HW/SW Co-Design for Embedded Systems

P. Giusto, A. Jurecska
Magneti Marelli, Torino, Italy

L. Lavagno
Politecnico di Torino, Italy
Cadence Berkeley Labs, CA

K. Suzuki
Hitachi Res. Lab. , Tokio, Japan

F. Balarin, E. Sentovich
Cadence Berkeley Labs, CA

M. Chiodo
Alta Group, Sunnyvale, CA

H. Hsieh, A. Sangiovanni-Vincentelli
University of California, Berkeley, CA

Outline

- Reactive Real-Time Embedded Systems
- Specification Models and Languages
  - Data Flow
  - Extended Finite State Machines
- Proposed Design Methodology
  - System Specification
  - Validation
  - System Partitioning
  - Software, Hardware and Interface Synthesis
  - Real-time Operating System and Scheduling
- Summary

Embedded Systems

- An embedded system
  - uses a computer to perform some function, but
  - is not used (nor perceived) as a computer
- Software is used for features and flexibility
- Hardware is used for performance
- Typical characteristics:
  - it performs a single function
  - it is part of a larger (controlled) system
  - cost and reliability are often the most significant aspects

Embedded System Applications

- **Consumer electronics**

  (microwave oven, camera, ...)
- **Telecommunication switching and terminal equipment**

  (cellular phone, ...)
- **Automotive, aero-spatial**

  (engine control, anti-lock brake, ...)
- **Plant control and production automation**

  (robot, plant monitor, ...)
- **Defense**

  (radar, intelligent weapon, ...)

Reactive Real-time Systems

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

Embedded Controller Example: In-Vehicle Network (IVN)

Several protocols have been proposed for the implementation of in-vehicle networks. Among them:

- **CAN, VAN (Europe)**
- **J1850 (USA)**



IVN - Implementation

Automotive networks come in three classes:

class	application	max. latency	bit rate
A	Body electronics	20-50 ms	< 10 Kbit/s
B	Information sharing	1-10 ms	10-20 Kbit/s
C	Real-time controls	< 1 ms	0.125-1 Mbit/s

The implementation can be different for different classes of applications. For example:

- **class A - CPU can handle communication + application**
- **class C - communication IC required**

Embedded Controller Example: Engine Control Unit (ECU)

Task: control the torque produced by the engine by timing fuel injection and spark

- **Major constraints:**
  - **Low fuel consumption**
  - **Low exhaust emission**

Engine Control Unit (ECU) - 2

Task: control injection time (3 sub-tasks)



Engine Control Unit (ECU) - Option 1

CPU has to:

- process input data
- compute outputs
- control actuators

- Relatively easy to design
- May not meet timing requirements

Engine Control Unit (ECU) - Option 2



- CPU processes input data and computes outputs
- FPGA controls actuators

Engine Control Unit (ECU) - Option 3



- DSP processes input data
- CPU computes outputs
- FPGA controls actuators

RRTES Implementations

- **Possibly contain both hardware and software (ASIC plus embedded software)**
- **Past Design Methodology**
  - **Software implementation: timing $\longrightarrow$ offload to hardware**
  - **Specify and design hardware and software separately**

Problems with Past Design Method

- **Lack of unified hardware-software representation**
- **Partitions are defined *a priori***
  - **Can't verify the entire system**
  - **Hard to find incompatibilities across HW-SW boundary**
- **Lack of well-defined design flow**
  - **Time-to-market problems**
  - **Specification revision becomes difficult**

➠ **Need Hardware-Software Co-Design**

Hardware/Software Co-Design Goals and Requirements

- Unified design approach
  - Facilitates system specification
  - Easy HW-SW trade-off evaluation
  - Flexible HW-SW partitioning
- Implementation Independent
  - Stress system design issues
  - Allow different hardware and software styles
- Design/ Implementation Verification
  - Formal Verification
  - Simulation
- Automatic Hardware and Software Synthesis

Outline

- Reactive Real-Time Embedded Systems
- Specification Models and Languages
  - Data Flow
  - Extended Finite State Machines
- Proposed Design Methodology
  - System Specification
  - Validation
  - System Partitioning
  - Software, Hardware and Interface Synthesis
  - Real-time Operating System and Scheduling
- Summary

System Specification Models

- **Main purpose: provide clear and unambiguous description of system *function***
  - **documentation of initial design process**
  - **allow the application of Computer Aided Design:**
    - **design space exploration**
    - **partitioning**
    - **synthesis**
    - **validation**
    - **testing**
  - **ideally should not constrain the *implementation***

System Specification Models

- **Distinguish between *models* and *languages***
  (a language implies one or more models)
- **Main models for embedded systems:**
  - **Data Flow Diagrams (Petri Nets)**
  - **Finite State Machines**
  - **Software models**
  - **Hardware simulation models**

System Specification Models

- **Model choice depends on:**
  - **Application domain**

    E.g. data flow for digital signal processing, finite state machines for control, simulation engine for hardware, ...
- **Language choice depends on:**
  - **Available tools**
  - **Personal taste and/or company policy**
  - **Underlying model**

    (the language must have a semantics in the chosen model)

Control versus Data Flow

- Fuzzy distinction, yet useful for:
  - specification (language, model, ...)
  - synthesis (scheduling, optimization, ...)
  - validation (simulation, formal verification, ...)
- Rough classification:
  - control:
    - don’t know when data arrive (quick reaction)
    - time of arrival often matters more than value
  - data:
    - data arrive in regular streams (samples)
    - value matters most

Control versus Data Flow

- **Specification, synthesis and validation methods emphasize:**
  - **for control:**
    - **event/reaction relation**
    - **response time**

      (Real Time scheduling for deadline satisfaction)
    - ***priority* among events and processes**
  - **for data:**
    - **functional dependency between input and output**
    - **memory/time efficiency**

      (data flow scheduling for efficient pipelining)
    - **all events and processes are *equal***

