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ESL Design

- Designing embedded systems requires addressing concurrently different engineering domains, e.g., mechanics, sensors, actuators, analog/digital electronic hardware, and software.

- In this tutorial, we focus on Electronic System Level Design (ESLD), traditionally considered as the design step that pertains to the electronic part (hardware and software) of an embedded system.

- ESL design starts from system specifications and ends with a system implementation that requires the definition and/or selection of hardware, software and communication components.
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Embedded Systems

• Computational
  – but not first-and-foremost a computer

• Integral with physical processes
  – sensors, actuators

• Reactive
  – at the speed of the environment

• Heterogeneous
  – hardware/software, mixed architectures

• Networked
  – shared, adaptive

Source: Edward A. Lee
FUNCTION OF CONTROLS

Typical commercial HVAC application

Configure
Sense
Actuate
Regulate
Display
Trend
Diagnose
Predict
Archive
OTIS Elevators

1. EN: GeN2-Cx
2. ANSI: Gen2/GEM
3. JIS: GeN2-JIS
$4 billion development effort
40-50% system integration & validation cost
Electronics and the Car

• More than 30% of the cost of a car is now in Electronics
• 90% of all innovations will be based on electronic systems
## Complexity, Quality, & Time To Market today

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>PWT UNIT</th>
<th>BODY GATEWAY</th>
<th>INSTRUMENT CLUSTER</th>
<th>TELEMATIC UNIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>256 Kb</td>
<td>128 Kb</td>
<td>184 Kb</td>
<td>8 Mb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines Of Code</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>6 Lines/Day</td>
<td>10 Lines/Day</td>
<td>6 Lines/Day</td>
<td>10 Lines/Day*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual Defect Rate @ End Of Dev</td>
<td>3000 Ppm</td>
<td>2500 ppm</td>
<td>2000 ppm</td>
<td>1000 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing Rate</td>
<td>3 Years</td>
<td>2 Years</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>&lt; 1 Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dev. Effort</td>
<td>40 Man-yr</td>
<td>12 Man-yr</td>
<td>30 Man-yr</td>
<td>200 Man-yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation Time</td>
<td>5 Months</td>
<td>1 Month</td>
<td>2 Months</td>
<td>2 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time To Market</td>
<td>24 Months</td>
<td>18 Months</td>
<td>12 Months</td>
<td>&lt; 12 Months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* C++ CODE

FABIO ROMEO, Magneti-Marelli
DAC, Las Vegas, June 20th, 2001
Distributed Car Systems Architectures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Systems</th>
<th>Telematics</th>
<th>Fail Stop</th>
<th>Soft Real Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Communications</td>
<td>Navigation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOST Firewire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Wall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to WWW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Electronics</td>
<td>Body Functions</td>
<td>Fail Safe</td>
<td>Real Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Conditioning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft warning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door Module</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Module</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Electronics</td>
<td>Driving and Vehicle Dynamic Functions</td>
<td>Fail Safe</td>
<td>Hard Real Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAN TTCAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gate Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAN Lin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gate Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift by Wire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engine Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gate Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Electronics</td>
<td>System Electronics</td>
<td>Fail Safe</td>
<td>Hard Real Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steer by Wire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brake by Wire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FlexRay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Design**

- From an idea...
- ... build something that performs a certain function
- Never done directly:
  - some aspects are not considered at the beginning of the development:
    - Node and Network
    - Processes and Processors
    - SoC Software and Hardware
  - the designer wants to explore different possible implementations in order to maximize (or minimize) a cost function
- The solution is a trade-off among:
  - Mechanical partition
  - Hardware partition: analog and digital
  - Software partition: low, middle and application level
(Automotive) V-Models: Car level

- **What:**
  - Functionality
- **How:**
  - Architecture
- **Trading (ES):**
  - Computation (hw/sw)
  - Communication (hw/sw)
    - Time trigger/Event trigger
- **Abstractions?**
- **Cost evaluation?**
(Automotive) V-Models: Subsystem Level

- **What:** Functionality
- **How:** Architecture
- **Trading (ES):**
  - Algorithm complexity (hw/sw)
  - Sensors/Actuators
- **Abstractions?**
- **Cost evaluation?**

**Development of Distributed System**

**Development of Sub-System**

**Development of Mechanical Part(s)**

**ECU Development**

**Distributed System Sign-Off! Sub-System(s) Integration, Test, and Validation**

**Sub-System Sign-Off!**

**ECU/ Sens./Actrs./Mech. Part(s) Integration, Calibration, and Test**
(Automotive) V-Models: ECU level (Hw/Sw)

**Standardization**

AUTOSAR – ECU Software Architecture

AUTOSAR Runtime Environment (RTE)

- ECU Hardware
- Basic Software
- AUTOSAR Software
- Actuator Software Components
- Sensor Software Components
- System Software Components
- System Interface
- AUTOSAR Interface
- AUTOSAR Runtime Environment

AUTOSAR Open System Architecture (AUTOSAR):
- Standardized, openly disclosed interfaces
- HW independent SW layer
- Transferability of functions
- Redundancy activation

**AUTOSAR RTE:**
by specifying interfaces and their communication mechanisms, the applications are decoupled from the underlying HW and Basic SW, enabling the realization of Standard Library Functions.

- **What:** Functionality
- **How:** Architecture
- **Trade (ES):**
  - Hardware
  - Software
- **Abstractions?**
- **Cost evaluation?**

**ECU Development**

- ECU HW Development
- ECU SW Development
- ECU HW/Software Implementation
- Sub-System(s) Integration, Test, and Validation
- ECU HW/Software Sign-Off
- Distributed System Sign-Off

**Integration & Test**

- ECU HW/SW Integration and Test
- ECU SW Integration and Test
- ECU Sign-Off
- Calibration, and Test
(Automotive) V-Models

- Development of Distributed System
- Development of Sub-System
- Development of Mechanical Part(s)
- ECU Development
- ECU SW Development
- ECU HW Development
- ECU SW Implementation
- ECU HW Sign-Off!
- ECU SW Integration and Test
- ECU HW/SW Integration and Test
- ECU Sign-Off!
- ECU/ Sens./Actrs./Mech. Part(s) Integration, Calibration, and Test
- Sub-System Sign-Off!
- Distributed System Sign-Off!
- Sub-System(s) Integration, Test, and Validation
- ECU/ Sens./Actrs./Mech. Part(s) Integration, Calibration, and Test
- ECU SW Integration and Test
Common Situation in Industry

- Different hardware devices and architectures
- Increased complexity
- Non-standard tools and design processes
- Redundant development efforts
- Increased R&D and sustaining costs
- Lack of standardization results in greater quality risks
- Customer confusion
How to…

◆ How to propagate functionality from top to bottom
◆ How to evaluate the trade offs
◆ How to cope with:
  ♦ Design Time
  ♦ Design Reuse
  ♦ Design Heterogeneity
◆ How to abstract with models that can be used to reason about the properties
Heterogeneity in Electronic Design

◆ Heterogeneity in:

- Specification:
  - formal/semi-formal/natural language
  - MoC
  - Language
- Analysis
- Synthesis:
  - Manual/automatic/semi-automatic
- Verification
- Methodology
- Design Process
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Separation of concerns

- Computation versus Communication
- Function versus Architecture
- Function versus Time
Separation of Concerns (1990 Vintage!)

- IPs
- Behavior Components
  - C-Code
  - Matlab
  - ASCET
- Virtual Architectural Components
  - CPUs
  - Buses
  - Operating Systems

- Analysis
- Specification
- Implementation
- Calibration
- After Sales Service

Development Process

- System Behavior
- System Platform
- Mapping
- Performance Analysis
- Refinement
- Evaluation of Architectural and Partitioning Alternatives
**Principles of Platform methodology: Meet-in-the-Middle**

◆ **Top-Down:**
  - Define a set of abstraction layers
  - From specifications at a given level, select a solution (controls, components) in terms of components (Platforms) of the following layer and propagate constraints

◆ **Bottom-Up:**
  - Platform components (e.g., micro-controller, RTOS, communication primitives) at a given level are abstracted to a higher level by their functionality and a set of parameters that help guiding the solution selection process. The selection process is equivalent to a covering problem if a common semantic domain is used.
Platform Models for Model Based Development

Development of Distributed System

Distributed System Requirements

Distributed System Partitioning

Sub-Systems Model Based Development

Sub-Systems (s) Requirements

Network Protocol Requirements

Sub-System(s) Sign-Off!

