

# ConfigBot: Adaptive Resource Allocation for Robot Applications in Dynamic Environments

Rohit Dwivedula

The University of Texas at Austin  
Austin, Texas, USA  
rohitdwivedula@utexas.edu

Sadanand Modak

The University of Texas at Austin  
Austin, Texas, USA  
sadanandm@utexas.edu

Aditya Akella

The University of Texas at Austin  
Austin, Texas, USA  
akella@cs.utexas.edu

Joydeep Biswas

The University of Texas at Austin  
Austin, Texas, USA  
joydeepb@cs.utexas.edu

Daehyeok Kim

The University of Texas at Austin  
Austin, Texas, USA  
daehyeok@utexas.edu

Christopher J. Rossbach

The University of Texas at Austin  
Austin, Texas, USA  
rossbach@cs.utexas.edu

## Abstract

The growing use of autonomous mobile service robots (AMSRs) in dynamic environments requires flexible management of compute resources to optimize the performance of diverse tasks such as navigation, localization, perception, and so on. Current robot deployments, which oftentimes rely on static configurations (of the OS, applications, etc.) and system over-provisioning, fall short since they do not account for the tasks’ performance variations resulting in poor system-wide behavior such as robot instability and/or inefficient resource use. This paper presents CONFIGBOT, a system designed to adaptively reconfigure AMSR applications to meet a predefined performance specification by leveraging runtime profiling and automated configuration tuning. Through experiments on a Boston Dynamics Spot robot equipped with NVIDIA AGX Orin, we demonstrate CONFIGBOT’s efficacy in maintaining system stability and optimizing resource allocation across diverse scenarios. Our findings highlight the promise of tailored and dynamic configurations for robot deployments.

## 1 Introduction

There is growing interest in developing autonomous mobile service robots (AMSRs) to assist humans in everyday environments. Examples of commercial AMSR projects include Amazon Astro [3], EEEV Willow [34], and Misty the Robot [28]. While current AMSRs are largely limited to the functions programmed by their manufacturers, it is likely that in the near future, AMSRs will become extensible through third-party applications. These applications will unlock new capabilities, enhancing how AMSRs assist humans, much like how mobile applications [7, 17] revolutionized the functionality of smartphones.

A key requirement of robot applications is *real-time responsiveness*. Delays in processing or outdated data can reduce the usefulness of the information and hinder the robot’s ability

to take timely and effective actions in dynamic environments. Looking ahead, future AMSRs are expected to support the concurrent execution of multiple applications, with the set of active applications dynamically evolving as users install or uninstall them. Additionally, the robot’s active functionality will change as it moves through different environments and engages in activities that require different capabilities – especially so in robotic systems that personalize how a robot behaves on a per-person basis [13, 18, 29].

Ensuring that multiple concurrent, latency-sensitive robot applications can run effectively presents a *challenging and novel resource allocation problem*. This issue has several defining attributes, which are discussed in detail in §2.2.

First, robot applications have widely varying resource requirements, performance targets, and service level objectives (SLOs). Second, robots are typically resource-constrained, meaning applications cannot simply scale up resources on demand (unlike cloud servers) to meet performance needs. Third, robot applications are inherently complex, with intricate data-flow dependencies, as each application consumes data from a mix of I/O devices, sensors, and other applications. Finally, robot applications are deployed in diverse environments—such as homes, workplaces, and outdoor settings—where even a static and unchanging set of applications can have varying resource demands due to fluctuations in the physical environment.

In developing a solution to this problem, we identify several unique *opportunities* in robot apps: (1) They typically involve *long-running, persistent* tasks executed in continuous loops to maintain ongoing functionality as the robot interacts with its surroundings (e.g., object tracking, depth estimation, sensor data processing) [19, 30]. (2) Most apps are *inherently designed with fault tolerance in mind*; for example, an object tracking system may continue to function at a reduced capacity even if a few frames from an input sensor (e.g., a camera) are lost, preventing catastrophic failures due to the loss of individual data points (e.g., losing track of an

object). (3) Apps can be categorized as *core vs non-core* – where core apps (e.g., localization, navigation) are essential to the robot’s physical functioning. Aiming resource allocation to ensure core apps’ needs are met while optimizing other apps simplifies the problem.

Based on these, we develop a novel resource allocation framework for future robots called CONFIGBOT, which uses Bayesian Optimization to automatically learn the best resource allocation configuration for the current operating environment given a developer-defined specification that the robot must meet. Our approach identifies both operating system settings (specifically, cgroup settings) as well as the configurations for a new application-level construct we introduce, called “*adaptors*”, that enable resource control in application space without modifying application logic. Our approach also enables the robot to automatically detect when environment changes occur, relearning a new optimal configuration.


We implement and evaluate our approach on a Boston Dynamics Spot robot equipped with NVIDIA AGX Orin in real-world settings. We run a variety of complex realistic robot apps with complex structures, dependencies, and requirements. Despite the complexity and drastic environment changes, we show that our approach can find (and re-find) optimal configurations to support application requirements. We demonstrate how using CONFIGBOT allows us to run a basic robot stack of apps on 4x fewer CPUs compared to today’s OS (“default”) settings while still satisfying reliability and safety properties. In fact, the default setting fails catastrophically even when provisioned with 2x the CPUs CONFIGBOT uses.

## 2 Background and Motivation

This section will begin by introducing modern robot hardware and compute (§2.1). We then describe how typical robot applications are implemented, followed by their key attributes (§2.2). Then, we empirically show how these attributes make resource management challenging (§2.3). Finally, we introduce tuneable knobs that can help with resource allocations (§2.4).

### 2.1 Robot Hardware & Compute

AMSRs come in different sizes and are equipped with a diverse range of hardware configurations tailored to their operational environments. Typically, AMSRs feature onboard compute resources that may include multi-core CPUs and, in advanced setups, GPUs to support real-time perception and decision-making tasks. The availability of compute resources can vary widely – often relying on resource-constrained embedded systems (e.g., , NVIDIA Jetson TX2 [4]). Most robots are equipped with (1) either LiDAR or depth camera sensors



**Figure 1: STACK-A. A basic stack (set of robot apps) w/ navigation, localization, sensor I/O and telemetry.**

to get 3D point clouds encoding the environment and (2) an inertial measurement unit that provides odometry and orientation, as these are essential for navigating in the environment while avoiding obstacles. Optionally, robots with perception needs also have RGB cameras, which could be monocular or stereo. Furthermore, specialized hardware depending on the application domain might be employed, e.g., , tactile sensing for terrain-aware navigation [22], or network cards for sending information to servers [39] and/or remote processing [19].

