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About scheduling analysis

- **Simplified models of functions**: e.g. periodic task: processor demand + deadline.
- **Analysis**: feasibility tests, simulations, formal methods, …

1. **Scheduling Simulation**:

2. **Schedulability tests**:

   \[
   R_i = C_i + \sum_{j \in hp(i)} \left[ \frac{R_i}{P_j} \right] \cdot C_j
   \]

3. **Formal methods (e.g. model checking)**

   *Not used as much we can expect 😞*
About scheduling analysis and early verification

- **Motivation for early verification (source AMRDEC):**
  - 70% of fault are introduced during the design step; Only 3% are found/solved. Cost: x1
  - Unit test step: 20% of fault are introduced; 16% are found/solved. Cost: x5
  - Integration test step: 10% of fault are introduced; 50% are found/solved. Cost: x16

- **Objective:** increase the number of faults found at design step!

- **Early verification:** multiple verifications, including expected performances, i.e. deadlines can be met?
About scheduling analysis and early verification

1. How and what to model, in order to achieve early verifications?

2. Scheduling analysis requires advanced skills:
   - Numerous theoretical results: how to choose the right one?
   - Numerous assumptions for each result.
   - What to model? What to abstract?

3. Engineers must be helped to use tools and methods:
   - With which design languages?
   - How to use scheduling tools?

4. ...

What is the role of an Architecture Description Language?
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Cheddar project: context and motivations

Motivations: how to apply real-time scheduling analysis at early steps?

- Started in 2002 by U. of Brest, partnership with Ellidiss Tech. since 2008 (industrial support).
- Cheddar tool (open source, educational, research), AADLInspector (commercial product)
- Modeling language: AADL as a driving line since 2004

Other contributors: Télécom-Paris-Tech (L. Pautet, E. Borde), ISAE (J. Hugues), Univ. Lisboa (J. Rufino), Univ. Sfax (B. Zalila), IUC (C. Fotsing)

Main supports: Ellidiss Tech., Brittany council, Brest City, Finistère council, Thalès communication, EGIDE/Campus France
Cheddar project: context and motivations

1. Propose, implement (early) scheduling analysis (Cheddar), investigate how to use them with AADL (AADLInspector)

2. What to abstract from software and execution platform to achieve early scheduling analysis?
   - AADL (modeling language), Cheddar ADL (analysis language)

3. How to automatically perform scheduling analysis?

4. How to achieve tools interoperability?
   - Various involved tools: model editors (Stood), code generators (Ocarina), WCET (aiT), system-C simulators, design exploration tools (Ramses), scheduling analysis (Cheddar), tool chains (TASTE)
   - Relationships between tools, formalize data interoperability
Summary

1. About Scheduling analysis for early verification
2. Cheddar projet
3. AADL features to scheduling analysis
4. Example of AADL software modeling and scheduling analysis
5. Example of AADL execution platform modeling and scheduling analysis
6. Conclusion
What to model to achieve early scheduling analysis

1. Software side:
   - Workload: release time, execution time
   - Timing constraints
   - Software entity interferences, examples:
     - Tasks relationships/communication or synchronization: e.g. shared data, data flow
     - Task containers: ARINC 653 partition, process

2. Hardware (should be called execution platform) side:
   - Available resources, e.g. computing capabilities
   - Contention, interference, examples:
     - Processing units, cache, memory bus, NoC, …

3. Deployment

=> Architecture models
   => It is the role of an Architecture Description Language to model those elements
AADL to the rescue?

- Why AADL helps:
  - All required model elements are given for the analysis
    - Component categories: thread, data, processor
    - Feature categories: data access, data port, ...
    - Properties: Deadline, Priority, WCET, Ceiling Priority, ...
    - Annexes (e.g. behavior annex)
  - AADL semantic: formal and natural language
    - E.g. automata to define the concept of periodic thread
    - Close to the real-time scheduling analysis methods
  - Model engineering: reusability, several levels of abstraction
  - Tools & chain tools: AADL as a pivot language (international standard)
    - VERSA, OSATE, POLA/FIACRE/TINA, CARTS, MAST, Marzhin, Cheddar, ... by Ocarina/AADLInspector/RAMSES/MOSART/OSATE ...
AADL to the rescue?

- But AADL does not solve everything:
  - AADL is a complex language
  - How to ensure model elements are compliant with analysis requirements/assumptions, sustainability, accuracy, ...
  - Not a unique AADL model for a given system to model
  - Not a unique mapping between a design model and an analysis model
  - Having AADL scheduling analysis tools is not enough too, how to use them?
  - ...
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Let assume we have to evaluate a given architecture model in a design exploration flow.

Problem statement:

- Numerous schedulability tests; how to choose the right one?
- Numerous assumptions for each schedulability test; how to enforce them for a given model?
- How to automatically perform scheduling analysis?
Approach:

- Define a set of AADL architectural design patterns of real-time (critical) systems:
  - models a typical thread communication or synchronization + a typical execution platform
  - set of constraints on entities/properties of the model.

- For each design pattern, define schedulability tests that can be applied according to their applicability assumptions.