Outline

- Reactive Real-Time Embedded Systems
- Specification Models and Languages
  - Data Flow
  - Extended Finite State Machines
- Proposed Design Methodology
  - System Specification
  - Validation
  - System Partitioning
  - Software, Hardware and Interface Synthesis
  - Real-time Operating System and Scheduling
- Summary

Data Flow Networks

- Collection of nodes (processes) connected by FIFOs
- Typical domains of application:
  - Digital Signal Processing
  - Performance estimation (queueing models)
- Very different models depending on *node interpretation*:
  - Uninterpreted

    (classical Petri Nets)
  - Arithmetic operators

    (classical DFGs)
  - Complex operators

    (queueing models, colored Petri Nets)

Data Flow Example

```
Process 1:
forever {
      x = 0; y = 0;
      while (x < 10) {
            y = y + get_data (B);
            x = x + 1;
      }
      put_data (A, y / 10);
}
```

```
Process 2:
forever {
      a = get_data (A);
      if (a < 0)
            put_data (C, a);
      else
            put_data (D, - a);
}
```



Data Flow Example



Data Flow Primitives

initial token (with value)

constant



deterministic split/merge

data dependency (FIFO)

operator

communication channel

flow duplication

History of Data Flow Networks

- **Kahn networks introduced to develop semantics for λ calculus (‘74):**
  - **nodes communicate via *unbounded* FIFO channels**
  - **nodes must *block* when reading from a FIFO**

    (cannot test and continue)
  - **nodes can choose which FIFO(s) they read from and write to**
- **Originally used to program data flow computers (Dennis ‘75)**
- **Recently used to specify algorithms for Digital Signal Processors (Lee ‘87, Buck ‘93)**

Properties of Data Flow Networks

- **Inherently *concurrent*, *asynchronous* computation model, *but*...**
- **Kahn Data Flow networks are *determinate***
  - **the stream of values produced by each node does not depend on the execution ("firing") order of the nodes**
- **Strong limitation (blocking read) implies strong result**
- **FSMs will need *synchronicity* to achieve the same objective**
- **Similar, but not identical to Petri nets (Petri '62)**

Petri Nets

- Very powerful *uninterpreted* model
- Bipartite graph (transitions and places)
- Describes explicitly
  - causality
  - concurrency
  - choice
- Does not describe
  - computation
  - reason for choice
    (non-determinism)



Petri Nets and Data Flow

- **Similarities:**
  - **distributed state (tokens in places, data in FIFOs)**
  - **firing nodes move tokens around**
- **Differences:**
  - **PN transitions cannot choose which successor place to mark,**

    DF nodes can
  - **PN transitions can share predecessor places,**

    DF nodes cannot
  - **uninterpreted PNs are (relatively) easy to analyze,**

    DF networks are Turing-equivalent (undecidability)

Summary of Data Flow Networks

- **Advantages:**
  - **Easy to use (graphical languages)**
  - **Powerful algorithms for**
    - **synthesis (scheduling and allocation)**
    - **verification (only PNs)**
  - **Explicit concurrency**
- **Disadvantages:**
  - **Efficient synthesis only for restricted models (no input or output choice)**
  - **Cannot describe reactive control (blocking read)**



Outline

- Reactive Real-Time Embedded Systems
- Specification Models and Languages
  - Data Flow
  - Extended Finite State Machines
- Proposed Design Methodology
  - System Specification
  - Validation
  - System Partitioning
  - Software, Hardware and Interface Synthesis
  - Real-time Operating System and Scheduling
- Summary

Finite State Machines

- **Typical domains of application:**
  - **control functions**
  - **protocols (telecom, computers, ...)**
- **Different communication mechanisms:**
  - **synchronous**

    (classical FSMs, Moore ‘64, Kurshan ‘90)
  - **asynchronous**

    (CCS, Milner ‘80; CSP, Hoare ‘85)

FSM Example

- **Informal specification:**

  If the driver

  turns on the key, and

  does not fasten the seat belt within 5 seconds

  then an alarm beeps

  for 5 seconds, or

  until the driver fastens the seat belt, or

  until the driver turns off the key

FSM Example



If no condition is satisfied, implicit self-loop in the current state

FSM Definition

- **FSM = (I, O, S, r, δ, λ)**
- **I = { KEY_ON, KEY_OFF, BELT_ON, END_TIMER_5, END_TIMER_10 }**
- **O = { START_TIMER, ALARM_ON, ALARM_OFF }**
- **S = { OFF, WAIT, ALARM }**
- **r = OFF**

Set of all subsets of I (implicit "and")

All other inputs are implicitly absent

- $\delta : 2^I \times S \rightarrow S$

  e.g. δ({KEY_OFF}, WAIT) = OFF

- $\lambda : 2^I \times S \rightarrow 2^O$

  e.g. λ ({KEY_ON}, OFF) = {START_TIMER}

Non-deterministic FSMs

- **δ and λ may be *relations* instead of *functions*:**
  - $\delta \subseteq 2^I \times S \times S$

implicit "and" *implicit "or"*

e.g. δ({KEY_OFF, END_TIMER_5}, WAIT) = {{OFF}, {ALARM}}

  - $\lambda \subseteq 2^I \times S \times 2^O$
- **Non-determinism can be used to describe:**
  - **an unspecified behavior**
    (incomplete specification)
  - **an unknown behavior**
    (environment modeling)

NDFSM: incomplete specification

- **E.g. error checking first partially specified:**



- **Then completed as *even parity*:**



- **Could be implemented as CRC later**

NDFSM: unknown behavior

- **Modeling the *environment***
- **Useful to:**
  - **optimize (don't care conditions)**
  - **verify (exclude impossible cases)**
- **E.g. driver model:**



=> KEY_ON or KEY_OFF or BELT_ON

- **Can be refined**

  E.g. introduce timing constraints (minimum reaction time 0.1 s)

NDFSM: time range

- Special case of unspecified/unknown behavior, but so common to deserve special treatment for efficiency
- E.g. undetermined delay between 6 and 10 s



