

Accelerating Traffic Simulation and Its Real-Time Challenges

Manato Hirabayashi, Shinpei Kato and Masato Edahiro
Department of Information Engineering
Nagoya University

Yuki Sugiyama
Department of Physics
Nagoya University

Abstract

Traffic simulation is a growing domain of computational physics. There are many applications in our industry and life that benefit from traffic simulation. A core challenge of this research domain, however, is posed due to an unbounded scale of computation. In this paper, we explore an advantage of using the graphics processing unit (GPU) to support its computation. Two schemes are presented to study how to maximize GPU performance in this context. Our evaluation using a commodity graphics card shows that our GPU implementation improves simulation time by about five times over the original CPU implementation. We also demonstrate by experiments that additional orders-of-magnitude improvements could be achieved by overcoming the current hardware limitation.

1 Introduction

Transportation systems underlie our industry and life as part of societal infrastructure. Economy depends highly on traffic flow. Once a traffic jam occurs, for example, it could cause significant economic damage through degradation of transport efficiency, energy consumption, and environmental poisoning. According to the Japanese government report a few years ago, economic losses due to traffic congestion reach one hundred billion dollars per year in Japan. Albeit a major issue of transportation systems, the mechanism of traffic jam is not well-explained in the literature. What is particularly important is “phantom jam”, which often happens on freeways without any accident. This phantom jam should be avoided by science, given that it is a physical phenomenon but not one caused by human errors. However, we are not aware of scientific and engineering solutions to such real-world problems.

In physics, traffic flow is described by mathematical models [1, 6, 9]. While their mathematical expressions are not identical, they are all compute-intensive procedures. For example, traffic simulation based on the Optimal Velocity (OV) model [1] computes locations and velocities of agents every sampling period, solving OV equations. Specifically,

the location x_n of the n th agent is described by the following equation, where $\Delta x_n = x_{n+1} - x_n$ is a distance to a preceding agent, a is a sensitivity, and $V()$ is an optimal velocity function:

$$\frac{d^2 x_n}{dt^2} = a \left\{ V(\Delta x_n) - \frac{dx_n}{dt} \right\}. \quad (1)$$

Applying a large number of agents to simulation using the above formula, it is apparent that computational workload increases exponentially. In fact, the above formula considers only one dimension, which restricts applications of simulation to freeway traffic flows, powder flows, molecular motors, and so on. Making it multi-dimensional further increases computational workload, while allowing more complicated simulations, such as traffic networks, internet packet flows, evacuation routes, and herd formations of animals, to use similar optimal velocity models. Given a scale of million agents in the real world, traffic simulation should be supported by powerful computer systems.

Deployment of traffic simulation may require real-time feedback from the real world. This turns out to be a cyber-physical systems (CPS) problem. Real-time traffic simulation is another challenging issue, where the rate and the preciseness of simulation must be traded to meet the requirement of a given scenario. For instance, evacuation may want very high rate simulation, sacrificing the preciseness of simulation to some extent. Unfortunately, none of those challenges has been explored yet, largely due to a lack of multidisciplinary research collaborations between physics and computer science.

This paper explores how to accelerate traffic simulation using the state-of-the-art parallel computing technology. In particular, we use the graphics processing unit (GPU), which integrates hundreds of cores on a chip. Recent GPUs are becoming more and more suitable for general-purpose data-parallel applications. The traffic simulation program used in this paper applies Equation (1) to a large number of agents. The resulting workload is highly data-parallel and compute-intensive, which can be nicely offloaded on to the GPU. We also identify the bottleneck in accelerating our traffic simulation program using the GPU, and provide some insight into its solution.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the assumption and terminology used this paper. Section 3 briefly explains our traffic simulation program. Section 4 presents our schemes of GPU implementations of traffic simulation. Section 5 evaluates the benefit of our GPU implementations, and provides an insight into future work. Section 6 concludes this paper.

2 Assumption and Terminology

We assume the Compute Unified Device Architecture (CUDA) for GPU programming. In CUDA, a unit of pieces of code that is launched on the GPU is called a *kernel*. The kernel is typically composed of multiple *threads* that executes the code in parallel. A unit of threads that are co-scheduled by hardware is called a *block*, while a collection of blocks for the corresponding kernel is called a *grid*. The maximum number of threads that can be contained by an individual block is defined by the GPU architecture.