In this paper, we utilize a specific AMSR, the Boston Dynamics Spot robot [10], equipped with NVIDIA AGX Orin [4], for our experiments. The detailed hardware configuration and sensor suite are described later in §4.1. This is a highly overprovisioned (and hence expensive and power-hungry) set up, but the choice of this platform allows us to explore a range of scenarios, including those where compute resources are limited to emulate typical and realistic AMSR constraints.

### 2.2 Characteristics of Robot Applications

This subsection provides a background on how robot applications are typically implemented and describes their attributes that make resource allocation in the AMSR setting challenging, motivating the problem formulation we present in a later section.

**Application structure.** The *de facto* approach for implementing robot applications is to use the ROS [1] framework. In ROS, applications are implemented as a group of *nodes*, with each node performing a specific, well-defined task. Each node is a separate Linux process, and nodes communicate via *topics* through a message-passing mechanism – topics are named queues (of *messages*), and multiple nodes can publish (or subscribe) to a topic. Figure 1 illustrates the high-level

**Table 1: Robot apps, resource needs, and performance metrics**

App	Frequency	Resources Used	Performance Metric	# Publishes to	# Subscribes to
LiDAR processing	40 - 60 Hz	I/O, CPU	Latency, Density	12	2
Navigation	20 - 40 Hz	CPU (GPU, in some cases)	Stability (e.g. smooth movements) Safety (no collisions)	21	16
Localization	30 - 40 Hz	CPU	Accuracy, Recovery	4	5
Web dashboard	10 Hz	Network	Latency/delay, throughput	3	12
Object detection	1-5 Hz	CPU, GPU	Frame rate, detection accuracy	2	2

implementation of a navigation (NAV) app (black dashed rectangle). The NAV app is primarily implemented in three ROS nodes (localization, pointcloud to laserscan, and the core navigation algorithm) which are represented with blue, rectangular boxes in the figure.

**Application complexity and diversity.** While Figure 1 begins to hint at the complexity involved in robotic apps (e.g., multiprocessing, multiple publisher-consumer style dependencies), it is still a simplification showing only the important parts of the application; the full ROS application structure, including dependencies, is much more complex (details omitted for brevity). For example, the “navigation algo” node in the picture publishes data to 21 topics and subscribes to 16 topics. Many of the ROS nodes inside the app (e.g., localization, navigation, etc.) are multithreaded and use thread-level communication and synchronization mechanisms as well.

Furthermore, robot apps often have mutual (inter-app) dependencies that add further complexity. For example, the NAV app above communicates with three other applications, represented with dashed rectangles – (a) a driver app (§4.2.1) that communicates with the underlying low-level robot actuators, (b) an RGBD depth camera app (§4.2.3) that converts the depth channel of the camera into a point-cloud format, and (c) a web-socket (§4.2.6) based dashboard that allows remote clients to observe the current status of the robot as well as send new navigation commands. Each of these dependencies is implemented with one or more ROS nodes and uses similar topic-based communication for internal message passing. Table 1 gives an overview of the richness of key robot applications.

**Diverse performance and resource needs.** Furthermore, each of these co-dependent applications has distinct resource usage profiles and performance objectives, contributing to the complexity of managing their concurrent execution on resource-constrained systems. For example, as shown in Table 1, the NAV app operates at a frequency of around 40Hz, while the object detection app processes image frames at a slower rate of 1-5Hz. The latter might use an on-board GPU for ML model inference, while the NAV app and other components rely only on the CPU for compute. Additionally, the web dashboard and driver stack depend on networking,

**Table 2: Resource usage of a navigation (NAV) app under the various algorithms it implements. §4.2.5 provides more details.**

Algorithm	Compute	Memory
Basic NAV	1.1 CPUs	526 MB
NAV with Obstacle-based Planner	1.5 CPUs	490 MB
NAV with Terrain-aware Planner	6.9 CPUs + GPU inference	1267 MB

while the depth node utilizes the I/O subsystem. These diverse demands underscore the challenges of coordinating interdependent applications to ensure stable and efficient system performance.

**Environment-dependent resource consumption.** Finally, we observe that the resource usage of a robot app often depends heavily on the physical environment. We illustrate this using three standard robot applications.

*Navigation* is a crucial skill for mobile robots and, as described later in §4.2.5, there are different types of navigation algorithms that can be used. The choice of which algorithm would be the best depends a lot on the surrounding environment in which the robot operates. For instance, a crowded situation with a lot of people might demand some type of socially-aware navigation [14], or terrain-aware navigation might be needed when the robot is outdoors in off-road deployments [22]. Consequently, these would have significantly different resource consumption profiles and a robot developer could choose to dynamically change the algorithm used at runtime based on these environmental factors [43]. Table 2 shows resource usage<sup>1</sup> for three different navigation algorithms we tested (average across multiple runs).

*Human pose estimation* [47] apps aim to detect the orientation of humans’ joints from an image. Certain pose estimation systems [11, 20, 45] perform this task in two phases: using one subsystem to identify humans in a picture, and for each human found, invoke another subsystem to perform the

<sup>1</sup>In the table, CPU utilization is calculated by dividing the total CPU-seconds consumed by the application (across all cores) by the wall clock time.

pose estimation on that specific human. Such systems use linearly increasing compute resources as the number of humans in the environment increases. Similar design patterns are seen in object tracking systems [48] as well.


*Data streaming* is another environment-dependent task. Telemetry systems [32], for example, compress video or LIDAR streams before offloading them to servers, reducing bandwidth demands. Similarly, edge-cloud robotics frameworks [21, 26] employ compression for remote compute tasks. Compression effectiveness depends heavily on scene dynamics: static environments compress well, lowering network load and CPU usage, while highly dynamic scenes yield poor compression, increasing data volume and compute costs.

### 2.3 Resource Allocation

Given the unique complexities that robot apps introduce, it is a valid question to ask if the default resource allocation strategies employed by current operating systems are sufficient. What follows is a discussion on (a) how the aforementioned unique characteristics make it challenging to effectively allocate resources to robot apps and (b) possible natural ways around it and their shortcomings.