NDFSMs and FSMs

- **Formally FSMs and NDFSMs are equivalent (Rabin-Scott construction, Rabin '59)**
- **In practice, NDFSMs are often more compact (exponential blowup for determinization)**





FSM Composition

- **Bridle complexity via hierarchy: *FSM product yields an FSM***
- **Fundamental hypothesis:**
  all the FSMs change state together (*synchronicity*)
- **System state = Cartesian product of component states**
  (state explosion may be a problem...)
- **E.g. seat belt control + timer**



FSM Composition



FSM Composition

- **product of FSM_1 and FSM_2**
- **$I = I_1 \cup I_2$**
- **$O = O_1 \cup O_2$**
- **Assume e.g. that $o_1 \in I_2$, $o_1 \in O_1$ (communication)**
- **$S = S_1 \times S_2$**
- **δ e λ are such that, e.g., for each pair:**
  - **$\delta_1(\{i_1\}, s_1) = t_1$, $\lambda_1(\{i_1\}, s_1) = \{o_1\}$**
  - **$\delta_2(\{i_2, o_1\}, s_2) = t_2$, $\lambda_1(\{i_2\}, s_2) = \{o_2\}$**

  we have:
  - **$\delta(\{i_1, i_2, o_1\}, (s_1, s_2)) = (t_1, t_2)$**
  - **$\lambda(\{i_1, i_2, o_1\}, (s_1, s_2)) = \{o_1, o_2\}$**

Summary of Finite State Machines

- **Advantages:**
  - **Easy to use (graphical languages)**
  - **Powerful algorithms for**
    - **synthesis (SW and HW)**
    - **verification**
- **Disadvantages:**
  - **Sometimes overspecify implementation**

    (sequencing is fully specified)
  - **Numerical computations cannot be specified compactly**

    (need extended FSMs)



Extended FSM Example

```
Process 1:
forever {
      x = 0; y = 0;
      while (x < 10) {
            y = y + get_data (B);
            x = x + 1;
      }
      put_data (A, y / 10);
}
```

```
Process 2:
forever {
      a = get_data (A);
      if (a < 0)
            put_data (C, a);
      else
            put_data (D, - a);
}
```



Extended FSM Example



Formal Extended FSM Example



Extended FSM primitives



initial state



state



decision

transition



FSM/data connection



constant

variable

communication channel

data dependency

operator

loading

Communication models

- **Synchronous:**

  all FSMs make a transition simultaneously

- **Asynchronous:**

  communication is mediated by "channels":

  - **blocking write/blocking read**

    (rendez-vous: both partners must be ready)

  - **non-blocking write/blocking read**

    (FIFOs)

  - **non-blocking write/non-blocking read**

    (shared variables)

Communication models

- **Synchronous:**
  - **predictable (determinacy)**
  - **highly constraining**
- **Asynchronous:**
  - **unpredictable (result depends on scheduling/timing)**
  - **does not constrain the implementation**

    (good for heterogeneous embedded systems)
  - **blocking write: difficult to implement correctly**
  - **non-blocking write: needs unbounded buffers (or may lose events)**
  - **non-blocking read: consistency problems**

Outline

- Reactive Real-Time Embedded Systems
- Specification Models and Languages
  - Data Flow
  - Extended Finite State Machines
- Proposed Design Methodology
  - System Specification
  - Validation
  - System Partitioning
  - Software, Hardware and Interface Synthesis
  - Real-time Operating System and Scheduling
- Summary

Software Models

- **Advantages:**
  - **Executable model**
  - **Object-oriented analysis:**
    - **Natural hierarchical decomposition**
    - **Inheritance**

      (simplifies extension and re-use)
    - **Method invocation as communication primitive**
- **Disadvantages:**
  - **Strongly biased towards SW**
  - **(Almost) impossible to verify formally**



Object-Oriented Methodologies

- **Various CASE methodologies use an Object-Oriented paradigm**

  (Shlaer-Mellor ‘88)
- **Languages are widely known (C++, Java, ...)**
- **Typical domains of application:**
  - **Rapid prototyping**
  - **Complex (mainly SW) systems**
  - **Network-wide programming**
- **The Object-oriented ideas are not limited to software models !!!**

Hardware Simulation Models

- **Advantages:**
  - **Powerful algorithms for**
    - **synthesis**
    - **verification**
  - **(Almost) standard languages (VHDL, Verilog, UDL/I)**
  - **Timing is handled explicitly**
  - **Software-like extensions (e.g. VHDL, Verilog)**
- **Disadvantages:**
  - **Strongly biased towards HW**
  - **Not really formal...**



Hardware Simulation Models

- **Typical domain of application:**
  - **Hardware design**
- **Can be considered a least common denominator among SW and HW**
- **With some constraints, can have an EFSM-based semantics**
  - **“synthesizable subsets”**
  - **cycle-based simulation**

Outline

- Reactive Real-Time Embedded Systems
- Specification Models and Languages
  - Data Flow
  - Extended Finite State Machines
- Proposed Design Methodology
  - System Specification
  - Validation
  - System Partitioning
  - Software, Hardware and Interface Synthesis
  - Real-time Operating System and Scheduling
- Summary

Reactive Specification Languages

- **Main aspects of language choice:**
  - **Ease of use (domain-specific)**
  - **Availability of tools/methodologies:**
    - **a tool/methodology implies one or more languages (and models)**
    - **graphical capabilities**
  - **(e.g. structured analysis uses DF and FSMs)**
  - **Standards/regulations**
  - **Tradition ...**

Graphical FSM Languages

- StateCharts, BetterCharts, SpeedCharts, ...
  (Har'el '90)
- Easy to use for control-dominated systems
- Simulation (animated), SW and HW synthesis
- Extended with arithmetics
- Hierarchical states necessary for complex reactive system specification