CUDA programs use a set of the application programming interface (API) functions to control the GPU. We usually take the following steps to use the GPU: (i) allocate space to device memory, (ii) copy data to the allocated device memory space, (iii) launch the program on the GPU, (iv) copy resultant data back to host memory, and (v) free the allocated device memory space.

Our computing platform is composed of a single CPU and GPU. The traffic simulation program is a single process from the CPU point of view. Hence, kernels are launched from the CPU sequentially, while each kernel is executed by parallelized threads on the GPU.

3 Traffic Simulation

The motivation to study traffic flow is to understand the property of traffic flow, mainly why traffic congestion occurs. The study of traffic flow has a long history, and many engineering and physical models exist. This paper is particularly focused on the OV model [1]. In this model, a driver is supposed to maintain an optimal velocity that depends on the driver's headway. Its motion is given by Equation (1). The optimal velocity function introduced in this equation is represented by the relationship between the driver's headway and velocity.

The OV model has a simple form with a single parameter of sensitivity a . This simplicity allows us to understand the mechanisms of phenomena, and also predict the results of experiments. The disadvantage of this model, on the other hand, is a little allowance for control systems to turn up the parameter. There is indeed a need for collaborations between the research domains of engineering and physics. To begin with, however, we restrict our attention to the OV model. More details are found in [1].

The traffic simulation program based on the OV model is straightforward, as the model itself has a simple form:

1. Initialize the time t , and set the initial values of $x_n(t)$ (also $y_n(t)$ and $z_n(t)$, if necessary for multidimensional versions).
2. Increase the time t by the sampling period Δt .
3. Compute the location $x_n(t)$ (also $y_n(t)$ and $z_n(t)$, if necessary for multidimensional versions), and the velocity $v_x(t)$ at time t for each agent A_n , using the OV model.
4. Go back to Step 2, if the simulation time is expired.
5. Exit the program.

The computation in Step 3 exploits a lot of loop procedures to derive locations and velocities of agents. This part is the most compute-intensive, and thus can be accelerated by the GPU.

4 GPU Implementation

GPU performance is dominated by the program design. GPU-accelerated programs are typically divided into two pieces of code. The CPU code plays a role of a master thread that controls the program flow. The GPU code, on the other hand, spawns a bunch of worker threads to execute compute-intensive parts of the program in parallel, thus accelerating the overall program. What is often argued in performance optimization is how to parallelize the compute-intensive parts into threads. This is actually the well-studied problem in the literature. What is not really understood yet is when to offload the program on to the GPU. This paper explores two schemes that use the GPU at different timings to see how GPU performance is affected.

4.1 Sample-in-CPU Scheme

We first implement such a scheme that uses the GPU *only if necessary*. In other words, the program is offloaded on to the GPU, only when computations of locations and velocities of agents are accelerated by parallelization. The CPU bridges across sampling periods to manage simulation. In this scheme, the control flow of simulation is always returned to the CPU at the end of each sampling period. Such a synchronized approach makes the programmer easy to obtain intermediate results of simulation, whereas the overhead imposed on moving back and forth between the CPU and the GPU must be compromised.

Figure 1 shows a brief overview of the Sample-in-CPU scheme. This scheme also has several alternatives depending on how many kernels need to be launched on the GPU in each period. Suppose that we want to offload n pieces of




Figure 1. Block diagram of the Sample-in-CPU scheme.




Figure 2. Block diagram of the Sample-in-GPU scheme.

for loops on to the GPU. We may return to the CPU n times in total, that is, return every time one *for* loop breaks, or otherwise we may just return once when all the n *for* loops end. This is a design decision, and is also dependent on the GPU architecture and the parallelization structure. In general, parallelized threads need to be synchronized when moving across basic blocks. Specifically, when moving to the next *for* loop executed in parallel, all the threads relevant to this parallel computing procedure must synchronize with each other. However, the maximum number of threads that can be synchronized on the GPU is often limited. As of 2012, for example, NVIDIA’s GPU architectures limit the number of such threads to 1024 or less [12]. Our implementation therefore forces the program to return to the CPU every time one *for* loop breaks. Note that this is not a conceptual limitation of GPU computing, but is a current limitation of hardware. We believe that this limitation would be removed or mitigated in next-generation GPU architectures.