**2.3.1 Default OS decision-making leads to bad behavior.** A crucial objective of any AMSR is to be able to navigate safely. We investigate whether default OS allocation strategies allow the robot to fulfill this primary objective well. We conduct experiments on STACK-A (Figure 1), where we restrict the number of cores (and memory) available to the robot stack to simulate resource constrained systems and see how well it manages to navigate through indoor spaces. We noticed very quickly, that the robot exhibits a wide range of performance degradations that lead to behavior such as stumbling or shaking, inability to stabilize itself at the destination, and in extreme cases, inability to move at all. Then, we attempt to add contention to the system by introducing a second app, obj - an object detection system [36] and measure the impact of its' performance. These investigations revealed to us that this robot stack works well when it is provisioned with four or more CPUs, and starts exhibiting worse behavior as resources become scarcer.

Figure 2 plots one *performance metric* of interest - the frequency at which the navigation application publishes new decisions. This application was designed to run at a frequency of 35-40Hz, which only configuration (iv) achieves. However, when we run the object detection app (obj) along with STACK-A on 4 CPUs, this performance metric quickly falls beneath the design specification once again. Additionally, we observed the robot exhibiting some forms of bad behavior under this contention (stumbling, inability to stabilize at the goal). This example showed us that even simple




**Figure 2: Measured frequency at which NAV controller publishes new decisions. Dotted lines indicate raw measurements and the solid lines indicate an exponentially smoothed averages. We notice that in all of these configurations there is high variability in the performance metric.**

contention, in the form of a single application can cause visible performance degradation.

One obvious solution to this would be to schedule additional tasks only when ample resources are available (e.g., a 6 CPU robot) and kill all non-essential tasks in more resource constrained systems. However, we can do better than this binary choice. cgroup controllers, discussed in §2.4, allow us to do fractional allocation for individual apps, such that we can reduce contention to a point where good behavior is restored. We’ll later show that it indeed is possible to achieve good behavior on all of these setups by making appropriate changes to resource allocation strategies using this *config knob*.

**2.3.2 Individual fractional resource allocation not sufficient.** Can cgroup controllers rectify bad behavior in robot applications always? **No**. To illustrate this, we’ll show two very frequently occurring scenarios, using an example STACK-B as shown in Figure 3.

**Internal contention.** Going back to the example in §2.3.1, we observed that contention from a non-essential app (e.g., object detection) caused performance degradation of the essential app (navigation), and we noted that throttling resources allocated to a contending app (e.g., extreme case being simply killing/not having it) may restore good behavior. However, due to the complex nature of ROS-based message passing, there are situations where this will not suffice. Consider a scenario where the RGB images from the camera app are used by the navigation node such that the navigation algorithm computes local goals and then overlays them over the image and publishes it so that the robot developer knows where the robot is navigating to currently. This is needed by



**Figure 3: STACK-B.** This set of apps includes an object detection model (underlined) which was not a part of STACK-A.

the robot developer typically for safety monitoring (*i.e.*, to make sure the robot does not plan a path that collides with objects). Thus, in addition to the standard CPU-intensive task of navigation planning that the NAV node does, there is an additional task of overlaying the local goal over the image which gets triggered inside the navigation node each time it receives a new RGB image.


In our experimental setup, a 35 Hz command frequency for published navigation commands from the navigation app is desirable, and typically a robot developer would need the local goal information overlaid onto the image once a second (1 Hz). As shown in Table 3, the baseline experiment with the stack shown in Figure 1 running on 2 cores gives bad behavior. A possible solution (shown as THROTTLE-0.25 in the table) is to throttle the camera app up to the point (*i.e.*, which is 0.25 cores here) that it does not violate the local goal overlay constraint. This does lead to improvement in behavior, though not sufficient. Throttling further violates the second constraint.

Is there a way to throttle only the CPU-intensive task of local goal overlay that navigation does without throttling the camera app? **Yes**, using what we call as *adaptors* introduced later in §2.4, that allow independent control of frequencies at which data is published or consumed by nodes (which would then control the frequency at which the local goal overlay task gets triggered inside navigation app).

**Catastrophic falls.** Consider the example of an object detection application (*e.g.*, YOLO [24]). This application consumes RGB images produced by the camera app, and detects objects in these images. This application is usually lower priority than more critical applications such as obstacle avoidance or navigation. In a resource constrained robot stack experiencing contention (such as STACK-B), a natural thing to

**Table 3: Bad behavior cannot be fixed by throttling resources to contending apps alone. Here, frequencies are averaged over a run. Ticks and crosses are with respect to the desirable targets of 35 and 1 Hz resp.**

Method	Command Freq.	Local Goal Monitor Freq.
Baseline	23.2 (✗)	5.2 (✓)
+ THROTTLE-0.25	30.8 (✗)	1.1 (✓)
+ THROTTLE-0.0	35.6 (✓)	0.0 (✗)



**Figure 4: Behavior of object detection app as we constrain CPUs**

do would be to reduce the share of CPU allocated to this application using the cgroup controllers discussed in §2.3.1.

We examine an object detection program that is implemented as follows:

- When a new image comes in, a new worker thread starts preprocessing it. The number of such worker threads is capped to a threshold (in this case, 10)
- When the previous sample is done running on the GPU, the next image is scheduled onto GPU

We tried reducing this application’s CPU share, and immediately noticed the number of active threads increases, shown in Figure 4. If we were to go into the application source code and modify it to be single-threaded (which we did for this experiment) it would behave far more gracefully under resource cuts as illustrated in Table 4.

However, changing the application is unwieldy and often impossible; we would rather just reduce the rate at which new data is sent to this app – this would have the same effect with no changes needed to the app itself by the robot developer. It is worth noting that this is not an isolated example; for example, a common design that ROS apps use to

**Table 4: Latency per image of object detection app under varying CPU resource constraints**

n_cpu	Threaded	Non-threaded
0.5 CPU	2163	500
1 CPU	793	179

“subscribe” to topics is to define a callback function that gets triggered on every new incoming message on that topic.

Even in a kernel that supports real-time scheduling (e.g., RTOS), problems such as the queue buildup shown in Figure 4 still remain. Additionally, deciding which specific nodes (or threads) receive prioritized scheduling is challenging due to the complex web of dependencies seen in robot applications.