Synchronous Languages

- **Assumptions:**
  - **the system continuously reacts to internal and external *events* by emitting other events**
  - **events can occur only at discrete instants**
  - ***zero* (negligible) reaction time**
- **Both control (Esterel) and data flow (Lustre, Signal)**
- **Very simple syntax and clean semantics**

  (based on FSMs)
- **Deterministic behavior**
- **Simulation, software and hardware synthesis, verification**

ESTEREL

- Designed at INRIA by Berry et al.
- Concurrent modules:
  - interface signals, possibly with values
  - local signals and variables
  - statements, e.g.:
    - await (single or multiple signals)
    - do stmt1 watching signal [timeout stmt2] (instantaneous killing of stmt1)
    - trap exception in stmt1 [handle do stmt2] (allow stmt1 to terminate)
  - allows “external” procedures and functions

Example: readable counter

```
module counter:
input go, reset, req; output ack(integer);
var t:integer in
loop do
    t:=0;
    every go do
        t:=t+1;
        await req; emit ack(t)
    end
watching reset
end end.
```



Summary of Models/Languages

- **Models/languages for control and data:**
  - **same object (embedded computation), yet...**
  - **different specification, different optimization, different validation**
- **Currently: need to pick style at the beginning, and hope for the best**
- **Future:**
  - **at least, mix styles freely**
  - **at best, decouple *specification* and *optimization* styles**

    (unified underlying model)

Outline

- Reactive Real-Time Embedded Systems
- Specification Models and Languages
  - Data Flow
  - Extended Finite State Machines
- Proposed Design Methodology
  - System Specification
  - Validation
  - System Partitioning
  - Software, Hardware and Interface Synthesis
  - Real-time Operating System and Scheduling
- Summary

Main Codesign Methods and Tools

- **CHINOOK (Chou, Ortega, Borriello et al. '92-...)**
- **COSYMA (Ernst, Henkel et al. '92-...)**
- **MEIJE (Berry, Gonthier, Halbwachs, Caspi, Benveniste, Le Guernic et al. '91-...)**
- **POLIS (Chiodo, Lavagno, Sangiovanni et al. '92-...)**
- **PTOLEMY (Kalavade, Buck, Lee et al. '92-...)**
- **VULCAN (Gupta, Coelho, De Micheli et al. '92-...)**
- **...**

CHINOOK (U. of Washington)

- **Specification: Verilog HDL**
- **Internal representation: Event Graph (CDFG)**
- **Validation: none specific (Verilog simulation)**
- **Partitioning: directed by scheduling constraints**
- **Scheduling: aimed at satisfying timing constraints**
  (“modes” allow complex constraints)
- **Synthesis: Verilog to C translator**
- **Main emphasis on *interface synthesis***
  (port assignment and driver synthesis)

COSYMA (U. of Braunschweig)

- Specification: C* (C++ extended with concurrency)
- Internal representation: ES graph (CDFG)
- Validation: none specific (C++ execution)
- Partitioning: two nested loops
  - outer: hand-driven, uses synthesis and profiling for cost estimation
  - inner: simulated annealing, uses quick estimator
- Scheduling: none specific
- Synthesis: hardware extraction from (subset of) ES graph
- Main emphasis on *partitioning* for hardware accelerators

MEIJE (INRIA and others)

- **Specification: synchronous languages for control and data flow (Esterel, Lustre, Signal)**
- **Internal representation: OC (EFSM)**
- **Validation:**
  - **synchronous simulation**
  - **formal verification**
- **Partitioning: none**
- **Scheduling: not needed (synchronous hypothesis)**
- **Synthesis: hardware from EFSM, software from hardware**
- **Main emphasis on *determinate* reaction to events**

POLIS (U. C. Berkeley)

- **Specification: FSM-based languages (Esterel, ...)**
- **Internal representation: CFSM network**
- **Validation:**
  - **high-level co-simulation**
  - **FSM-based formal verification**
- **Partitioning: by hand, based on co-simulation estimates**
- **Scheduling: classical RT algorithms**
- **Synthesis:**
  - **S-graph-based code synthesis for software**
  - **logic synthesis for hardware**
- **Main emphasis on *unbiased verifiable specification***

PTOLEMY (U. C. Berkeley)

- **Specification: Data Flow graph**
- **Internal representation: DFG**
- **Validation: multi-paradigm co-simulation**
  (DF, discrete events, ...)
- **Partitioning: greedy, based on scheduling**
- **Scheduling: linear, sorting blocks by "criticality"**
  (bit-level in HW, memory-intensive in SW)
- **Synthesis:**
  - **DSP code stitching for software**
  - **custom DSP synthesis (LAGER) for hardware**
- **Main emphasis on *heterogeneous computation models***

VULCAN (Stanford U.)

- **Specification: Hardware C**
- **Internal representation: CDFG**
- **Validation: custom co-simulator**
- **Partitioning: greedy, based on scheduling**
- **Scheduling: timing-driven**
  - **each I/O operation or unbounded loop initiates a *thread***
- **Synthesis: high-level synthesis (OLYMPUS) for hardware**
- **Main emphasis on *timing-driven* scheduling of threads**

Outline

- Reactive Real-Time Embedded Systems
- Specification Models and Languages
  - Data Flow
  - Extended Finite State Machines
- Proposed Design Methodology
  - System Specification
  - Validation
  - System Partitioning
  - Software, Hardware and Interface Synthesis
  - Real-time Operating System and Scheduling
- Summary

Our Co-design Environment



Codesign Finite State Machines

- We have chosen an FSM model for
  - uncommitted
  - synthesizable
  - verifiable

  HW/SW specification
- Translators from state diagrams, Esterel, HDLs into a single FSM-based language
- Need efficient hw/sw communication primitive:
  - Event broadcasting
- Software response could take a long time:
  - Unbounded delay assumption

Communication primitive: event

- One-way data communication
- Need efficient implementation

  (interrupts, buffers...)
- No mutual synchronization requirement, but...