Virtual Integration of Sub-System(s) w/ Network Protocol, Test, and Validation

Sub-System(s) Implementation Models Sign-Off!

Network Communication Protocol Sign-Off!

Platform Abstraction
Meet-in-the-middle

WHAT?
- Design Exploration
  - Partitioning
  - Scheduling
  - Estimation

- Interface Synthesis
  (or configuration)
- Component Synthesis
  (or configuration)

HOW?
- Platform Abstraction

FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS
- Functional Description
- Platform Description
- Function/Platform Mapping
- Synthesis

NON FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS
- Verification

Platform
Abstraction
Aspects of the Hw/Sw Design Problem

◆ Specification of the system (top-down)
◆ Architecture export (bottom-up)
  • Abstraction of processor, of communication infrastructure, interface between hardware and software, etc.
◆ Partitioning
  • Partitioning objectives
    ◆ Minimize network load, latency, jitter,
    ◆ Maximize speedup, extensibility, flexibility
    ◆ Minimize size, cost, etc.
  • Partitioning strategies
    ◆ partitioning by hand
    ◆ automated partitioning using various techniques, etc.
◆ Scheduling
  • Computation
  • Communication
◆ Different levels:
  • Transaction/Packet scheduling in communication
  • Process scheduling in operating systems
  • Instruction scheduling in compilers
  • Operation scheduling in hardware
◆ Modeling the partitioned system during the design process
Platform-based Design

Platform: library of resources defining an abstraction layer
- hide unnecessary details
- expose only relevant parameters for the next step
**Formal Mechanism**

- **Function Space**
  - Function
  - Closure under constrained composition (term algebra)
  - Library Elements

- **Architecture Platform**

- **Platform Instance**
PARADES

Mapping

Function Space

Function

Semantic Platform

Platform Instance

Mapped Instance

Admissible Refinements
Platform stack & design refinements

Application Space

Platform 1
application instance

Platform 2
plat.2 instance

Platform 3
plat.3 instance

Implementation Space

Platform 4
implementation instance

Platform Mapping

Platform Design-Space Export

Refinement

Platform i
platform i instance

Platform i+1
platform i+1 instance
**Automotive Supply Chain:**

**Tier 1 Subsystem Providers**

- Subsystem Partitioning
- Subsystem Integration
- Software Design: Control Algorithms, Data Processing
- Physical Implementation and Production

1. Transmission ECU
2. Actuation group
3. Engine ECU
4. DBW
5. Active shift display
6/7. Up/Down buttons
8. City mode button
9. Up/Down lever
10. Accelerator pedal position sensor
11. Brake switch
Magneti Marelli Power-train Platform Stack

- Powertrain System Specifications
  - Powertrain System Behavior
  - Functional Decomposition
  - Capture System Architecture

- Functional Network
  - Partitioning and Optimization
  - Capture Electrical/Mechanical Architecture
  - Operation Refinement

- Operational Architecture (ES)
  - HW/SW Partitioning
  - Capture Electronic Architecture
  - Verify Performance

- Design Mechanical Components
  - Design Mechanical Architecture (ES)

- Electronic System Mapping
  - Design Components
  - Verify Components
  - HW and SW Components Implementation

- Operations and Macro Architecture
  - Verify Components

- Performance Back-Annotation

- Implementation Space
  - System Specification
    - System (S)
  - Functional Decomposition
    - Functional struct. & par. (Ji)
    - Functional struct. & par. (Ji)
    - Control struct. & par. (r, c)
  - Control Strategies
    - control struct. & par. (r,c)
    - implem. struct. & par. (s,p)
  - Only SW components
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Design Formalization

◆ Model of a design with precise unambiguous semantics:
◆ Implicit or explicit relations: inputs, outputs and (possibly) state variables
◆ Properties
◆ “Cost” functions
◆ Constraints

**Formalization of Design + Environment**  =  
**closed system of equations and inequalities over some algebra.**
What: Functional Design

◆ A rigorous design of functions requires a mathematical framework
  • The functional description must be an invariant of the design
  • The mathematical model should be expressive enough to capture easily the functions
    ♦ The different nature of functions might be better captured by heterogeneous model of computations (e.g. finite state machine, data flows)

◆ The functional design requires the abstraction of
  • Time (i.e. un-timed model)
    ♦ Time appears only in constraints that involve interactions with the environment
  • Data type (i.e. infinite precision)

◆ Any implementation MUST be a refinement of this abstraction (i.e. functionality is “guaranteed”):
  • E.g. Un-timed -> logic time -> time
  • E.g. Infinite precision -> float -> fixed point
Models of Computation

- FSMs
- Discrete Event Systems
- CFSMs
- Data Flow Models
- Petri Nets
- The Tagged Signal Model
- Synchronous Languages and De-synchronization
- Heterogeneous Composition: Hybrid Systems and Languages
- Interface Synthesis and Verification
- Trace Algebra, Trace Structure Algebra and Agent Algebra

**Definition:** A mathematical description that has a syntax and rules for computation of the behavior described by the syntax (semantics). Used to specify the semantics of computation and concurrency.
Usefulness of a Model of Computation

- Expressiveness
- Generality
- Simplicity
- Compilability/Synthesizability
- Verifiability

The Conclusion

One way to get all of these is to mix diverse, simple models of computation, while keeping compilation, synthesis, and verification separate for each MoC. To do that, we need to understand these MoCs relative to one another, and understand their interaction when combined in a single system design.
Reactive Real-time Systems

- Reactive Real-Time Systems
  - “React” to external environment
  - Maintain permanent interaction
  - Ideally never terminate
  - timing constraints (real-time)

- As opposed to
  - transformational systems
  - interactive systems
Models Of Computation for reactive systems

- We need to consider essential aspects of reactive systems:
  - time/synchronization
  - concurrency
  - heterogeneity

- Classify models based on:
  - how specify behavior
  - how specify communication
  - implementability
  - composability
  - availability of tools for validation and synthesis
**Models Of Computation for reactive systems**

- **Main MOCs:**
  - Communicating Finite State Machines
  - Dataflow Process Networks
  - Petri Nets
  - Discrete Event
  - (Abstract) Codesign Finite State Machines
  - Synchronous Reactive
  - Task Programming Model

- **Main languages:**
  - StateCharts
  - Esterel
  - Dataflow networks
  - Simulink
  - UML
Models Of Computation for reactive systems

- Main MOCs:
  - Communicating Finite State Machines
  - Dataflow Process Networks
  - Petri Nets
  - Discrete Event
  - Codesign Finite State Machines
  - Synchronous Reactive
  - Task Programming Model

- Main languages:
  - StateCharts
  - Esterel
  - Dataflow networks
  - Simulink
  - UML
The Synchronous Programming Model

- Synchronous programming model* is dealing with concurrency as follows:
  - non overlapping computation and communication phases taking zero-time and triggered by a global tick

- Widely used and supported by several tools: Simulink, SCADE, ESTEREL ...