## 2.4 Configuration knobs

As we have seen in previous subsections, default resource allocation strategies in the context of robot applications with complex message-passing structures can lead to essential apps such as NAV being starved leading to bad behavior. Also, there are situations where we need independent control of the rates at which a source node publishes a message and a destination node subscribes to it. This motivates the use of following *config knobs*:

- **cgroup settings:** `cpu.max` cgroup controller allows us to set a maximum time fraction that an app can occupy on CPU. (Control groups (cgroups) are an existing feature in modern Linux-based operating systems that enable fine-grained resource management for processes. cgroups and their settings are typically exposed through the `/sys/fs/cgroup` virtual file system, allowing administrators and applications to manage CPU, memory, and I/O usage for grouped processes.) This would allow us to prioritize essential apps like NAV and alleviate the problem mentioned in §2.3.1.
- **Adaptors:** In traditional ROS-based communication, if node A publishes to a topic at  $n$  Hz, then any subscribers to it can only consume the data stream at the same rate. We introduce novel *adaptors* that can control the frequency of each subscriber-publisher edge independent of all other edges. This added flexibility – rooted in a key opportunity offered by robot applications, namely, that they are designed with fault-tolerance in mind – would help solve the problems we saw in §2.3.2.

Furthermore, as argued earlier, because resource usage and the real-world environment are tightly coupled, resource allocation decisions need to be tailored to each environment. Existing resource allocation systems fail to take this into

account. Further, given the complexity inherent to robot apps and the fact that multiple apps may run concurrently, manually setting these configuration knobs at many possible application “locations” is difficult if not impossible. As we’ll describe in Section 3, using the config knobs we can further alleviate this problem using *learning to dynamically* and *automatically* find a *good* global config each time a new environment is observed.

## 3 Design

Having established that running robot applications naively with the default OS resource allocation configurations often results in suboptimal performance, our goal is to identify a configuration that ensures efficient and effective behavior based on a defined specification. We first present our problem formulation and then introduce our approach, CONFIGBOT.

### 3.1 Problem Definition

Consider a robot stack (*i.e.*, the set of applications  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n$ ) operating under specified conditions, which include both system resources and the physical environment. For each application, we assume the developer provides a performance metric ( $J_i$ ) to evaluate its behavior (*e.g.*, frame rate, message publish frequency) and a *desirable target* value  $J_i^o$ . Achieving this target ensures the robot operates effectively. This assumption is reasonable, as such metrics are often straightforward to define.


We observe that robot applications can be categorized into two broad classes:

- **Core applications ( $A_c$ ):** These are critical for the robot’s functionality (*e.g.*, localization, navigation, obstacle avoidance) and must always perform reliably.
- **Third-party applications ( $A_t$ ):** These are non-essential and can be executed opportunistically when resources permit.

Armed with this categorization, we can simply the task of identifying an optimal configuration and specify it as a constrained black-box multi-objective optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{c}{\operatorname{argmax}} \quad & \min(J_i(c), J_i^o) \quad \forall a_i \in A_t \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & J_i(c) \geq J_i^o \quad \forall a_i \in A_c \\ & c \in \mathbf{C} \quad \text{i.e., config knobs space} \end{aligned}$$

In this formulation, there are  $|A_t|$  objectives and  $|A_c|$  constraints, with the full solution existing on a Pareto front. The  $\operatorname{argmax}$  is performed over the *configuration knobs space*, as defined earlier. The  $\min$  operation considers a tuple of  $J_i(c)$  (the performance metric of the application under configuration  $c$ ) and its desirable target value  $J_i^o$ . Thus, the  $\operatorname{argmax}$



**Figure 5: CONFIGBOT Overview:** Given a set of robot applications running on the system along with the specified system resources, CONFIGBOT leverages *configuration knobs* to determine an optimal configuration that ensures effective robot behavior. During runtime, it continuously monitors constraint satisfaction, as constraints may be violated when the robot transitions to a new environment. If necessary, CONFIGBOT adapts by relearning an optimal configuration for the new environment.

over the min of this tuple seeks to find a configuration that maximizes  $J_i(c)$  up to its desirable target.

This approach ensures that resources are not excessively allocated to applications that have already achieved their target performance. For applications without a natural upper desirable bound, we assign a target of  $\infty$ . Importantly, an UNSAT result indicates that the specifications for core applications are too stringent to meet under the given operating conditions.

### 3.2 Approach: CONFIGBOT

Figure 5 provides an overview of the framework. To address the optimization problem outlined in §3.1, CONFIGBOT operates in four main phases: (1) specification provisioning, (2) initial profiling, (3) configuration optimization, and (4) online monitoring and relearning. Each phase is detailed below.


**1. Specifications.** The robot developer provides a list of applications (*i.e.*, ROS nodes) running on the system, along with the available system resources. For each application, they specify desirable target values,  $J^o$ , and a method to evaluate the performance metric  $J(c)$ . These specifications form the basis for performance assessment and optimization.

**2. Initial Profiling.** In this phase, CONFIGBOT identifies the (pub, sub) edges in the current dependency structure and attaches adaptor knobs to each edge. The system then creates a new cgroup for every ROS node and determines which cgroup.controllers should be assigned. For instance, a ROS node that utilizes only the CPU will have a `cpu.max`

configuration knob, whereas a node that requires both CPU and I/O resources will have `cpu.max` and `io.niceness` configuration knobs.

**3. Configuration Optimization.** Using the provided specifications, CONFIGBOT treats the requirements of core applications as constraints and those of third-party applications as optimization objectives. CONFIGBOT leverages Bayesian optimization, a method well-suited for this problem due to its ability to efficiently explore and exploit configurations in high-dimensional, black-box scenarios. The implementation is based on existing approaches [15, 33]. The use of Bayesian Optimization is made feasible by an important characteristic of robot applications—their long-running, persistent nature. This allows the system to invest a reasonable amount of time in finding an optimal solution, as the benefits of optimization can be amortized over an extended period. If new applications were to appear every few seconds, this approach would become impractical, as there would not be enough time to offset the cost of the optimization process.

**4. Online Monitoring and Relearning.** Once an optimal configuration is identified, the system operates with it until the *online monitor* detects a constraint violation. Such violations may occur due to (1) significant changes in the physical environment, or (2) the addition of a new application, either of which can substantially alter resource consumption profiles. In the latter case, CONFIGBOT revisits the Initial Profiling phase to introduce knobs for the new application. For both cases, CONFIGBOT constantly checks if the constraints outlined in §3.1 are violated to identify if condition 1 or 2 is



**Figure 6: The Spot Robot and attached sensors. (1) Front spot cameras (left + right), (2) Azure Kinect RGB-D camera, (3) Velodyne VLP-16 lidar, (4) Vectornav IMU, (5) NVIDIA AGX Orin onboard compute, (6) Rear and side spot cameras**

met; if so, CONFIGBOT re-executes the optimization phase to *relearn* an optimal configuration.