  ➠Building block for higher-level synchronization primitives
- Examples:
  - *valued event* : temperature sample
  - *pure event* : excessive temperature alarm

Introducing a CFSM...

- **A Finite State Machine**
- **Input events, output events and *state* events**
- **Initial values (for state events)**
- **A transition function**
  - **Transitions may involve *complex, memory-less, instantaneous* arithmetic and/or Boolean functions**
  - **All the state of the system is under form of events**
- **Need rules that define the CFSM behavior**

CFSM Rules: phases

- **Four-phase cycle:**
  - **❶ Idle**
  - **❷ Detect input events**
  - **❸ Execute one transition**
  - **❹ Emit output events**
- **Discrete time**
  - **Sufficiently accurate for synchronous systems**
  - **Feasible formal verification**
- **Model semantics: *Timed Traces* i.e. sequences of events labeled by time of occurrence**

CFSM Trace Semantics



CFSM Rules: phases

- **Implicit *unbounded delay* between phases**
- ***Non-zero* reaction time (avoid *inconsistencies* when interconnected): minimum delay is 1 time unit**
- ***Causal* model based on *partial order* (potential verification speed-up)**
- **Phases may overlap**

CFSM Rules: events

- Hw is always “ready”
- Software may not be ready
  - Events may be “lost”
  - Implicit depth-1 buffer associated with every event
- Event: basic tool to implement synchronization
  - Trigger event can cause at most 1 transition
  - All output events of a transition must be emitted

CFSM Rules: additional constraints

- What if some event may not be lost ?
- Tag some event as “critical”
- The problem is deferred to the partitioning and scheduling phases:
  - use Formal Verification to identify critical events
  - partition or schedule the system so that the resulting constraint is satisfied
- The same technique can be used to assign *priorities* to events

Network of CFSMs: Depth-1 Buffers



CFSMs and FSMs

- **The best known automated formal verification methods are based on synchronous FSMs**
  - ➠ **define the behavior of a CFSM network as an equivalent "standard" FSM network**
- **Event-driven model: self-loop until events are detected**
- **Depth-1 buffers on input and output events implemented as *non-deterministic* FSMs**
- **Additional "verifiability" (atomicity) constraints:**
  - **events are detected only if a transition occurs**
  - **all inputs are "cleared" if a transition occurs**

Buffer FSMs





Software Hardware Intermediate FormaT

- CSFM network
  - Specific representation format: SHIFT
  - Unbounded-delay interpretation
- SHIFT description
  - List of input variables
  - List of output variables
  - Tabular transition relation
  - Arithmetic expressions represented as (library) function netlists

Our Co-design Environment



Hardware - Software Architecture

- **Hardware:**
  - **One or more microcontrollers**
  - **ASICs, DSPs....**
- **Software:**
  - **Set of concurrent *tasks***
  - **Scheduler**
  - ➠**Customized operating system**
- **Interfaces:**
  - **Hardware modules**
  - **Software procedures (polling, interrupt handlers, ...)**

System Partitioning



Interfaces Among Partitions

- **Automatically generated**
- **Standardized strobe/data protocol (corresponding to the event/value primitive)**
- **Allow to use hand-designed modules (following the interfacing convention)**



An example of interface: hw to sw







Our Co-design Environment



System Validation

- Safety-critical real-time systems *must* be validated
- Explicit exhaustive simulation is infeasible
- Formal verification can achieve the same level of safeness
- How to use verification and simulation together ?
- Simulation can be used initially for
  - Quick functional debugging
  - Ruling out obvious cases (can be expensive to verify)
- Then formal verification takes over for exhaustive checking, but...
- Simulation is used again as *user interface* to provide the designer with *error traces*

Example of Formal Verification



Example of Formal Verification

- **Untimed property, e.g. using Temporal Logic (CTL, Pnueli '77)**
  - **AG(ALARM_ON --> AF(ALARM_OFF))**

- **Assumption: *non-zero unbounded* delays**
  - **Property doesn't hold**
  - **Deduce reason for failure from error trace**
    - **Need tighter delay range**
    - **Specification refinement**

Example of Formal Verification

- **Pick any delay K**
  - **Property holds**

- **Conclusion:**
  - **Any implementation with *bounded non-zero* delays satisfies the property**

Example of Formal Verification

- **Timed property, e.g. Timed Temporal Logic (TCTL, Koymans '85)**
  - **AG(ALARM_ON --> $AF_{<6\ s}$(ALARM_OFF))**
- **Property doesn't hold for all K, it only holds for:**
  - **0 input delay, and**
  - **output delay ranging from 0 to 0.5 s**

Example of Formal Verification

- **A weaker timed property**
  - **AG(ALARM_ON-->$AF_{<11s}$(ALARM_OFF))**
- **There are some combinations of input and output delays that satisfy the property**
- **This delay information can be used to “refine” the specification and restrict “legal” implementations to be consistent with the specification**

Example of Formal Verification

- Purely hardware implementation
  - Both “6s” and “11s” properties hold if propagation delay < 0.5s
- Hw-Sw implementation
  - Software implementation has non-zero input delays
    - No Hw-Sw can satisfy the “6s” property: zero input delay is not feasible
  - Some “fast” Hw-Sw implementation can satisfy the “11s” property

Problems of Formal Verification

- Is the error trace “real?”
  - Maybe not, because of our simple model of environment...
  - No driver can turn off and on the key in one tenth of a second !
  - ➠Some behaviors may not be possible
- The cause of failure may be hard to decipher from “automatic” simulation
- Formal verification is hard (state explosion)
  - Longest run takes 6.5 hrs
    - 60 million states (time unit 0.1s)

Our Co-design Environment



High-level Co-simulation

- **Functional (untimed) simulation allows:**
  - **functional (partial) correctness, by generating inputs and observing outputs**
  - **debugging, by easy access to internal states**
- **High-level (timed) co-simulation allows:**
  - **feasibility analysis for specification**
  - **hardware/software partitioning**
  - **architecture selection (CPU, scheduler, ...)**
- **Cannot be used to validate the final implementation**
  - ☞ **need a much more detailed model of HW and SW architecture**

Co-simulation Requirements

- Fast, for rapid testing of
  - different input stimuli
  - different architectures
- Interactive
  - quickly change architectural parameters
  - easily analyze results and debug

    (graphical interface)
- Accurate
  - hardly compatible with speed and interactivity

Existing tools and methods

- Hardware-oriented simulation
  - Processor modeled at instruction or Register Transfer level (Verilog, VHDL, ...)
  - Fairly accurate, but fairly slow
- Functional simulation (mostly for DSP)
  - “Block” programming environments
    - data flow: MATLAB, SPW, COSSAP, ...
    - control flow: SDL, StateCharts, ...
  - System modeled as discrete or continuous data flow
  - Computation time is usually ignored
- Prototyping (breadboards...)