- Strong constraints on the final implementation to preserve the separation between computation and communication phases

The Synchronous Reactive (SR) MoC (*)

- Discrete model of time (global set of totally ordered “time ticks”)
- Blocks execute **atomically** at every time tick
- Blocks are computed in **causal order** (writer before reader)
- State variables (MEMs) are used to break combinatorial paths
- Combinatorial loops have fixed-point semantics

\[
U_k = W_{k-1} \\
Y_k = G*U_k = G*W_{k-1} \\
W_k = V_k+Y_k = V_k+G*W_{k-1}
\]

The Task Programming Model (TPM)

- A task is a logically grouped sequence of operations
- Each task is released for execution on an event/time reference
- Task execution can be deferred as long as it meets its deadline
- Task scheduling is priority-based possibly with preemption
  - Priorities can be static or dynamic
- Communication between tasks occurs:
  - Locally: via shared variables
  - Globally: via communication network
- Output values depend on scheduling

Represented by Task Graphs
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(Automotive) V-Models: Car level

Development of Distributed System

Distributed System Sign-Off!
Sub-System(s) Integration, Test, and Validation
The Design Components at work
Co-Design Problem

◆ From:
  ♦ a model of the functionality (e.g. TPM or SPM)
  ♦ a model of the platform (abstraction of topology, network protocol, CPU, Hw/Sw etc)

◆ Allocate:
  ♦ The tasks to the nodes
  ♦ The communication signals to the network segments

◆ Schedule:
  ♦ The task sets in each node
  ♦ The packets (mapping signals) in each network segment

◆ Such that:
  ♦ The system is schedulable and the cost is minimized

◆ Design solutions:
  ♦ Architectural constrains
  ♦ Analytical approaches
  ♦ Simulation models
The Time Triggered Approach

- Time Triggered Architecture: Global notion of time
  - Communication and computation are synchronized and MUST HAPPEN AND COMPLETE in a given cyclic time-division schema
- Time-Triggered Architecture (TTA) C. Scheidler, G. Heiner, R. Sasse, E. Fuchs, H. Kopetz
- Find optimal allocation and scheduling of a Time Triggered TPM
- An Improved Scheduling Technique for Time-Triggered Embedded Systems, Paul Pop, Petru Eles, and Zebo Peng
- Extensible and Scalable Time Triggered Scheduling, Wei Zheng, Jike Chong, Claudio Pinello, Sri Kanajan, Alberto L. Sangiovanni-Vincentelli
- Models of bus/network speed and topology (Hw) and WCET (Hw/Sw) are needed
The Holistic Scheduling and Analysis

- Based on a Time and Event Triggered Task Graph Model allocated to a set of nodes
  - Worst Case Execution Time of Tasks and Communication time of each message are known

- Construct a correct static schedule for the TT tasks and ST messages (a schedule which meets all time constraints related to these activities) and conduct a schedulability analysis in order to check that all ET tasks meet their deadlines.

Network Calculus Modelings

Network calculus:

- “Network calculus”, J-Y Le Boudec and P. Thiran, Lecture Notes in Computer Sciences vol. 2050, Springer Verlag
Event models

- event stream model w. parameters
  - individual events replaced by stream variables with parameters
    - period, jitter, min. distance, ...

- Network Calculus
  - individual events replaced by sum of events in sliding time window $\Delta t$

\[
\eta(\Delta t) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{\Delta t + J}{T} & \text{for } \Delta t > 0 \\
\frac{\Delta t - J}{T} & \text{for } \Delta t < 0
\end{cases}
\]

T: period, J: jitter

upper bound

lower bound
Composition and Analysis

- independently scheduled subsystems are coupled by data flow

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{comp 1} \\
\text{P}_1 \\
\text{P}_2 \\
\text{scheduling comp 1} \\
\text{comp 2} \\
\text{P}_3 \\
\text{P}_4 \\
\text{scheduling comp 2} \\
\text{event stream} \\
\end{array} \]

⇒ subsystems coupled by stream of data
⇒ interpreted as activating events
⇒ coupling corresponds to event propagation

Provide:
- Schedulability check
- Output stream models

Other strategy to search solutions
(allocation and scheduling)

Px transformation based on:
- Output event dependency
- WCET
- BCET

Compositional analysis principle

- Environment model
- Local analysis
- Derive output event model
- Map to input event model
- Until convergence or non-schedulability

flexible and modular!
Executable Model: Computation and Communication
Communication Refinement: Platform Model

Sender → Device Driver → Clib → RTOS → Memory Access → Bus Adapter → CPU → Bus Arbiter → Local Bus → Controller Network → Memory → Bus Adapter

Task_A → Post() from Task_A → Communication Pattern → Value()/Enabled() from Task_B → Receiver

Device Driver → NetwLayer → RTOS → Clib → CPU → Memory Access → Bus Adapter → CPU Port → Local Bus → Bus Arbiter → Bus

Controller Network → Slave Adapter → LLC/MAC → Bus Adapter → Network Bus

Controller Network → Slave Adapter → LLC/MAC → Bus Adapter → Bus
Exploring Solutions by Simulation

Requires a model of the functionality and performance models of CPUs and network protocols

It is trace based!
(Automotive) V-Models: Subsystem Level

Development of Distributed System

Development of Sub-System

Development of Mechanical Part(s)

ECU Development

Distributed System Sign-Off!

Sub-System(s) Integration, Test, and Validation

Sub-System Sign-Off!

ECU/ Sens./Actrs./Mech. Part(s) Integration, Calibration, and Test
Control system design

- Specifications given at a high level of abstraction:
  - known input/output relation (or properties) and constraints on performance indexes

- Control algorithms design

- Mapping to different architectures using performance estimation techniques and automatic code generation from models

- Mechanical/Electronic architecture selected among a set of candidates
**HW/SW implementation architecture**

- A set of possible hw/sw implementations is given by:
  - $M$ different hw/sw implementation architectures
  - For each hw/sw implementation architecture $m \in \{1, \ldots, M\}$,
    - A set of hw/sw implementation parameters $z$
      - E.g. CPU clock, task priorities, hardware frequency, etc.
    - An admissible set $X_z$ of values for $z$
The classical and the ideal design approach

◆ Classical approach (decoupled design)
  • controller structure and parameters \((r \in R, c \in X_C)\)
    ♦ are selected in order to satisfy system specifications
  • implementation architecture and parameters \((m \in M, z \in X_Z)\)
    ♦ are selected in order to minimize implementation cost
  • if system specifications are not met, the design cycle is repeated

◆ Ideal approach
  • both controller and architecture options \((r, c, m, z)\) are selected at the same time to
    ♦ minimize implementation cost
    ♦ satisfy system specifications
  • too complex!!
Algorithm Explorations and Control Synthesis
**Implementation abstraction layer**

- we introduce an **implementation abstraction layer**
  - which exposes ONLY the implementation non-idealities that affect the performance of the controlled plant, e.g.
    - control loop delay
    - quantization error
    - sample and hold error
    - computation imprecision

- at the implementation abstraction layer, platform instances are described by
  - $S$ different implementation architectures
  - for each implementation architecture $s \in \{1, \ldots, S\}$,
    - a set of implementation parameters $p$
      - e.g. latency, quantization interval, computation errors, etc.
    - an admissible set $X_p$ of values for $p$
Effects of controller implementation in the controlled plant performance

◆ modeling of implementation non-idealities:
  ♦ $\Delta u, \Delta r, \Delta w$ : time-domain perturbations
    ♦ control loop delays, sample & hold, etc.
  ♦ $n_u, n_r, n_w$ : value-domain perturbations
    ♦ quantization error, computation imprecision, etc.
• Control Algorithm Specification

Model and Simulation files

• Simulink model
• Calibrations data
• Time history data

Simulation Results

Simulink Model

Time History

Calibration data
(Automotive) V-Models: ECU level (Hw/Sw)
(Automotive) V-Models: ECU level (Hw/Sw)

Main design tasks:

- Define ECU Hardware/Software Partitioning
  - Platform instance structure selection
- Software Implementation
- Hardware (SoC) Design and Implementation
Control Algorithm Implementation Strategy

Control algorithms are mapped to the target platform to achieve the best performance/cost trade-off.

- In most cases the platform can accommodate in software the control algorithms, if not:
  - New platform services might be required or
  - New hardware components might be implemented or
  - New control algorithms must be explored.
Platform Design Strategy

Minimize software development time

- Maximize model based software
  - Software generation is possible today from several MoC and languages:
    - StateCharts, Dataflow, SR, …
  - Implement the same MoC of specification or guarantee the equivalence
  - Fit into the chosen software architecture to maximize reuse at component level
    - E.g. AUTOSAR for automotive

- Maximize the reuse of hand-written software component
  - Define application and platform software architecture

Minimize the change requests for the hardware platform

- Implement as much as possible in software
The software application is composed of model-based and hand-written application-dependent software components (sources).

The software platform is cross applications and cross HW plats and is composed of parameterized software components (sources).
The software application is composed of model-based and hand-written application-dependent software components (sources).

The software platform is cross applications and cross HW platforms and is composed of parameterized software components (sources).
A control algorithm is a (synch or a-synch) composition of extended finite state machines (EFSM).
**Code Generation**

- Mapping a functional model to software platform:
  - Data refinement
  - Software platform services mapping (communication and computation)
  - Time refinement (scheduling)

- Data refinement
  - Float to Fixed Point Translation.
    - Range, scaling and size setting (by the designer).
    - Worst case analysis for internal variable ranges and scaling.
  - Signals and parameters to C-variables mapping.