## 4 Implementation

This section outlines the implementation details for CONFIGBOT. We start with key details of our robot and the robot applications we study. We then describe how adapters and our Bayesian Optimization and relearning loops (phases 3 and 4) are implemented.

### 4.1 Robots: Hardware and Compute

We perform all the experiments in this paper on a Boston Dynamics Spot Robot [10], shown in Figure 6. The robot is equipped with an NVIDIA AGX Orin 64 GB developer kit (12 cores) [35] for on-board compute, and the sensors listed in Table 5.

As previously noted, this is an overprovisioned setup and most robots have lower resource availability (such as fewer cores, a lack of GPU) and thus, to simulate realistic scenarios we test with differing amounts of resources for our experiments in this paper.

**Table 5: List of sensors.**

Sensor Type	Model
LIDAR	Velodyne VLP16 [16]
RGBD Camera	Azure Kinect [27]
Inertial Measurement Unit	VectorNav [2]
5x Grayscale stereo cameras	Spot Built-in

**Table 6: List of apps, grouped by type**

Type of apps	Apps
Sensor	SpotROS (§4.2.1), LIDAR (§4.2.2), Camera inputs (§4.2.3)
Perception	Depth estimation (§4.2.3), Object classification (§4.2.4),
Actuation	SpotROS (§4.2.1), Navigation (§4.2.5)
Telemetry	Web dashboard (§4.2.6)

## 4.2 List of applications

The applications we study are listed in Table 6 and include basic types such as telemetry, perception, actuation, and ML-inference. In what follows, we provide a brief description of each.

**4.2.1 SpotROS Driver App.** The driver stack contains a SpotROS driver node [37] that provides an interface for the ROS nodes to communicate with the robot hardware. Commands to the robot actuators and odometry information flow via this application. Additionally, the driver stack also implements an interface with a radio receiver which allows the robot to be controlled manually with a joystick<sup>2</sup>.

**4.2.2 LIDAR Input App.** This application reads data from the Velodyne laser scanner sensor and publishes the pointcloud to a ROS topic.

**4.2.3 Depth Camera App.** This application reads camera input from USB I/O and provides an RGB-D image. Additionally, it converts the depth channel of the camera to a pointcloud, which is then used by other apps (*e.g.*, navigation).

**4.2.4 Object detection app.** This application uses GroundedSAM [36] (or YOLO [24]) to identify objects seen by the robot (in the RGB camera). This is a parameterized app and requires a list of objects it is supposed to be looking for. At runtime, whenever the application receives a frame from the camera, it searches for these objects in the frame and returns an annotated image. This application also exposes a ROS service (*i.e.*, similar to an API endpoint) that allows other apps to dynamically change this list of objects at runtime. Robot

<sup>2</sup>We use a Spektrum DXS SPM1010 [42]

developers could use this service to change what classes of objects the model identifies in images.

**4.2.5 Navigation.** This application decomposes a high-level navigation objective, such as “move to coordinate  $(x, y)$ ” into a sequence of velocity (speed + direction) commands that are sent to the SpotROS driver. This application has access to a high-level map of the environment containing information on long-term obstacles (*i.e.*, walls, doors). The navigation algorithms use pointclouds of the immediate surrounding environment for both localization [9] and obstacle avoidance. This pointcloud could be generated using:

- a dedicated pointcloud generator (*i.e.*, the LIDAR stack)
- using the depth channel of the Kinect camera to construct a pointcloud
- or, if we only have an RGB camera (*i.e.*, no depth channel), depth-anything [44] could be used to generate the pointcloud.


In addition to this, the navigation app we studied implements a few different navigation algorithms:

- **Basic Navigation (NAV1):** this algorithm attempts to travel between waypoints in the most direct route possible while avoiding any obstacles that are immediately in its way.
- **Obstacle Based Planner (NAV2):** this algorithm plans A-star paths around the obstacles
- **Terrain-Aware Planner (NAV3):** Navigation with terrain aware planner, Sterling [22]. This algorithm takes in RGB images, projects it onto Birds-Eye-View (BEV) / top-down view, and then calculates *costmap* based on terrains visible in the image (*e.g.*, the sidewalk is preferable as compared to grass). Using the *costmap*, NAV1-like navigation is performed by generating local sub-goals.

**4.2.6 Web Dashboard.** This application on the robot essentially streams (i) location data, (ii) video camera feeds, (iii) sensor data to a remote server for telemetry, logging, etc. The specific implementation we use is *robotfleet-client* [39].

### 4.3 Adaptors

The key idea in implementing adaptors is to use topic remapping, in conjunction with ROS topic tools [5]. For each edge, we remap to a different unique topic (so that it doesn’t affect other dependencies) and then use adaptors to manage the frequency for that particular topic. This allows us to have *full* and *independent* control for all pub-sub edges even in complex ROS application graphs. This level of control is uniquely possible in robot apps due to their inherently fault tolerant design.



**Figure 7: Adaptors. (Top) Traditional ROS-based message passing where the published frequency is the frequency that all subscribers subscribe at; (Bottom) The red adaptors on the edges allow for flexible frequencies such that we can throttle each pub-sub edge independently.**

### 4.4 Optimization & Monitoring

We implement the Bayesian Optimization agent in 600 lines of Python code. The agent uses the Bayesian Optimization package [33], which supports constrained optimization [15]. Initially, we learn a good config based on the current operating conditions (*i.e.*, system resources and physical environment). However, as we have argued before, that resource consumption profiles are highly dependent on the environment and the set of apps that are running. Whenever either a new app is introduced or a (significant) environment change happens, a constraint violation (*i.e.*, one of the essential apps’ performance metric going below the desirable value) is triggered. When this happens, CONFIGBOT initiates a re-execution of the optimization phase to obtain a new good config for the changed operating conditions. In this way, CONFIGBOT can adapt to dynamically changing environments.

## 5 Evaluation

We conduct all experiments on a host system running Linux Kernel version 5.15.136 [25] on Ubuntu 20.04.6.