Our co-simulation approach

- **Based on synthesized software timing estimates**
- **Synthesized C code annotated with clock cycles required on several processors**
- **Clock cycle accumulation during simulation to synchronize the software**
  - **with the hardware**
  - **with the environment**
- **Uses Ptolemy (Lee *et al.* 92) as:**
  - **graphical interface**
  - **simulation engine**

    (heterogeneous models can coexist)

Our Co-simulation Approach

- **Resource scheduling problem:**
  - **hardware CFSMs are concurrent**

    (simulated in a cycle-based fashion)
  - **only one software CFSM can be active at a time**
  - **use the same (selectable) scheduling policy as will be used in the real system**

Trade-off Evaluation

- Parameters associated with each hierarchy level:
  - can be changed on the fly (no recompilation)
  - define different architectural aspects:
    - implementation of each CFSM
    - CPU type, clock speed, ...
    - constant inputs (scaling factors, priorities, ...)
- Hierarchical inheritance eases structured partitioning
- Automatically transmitted to following synthesis steps

Types of analysis

- Powerful graphical environment to generate inputs and analyze outputs (Ptolemy)
- Functional simulation:
  - no clock cycle accumulation
  - useful for debugging and demonstration to customer

    ("virtual prototype")
- Timed co-simulation:
  - "Lost" input events (missed deadlines) can be selectively reported
  - CPU utilization graphs (for schedulability analysis)

Future Work

- Interrupt handling
  - nested interrupts
  - maskable interrupts
- Multi-processor systems
  - static allocation
  - dynamic allocation
- Clock accumulation also within the scheduler
- Co-simulation in other environments
  - VHDL, Verilog output for HW and SW

Our Co-design Environment



Software Implementation Problem

- **Input:**
  - **set of tasks (specified by CFSMs)**
  - **set of timing constraints (e.g., input event rates and response constraints)**
- **Output:**
  - **set of procedures that implement the tasks**
  - **scheduler that satisfies the timing constraints**
- **Minimizing:**
  - **CPU cost**
  - **memory size**
  - **power, etc.**

Software Implementation

- How to do it ?
- Traditional approach:
  - hand-coding of procedures
  - hand-estimation of timing input to scheduling algorithms
- Long and error-prone
- Our approach: three-step *automated* procedure:
  - synthesize each task separately
  - extract (estimated) timing
  - schedule the tasks
- Customized RT-OS (scheduler + drivers)

Software Implementation

- **Current strategy:**
  - **Iterate between synthesis, estimation and scheduling**
  - **Designer chooses the scheduling algorithm**
- **Future work:**
  - **Top-down propagation of timing constraints**
  - **Software synthesis under constraints**
  - **Automated scheduling selection**

    (based on CPU utilization estimates)

Software Implementation

- **Sub-problems:**
  - **Find appropriate representations for**
    - **code optimization**
    - **scheduling**
  - **Find appropriate code optimization algorithms**

    (timing and memory occupation)
  - **Find appropriate scheduling algorithm**

    (guaranteed performance with acceptable overhead)

Software synthesis procedure



Task implementation

- **Goal: quick response time, within timing and size constraints**
- **Problem statement:**
  - **Given a CFSM transition function and constraints**
  - **Find a procedure implementing the *transition function* while meeting the constraints**
- **The procedure code is acyclic:**
  - **powerful optimization and analysis techniques**
  - **looping, state storage etc. are implemented outside (in the OS)**

Representation Issues

- The software representation should be:
  - Low-level enough to allow detailed optimization and estimation
  - High-level enough to avoid excessive details

    e.g. register allocation, instruction selection
- Main types of “user-mode” instructions:
  - data movement
  - ALU
  - conditional/unconditional branches
  - subroutine calls
- RTOS handles I/O, interrupts and so on

Multi-valued Decision Diagrams

- Extension of Binary-valued Decision Diagram (Akers ‘69, Bryant ‘86, Kam’92)
  - Appropriate for control-dominated tasks
  - Single-path, single-test evaluation
  - Size strongly depends on variable ordering
  - Well-developed set of optimization techniques
- Must be augmented with arithmetic and Boolean operators, to perform data computations



Our Representation: S-graphs

- Acyclic extended decision diagram computing a transition function
- S-graph structure:
  - directed acyclic graph
  - set of finite-valued variables
  - TEST nodes evaluate an expression and branch accordingly
  - ASSIGN nodes evaluate an expression and assign its result to a variable

An example of S-graph

- input event *c
- output event *y
- state int a
- input int b
- forever

```
if (detect(*c))
    if (a < b)
        a := a + 1
        emit(*y)
    else
        a := 0
        emit(*y)
```



S-graphs and functions

- **Execution of an s-graph computes a function from a set of input and state variables to a set of output and state variables:**
  - **Output variables are initially undefined**
  - **Traverse the s-graph from BEGIN to END**
- **Well-formed s-graph:**
  - **every time a function depending on a variable is evaluated, that variable has a defined value**
- **How do we derive an s-graph implementing a given function ?**