- Software platform model:
  - variables and services (naming).
    - Access variable method are mapped with variable classes.
  - execution model:
    - Multi-rate subsystems are implemented as multi-task software components scheduled by an OSEK/VDX standard RTOS

- Time refinement
  - Task scheduling
Mapping Control Algorithms to the Platform

Automatic synthesis

From high level models:
- Automatic translation to C/C++ code
- (Semi)-Automatic data refinement for computation
- Automatic refinement of communication services

Flow examples:
ASCET, Simulink/eRTW/TargetLink, UML
### Example: Gasoline Direct Injection Engine Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Modelled Components</th>
<th>SLOC</th>
<th>% of Model Compiled SLOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Platform Components</strong></td>
<td>26-HandCoded</td>
<td>26500</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application Components</strong></td>
<td>86-AutomCoded, 13-HandCoded</td>
<td>93600</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of the total memory occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROM %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Platform</strong></td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application</strong></td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example: Gasoline Direct Injection Engine Control

◆ Tremendous increase in application-software productivity:
  ◆ Up to 4 time faster than in the traditional hand-coding cycle.

◆ Tremendous decrease in verification effort:
  ◆ Close to 0 ppm

◆ Tremendous reuse of modes and source code
Defining the Platform

Application Space (Features)

Application Instances

System Platform (no ISA)

Software Platform

Platform Specification

Platform Design Space Exploration

Platform Instance

Architectural Space (Performance)

Application Software

Application Software

RTOS

Device Drivers

BIOS

Hardware Platform

Input devices

Output Devices

Network Communication

DUAL-CORE

HITACHI

ST10

Hardware

network
Simulation Based (C/C++/SystemC) Exploration Flow

Different Languages and MoCs
- Simulink
- ASCET
- StateMate
- UML

Platform non idealities
- Algorithm Analysis

Code Generation (Synthesis)
- Generators

Defined MoC and Languages
- C/C++/SystemC

Unique Representation C/C++/SystemC
- Mapping Build

Platform Models
- Exporters

Platform non idealities
- Performance Traces
- Simulator
- Simulation and Performance Estimation
# SystemC and OCP Abstraction Levels

## Communication (I/F)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SystemC</th>
<th>Abstraction Accuracy</th>
<th>OCP Layers</th>
<th>Abstraction Removes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Untimed Functional</td>
<td>Token</td>
<td>Message (L-3)</td>
<td>Time Resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmers View (PV)</td>
<td>+Address</td>
<td>Transaction (L-2)</td>
<td>Clocks, protocols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmers View + Time (PVT)</td>
<td>+Transaction time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus cycle Accurate (BCA)</td>
<td>+Clock cycle</td>
<td>Transfer (L-1)</td>
<td>Wire registers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pin Cycle Accurate (PCA)</td>
<td>+Pin/clock</td>
<td>RTL (L-0)</td>
<td>Gates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Computation

| Untimed Functional (UTF)        | Function             |                      |                                    |
| Time Functional (TF)            | +Computation Time    |                      |                                    |
| Register Transfer (RT)          | +Clock cycle         |                      |                                    |
Mapping application to platform
SW estimation

◆ SW estimation is needed to
  - Evaluate HW/SW trade-offs
  - Check performance/constraints
    ♦ Higher reliability
  - Reduce system cost
    ♦ Allow slower hardware, smaller size, lower power consumption
**SW estimation: Static vs. Dynamic**

- **Static estimation**
  - Determination of runtime properties at compile time
  - Most of the (interesting) properties are undecidable => use approximations
  - An approximation program analysis is safe, if its results can always be depended on.
    - E.G. WCET, BCET
  - Quality of the results (precision) should be as good as possible

- **Dynamic estimation**
  - Determination of properties at runtime
  - DSP Processors
    - relatively data independent
    - most time spent in hand-coded kernels
    - static data-flow consumes most cycles
    - small number of threads, simple interrupts
  - Regular processors
    - arbitrary C, highly data dependent
    - commercial RTOS, many threads
    - complex interrupts, priorities
SW estimation overview

Two aspects to be considered

- The structure of the code *(program path analysis)*
  - E.g. loops and false paths
- The system on which the software will run *(micro-architecture modeling)*
  - CPU (ISA, interrupts, etc.), HW (cache, etc.), OS, Compiler

Level at which it is done

- Low-level
  - e.g. gate-level, assembly-language level
  - Easy and accurate, but long design iteration time
- High/system-level
  - Fast: reduces the exploration time of the design space
  - Accurate “enough”: approximations are required
  - Processor model must be cheap
    - “what if” my processor did X
    - future processors not yet developed
    - evaluation of processor not currently used
  - Must be convenient to use
    - no need to compile with cross-compilers and debug on my desktop
**SW estimation in VCC**

**Virtual Processor Model (VPM)**

*compiled code virtual instruction set simulator*

- An virtual processor functional model with its own ISA estimating computation time based on a table with instruction time information

  - **Pros:**
    - does not require target software development chain (uses host compiler)
    - fast simulation model generation and execution
    - simple and cheap generation of a new processor model
    - Needed when target processor and compiler not available

  - **Cons:**
    - hard to model target compiler optimizations (requires “best in class” Virtual Compiler that can also as C-to-C optimization for the target compiler)
    - low precision, especially for data memory accesses
**SW estimation by ISS**

**Interpreted instruction set simulator (I-ISS)**

- A model of the processor interpreting the instruction stream and accounting for clock cycle accurate or approximate time evaluation

  - **Pros:**
    - generally available from processor IP provider
    - often integrates fast cache model
    - considers target compiler optimizations and real data and code addresses

  - **Cons:**
    - requires target software development chain and full application (boot, RTOS, Interrupt handling, etc)
    - often low speed
    - different integration problem for every vendor (and often for every CPU)
    - may be difficult to support communication models that require waiting to complete an I/O or synchronization operation
# Accuracy vs Performance vs Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>Speed</th>
<th>$$$$$*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardware Emulation</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+ -</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle accurate model</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle counting ISS</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic estimation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static spreadsheet</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*$\$$\$$ = NRE + per model + per design
CoWare Platform Modeling Environment

- Focus on computation/communication separation
- Leverage their LISA platform and SystemC Transaction Level Models
CoWare Support for Multiple Abstraction Levels

- Support successive refinement for both processors and bus models
- Depending on abstraction level, simulation performance of 100 to 200 Kcycles/sec
Refining the Control Algorithm

Model based

- Model level

Code based

- Untimed, host data type
- Untimed, target data type
- Timed, target data type
- Real target

- Model-in-the-Loop: Controller model
  - Plant model or stimulus signals

- Software-in-the-Loop: C Code on host PC
  - Plant model or stimulus signals

- UF Platform-in-the-Loop: C Code on platform model
  - Plant model or stimulus signals
  - Platform model

- TF/RT Platform-in-the-Loop: C Code on platform model
  - Plant model or stimulus signals
  - Platform model

- Processor-in-the-Loop: C Code on target processor
  - Plant model or stimulus signals
  - Evaluation board
Model Based Control-Platform Co-Design

Control Specification

Function/Platform Mapping

Verification

void integratutto4_initializer( void )
{
    /* Initialize machine's broadcast event variable */
    _sfEvent_ = CALL_EVENT;

    _integratutto4MachineNumber_ = sf_debug_initialize_machine("integratutto4","sfun",0,0,0,0);
    sf_debug_set_machine_event_thresholds(_integratutto4MachineNumber_,0,0);
    sf_debug_set_machine_data_thresholds(_integratutto4MachineNumber_,0);
}

Software Platform (API services)

RTOS

Device Drivers

BIOS

CPUs

Net

ECU output devices

ECU input devices
The software platform is cross applications and cross HW plats and is composed of parameterized software components (sources).
Platform Design and Implementation

Hardware, computation:
- Cores:
  - Core selection
  - Core instantiation
- Coprocessors:
  - Selection (Peripherals)
  - Configuration/Synthesis
- Instructions:
  - ISA definition (VLIW)
  - ISA Extension Flow

Hardware, communication:
- Busses
- Networks

Software, granularity:
- Set of Processes
- Process/Thread
- Instruction sequences
- Instructions

Software, layers:
- RTOS
- HAL
- Middle layers
AUTOSAR Software Platform Standardization

**Standardization**

AUTOSAR – ECU Software Architecture

**Automotive Open System Architecture (AUTOSAR):**
- Standardized, openly disclosed interfaces
- HW independent SW layer
- Transferability of functions
- Redundancy activation

**AUTOSAR RTE:**
by specifying interfaces and their communication mechanisms, the applications are decoupled from the underlying HW and Basic SW, enabling the realization of Standard Library Functions.
The Different Levels of Parallelism to Exploit

- **Data Level Parallelism**
  - Inherent in most BB alg.'s
  - SIMD Architecture
    - High Efficiency
    - Compiler issues
    - Amdahl’s Law!

