

# ARTEFACT GUIDE

This folder contains the Cheddar models files provided by the design exploration tool as trade-offs between schedulability and security.

## 1. Implementation

A design space exploration tool is proposed with the PAES method and Exhaustive method. Both methods require callCheddar\_securityAnalysis to perform scheduling and security analysis of solutions. The Ada packages in the *framework/paes* and *framework/architecture\_exploration\_tools* folders are the source folders.

A readme file (Readme\_T2P) is provided in *framework/architecture\_exploration\_tools* folder. It describes how to run the design exploration tool using the PAES method or the exhaustive method.

This code is part of the Cheddar source code that can be fetched at <http://beru.univ-brest.fr/svn/CHEDDAR/trunk/src>

## 2. Results of the design space exploration

With the Ada packages above, we can provide Cheddar models that correspond to trade-offs between schedulability and security for a given case study described through a cheddar model.

We performed different experiments to evaluate our tool. The results of the experiments are grouped into the folders described below.

### a. Experimentation2

The case study (test\_Rosace\_Jpeg.xmlv3) considered in this experiment is made of a flight controller and JPEG applications. The folders Task\_grain, App\_grain, Mix\_grain contain the provided solutions by the Paes method for each of the three mutation algorithms (task-grain, app-grain, mix-grain).

### b. Experimentation3

This experiment considers different case studies made of a flight controller, multimedia based application, CFAR, and autopilot applications. This experiment is conducted for the three mutation algorithms on each case study (test\_Unifast.xmlv3) generated by varying the processor utilization from 50% to 100%.

Each directory contains the provided solutions by the Paes method for each case study represented by its processor utilization.

### c. Experimentation4

This experiment is conducted for the mix-grain mutation algorithm on each case study (test\_Unifast.xmlv3) generated by varying the processor utilization  $U$  from 50% to 100%. It is also assumed that intra-partition communications are not vulnerable.

Each directory contains the provided solutions by the Paes method for each case study represented by its processor utilization.

### d. Experimentation 5

This experiment is conducted with the mix-grain algorithm on the case studies generated in experimentation 3, with processor utilization of 60% and 90%.

The directory Experimentation\_with\_max\_2partitions (resp. Experimentation\_with\_max\_4partitions) contains the provided solutions by the Paes method with the maximum number of two (resp. four) partitions.

#### **e. Experimentation6**

This experiment is conducted with the three mutation algorithms on the case study generated in experimentation 3 with a processor utilization of 60%. It also assumed the overheads of intra-partition and inter-partition communications based on the execution time of the APEX calls given from the benchmark SFPBench.

The folders Task\_grain, App\_grain, Mix\_grain contain the provided solutions by the Paes method for each of the three mutation algorithms.

#### **f. Experimentation7**

This experiment compares an approximate Pareto front obtained with our three PAES based approaches (mutation algorithms) to the exact Pareto front.

The directory Paes has folders Task\_grain, App\_grain, Mix\_grain containing the provided solutions by the Paes method with each of the three mutation algorithms.

The directory Exhaustive contains the provided solutions by the exhaustive method.