4.2 Sample-in-GPU Scheme

We next implement such a scheme that uses the GPU *all the time*, even to control simulation. There is one big kernel running on the GPU, which is launched only once at the beginning. After offloading the program on to the GPU, the CPU is going to wait for the completion of simulation. This scheme is almost optimized in performance, since there is little overhead in communication between the CPU and the GPU. The downside of this scheme is that the CPU and the GPU are not synchronized. The progress of simulation is not visible from the CPU, unless the program implements

a specific interface to allow the CPU to access intermediate results of simulation running on the GPU. In our implementation, we consider providing a framework that the CPU downloads data from the GPU asynchronously without awareness of simulation, when the user requests intermediate results. This asynchronous data access may affect the performance of simulation, though in reality this access would not happen more than once in a sampling period.

Figure 2 shows a block diagram of the Sample-in-GPU scheme. The procedure is very simple. The most portion of code of simulation is executed on the GPU. Given that the single-thread performance of recent GPUs is getting more reliable, this approach is pretty reasonable. As mentioned in Section 4.1, however, the current limitation of the GPU architecture prevents us from synchronizing among blocks at a scale of thousands threads. Therefore, this scheme is speculative in a sense that it does not work today but may appear in the future.

This paper provides some degree of insights into how this scheme is effective. We implement this scheme with the current GPU architecture under the assumption that global synchronization among blocks works. There is also another possible approach for this scheme that we limit the number of threads to what is supported by the GPU architecture. This alternative implementation, however, is left open for future work.

5 Evaluation

We evaluate the performance of our GPU-accelerated traffic simulation programs, using an NVIDIA GeForce GTX 560 Ti graphics card. This is a middle-end graphics card based on the Fermi architecture [10], integrating 394 compute cores on a chip. The programs used in this evaluation are written in CUDA, and are compiled by the NVIDIA CUDA Compiler (NVCC) v4.2 suite [11].

We focus on the one-dimensional OV model [1], which can be applied to freeways simulation. The original program [13] of this simulation is written in C, without any parallelization. We use the same simulation parameters as the original default setup, while increasing the number of agents (cars) to see how simulation performance varies. The evaluation is conducted by comparing our GPU implementations with the original CPU implementation.

5.1 Performance Benefit

Figure 3 demonstrates the performance benefit of the GPU under the current hardware limitation. The Sample-in-CPU scheme herein exploits synchronization between the CPU and the GPU after every *for* loop to overcome the limitation that CUDA threads cannot synchronize beyond blocks. Despite of this restricted implementation, our GPU




Figure 3. Performance benefit of the GPU.




Figure 4. Impact of the hardware limitation.

implementation outperforms the original CPU implementation by about five times in simulation time, when the number of agents exceeds a scale of 1000. This evinces an affinity of the GPU and parallel computing for traffic simulation. It is also interesting to see that the CPU implementation has a better performance for a small number of agents. Thus, the overhead of communication between the CPU and the GPU has non-trivial impact if the achievable parallelism is not sufficient. Another notable observation is that the difference in performance of the CPU and the GPU implementations is saturated when the number of agents reaches 1000. This saturation implies the hardware potential of the NVIDIA GeForce GTX 560 Ti graphics card used in this evaluation. Using high-end graphics cards, the difference in performance may not be saturated at the same scale.

5.2 Impact of Hardware Limitation

Figure 4 demonstrates the impact of the current hardware limitation that CUDA threads cannot synchronize beyond blocks. In this experiment, we observe “what would happen if this hardware limitation is removed?”, compromis-

ing the preciseness of simulation results. Namely, we use the current CUDA synchronization function to synchronize threads running in different blocks, even though it does not work as expected. All the GPU implementations of the plotted schemes use this assumption. Therefore, the Sample-in-CPU scheme is now different from what we have evaluated in Figure 3, since there is no need anymore to return to the CPU every time one *for* loop breaks. We instead put a synchronization function between *for* loops on the GPU. The Sample-in-CPU-Sync scheme is an alternative version of the Sample-in-CPU scheme in that we download intermediate results from the GPU to the CPU at the end of each sampling period. The Sample-in-GPU scheme is what is presented in Section 4.2.