- **Instruction Level Parallelism**
  - VLIW Architecture
    - Compiler friendly
    - Register file issues
  - Complex Instructions

- **Task Level Parallelism**
  - Multiple Interleaved Threads
    - Relaxed Memory Requirements
    - Increased Latency
  - Multiple Processors Core
    (ASIPs, Coprocessors, Accelerators)

**Best Results By Exploiting All Levels Of Parallelism!**
Hardware Design Flow

- Not a unified approach to explore the different levels of parallelism

- The macro level architecture must be selected
  - Implementing function in RTL (SystemC/C++ Flow)
    - Hardware implementation of RTOS
  - Partition the function and implements some parts using a dedicated Co-Processor
  - Change Core Instruction Set Application (ISA): Parameterization of a configurable processor
  - Custom extension of the ISA
  - Define a new ISA (e.g. VLIW)
Traditional System-On-Chip Design Flow

“Traditional” Hardware Software Flow

- Specification(s)
- Application
  - RTOS
  - Drivers
- Software
- Hardware
- HDL - RTL
  - Design
  - Debug
  - Verification

System Architect
(MATLAB, SPW, C/C++)

Chip Designer
(Manual Methods)

- Algorithm Functional Description
- Floating Point Model
- Fixed Point Model
- Micro-architecture Definition
- RTL Design
- RTL Area/Timing Optimization
- RTL Synthesis
- Place & Route
- Hardware

Mentor Graphics
March 2006
C/C++ Synthesis Flow

C Synthesis Enables Faster Architectural Exploration and Shorter Time to RTL

System Architect
(MATLAB, SPW, C/C++)

Algorithm Functional Description
Floating Point Model
Fixed Point Model
Micro-architecture Definition
RTL Design
RTL Area/Timing Optimization
RTL Synthesis
Place & Route
Hardware ASIC/FPGA

Algorithm Functional Description
Floating Point Model
Fixed Point C++ Model
C Synthesis
RTL Synthesis
Place & Route
Hardware ASIC/FPGA
Evolution of System-On-Chip Design Flow

An Evolution of the “Traditional” Flow

- Paper Specification
- System High Level Model Executable Specification
- Hardware High Level Model
- Virtual Prototype
- Software
  - Application
  - RTOS
  - BSP (drivers)
- Hardware
  - Co-Verification
  - HDL - RTL
    - Design
    - Debug
    - Verification
  - Consistent Verification
  - Requirements follow-up

- Algorithm Functional Description
- Floating Point Model
- Fixed Point C++ Model
- C Synthesis
- RTL Synthesis
- Place & Route
- Hardware
  - ASIC/FPGA
**Implementing Function in RTL**

**General-purpose CPUs** used in traditional SOCs are not fast enough for data-intensive applications, don’t have enough I/O or compute bandwidth, lacks efficiency.

**Hardwired Logic**
- High performance due to parallelism
- Large number of wires in/out of the block
- Languages/Tools familiar to many

**But …**
- Slow to design and verify
- Inflexible after tapeout
- High re-spin risk and cost
- Slows time to market

Courtesy of Grant Martin, Chief Scientist, Tensilica
SystemC/C++ Synthesis Flow

High Level Models: TLM/Simulink

SystemC/C++ Models

IR: Control Flow Data Graph

High-Level Synthesis

Chunks Identification & System partitioning

Software Extraction

Software Compilation

Hardware implementations

Cost Function Evaluation

Software Cost Estimation

Hw/Sw Integration

Hardware Refinement

Hardware Cost Estimation

Performance Estimation

Hw/Sw Co-verification

Software Refinement

RTL Level
Celoxica and Forte Flows

DK Design Suite

Cynthesizer
**Coprocessor Synthesis**

◆ Loosely coupled coprocessor that accelerates the execution of compiled binary executable software code offloaded from the CPU

- Delivers the parallel processing resources of a custom processor.
- Automatically synthesizes programmable coprocessor from software executable (hw and sw).
- Maximizes system performance through memory access and bus communication optimizations.
**Criticalblue Approach**

◆ **Bottleneck Identification:**
  - Analyze the profiling results of the application software running on the main microprocessor.
  - Manually identifies the specific tasks to be migrated to the coprocessor.

◆ **Architecture Synthesis and Performance Estimation:**
  - User-defined constraints like gate count, clock cycle count, and bus utilization
  - Analysis of the instruction code and architect the coprocessor deploy the maximum parallelism consistent with the input constraints.
  - Estimation of gate-count and performance including estimates of communication overhead with the main processor.

◆ **Coprocessor-Performance and “What-If” Analysis:**
  - Generation of an instruction- and bit-accurate C model of the coprocessor architecture used in conjunction with the main processor’s instruction-set simulator (ISS).
  - Typical analysis: performance profiling, memory-access activity, and activation trace data
  - The model also is used to validate the coprocessor within a standard C or SystemC simulation environment.

◆ **Hardware Synthesis and Microcode generation:**
  - Generation of the coprocessor hardware, delivering synthesizable RTL code in either VHDL or Verilog and of the circuitry that’s needed to enable the coprocessor to communicate with the main processor’s bus interface.
  - Generation of the coprocessor microcode.
  - It automatically modifies the original executable code so that function calls are directed to a communications library.
  - This library manages the coprocessor handoff. It also communicates parameters and results between the main processor and the coprocessor.
  - Microcode can be generated independently of the coprocessor hardware, allowing new microcode to be targeted at an existing coprocessor design.
### Configurable and Extensible Processor

**Fully Configurable Processor Features**

- **Instruction Fetch / Decode**
  - Designer-defined FLIX parallel execution pipelines - “N” wide
  - User Defined Execution Units, Register Files and Interfaces
  - Register File

- **Base ISA Execution Pipeline**
  - Base ALU
  - Optional Execution Units
  - User Defined Execution Unit
  - Vectra LX DSP Engine

- **Processor Controls**
  - Trace/TJAG/OCD
  - Interrupts, Breakpoints, Timers
  - Local Instruction Memories
  - External Bus Interface
  - Local Data Memories
  - Xtensa Local Memory Interface

- **Load/Store Unit #2**
  - Data Load/Store Unit

- **User Defined Queues / Ports**
  - up to 1M Pins

- **Processor Interface (PIF)**
  - to System Bus

**Base ISA Feature**
- Configurable Functions
- Optional Function
- Optional & Configurable
- Designer Defined Features (TIE)

---

Courtesy of Grant Martin, Chief Scientist, Tensilica
The operation statement describes an entire new instruction, including:

1. Instruction name
2. Instruction format and arguments
3. Functional Behavior

From this single statement, Tensilica’s technology generates processor hardware, simulation and software development tool support for the new instruction.
operation MUL_SAT_16 {out AR z, in AR a, in AR b} {}
{
wire [31:0] m = TIEmul(a[15:0],b[15:0],1);
assign z = {16'b0,
        : ((m[31:23]==9'b0) ? m[23:8] : 16'h7fff) }
}
schedule ms {MUL_SAT_16} {def z 2;}

Core 32bit Register File (AR)

a
b
z

Pipeline Stage

E1
E2

OPERAND1
X
OPERAND2

SAT
RESULT
operation MUL_SAT_2x16 {out AR z, in AR a, in AR b} {}
{
    wire [31:0] m1 = TIEmul(a[31:16], b[31:16], 1);
    wire [31:0] m0 = TIEmul(a[15:0], b[15:0], 1);
    assign z = {m1[31] ? ((m1[31:23] == 9'b1) ? m1[23:8] : 16'h8000)
                : ((m1[31:23] == 9'b0) ? m1[23:8] : 16'h7fff),
            m0[31] ? ((m0[31:23] == 9'b1) ? m0[23:8] : 16'h8000)
                : ((m0[31:23] == 9'b0) ? m0[23:8] : 16'h7fff)};
}
schedule ms {MUL_SAT_2x16} {def z 2;}