S-graphs and functions

- **Problem statement:**
  - **Given: a finite-valued multi-output function over a set of finite-valued variables**
  - **Find: an s-graph implementing it**
- **Procedure based on Shannon expansion**

  $f = x\, f_x + x'\, f_{x'}$
- **Result heavily depends on ordering of variables in expansion**
  - **inputs before outputs: TESTs dominate over ASSIGNs**
  - **outputs before inputs: ASSIGNs dominate over TESTs**

Example of S-graph construction

x = a b + c

y = a b + d

Order: a, b, c, d, x, y (inputs before outputs)



Example of S-graph construction

x = a b + c

y = a b + d

Order: a, b, x, y, c, d (interleaving inputs and outputs)



S-graph optimization

- General trade-off:
  - TEST-based is faster than ASSIGN-based (each variable is visited at most once)
  - ASSIGN-based is smaller than TEST-based (there is more potential for sharing)
- The procedure can be iterated over s-graph fragments:
  - local optimization, depending on fragment criticality (speed versus size)
  - constraint-driven optimization (still to be explored)

From S-graphs to instructions

- **TEST nodes ➔ conditional branches**
- **ASSIGN nodes ➔ ALU ops and data moves**
- **No loops in a *single* CFSM transition**

  (user loops handled at the RTOS level)
- **Data flow handling:**
  - **“don’t touch” them (except common subexpression extraction)**
  - **map expression DAGs to C expressions**
  - **C compiler allocates registers and select opcodes**
- **Need source-level debugging environment (with any of the chosen entry languages)**

Software synthesis procedure



Performance and cost estimation

- S-graph: low-level enough to allow accurate performance estimation
- Cost parameters assigned to each node, depending on:
  - system type (CPU, memory, bus, ...)
  - node and expression type
- Cost parameters evaluated via simple benchmarks
  - need timing and size measurements for each target system
  - currently implemented for MIPS, 68332 and 68HC11 processors

Performance and cost estimation

- Example: 68HC11 timing estimation
- Cost assigned to s-graph edges
  - (different costs for taken/not taken branches)
- Estimated time:
  - min: 26 cycles
  - max: 126 cycles
- Accuracy: within 20% of profiling



Experimental results (68HC11)



Experimental results (68HC11)



- **Support:**
  inputs before dependent outputs
- **Two-level:**
  switch on state
  switch on inputs

Future Work

- **Better synthesis techniques**
  - **add state variables to simplify s-graph**
  - **performance-driven synthesis of critical paths**
  - **exact memory/speed trade-off**
- **Estimation of caching and pipelining effects**
  - **may have little impact on control-dominated systems**

    (frequent branches and context switches)
  - **relatively easy during co-simulation**

Software synthesis procedure



The scheduling problem

- **Given:**
  - **estimates on the minimum and maximum execution times for each CFSM transition (from the S-graph)**
  - **a set of timing constraints**

    e.g., input event rates and input-to-output deadlines, “critical” events
- **Find an execution ordering for CFSM transitions that satisfies the constraints:**
  - **either static, pre-computed (off-line)**
  - **or dynamic, decided at run time (on-line)**

Scheduling algorithms

- **Off-line scheduling: determine a cyclic execution order that satisfies the constraints**
  - **weak constraints: round-robin cyclic executive**

    (like the synchronous hypothesis in Esterel)
  - **tight constraints: call each CFSM only when it is expected to receive an event**

    (based on expected I/O rates)
- **Advantages: simple, fast, highly predictable**

  (essential for mission-critical systems)
- **Disadvantage: low utilization of CPU to guarantee constraint satisfaction**

Scheduling algorithms

- On-line scheduling: determine a set of priority values that determine the next runnable CFSM
- Priorities can be statically or dynamically determined
- A running CFSM may or may not be interrupted in the middle of a transition

  (preemptive/non-preemptive algorithms)
- Advantage: higher CPU utilization
- Disadvantage: more complex, higher overhead (dynamic and preemptive most complex)

Scheduling algorithms

- Currently implemented algorithms:
  - round-robin cyclic executive
  - off-line I/O rate-based cyclic executive
  - static pre-emptive: Rate Monotonic Scheduling (Liu '73):
    - highest I/O rate has highest priority
  - dynamic pre-emptive: Earliest Deadline First (Liu '73):
    - CFSM with nearest deadline has highest priority

Problems with Current Approach

- Current scheduling algorithms:
  - Lots of manual analysis required
  - Either guaranteed performance with high overhead
  - Or no guarantee but highly efficient
  - Schedulability analysis is usually very pessimistic
    - ☞ waste of CPU power at run time
- Scheduling algorithm choice is left to the user

Future Work

- **Propagation of constraints from external I/O behavior to each CFSM**
  - **probabilistic: Markov chains**
  - **exact: FSM state traversal**
- **Satisfaction of constraints within a single transition**

  (e.g., software-driven bus interface protocol)
- **Automatic choice of scheduling algorithm, based on performance estimation and constraints**
- **Scheduling for verifiability**

Other scheduling models

- **Problem: computation result may depend on dynamic schedule**
- **Synchronous systems (Esterel, Signal, Lustre): no scheduler needed**

  (as long as the software is fast enough)
- **Data-flow systems: result does not depend on scheduling if event detection is blocking (Kahn '74)**
- **Can we obtain determinism without losing efficiency ?**

Our Co-design Environment



Hardware Synthesis

- CFSMs interpreted as synchronous register-transfer specification
- Direct implementation as combinational logic + registers
- Non-zero delay implemented by latching all the outputs
  - Ensures correct composition (Moore-type synchronous FSMs)
  - Improves testability
- Logic synthesis for various target implementations
  - FPGAs and FPICs for rapid prototyping

Hardware Synthesis



Our Co-design Environment



Micro-controller peripherals

- **Custom HW (fully programmable, expensive)**
- **On-chip or off-chip peripheral (partially programmable, inexpensive)**



Previous work

- **Chou et al. (DAC 94): synthesis of device drivers**

  (given choice and protocol)
- **Mitra et al. (TVLSI 96): mapping of function to complex peripheral devices**