In this section, we apply CONFIGBOT to increasingly complex sets of apps and show that (1) using learned configs results in far less behavioral variability in robots, (2) that

CONFIGBOT can efficiently optimize for essential and non-essential apps (3) that CONFIGBOT can respond to environment-dependent changes by relearning a good config. In the following subsections, the  $J_i(c)$  and  $J_i^o$  for all apps under consideration are based on frequencies, *i.e.*, the rate at which each one of them run. As discussed in §2.3.1, profiling the NAV app with different system resources and/or contention reveals that 35 Hz is a good target for it. Hence, in the following subsections, we use  $J^o = 35$  Hz for the NAV app.

## 5.1 Learned configurations exhibit more stability

Recall STACK-A (Figure 1) that we discussed in §2.3.1. In that section, we mentioned how this stack required 4 CPUs before it exhibited good behavior. In this section, we use CONFIGBOT to tune this stack on a system with only 1 CPU. The parameters of the problem as stated in §3.1 for this case are the following:

- **Core App:** NAV,  $J^o = 35$  Hz
- **Objective:** maximize performance of Depth Camera app
- **Constraint:**  $J_{NAV}(c) > 35$
- **Config Space:** (i) number of adaptors = 13, (ii) number of cgroup settings = 21


Figure 8 demonstrates how the final configuration identified by CONFIGBOT is more stable. The blue-line in this plot is the same line from the plot in §2.3.1. A learned config from CONFIGBOT clearly (1) is more stable, and (2) satisfies the constraint and thus exhibits good behavior. Figure 9 shows the progress of optimization. We run the optimization for a fixed number of iterations, with each iteration taking about 30 seconds to complete, which includes 10 seconds of observation (*i.e.*, monitoring), and 20 seconds of optimization setup (*i.e.*, setting up adaptors, changing cgroup settings, etc).

## 5.2 NAV + Object detection app


As we had seen in Figure 2, running a CPU-intensive app such as an object detection model made the behavior deteriorate. Therefore, referring back to Figure 3, we apply CONFIGBOT to find a good config. The parameters for the optimization here are:

- **Core App:** NAV,  $J^o = 35$  Hz
- **Objective:** maximize performance of Object Detection app (upto a maximum frequency of 1 Hz)
- **Constraint:**  $J_{NAV}(c) > 35$
- **Config Space:** (i) number of adaptors = 14, (ii) number of cgroup settings = 22


Figure 10 shows the optimization process. We notice that around one-third of the configurations tested by the agent



**Figure 8: NAV app frequency over time, in the default OS settings and with the CONFIGBOT tuned config. In addition to achieving significantly higher performance, we are also less variable.**



**Figure 9: Optimization progress. Each iteration takes around 30s. 10s for observation, and 20s for setup.**



**Figure 10: Object detection app StackB**

violate the safety constraint we have above. In the end, CONFIGBOT finds a configuration that allows the object detection model to publish at a rate of 0.6 Hz.

## 5.3 Re-learning

As argued in §2.2, resource consumption can be extensively dependent on the environment the robot is operating under.

In this subsection, we show that CONFIGBOT can relearn a good config after it detects an environment change. Referring to Figure 11, consider a scenario where the robot uses NAV1 for the indoor area in its path, while it shifts to a more appropriate algorithm, NAV3 when running outdoors. This depicts an environment-induced app change scenario. In this application, the terrain cost model required for this app [22] is loaded into GPU memory and is kept on standby until the robot steps outside. We run this experiment on a 4 CPU system.

The robot is launched indoors, and thus initially optimizes itself as shown in Figure 12, Notice that we are optimizing for the non-essential app performance (*i.e.*, object detection) which reaches the frequency target of 1 Hz. Then, once the robot has identified the best config, it begins walking and a background process continues to monitor the behavior of the robot. Figure 13 plots the logs collected by this background process. Around  $t=45s$  in Figure 13, the robot steps outdoors (as per data from the robot’s localization process), and switches over to the terrain-based navigation, *i.e.*, NAV3. And around  $t=57s$ , our runtime monitoring model detects a change and triggers relearning. For our runtime monitoring system, we use a heuristic that checks if constraints are violated for a contiguous segment of 10s before triggering retraining. This is to prevent random jitter or noise from triggering spurious retraining. Figure 14 depicts the optimization process in the new, outdoor environment. Notice that, after the end of the process, the object detection model in the outdoor environment has a frame rate of only 0.89 Hz. The optimizer could likely not find a configuration that maximizes the performance of the object detection model all the way to the max since NAV3 is more computationally intense than NAV1.

## 6 Related Work

**Automated config search.** Automated config search for robot OS tuning has not been attempted so far to the best of our knowledge. However, approaches like this have been successful in other application areas such as cloud server configuration [6], network servers [8], databases [46], and cloud apps [41]. Cherrypick [6] uses Bayesian optimization to efficiently identify the optimal cloud configuration (*i.e.*, VM type, number of CPUs, etc) for big data jobs. Configanator [31] and Config-Snob [8] select optimal network configurations (e.g., congestion control and HTTP knobs) for a CDN server on a per-connection basis. OPPerTune [41] uses “hybrid bandits” to converge onto an optimal configuration for cloud apps, while handling both real valued and categorical inputs. SelfTune [23] tunes config knobs for VM allocators and autoscalers using a combination of Bayesian

Optimization and reinforcement learning.

### **Anomaly detection and runtime monitoring for robots.**

Most works in this area predominantly focus on environment-dependent anomalies. Recover [12] assumes that failure states in terms of environment observations are provided, and then it checks the provided invariants during runtime using state-of-the-art vision models. Another work [38] uses past collected images from a quadrotor and learns a classifier to detect environment failures. A similar approach [40] uses a vision foundation model to obtain embedding vectors and learns a stage-one failure classifier, with stage-two being an LLM-based reasoner that tries to *reason* about the failure and provides an appropriate recovery protocol. To the best of our knowledge, there is no other work that exposes system knobs to monitor and correct robot bad behaviors occurring due to resource allocation sub-optimality.

## 7 Conclusion and Future Work

The increasing adoption of autonomous mobile service robots (AMSRs) in dynamic environments demands efficient and adaptive management of computational resources to optimize the performance of critical tasks such as navigation, localization, and perception. Current robot deployments often rely on static configurations and system over-provisioning, which fail to accommodate variations in task performance. This mismatch can lead to system-wide issues, including robot instability and inefficient resource utilization.