Core 32bit Register File (AR)

a  a1  a0
b  b1  b0
z

MUL

SAT

a1  b1
a0  b0
Multiple Instruction Issues - FLIX™ Architecture

- **FLIX™ - Flexible Length Instruction Extensions**

- **Multiple, concurrent, independent, compound operations per instruction**
  - Modeless intermixing of 16, 24, and 32 or 64 bit instructions
  - Fast and concurrent code (concurrent execution) when needed
  - Compact code when concurrency / parallelism isn't needed
  - Full code compatibility with base 16/24 bit Xtensa ISA

- **Minimal overhead**
  - No VLIW-style code-bloat
  - ~2000 gates added control logic

| Designer-Defined FLIX Instruction Formats with Designer-Defined Number of Operations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 63 | 63 | 31 |
| Operation 1 | Operation 2 | Operation 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Example 3 – Operation, 64b Instruction Format |
| Operation 1 | Operation 2 | Op 3 | Op 4 | Operation 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Example 5 – Operation, 64b Instruction Format |
| Op 1 | Op 2 | Op 3 | Op. 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Example 4 – Operation, 32b Instruction Format |

Courtesy of Grant Martin, Chief Scientist, Tensilica
Parallelism at Three Levels in Extensible Instructions

Three forms of instruction-set parallelism:
- Very Long Instruction Word (VLIW)
- Single Instruction Multiple Data (SIMD) aka “vectors”
- Fused operations aka “complex operations”

Parallelism: \( L \times M \times N \)

Example: \( 3 \times 4 \times 3 = 36 \text{ ops/cycle} \)
**HW & SW automatically generated**

**Xtensa Xplorer**
- Integrated Development Environment
- TIE Development tools
- C Development tools
- Profiling & visualization tools

**Software**
- Scheduling assembler
- Xtensa C/C++ Compiler: vectorizing C/C++ compiler
- Xtensa Instruction Set Simulator – Pipeline accurate
- Debuggers
- XTMP: System Modeling API
- Bus Functional Model for HW/SW co-simulation model
- RTOS: VxWorks, Nucleus, XTOS

**Hardware**
- Synthesizable RTL
- Synopsys/Cadence flows

Courtesy of Grant Martin, Chief Scientist, Tensilica
Automation: Optimized Processor & Matching Software Tools

**Design Flow**

- **ANSI C/C++ Code**
  - Source code
  ```c
  int main()
  {
    int i;
    short c[100];
    for (i=0;i<N/2;i++)
    {
      // Code
    }
  }
  ```

- **XPRES Compiler**
  - Optional Step
  - Runs in Minutes

- **Electronic Specification**
  - Configuration selection and custom-instruction description

- **Xtensa Processor Generator**

- **Complete Hardware Design**
  - Source RTL, EDA scripts, test suite

- **Customized Software Tools**
  - C/C++ compiler
  - Debuggers
  - Simulators
  - RTOSes

- **Use standard ASIC/COT design techniques and libraries for any IC fabrication process**

- **Iterate in hours**

* US Patent: 6,477,697

Courtesy of Grant Martin, Chief Scientist, Tensilica
Designing with many processors

Courtesy of Grant Martin, Chief Scientist, Tensilica
Exploiting MP: Many Possible Architectures

Shared Bus

On-chip Routing Network

Cross-Bar

Application-specific

Courtesy of Grant Martin, Chief Scientist, Tensilica
**Multiprocessor Design Flow**

Possible Solutions: top-down flow

Conceptual Model Of Application

- Partition Application into Tasks
- Add Communication Channels b/w Tasks
- Refine Arch: Add TIE, Mem, Queues
- Map Tasks to Processors & Comm. Channels to Queues, Shared Memories

Simulation Model of System

- Simulate, Profile, Analyze, Iterate

Top-level RTL

- Component RTL
- Sample Test Bench

Change Processor Config

Change System Architecture

Spec, Matlab, C/C++, SystemC
From unstructured connectivity to a …

Courtesy of SONICS
Communication Centric Design Flow

“Communication Centric Platform”

- SONIC, Palmchip
- Concentrates on communication
  - Delivers communication framework plus peripherals
  - Limits the modeling efforts

SONICs Architecture
SONICS Automated flow

- Behavioral models
- Trace generation
- Monitors
- Disassemblers
- Protocol checkers
- Performance analysis
- SystemC models
- Timing constraint propagation
- Synthesis script generation
- Floorplanner interface
Outline

◆ Embedded System Applications
◆ Platform based design methodology
◆ Electronic System Level Design
  ◆ Functions: MoC, Languages
  ◆ Architectures: Network, Node, SoC
◆ Metropolis
◆ Conclusions
**Metropolis: an Environment for System-Level Design**

- **Motivation**
  - Design complexity and the need for verification and time-to-market constraints are increasing
  - Semantic link between specification and implementation is necessary

- **Platform-Based Design**
  - Meet-in-the-middle approach
  - Separation of concerns
    - Function vs. architecture
    - Capability vs. performance
    - Computation vs. communication

- **Metropolis Framework**
  - Extensible framework providing simulation, verification, and synthesis capabilities
  - Easily extract relevant design information and interface to external tools

- **Released Sept. 15th, 2004**
Metropolis: Target and Goals

◆ Target: Embedded System Design
  - Set-top boxes, cellular phones, automotive controllers, …
  - Heterogeneity:
    - computation: Analog, ASICs, programmable logic, DSPs, ASIPs, processors
    - communication: Buses, cross-bars, cache, DMAs, SDRAM, …
    - coordination: Synchronous, Asynchronous (event driven, time driven)

◆ Goals:
  - Design methodologies:
    - abstraction levels: design capture, mathematics for the semantics
    - design tasks: cache size, address map, SW code generation, RTL generation, …
  - Tool set:
    - synthesis: data transfer scheduling, memory sizing, interface logic, SW/HW generation, …
    - verification: property checking, static analysis of performance, equivalence checking, …
Metropolis Project

Participants:

- UC Berkeley (USA): methodologies, modeling, formal methods
- CMU (USA): formal methods
- Politecnico di Torino (Italy): modeling, formal methods
- Universita Politecnica de Catalunya (Spain): modeling, formal methods
- Cadence Berkeley Labs (USA): methodologies, modeling, formal methods
- PARADES (Italy): methodologies, modeling, formal methods
- ST (France-Italy): methodologies, modeling
- Philips (Netherlands): methodologies (multi-media)
- Nokia (USA, Finland): methodologies (wireless communication)
- BWRC (USA): methodologies (wireless communication)
- Magneti-Marelli (Italy): methodologies (power train control)
- BMW (USA): methodologies (fault-tolerant automotive controls)
- Intel (USA): methodologies (microprocessors)
- Cypress (USA): methodologies (network processors, USB platforms)
- Honeywell (USA): methodologies (FADEC)
Metropolis Framework

Function Specification

Design Constraints & Assertions

Architecture (Platform) Specification

Metropolis Infrastructure
- Design methodology
- Meta model of computation
- Base tools
  - Design imports
  - Meta model compiler
  - Simulation

Synthesis/Refinement
- Compile-time scheduling of concurrency
- Communication-driven hardware synthesis
- Protocol interface generation

Analysis/Verification
- Static timing analysis of reactive systems
- Invariant analysis of sequential programs
- Refinement verification
- Formal verification of embedded software
Meta Frameworks: Metropolis

Metropolis provides a process networks abstract semantics and emphasizes formal description of constraints, communication refinement, and joint modeling of applications and architectures.
Metropolis Objects: adding quantity managers

- Metropolis elements adhere to a “separation of concerns” point of view.

