheme between every pair of devices
- Pervasive, extending network communication to billions of endpoints
- Reaching into the physical world, reaching deep into (production) systems, gathering large amounts of detailed information about states and events







Another typical SoS and IoT system(s)



SoS characteristics

- Operational Independence
 - autonomous behavior and goal of subsystems
- Managerial Independence
 - subsystems managed by different authorities
- Evolutionary Independence

- Geographic distribution
- Emergent behavior
 - properties deriving from the combination of subsystems
 - properties difficult or impossible to deduce from subsystems
- Heterogeneity
- Networks as integration point



Composition of systems into SoS



Two worlds

- Pervasive connectivity moves into the safety critical domain
 - by including actuation
 - by penetrating safety critical systems
 - *uncertainty* and concerns of *connectivity* and *scalability* are complemented with *timeliness* and *dependability*
- Safety critical systems (CPS) are becoming connected
 - by including open networks
 - robustness and (timing) guarantees are complemented with scalability and uncertainty



Connected domains

- Applications run on top of connected (managerial) domains
 - an application takes resources from that domain and possibly runs code
 - within a domain a single behavioral policy may be assumed
 - the overall application is emergent
- The perimeter is not that clear
 - the domain can be more logical than physical

IoT example: smartphone apps

- take resources from phone, network, back office cloud
- crossing of managerial domains by user consent
 - sometimes policy, sometimes just black & white



How to engineer (compose) SoS applications?

- E.g. a Smart City application
- Lewis et al.: three step life cycle
 - 1. list all software services in the concerned subsystems
 - 2. build the integrated SoS application from these
 - examine and realize the consequences for the original subsystems
 - e.g. access to data, using computation and data resources

- Some thing like this has to be done *but*
 - this assumes a stable software 'base' (independent evolution!)
 - it requires subsystem managers to be involved
 - it invites adjustments of subsystems to the applications at hand leading to maintenance problems
 - reducing dependencies is key
 - it is difficult to involve third party application developers



Composition architecture – some requirements

- Separate the following
 - development API for application developers ("North side")
 - *integration API* for subsystems ("South side")
 - adaptation layer for subsystems
- Interfaces include
 - reservation of resources
 - policies, and negotiation thereof
 - coordination of SoS applications





In summary

- Pervasive networking and Safety Critical systems move closer and get mixed
- Both domains have characteristics of Systems of systems
 - · composition of systems with an independent goal
 - composition of applications on top
- Such compositions should focus on:
 - reservations, extra-functional properties at interfaces
 - an explicit role for third party developers
 - avoiding increasing complexity in individual subsystems ad-hoc solutions