This paper introduced CONFIGBOT, a system designed to dynamically reconfigure AMSR applications to meet predefined performance specifications. CONFIGBOT achieves this by leveraging runtime profiling and automated configuration optimization. Through extensive experiments on a Boston Dynamics Spot robot equipped with an NVIDIA AGX Orin, we demonstrate CONFIGBOT’s ability to maintain system stability and optimize resource allocation across a range of challenging scenarios. These findings underscore the potential of dynamic, tailored configurations for improving robot deployments.

Looking ahead, we identify two key directions for future work. First, automating the process of defining performance specifications remains an open challenge. Developing methods to infer these specifications directly from robot applications, user preferences, or high-level task descriptions could significantly reduce the burden on developers and ensure more consistent performance outcomes.

Second, while CONFIGBOT currently reacts to changes in the environment or application demands, incorporating reinforcement learning (RL) could enable proactive management



Figure 11: Relearning a good config once monitor detects an environment change




Figure 12: Optimization process with NAV1 (indoor environment)




Figure 13: Runtime monitoring of the robot. (environment change at t=45s)

of resources. By predicting potential performance bottlenecks or resource conflicts before they occur, an RL-driven approach could anticipate problems and adapt configurations preemptively, further enhancing system robustness and efficiency. These advancements have the potential to make AMSR deployments even more resilient and adaptive to complex, real-world environments.




Figure 14: Optimization process with NAV3 (outdoor environment)

## References

- [1] 2020. ROS Noetic Ninjemys. <http://wiki.ros.org/noetic> Accessed: 2024-12-04.
- [2] 2021. VectorNav. <https://github.com/dawonn/vectornav> Accessed: 2024-12-04.
- [3] 2024. Amazon Astro. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Amazon\\_Astro](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Amazon_Astro). Accessed: 2024-12-01.
- [4] 2024. NVIDIA Jetson. <https://developer.nvidia.com/embedded-computing> Accessed: 2024-12-04.
- [5] n.d. Topic Tools: throttle - ROS Wiki. [http://wiki.ros.org/topic\\_tools/throttle](http://wiki.ros.org/topic_tools/throttle) Accessed: 2024-12-10.
- [6] Omid Alipourfard, Hongqiang Harry Liu, Jianshu Chen, Shivaram Venkataraman, Minlan Yu, and Ming Zhang. 2017. {CherryPick}: Adaptively unearthing the best cloud configurations for big data analytics. In *14th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 17)*. 469–482.
- [7] Apple. 2024. App Store - Apple. <https://www.apple.com/app-store/> Accessed: 2024-12-01.
- [8] Manaf Bin-Yahya, Yifei Zhao, Hossein Shafieirad, Anthony Ho, Shijun Yin, Fanzhao Wang, and Geng Li. 2024. {Config-Snob}: Tuning for the Best Configurations of Networking Protocol Stack. In *2024 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC 24)*. 749–765.
- [9] Joydeep Biswas and Manuela M. Veloso. 2017. Episodic non-Markov localization. *Robotics and Autonomous Systems* 87 (2017), 162 – 176. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.robot.2016.09.005>
- [10] Boston Dynamics. 2024. Spot (R) - The Agile Mobile Robot. <https://bostondynamics.com/products/spot/> Accessed: 2024-12-02.
- [11] Yuanhao Cai, Zhicheng Wang, Zhengxiang Luo, Binyi Yin, Angang Du, Haoqian Wang, Xiangyu Zhang, Xinyu Zhou, Erjin Zhou, and Jian Sun. 2020. Learning delicate local representations for multi-person pose