- **Processes (Computation)**
  
  ![Active Objects]
  
  Sequential Executing Thread

- **Media (Communication)**
  
  ![Passive Objects]
  
  Implement Interface Services

- **Quantity Managers (Coordination)**
  
  Schedule access to resources and quantities
A Producer–Consumer Example

- A process P producing integers
- A process C consuming integers
- A media M implementing the communication services
**Writer: Process P (Producer)**

- **Writer.mmm: Port (interface) definition**

```java
package producers_consumer;
interface IntWriter extends Port{
    update void writeInt(int i);
    eval int nspace();
}
```

- **P.mmm: Process behavior definition**

```java
package producers_consumer;
process P {
    port IntWriter port_wr;
    public P(String name) {} 
    void thread() {
        int w = 0;
        while (w < 30) {
            port_wr.writeInt(w);
            w = w + 1;
        }
    }
}
```
**Metro. Netlists and Events**

**Metropolis Architectures are created via two netlists:**
- Scheduled – generate events\(^1\) for services in the scheduled netlist.
- Scheduling – allow these events access to the services and annotate events with quantities.

---

**Related Work**

**Event\(^1\) –** represents a transition in the action automata of an object. Can be annotated with any number of quantities. This allows performance estimation.
Key Modeling Concepts

◆ An event is the fundamental concept in the framework
  ◆ Represents a transition in the action automata of an object
  ◆ An event is owned by the object that exports it
  ◆ During simulation, generated events are termed as event instances
  ◆ Events can be annotated with any number of quantities
  ◆ Events can partially expose the state around them, constraints can then reference or influence this state

◆ A service corresponds to a set of sequences of events
  ◆ All elements in the set have a common begin event and a common end event
  ◆ A service may be parameterized with arguments

**Action Automata**

- Processes take *actions*.
  - statements and some expressions, e.g.
    
    \[ y = z + \text{port.f}(); \]
    
    \[ z + \text{port.f}, \ 	ext{port.f}, \ i < 10, \ldots \]
  - only calls to media functions are *observable actions*

- An *execution* of a given netlist is a sequence of vectors of *events*.
  - *event* : the beginning of an action, e.g. \( B(\text{port.f}) \),
  - the end of an action, e.g. \( E(\text{port.f}) \), or null \( N \)
  - the \( i \)-th component of a vector is an event of the \( i \)-th process

- An execution is *legal* if
  - it satisfies all coordination constraints, and
  - it is accepted by all action automata.
Execution semantics

**Action automaton:**

- one for each action of each process
  - defines the set of sequences of events that can happen in executing the action

- a transition corresponds to an event:
  - it may update shared memory variables:
    - process and media member variables
    - values of actions-expressions
  - it may have guards that depend on states of other action automata and memory variables

- each state has a self-loop transition with the null N event.

- all the automata have their alphabets in common:
  - transitions must be taken together in different automata, if they correspond to the same event.
Action Automata

\[ y = x + 1; \]

- \( y = x + 1 \)
- \( x + 1 \)
- \( V_{x+1} \)
- \( V_{x+1} \)
- \( y \)
- \( x \)

\[ B y = x + 1 \quad N \quad B x + 1 \quad N \quad N \quad E x + 1 \quad E y = x + 1 \]
Semantics summary

- Processes run sequential code concurrently, each at its own arbitrary pace.

- Read-Write and Write-Write hazards may cause unpredictable results
  - atomicity has to be explicitly specified.

- Progress may block at synchronization points
  - awaits
  - function calls and labels to which awaits or constraints refer.

- The legal behavior of a netlist is given by a set of sequences of event vectors.
  - multiple sequences reflect the non-determinism of the semantics:
    concurrency, synchronization (awaits and constraints)
Two mechanisms are supported to specify constraints:

1. Propositions over temporal orders of states
   - execution is a sequence of states
   - specify constraints using linear temporal logic
   - good for scheduling constraints, e.g.
     “if process P starts to execute a statement s1, no other process can start the statement until P reaches a statement s2.”

2. Propositions over instances of transitions between states
   - particular transitions in the current execution: called “actions”
   - annotate actions with quantity, such as time, power.
   - specify constraints over actions with respect to the quantities
   - good for real-time constraints, e.g.
     “any successive actions of starting a statement s1 by process P must take place with at most 10ms interval.”
Logic of Constraints (LOC)

A transaction-level quantitative constraint language

Works on a sequence of events from a particular execution trace

The basic components of an LOC formula:

- Boolean operators: (not), (or), (and) and (imply)
- Event names, e.g. “in”, “out”, “Stimuli” or “Display”
- Instances of events, e.g. “Stimuli[0]”, “Display[10]”
- Annotations, e.g. “t(Display[5])”
- Index variable i, the only variable in a formula, e.g. “Display[i-5]” and “Stimuli[i]”
LOC Constraints

Throughput: “at least 3 Display events will be produced in any period of 30 time units”.

\[ t(\text{Display}[i+3]) - t(\text{Display}[i]) \leq 30 \]

Other LOC constraints

Performance: rate, latency, jitter, burstiness

Functional: data consistency
Meta-model: architecture components

An architecture component specifies services, i.e.

• what it can do:
  interfaces, methods, coordination (awaits, constraints), netlists

• how much it costs:
  quantities, annotated with events, related over a set of events

interface BusMasterService extends Port {
  update void busRead(String dest, int size);
  update void busWrite(String dest, int size);
}

medium Bus implements BusMasterService ...
{
  port BusArbiterService Arb;
  port MemService Mem; ...
  update void busRead(String dest, int size) {
    if(dest== ... ) Mem.memRead(size);
  }
}

...
**Meta-model: quantities**

- The domain D of the quantity, e.g. *real* for the global time,
- The operations and relations on D, e.g. subtraction, <, =,
- The function from an event instance to an element of D,
- Axioms on the quantity, e.g.
  
  the global time is non-decreasing in a sequence of vectors of any feasible execution.

```java
class GTime extends Quantity {
    double t;
    double sub(double t2, double t1){...}
    double add(double t1, double t2){...}
    boolean equal(double t1, double t2){ ... }
    boolean less(double t1, double t2){ ... }
    double A(event e, int i){ ... }
    constraints{
        forall(event e1, event e2, int i, int j):
            GXI.A(e1, i) == GXI.A(e2, j) -> equal(A(e1, i), A(e2, j)) &&
            GXI.A(e1, i) < GXI.A(e2, j) -> (less(A(e1, i), A(e2, j)) || equal(A(e1, i), A(e2. j)))
    }
}
```
This modeling mechanism is generic, independent of services and cost specified.

Which levels of abstraction, what kind of quantities, what kind of cost constraints should be used to capture architecture components?

- depends on applications: on-going research

**Transaction:**
- fuzzy instruction set for SW, execute() for HW
- bounded FIFO (point-to-point)

**Quantities:**
- #reads, #writes, token size, context switches

**Virtual BUS:**
- data decomposition/composition
- address (internal v.s. external)

**Quantities:** same as above, different weights

**Physical:**
- full characterization
- time
**Quantity resolution**

The 2-step approach to resolve quantities at each state of a netlist being executed:

1. **quantity requests**
   
   for each process $P_i$, for each event $e$ that $P_i$ can take, find all the quantity constraints on $e$.
   
   In the meta-model, this is done by explicitly requesting quantity annotations at the relevant events, i.e.
   
   Quantity.request(event, requested quantities).

2. **quantity resolution**
   
   find a vector made of the candidate events and a set of quantities annotated with each of the events, such that the annotated quantities satisfy:
   
   - all the quantity requests, and
   - all the axioms of the Quantity types.
   
   In the meta-model, this is done by letting each Quantity type implement a resolve() method, and the methods of relevant Quantity types are iteratively called.
   
   - theory of fixed-point computation
Quantity resolution

- The 2-step approach is same as how schedulers work, e.g. OS schedulers, BUS schedulers, BUS bridge controllers.

- Semantically, a scheduler can be considered as one that resolves a quantity called execution index.