Schedulability analysis of an AADL model:

1. Check compliancy of his model with one of the design-patterns … which then gives him which schedulability tests we can apply.
2. Perform schedulability verification.
Example: «Ravenscar» design pattern

- Specification of various design patterns:
  - Time-triggered: sampling data port communication between threads
  - Ravenscar: PCP shared data communication between threads
  - Queued buffer/ARINC653: producer/consumer synchronization
  - Black board/ARINC653: readers/writers synchronization
  - ...
  - Compositions of design patterns.

- Ravenscar: used by TASTE/ESA

- Constraints defining “Ravenscar” to perform the analysis with a given schedulability test:
  - Constraint 1: all threads are periodic
  - Constraint 2: threads start at the same time
  - Constraint 3: shared data with PCP
  - Constraint n: fixed preemptive priority scheduling + uniprocessor
  - ...
Example: «Ravenscar» design pattern

- Properties related to processor component:

```plaintext
Preemptive_Scheduler : aadlboolean applies to (processor);

Scheduling_Protocol:
  inherit list of Supported_Scheduling_Protocols
  applies to (virtual processor, processor);
-- RATE_MONOTONIC_PROTOCOL,
-- POSIX_1003_HIGHEST_PRIORITY_FIRST_PROTOCOL,
-- ..
```
Example: «Ravenscar» design pattern

- Properties related to threads/data components:

  **Compute Execution Time**: Time Range
  applies to (thread, subprogram, ...);

  **Deadline**: inherit Time => Period applies to (thread, ...);

  **Period**: inherit Time applies to (thread, ...);

  **Dispatch Protocol**: Supported Dispatch Protocols
  applies to (thread);
  -- Periodic, Sporadic, Timed, Hybrid, Aperiodic, Backg.
  ...

  **Priority**: inherit aadlinteger applies to (thread, ..., data)

  **Concurrency Control Protocol**:
  Supported Concurrency Control Protocols applies to (data)
  -- None, PCP, ICPP, ...
Example: «Ravenscar» design pattern

thread implementation ordo_bus.impl
properties
    Dispatch_Protocol => Periodic;
    Compute_Execution_Time => 31 ms .. 50 ms;
    Deadline => 250 ms;
    Period => 250 ms;
end ordo_bus.impl;

data implementation black.impl
properties
    Concurrency_Control_Protocol => PRIORITY_CEILING_PROTOCOL;
end blanck.impl;

process implementation Application.impl
subcomponents
    camera : thread camera.impl;
    ordo_bus : thread ordo_bus.impl;
    target : data black.impl;
    ...
end Application.impl;

processor implementation leon2
properties
    Scheduling_Protocol => POSIX1003_HPF_PROTOCOL;
    Preemptive_Scheduler => true;
end leon2;

system implementation finder
subcomponents
    process1 : process soft.impl;
    cpu1 : processor leon2;
    ...
end finder;
Design pattern compliancy verification

- **Top right part:** real-time system architecture model to verify.
- **Bottom right part:** modeling of a feasibility test applicability assumption.
- **Left part:** result of the model compliancy analysis.
Example: «Ravenscar» design pattern
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AADL Modeling of Multiprocessor Systems

- **Problem statement:**
  1. Which design patterns for multiprocessor architectures?
  2. From scheduling analysis point of view: how to model classical multiprocessor scheduling analysis concepts:
     - *partitioned scheduling or global scheduling*
  3. Various multiprocessor architectures?
  4. With (or without) shared resources? cache unit, NoC?
  5. Which analysis methods?

- Example of a SoC with two Leon4 cores, with L1 cache and a multimedia application
Example: Design-Pattern for Partitioned Scheduling

```plaintext
SYSTEM IMPLEMENTATION product.impl
SUBCOMPONENTS
  hard : SYSTEM soc_leon4::soc.asic_leon4;
  bank0 : MEMORY ram.ddr2;
  bank2 : MEMORY ram.ddr2;
  soft : PROCESS edgeDetection.impl;
PROPERTIES
  actual_processor_binding => (REFERENCE(hard.Proc_System.Core1)) APPLIES TO soft.getLine;
  actual_processor_binding => (REFERENCE(hard.Proc_System.Core2)) APPLIES TO soft.sharp;
  actual_processor_binding => (REFERENCE(hard.Proc_System.Core2)) APPLIES TO soft.edge;
  Scheduling_Protocol => (Rate_Monotonic_Protocol) applies to hard.core1;
  Scheduling_Protocol => (Rate_Monotonic_Protocol) applies to hard.core2;
END product.impl;
```
Design exploration, i.e. task partitioning

AADL model before partitioning

AADL model after partitioning

Partitioning tools: RAMSES, AADLInspector, Cheddar
Example: Design-Pattern for Global Scheduling