- estimation. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part III* 16. Springer, 455–472.
- [12] Cristina Cornelio and Mohammed Diab. 2024. Recover: A Neuro-Symbolic Framework for Failure Detection and Recovery. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.00756* (2024).
- [13] Yan Ding, Xiaohan Zhang, Chris Paxton, and Shiqi Zhang. 2023. Task and motion planning with large language models for object rearrangement. In *2023 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2086–2092.
- [14] Anthony Francis, Claudia Pérez-d’Arpino, Chengshu Li, Fei Xia, Alexandre Alahi, Rachid Alami, Aniket Bera, Abhijat Biswas, Joydeep Biswas, Rohan Chandra, et al. 2023. Principles and guidelines for evaluating social robot navigation algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.16740* (2023).
- [15] Jacob R Gardner, Matt J Kusner, Zhixiang Eddie Xu, Kilian Q Weinberger, and John P Cunningham. 2014. Bayesian optimization with inequality constraints. In *ICML*, Vol. 2014. 937–945.
- [16] Craig L Glennie, Arpan Kusari, and Aldo Facchin. 2016. Calibration and stability analysis of the VLP-16 laser scanner. *The International Archives of the Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences* 40 (2016), 55–60.
- [17] Google. 2024. Android Apps on Google Play. <https://play.google.com/store/apps/> Accessed: 2024-12-01.
- [18] Dongge Han, Trevor McInroe, Adam Jelley, Stefano V Albrecht, Peter Bell, and Amos Storkey. 2024. LLM-Personalize: Aligning LLM Planners with Human Preferences via Reinforced Self-Training for Housekeeping Robots. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.14285* (2024).
- [19] Zichao Hu, Francesca Lucchetti, Claire Schlesinger, Yash Saxena, Anders Freeman, Sadanand Modak, Arjun Guha, and Joydeep Biswas. 2024. Deploying and evaluating llms to program service mobile robots. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters* (2024).
- [20] Shaoli Huang, Mingming Gong, and Dacheng Tao. 2017. A coarse-fine network for keypoint localization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*. 3028–3037.
- [21] Jeffrey Ichnowski, Kaiyuan Chen, Karthik Dharmarajan, Simeon Adabola, Michael Danielczuk, Víctor Mayoral-Vilches, Nikhil Jha, Hugo Zhan, Edith LLontop, Derek Xu, et al. 2023. FogROS2: An adaptive platform for cloud and fog robotics using ros 2. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 5493–5500.
- [22] Haresh Karnan, Elvin Yang, Daniel Farkash, Garrett Warnell, Joydeep Biswas, and Peter Stone. 2023. Self-supervised terrain representation learning from unconstrained robot experience. In *ICRA2023 Workshop on Pretraining for Robotics (PT4R)*.
- [23] Ajaykrishna Karthikeyan, Nagarajan Natarajan, Gagan Somashekar, Lei Zhao, Ranjita Bhagwan, Rodrigo Fonseca, Tatiana Racheva, and Yogesh Bansal. 2023. {SelfTune}: Tuning Cluster Managers. In *20th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 23)*. 1097–1114.
- [24] Rahima Khanam and Muhammad Hussain. 2024. Yolov11: An overview of the key architectural enhancements. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.17725* (2024).
- [25] Greg Kroah-Hartman. 2023. Linux 5.15.136. *LWN.net* (2023). <https://lwn.net/Articles/948300/> Accessed: 2024-12-02.
- [26] Luyang Liu, Hongyu Li, and Marco Gruteser. 2019. Edge assisted real-time object detection for mobile augmented reality. In *The 25th annual international conference on mobile computing and networking*. 1–16.
- [27] Microsoft. 2018. Azure Kinect DK - Fact Sheet. <https://news.microsoft.com/wp-content/uploads/prod/2019/06/Factsheet-Azure-Kinect-DK.pdf> Accessed: 2024-12-02.
- [28] Misty Robotics. 2024. Misty Robotics Official Website. <https://www.mistyrobotics.com> Accessed: 2024-12-01.
- [29] Sadanand Modak, Noah Patton, Isil Dillig, and Joydeep Biswas. 2024. Synapse: Learning Preferential Concepts from Visual Demonstrations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.16689* (2024).
- [30] Sadanand Modak, Noah Patton, Isil Dillig, and Joydeep Biswas. 2024. Synapse: Learning Preferential Concepts from Visual Demonstrations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.16689* (2024).
- [31] Usama Naseer and Theophilus A Benson. 2022. Configanator: A Data-driven Approach to Improving {CDN} Performance.. In *19th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 22)*. 1135–1158.
- [32] Fabrizio Nenci, Luciano Spinello, and Cyrill Stachniss. 2014. Effective compression of range data streams for remote robot operations using H.264. In *2014 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*. 3794–3799. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IROS.2014.6943095>
- [33] Fernando Nogueira. 2014–. Bayesian Optimization: Open source constrained global optimization tool for Python. <https://github.com/bayesian-optimization/BayesianOptimization>
- [34] NVIDIA. 2024. AI-Powered Lawn Care and Home Security Robot. <https://www.nvidia.com/en-us/case-studies/ai-powered-lawn-care-home-security-robot/> Accessed: 2024-12-01.
- [35] NVIDIA Corporation. 2024. Jetson AGX Orin Developer Kit User Guide. [https://developer.nvidia.com/embedded/learn/jetson-agx-orin-devkit-user-guide/developer\\_kit\\_layout.html](https://developer.nvidia.com/embedded/learn/jetson-agx-orin-devkit-user-guide/developer_kit_layout.html) Accessed: 2024-12-02.
- [36] Tianhe Ren, Shilong Liu, Ailing Zeng, Jing Lin, Kunchang Li, He Cao, Jiayu Chen, Xinyu Huang, Yukang Chen, Feng Yan, et al. 2024. Grounded sam: Assembling open-world models for diverse visual tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.14159* (2024).
- [37] Clearpath Robotics. 2024. Spot ROS Driver. [https://github.com/clearpathrobotics/spot\\_ros](https://github.com/clearpathrobotics/spot_ros) Accessed: 2024-12-04.
- [38] Dhruv Mauria Saxena, Vince Kurtz, and Martial Hebert. 2017. Learning robust failure response for autonomous vision based flight. In *2017 IEEE international conference on robotics and automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 5824–5829.
- [39] Kavan Singh Sikand, Logan Zartman, Sadegh Rabiee, and Joydeep Biswas. 2021. Robofleet: Open source communication and management for fleets of autonomous robots. In *2021 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 406–412.
- [40] Rohan Sinha, Amine Elhafi, Christopher Agia, Matthew Foutter, Edward Schmerling, and Marco Pavone. 2024. Real-time anomaly detection and reactive planning with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.08735* (2024).
- [41] Gagan Somashekar, Karan Tandon, Anush Kini, Chieh-Chun Chang, Petr Husak, Ranjita Bhagwan, Mayukh Das, Anshul Gandhi, and Nagarajan Natarajan. 2024. {OPPerTune}: {Post-Deployment} Configuration Tuning of Services Made Easy. In *21st USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 24)*. 1101–1120.
- [42] Spektrum RC. 2020. *SPM1010 User Manual*. <https://www.spektrumrc.com/on/demandware.static/-/Sites-horizon-master/default/dwc1ed33db/Manuals/SPM1010-Manual-EN.pdf> Accessed: 2024-12-05, Archived: <https://web.archive.org/web/20241205094633/https://www.spektrumrc.com/on/demandware.static/-/Sites-horizon-master/default/dwc1ed33db/Manuals/SPM1010-Manual-EN.pdf>.
- [43] Wenbing Tang, Libin Zheng, Mingyue Jiang, and Zuohua Ding. 2020. Dynamic Algorithm Selection for Mobile Robots Motion Planning. In *2019 6th International Conference on Dependable Systems and Their Applications (DSA)*. 499–500. <https://doi.org/10.1109/DSA.2019.00084>
- [44] Lihe Yang, Bingyi Kang, Zilong Huang, Xiaogang Xu, Jiashi Feng, and Hengshuang Zhao. 2024. Depth Anything: Unleashing the Power of Large-Scale Unlabeled Data. In *CVPR*.

- [45] Feng Zhang, Xiatian Zhu, Hanbin Dai, Mao Ye, and Ce Zhu. 2020. Distribution-aware coordinate representation for human pose estimation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 7093–7102.
- [46] Limeng Zhang and M Ali Babar. 2024. Automatic Configuration Tuning on Cloud Database: A Survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.06043* (2024).
- [47] Ce Zheng, Wenhan Wu, Chen Chen, Taojiannan Yang, Sijie Zhu, Ju Shen, Nasser Kehtarnavaz, and Mubarak Shah. 2023. Deep learning-based human pose estimation: A survey. *Comput. Surveys* 56, 1 (2023), 1–37.
- [48] Linyu Zheng, Ming Tang, Yingying Chen, Guibo Zhu, Jinqiao Wang, and Hanqing Lu. 2021. Improving multiple object tracking with single object tracking. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2453–2462.