- Two ways to model schedulers:
  1. As processes:
     - explicitly model the scheduling protocols using the meta-model building blocks
     - a good reflection of actual implementations
  2. As quantities:
     - use the built-in request/resolve approach for modeling the scheduling protocols
     - more focus on resolution (scheduling) algorithms, than protocols: suitable for higher level abstraction models
Programmable Arch. Modeling

◆ Computation Services

PPC405  MicroBlaze  SynthMaster  SynthSlave

Computation Services
Read (addr, offset, cnt, size), Write(addr, offset, cnt, size),
Execute (operation, complexity)

◆ Communication Services

Processor Local Bus (PLB)  On-Chip Peripheral Bus (OPB)  BRAM

Communication Services
addrTransfer(target, master)
addrReq(base, offset, transType, device)
addrAck(device)
dataTransfer(device, readSeq, writeSeq)
dataAck(device)

◆ Other Services

OPB/PLB Bridge  Mapping Process

Task Before/Mapping
Read (addr, offset, cnt, size)
**Programmable Arch. Modeling**

- **Coordination Services**
  - PPC Sched
  - MicroBlaze Sched
  - PLB Sched
  - OPB Sched
  - BRAM Sched
  - General Sched

**Request (event e)**
- Adds event to pending queue of requested events

**PostCond()**
- Augments event with information (annotation). This is typically the interaction with the quantity manager

**Resolve()**
- Uses algorithm to select an event from the pending queue

GTime
**Prog. Platform Characterization**

Create database **ONCE** prior to simulation and populate with independent *(modular)* information.

1. **Data detailing** performance based on physical implementation.

2. Data detailing the composition of communication transactions.

3. **Data detailing the processing elements computation.**

**Work with Xilinx Research Labs**


Modeling & Char. Review

Scheduled Netlist

- Task1
- Task2
- Task3
- Task4

- PPC
- PLB
- BRAM

Scheduling Netlist

- DedHW Sched
- PPC Sched
- PLB Sched
- BRAM Sched

Enabled Event
Disabled Event

Characterizer

Global Time

Media (scheduled)
Quantity Manager
Mapping in Metropolis

◆ Objectives:
  - Map a functional network with an architectural network without changing either of the two
    - Support design reuse
  - Specify the mapping between the two in a formal way
    - Support analysis techniques
    - Make future automation easier

◆ Mechanism:
  - Use declarative synchronization constraints between events
  - One of the unique aspects of Metropolis
**Synchronisation constraints**

- **Synchronisation constraint between two events** $e_1$ and $e_2$:
  - $\text{ltl synch}(e_1, e_2)$
  - $e_1$ and $e_2$ occur **simultaneously or not at all** during simulation

- **Optional variable equality portion:**
  - $\text{ltl synch}(e_1, e_2: \text{var}_1@e_1 == \text{var}_2@e_2)$
  - The value of $\text{var}_1$ in the scope of $e_1$ is equal to the value of $\text{var}_2$ when $e_1$ and $e_2$ occur
  - Can be useful for “passing” values between functional and architectural models
Metropolis Example

e1 = beg(P1, M1.read);
e2 = beg(T1, T1.read);
ltl synch(e1, e2: items@e1 == i@e2);
e3 = end(P1, M1.read);
e4 = end(T1, T1.read);
ltl synch(e3, e4);

P1

M1: void read (int items)
    { ... }

T1:
    await {
        (true;;) read (int i);
        (true;;) write (int i);
    }

Global Time

CPU
Meta-model: mapping netlist

MyMapNetlist

\[ B(P1, M.\text{write}) \leftrightarrow B(mP1, mP1.\text{writeCpu}); \quad E(P1, M.\text{write}) \leftrightarrow E(mP1, mP1.\text{writeCpu}); \]
\[ B(P1, P1.f) \leftrightarrow B(mP1, mP1.mapf); \quad E(P1, P1.f) \leftrightarrow E(mP1, mP1.mapf); \]
\[ B(P2, M.\text{read}) \leftrightarrow B(mP2, mP2.\text{readCpu}); \quad E(P2, M.\text{read}) \leftrightarrow E(mP2, mP2.\text{readCpu}); \]
\[ B(P2, P2.f) \leftrightarrow B(mP2, mP2.mapf); \quad E(P2, P2.f) \leftrightarrow E(mP2, mP2.mapf); \]
Meta-model: platforms

A set of mapping netlists, together with constraints on event relations to a given interface implementation, constitutes a platform of the interface.

```
interface MyService extends Port {  int myService(int d);  }
```

```
middle AbsM implements MyService{
  int myService(int d) { … }
}
```

```
refine(AbsM, MyMapNetlist1)
```

```
refine(AbsM, MyMapNetlist2)
```

```
B(P1, M.write) <=> B(mP1, mP1.writeCpu);
B(P1, P1.f) <=> B(mP1, mP1.mapf);  E(P1, P1.f) <=> E(mP1, )
B(P2, M.read) <=> B(P2, mP2.readCpu);
E(P2, P2.f) <=> E(mP2, mP2.mapf);
```

```
B(P1, M.write) <=> B(mP1, mP1.writeCpu);
B(P1, P1.f) <=> B(mP1, mP1.mapf);  E(P1, P1.f) <=> E(mP1, )
B(P2, M.read) <=> B(P2, mP2.readCpu);
E(P2, P2.f) <=> E(mP2, mP2.mapf);
```

```
```

```
refine(AbsM, MyMapNetlist1)
```

```
refine(AbsM, MyMapNetlist2)
```

```
B(P1, M.write) <=> B(mP1, mP1.writeCpu);
B(P1, P1.f) <=> B(mP1, mP1.mapf);  E(P1, P1.f) <=> E(mP1, )
B(P2, M.read) <=> B(P2, mP2.readCpu);
E(P2, P2.f) <=> E(mP2, mP2.mapf);
```

```
refine(AbsM, MyMapNetlist2)
```

```
B(P1, M.write) <=> B(mP1, mP1.writeCpu);
B(P1, P1.f) <=> B(mP1, mP1.mapf);  E(P1, P1.f) <=> E(mP1, )
B(P2, M.read) <=> B(P2, mP2.readCpu);
E(P2, P2.f) <=> E(mP2, mP2.mapf);
```

```
refine(AbsM, MyMapNetlist2)
```

```
B(P1, M.write) <=> B(mP1, mP1.writeCpu);
B(P1, P1.f) <=> B(mP1, mP1.mapf);  E(P1, P1.f) <=> E(mP1, )
B(P2, M.read) <=> B(P2, mP2.readCpu);
E(P2, P2.f) <=> E(mP2, mP2.mapf);
```
Meta-model: recursive paradigm of platforms

\[ B(Q2, S.cdx) \iff B(Q2, mQ2.excCpu); \]
\[ B(Q2, Q2.f) \iff B(mQ2, mQ2.mapf); \]
\[ E(Q2, M.cdx) \iff E(mQ2, mQ2.excCpu); \]
\[ E(Q2, P2.f) \iff E(mQ2, mQ2.mapf); \]
Evaluate the methodology with formal techniques applied.

- Function
  - Input: a transport stream for multi-channel video images
  - Output: a PiP video stream
    - the inner window size and frame color dynamically changeable

60 processes with 200 channels
Multi-Media System: Abstraction Levels

- Network of processes with sequential program for each
- Unbounded FIFOs with multi-rate read and write

- Communication refined to bounded FIFOs and shared memories with finer primitives (called TTL API):
  allocate/release space, move data, probe space/data

- Mapped to resources with coarse service APIs
- Services annotated with performance models
- Interfaces to match the TTL API

- Cycle-accurate services and performance models
Metropolis design environment

- Load designs
- Browse designs
- Relate designs
- Refine, map etc
- Invoke tools
- Analyze results
**Backend Point Tools**

**Synthesis/refinement:**
- Quasi-static scheduling
- Scheduler synthesis from constraint formulas
- Interface synthesis
- Refinement (mapping) synthesis
- Architecture-specific synthesis from concurrent processes for:
  - Hardware (with known architecture)
  - Dynamically reconfigurable logic

**Verification/analysis:**
- Static timing analysis for reactive processes
- Invariant analysis of sequential programs
- Refinement verification
- Formal verification for software
Conclusions

- The trade-off between hardware and software starts long before the RTL design of an SoC

- Starting from the system specification:
  - Functionality, i.e., WHAT the system is required to do
  - Constraints, i.e., the set of requirements that restrict the design space by taking into consideration non functional aspects of the design such as cost, power consumption, performance, fault tolerance and physical dimensions.
  - Architecture, i.e., the set of available components from which the designer can decide HOW she can implement the functionality satisfying the constraints

- The PBD methodology progresses towards the implementation of the design “mapping” the functionality of the design to the available components.
  - The library of available components (they can be already fully designed or they can be considered virtual components) is called a platform.
  - Mapping implies the selection of the components, of their interconnection scheme and of the allocation of the functionality to each
  - Several models and methods are applied to achieve the final implementation
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