It is very notable that the Sample-in-GPU scheme improves the simulation time by a factor of 1000 as compared to the original CPU implementation. This result encourage support for thread synchronization among blocks in CUDA programming. There are also several interesting observations obtained in this experiment. Comparing the Sample-in-CPU and the Sample-in-CPU-Sync schemes, it turns out that the cost of downloading intermediate results from the GPU to the CPU is becoming trivial as the scale of simulation increases. Hence, a common argument of “host-device data communication in GPU programming is expensive” does not apply to large-scale traffic simulation. Another issue of concern often discussed in GPU programming is that a single-thread performance of GPUs is weak as compared to that of CPUs. This is true in general, but our experimental result shows that the performance loss caused by pushing most pieces of code into the GPU in the Sample-in-GPU scheme is not significant even for a small number of agents. This observation leads to some conclusion that the Sample-in-GPU scheme would be the best choice for any scale of traffic simulation.

5.3 Practical Concern

We finally examine the impact of misbehavior of thread synchronization in our GPU implementations. The simulation results produced by our GPU implementations are not precise except for those of the Sample-in-CPU scheme presented in Figure 3, due to our optimistic use of thread synchronization on the GPU. We need to wait for new GPU architectures removing the limitation of thread synchronization in order to make them precise. Practically speaking, however, imprecise results of simulation are still valuable and meaningful as far as they are limited to an acceptable range of errors for traffic flow.

Figure 5 demonstrates the error percentage of location and velocity between the simulation results produced by the original CPU and the imprecise Sample-in-GPU implementations. Since this is one-dimensional OV simulation, there




Figure 5. Error in location and velocity due to imprecise synchronization.

are only forward or backward in location, and high or low in velocity. Under this constraint, the error in location is very trivial. This is because the characteristic of traffic flow is well captured, even though the simulated locations and velocities have some error in their individual values. A degree of the error in velocity is slightly high as compared to that in location. This means that velocity is more sensitive to imprecise results than location. However, the maximum error in velocity observed in our experiment is at most 5%. Suppose that the average driving speed is 50mph. The simulated speed in our imprecise implementation would still be within a range of 47.5 to 52.5mph. Intuitively, this scale of error is acceptable in practice. We plan to further investigate if the same argument can be applied to a more variety of parameter setups and multidimensional OV simulation programs.

5.4 Discussion

According to the experimental results, it is highly desired to use the Sample-in-GPU scheme, if available. It provides an orders-of-magnitude improvement in simulation time. The downside of this scheme at the moment is a lack of functionality in thread synchronization due to the current hardware limitation. Simulation results are never precise unless thread synchronization operates correctly. Although we have demonstrated that the error in simulation results caused by a lack of thread synchronization is acceptable in our experimental setup, the range of error is never bounded as depicted in Figure 5. Hence, the availability of this scheme depends highly on practical setups.

We consider that the problem of this scheme may be relevant to the Imprecise Computation model [7]. The Sample-in-CPU scheme is precise-but-slow, while the Sample-in-GPU scheme is imprecise-but-fast. If we are allowed to em-

ploy multiple GPUs in the system, we may run the two types of simulation programs on different GPUs concurrently. At some point of time t , the simulation result produced by the Sample-in-GPU scheme represents a scenario way ahead of that produced by the Sample-in-CPU scheme; the question is how precise it is. Figure 5 demonstrates that the error in the simulation result produced by the Sample-in-GPU scheme is getting larger as time goes by. If we can find such a time duration that causes the value of error to fall out the acceptable range for practical use, we define this time duration to be Δt . Suppose that the two simulation programs based on the Sample-in-GPU and the Sample-in-CPU schemes, respectively, are running concurrently. At every interval of time Δt , we reset the simulation result produced by the Sample-in-GPU scheme, and input the latest precise simulation result produced by the Sample-in-CPU scheme during the same interval. By this means, the value of error in the simulation result produced by the Sample-in-GPU scheme never falls out the acceptable range, while we still benefit from its simulation speed within an interval of time Δt . The value of Δt can be determined adaptively based on the Imprecise Computation model.