  (syntactic matching only)

Peripheral modeling approach

- **Ideally: implement specified function using peripherals (if possible)**
- **Currently: use three models**
  - **Behavioral (Ptolemy) model for co-simulation**
  - **CFSM model for RTL co-simulation and rapid prototyping**
  - **C model for implementation (programming and interfacing with the peripheral)**
- **Parameters customize *all* models simultaneously**

  (plug-in replacement of abstraction levels)
- **Synthesizable CFSM model key to limited re-targetability**

Peripheral modeling approach

- **The user must**
  - **decide in advance which functions *may need to be* implemented on a library peripheral**
  - **choose the best fitting model from a library**
  - **co-simulate to decide implementation**

    (SW, custom HW, peripheral, …)
- **The co-design environment takes care of:**
  - **synthesizing in SW or HW**
  - **extracting peripheral programming SW from library**

    (may be partially micro-controller independent)
  - **interfacing transparently**

Current Status

- Modeled various peripherals of the 68hc11 family
  - Timer unit
    - input capture (measuring time of events)
    - output compare (generating delays)
  - A/D converter
  - PWM generators
- Writing and debugging a new model requires 1-2 days (for simple peripherals)

Our Co-design Environment



Why hardware prototypes ?

- High-level co-simulation cannot be used to validate the final implementation
  - need a much more detailed model of HW and SW architecture
- Low-level co-simulation (using HW simulator) is too slow
- Need to validate the design in the real environment
- Example: engine control
  - specification cannot be formalized

    ("must run well")
  - must be loaded on a vehicle for test drives

Rapid prototyping methodology

- **Synthesis from a high-level uncommitted specification**
- **Hardware, software, RT-OS and interfaces are automatically generated**
- **Use the APTIX Field-Programmable Interconnect Circuits to quickly modify the board configuration**
- **System netlist changes reflected on the board in a matter of minutes**
- **Can be programmed via EPROM for field deployment**

The APTIX Board



The Development Environment



The Development Environment

- Microcontroller emulator for software debugging
- XCHECKER to program and observe XILINX FPGAs
- APTIX FPIC-D can bring any interconnection to a logic analyzer pod
- APTIX software can program the HP logic analyzer
- Currently the bottleneck is the FPGA programming environment (slow CAD, slow programming, slow debugging)

Current status and future work

- Virtual prototyping environment is complete
- Physical prototyping environment:
  - debugged “toy” system
  - currently developing a dashboard controller
- Future work:
  - enhance software debugging capabilities
    (ESTEREL source debugging via emulator)
  - automate system netlist generation
  - explore new types of FPGAs

Current Design Flow

- System specification:
  - ESTEREL
  - FSM editor
  - graphical CFSM net editor
- SW synthesis and estimation
- High-level co-simulation
  - functional debugging
  - trade-off evaluation
- Formal verification
- SW, HW, RTOS synthesis
- Low-level co-simulation and prototyping

Car dashboard example

- Implemented a dashboard controller:
  - Speedometer and odometer
  - Safety functions (seat-belt alarm)
  - Fuel gauge control
- Timing functions implemented by the user (custom scheduler)
- 23 interacting CFSMs, of 13 different sorts:
  - Speed, Odo, RPM (speedometer, odometer)
  - Belt (safety)
  - Crossdisp (fuel)
  - FRC, Timer (scheduler)

Car dashboard example

- Control functions specified with Esterel
  - automated translation from Esterel to CFSMs
- CFSM interconnection specified graphically



Car Dashboard Implementation (I)

- Defined by hand, based on fast co-simulation output
- Custom HW blocks:
  - Timer counter (originally part of 68HC11 timer unit)
  - PWM generators (jitter is critical)
- SW blocks: everything else
- Estimated code size: 7Kbytes (excluding OS)
- Estimated CLBs on XILINX: >170
- HW/SW communication: 31 bits (events) + 82 bytes (values) of memory-mapped I/O

Car Dashboard Implementation (I)

- **Actual code size:**
  - **user code: 9130 bytes ROM + 370 bytes RAM**
  - **custom RTOS: 1543 bytes ROM + 1475 bytes RAM**
  - **size estimation accuracy: within 20%**

    (error due to ignoring different cost of SW MULT)
- **Actual HW size: 2 XILINX 3000**
  - **130 CLB + 50 I/O**
  - **144 CLB + 48 I/O**

  (automated partitioning)

Car dashboard Implementation (II)

- **Re-defined using 68HC11 peripherals:**
  - **Timer unit for input event processing and scheduling**
  - **PWM generators for outputs (on 68HC11GAUSS)**
- **SW blocks: everything else**
- **Estimated code size: 10Kbytes (including RTOS)**
- **PWM generators can also be implemented on FPGA (if not available on micro-controller)**

Comparison with Manual Design

- Exact comparison is difficult
- Similar code size

  (8K bytes vs. 10Kbytes)
- Synthesized code is much faster

  (3 times for the speedometer computation chain)
- RTOS overhead is being reduced
  - careful usage of RAM
  - support for micro-controller resource usage

    (timers, PWM generators, serial I/O)

Conclusions

- **Introduced a new model for hardware and software**
  - **Simple: finite state, no complex synchronization,...**
  - **Uncommitted to a specific implementation**
  - **Event-driven causal model with implicit unbounded delays**

Conclusions

- **The proposed methodology is based on a implementation - independent specification format**
- **Partitioning and synthesis are made easier by the common model used**
- **Partitioned hardware and software implementations are automatically generated**
- **The FSM model derived from a CFSM is compatible with many formal verification algorithms**

Conclusions

- Rapid prototyping is required for embedded system design
- Three levels of prototypes:
  - functional prototype, with animation
  - approximate timing prototype, for performance evaluation and partitioning
  - physical prototype for testing on the field
- All three depend on
  - uncommitted formal specification
  - automated synthesis