Actual_Processor_Binding => (REFERENCE(hard.Proc_System.Core1),
REFERENCE(hard.Proc_System.Core2))
APPLIES TO soft.getLine;
Actual_Processor_Binding => (REFERENCE(hard.Proc_System.Core1),
REFERENCE(hard.Proc_System.Core2))
APPLIES TO soft.sharp;
Actual_Processor_Binding => (REFERENCE(hard.Proc_System.Core1),
REFERENCE(hard.Proc_System.Core2))
APPLIES TO soft.edge;
Scheduling_Protocol => Rate_Monotonic_Protocol applies to hard.Core1;
Scheduling_Protocol => Rate_Monotonic_Protocol applies to hard.Core2;

Actual_Processor_Binding => (REFERENCE(hard.Proc_System.Core1),
REFERENCE(hard.Proc_System.Core2)) applies to soft;
Example of analysis with AADLInspector
Problem statement: What to model to priority assignment?
- Thread code: to compute execution time and CFG
- Cache and memory configuration: to compute thread cache access profile
- Scheduling parameters

AADL: is able to model thread execution time, scheduling parameters, cache and memory configuration
- CFG? Behavior annex?
- Cache access profile (computed)? Properties? Behavior annex?
Shared resource example: cache unit

- **Example:** an example of user-defined property sets

```plaintext
PROCESSOR IMPLEMENTATION core.leon4
SUBCOMPONENTS
11_inst_cache : MEMORY cache.impl1 {
  BYTE_COUNT => 8192 Byte;
  CACHE_PROPERTIES::LINE_SIZE => 32 Byte;
  CACHE_PROPERTIES::CACHE_TYPE => Instruction_Cache;
  CACHE_PROPERTIES::SET_ASSOCIATIVITY => Set_Associative;
  CACHE_PROPERTIES::WRITE_POLICY => No_Allocated_Write_Through;
  CACHE_PROPERTIES::REPLACEMENT_POLICY => LRR;
  CACHE_PROPERTIES::CACHE_LEVEL => 1;
  CACHE_PROPERTIES::SET_SIZE => 2;
  CACHE_PROPERTIES::CACHE_COHERENCY_PROTOCOL => Private_Invalid;
};

11_data_cache : MEMORY cache.impl1 {
  BYTE_COUNT => 4096 Byte;
  CACHE_PROPERTIES::LINE_SIZE => 32 Byte;
  CACHE_PROPERTIES::CACHE_TYPE => Data_Cache;
  CACHE_PROPERTIES::SET_ASSOCIATIVITY => Set_Associative;
  CACHE_PROPERTIES::WRITE_POLICY => No_Allocated_Write_Through;
  CACHE_PROPERTIES::REPLACEMENT_POLICY => LRR;
  CACHE_PROPERTIES::CACHE_LEVEL => 1;
  CACHE_PROPERTIES::SET_SIZE => 2;
  CACHE_PROPERTIES::CACHE_COHERENCY_PROTOCOL => Private_Invalid;
};

END core.leon4;
```
In fixed priority preemptive scheduling context, tasks can preempt and evict data of other tasks in the cache.

Cache related preemption delay (CRPD): additional time to refill the cache with the cache blocks evicted by the preemption.

Problem statement:
- CRPD may be high, non-negligible preemption cost (Pellizzoni et al., 2007).
- No fixed priority assignment algorithm takes CRPD into account.
Approach:

- Extend Audsley’s priority assignment algorithm (Audsley, 1995) to take into account CRPD.
- CRPD-aware priority assignment algorithms (CPA) that assign priority to tasks and verify theirs schedulability.
- 5 algorithms with different levels of schedulability efficiency (1) and complexity (2), scalability (3).
- Implemented into Cheddar, Not available in AADLInspector today

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CPA-PT-Simplified</th>
<th>CPA-PT</th>
<th>CPA-Tree</th>
<th>Exhaustive Search</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>100 tasks</td>
<td>30 tasks</td>
<td>10 tasks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scheduling Simulator with execution platform shared resources

- **Problem statement:**
  - How to model shared resources? Abstraction level?
  - Tick accurate versus cycle accurate
  - Take into account various parameters from different sources (tools)
  - Theoretical issues (feasibility interval, sustainability, accuracy)

- Focus on instruction cache, NoC
- Not available in AADLInspector today

- **Example with NoC:**
  - Dual Task and Flow Model (DTFM) : computes the flow model from a task model, task mapping, precedence constraints on a NoC
  - Identify/compute delays induced by Wormhole XY NoC and perform scheduling analysis for AADL data port software design
  - Evaluation with tick + cycle accurate simulator (SHOC SystemC NoC simulator + Cheddar)
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Conclusion

- **AADL & early scheduling analysis:**
  - Design-pattern approach
  - Constraints on model entities (e.g. component categories, feature categories, properties, annexes) to enforce analysis
  - One model for a given intend
  - Examples of both software and execution platform modeling/analysis
  - Current work: multiprocessor architectures
  - Evaluation, details => see publications

- **Lessons learnt:**
  - AADL v2 is enough to model (most of) the software-execution platforms we investigated
  - Tools can interact: STOOD, RAMSES, AADLInspector, Ocarina, OSATE, WCET tools, System-C simulators, Cheddar, …
  - Analysis features developed by the Lab-STICC: prototyped with Cheddar, available for AADL with AADLInspector