So far we have studied a single process of traffic flow. In reality, however, there are multiple processes of traffic flow. Real-time feedback from the real road conditions may also be additionally required to deploy traffic simulation. All these pieces of simulation must meet the quality-of-service (QoS) requirement for users. Now, this turns into a real-time systems problem. We have developed a lot of solutions to use the GPU in real-time systems [2, 3, 4, 5]. We believe that some of these work could contribute to GPU-accelerated real-time traffic simulation.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we have presented GPU-accelerated traffic simulation based on the OV model. The current hardware limitation of the GPU architecture caps improvements in performance to a factor of ten or less, as compared to the original CPU implementation. However, we demonstrated that additional orders-of-magnitude improvements could be achieved by removing that limitation. We also discussed a conceivable solution to cope with that limitation, using a concept of the Imprecise Computation model.

In future work, we extend our scheme to multidimensional OV models. This extension allows our research to be applied to a broader range of problems beyond free-ways traffic simulation. We also plan to consider a specific approach to the integration of the Imprecise Computation model into our scheme in order to facilitate deployment of traffic simulation in the real world. Another interesting direction in this line of work is to coordinate with engineering-based simulation such as AutoMatrix [8].

References

- [1] M. Bando, K. Hasebe, K. Nakanishi, A. Nakayama, A. Shibata, and Y. Sugiyama. Phenomenological Study of Dynamic Model of Traffic Flow. *Journal de Physique I France*, 5(11):1389–1399, 1995.
- [2] S. Kato, K. Lakshmanan, Y. Ishikawa, and R. Rajkumar. Resource Sharing in GPU-accelerated Windowing Systems. In *Proc. of the IEEE Real-Time and Embedded Technology and Applications Symposium*, pages 191–200, 2011.
- [3] S. Kato, K. Lakshmanan, A. Kumar, M. Kelkar, Y. Ishikawa, and R. Rajkumar. RGEM: A Responsive GPGPU Execution Model for Runtime Engines. In *Proc. of the IEEE Real-Time Systems Symposium*, pages 57–66, 2011.
- [4] S. Kato, K. Lakshmanan, R. Rajkumar, and Y. Ishikawa. TimeGraph: GPU Scheduling for Real-Time Multi-Tasking Environments. In *Proc. of the USENIX Annual Technical Conference*, 2011.
- [5] S. Kato, M. McThrow, C. Maltzahn, and S. Brandt. Gdev: First-Class GPU Resource Management in the Operating System. In *Proc. of the USENIX Annual Technical Conference*, 2012.
- [6] B.S. Kelner and P. Konhauser. Cluster Effect in Initially Homogeneous Traffic Flow. *Physical Review E*, 48:2335–2338, 1993.
- [7] K. Lin, S. Natarajan, and J.-S. Liu. Imprecise Results: Utilizing Partial Computations in Real-Time Systems. In *Proc. of the IEEE Real-Time Systems Symposium*, pages 210–217, 1987.
- [8] R. Mangharam and A. Saba. Anytime Algorithms for GPU Architectures. In *Proc. of the IEEE Real-Time Systems Symposium*, pages 47–56, 2011.
- [9] K. Nagel and M. Schreckenberg. A Cellular Automaton Model for Freeway Traffic. *Journal de Physique I France*, 2(12):2221–2229, 1992.
- [10] NVIDIA. NVIDIA’s next generation CUDA computer architecture: Fermi. http://www.nvidia.com/content/PDF/fermi_white_papers/NVIDIA_Fermi_Compute_Architecture_Whitepaper.pdf, 2009.
- [11] NVIDIA. CUDA 4.2. <http://developer.nvidia.com/cuda/cuda-downloads>, 2012.
- [12] NVIDIA. NVIDIA GeForce GTX 680: The fastest, most efficient GPU ever built. http://www.geforce.com/Active/en_US/en_US/pdf/GeForce-GTX-680-Whitepaper-FINAL.pdf, 2012.
- [13] The Mathematical Society of Traffic Flow. Optimal Velocity Model. http://traffic.phys.cs.is.nagoya-u.ac.jp/~mstf/sample/ov_e.html, 1995.