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Are Resource Limitations the Key Defining Factor for Embedded Software?

- small memory
- small data word sizes
- relatively slow clocks

To deal with these problems, emphasize efficiency:
- write software at a low level (in assembly code or C)
- avoid operating systems with a rich suite of services
- develop specialized computer architectures
  - programmable DSPs
  - network processors

*This is how embedded SW has been designed for 25 years*
Why hasn’t Moore’s law changed all this in 25 years?

Hints that Embedded SW Differs Fundamentally from General Purpose SW

- object-oriented techniques are rarely used
  - classes and inheritance
  - dynamic binding
- processors avoid memory hierarchy
  - virtual memory
  - dynamically managed caches
- memory management is avoided
  - allocation/de-allocation
  - garbage collection

To be fair, there are some applications: e.g. Java in cell phones, but mainly providing the services akin to general purpose software.
More Hints: Fundamentally Different Techniques Applied to Embedded SW.

- **nesC/TinyOS**
  - developed for programming very small programmable sensor nodes called “motes”

- **Click**
  - created to support the design of software-based network routers

- **Simulink with Real-Time Workshop**
  - created for embedded control software and widely used in the automotive industry

- **Lustre/SCADE**
  - created for safety-critical embedded software (e.g. avionics software)

---

Standard Software Abstraction (20-th Century Computation)

- **Sequence**
  - initial state
  - \( f: \text{State} \rightarrow \text{State} \)
  - final state

- **Time is irrelevant**
- **All actions are ordered**
Standard Software Abstraction:
Processes or Threads

Infinite sequences of state transformations are called "processes" or "threads"

The operating system (typically) provides:
• suspend/resume
• mutual exclusion
• semaphores

resume

Standard Software Abstraction:
Concurrency via Interacting Threads

Potential for race conditions, deadlock, and livelock severely compromises software reliability.

These methods date back to the 1960's (Dijkstra).
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A Stake in the Ground

Nontrivial concurrent programs based on processes, threads, semaphores, and mutexes are incomprehensible to humans, and should not be used in safety critical software.

- No amount of software engineering process is going to solve this problem.
  - the human brain doesn’t work this way.
- Formal methods may help
  - scalability? understandability?
- Better concurrency abstractions will help more
  - four promising examples: nesC/TinyOS, Click, Lustre/SCADE, and Simulink.

Alternative Concurrency Models: First example: nesC and TinyOS

Typical usage pattern:
- hardware interrupt signals an event.
- event handler posts a task.
- tasks are executed when machine is idle.
- tasks execute atomically w.r.t. one another.
- tasks can invoke commands and signal events.
- hardware interrupts can interrupt tasks.
- exactly one monitor, implemented by disabling interrupts.

Command implementers can invoke other commands or post tasks, but do not trigger events.
Alternative Concurrency Models: Second example: Click

Typical usage pattern:
- queues have push input, pull output.
- schedulers have pull input, push output.
- thin wrappers for hardware have push output or pull input only.

Observations about nesC/TinyOS & Click

- Very low overhead
- Bounded stack sizes
- No (unintended) race conditions
- No threads or processes
- Access to timers
- Can create thin wrappers around hardware

- But rather specialized
  - Unfamiliar to programmers
  - No preemption (tasks must be decomposed)
Alternative Concurrency Models: Third example: Lustre/SCADE

Typical usage pattern:
- specify tasks aligned to a master “clock” and subclocks
- clock calculus checks for consistency and deadlock
- decision logic is given with hierarchical state machines.

Observations about Lustre/SCADE

- Very low overhead
- Bounded stack sizes
- No (unintended) race conditions
- No threads or processes
- Verifiable (finite) behavior
- Certified compiler (for use in avionics)

- But rather specialized
  - Unfamiliar to programmers
  - No preemption
  - No time
The Real-Time Problem

- Programming languages have no time in their core semantics
- Temporal properties are viewed as "non-functional"
- Precise timing is poorly supported by hardware architectures
- Operating systems provide timed behavior on a best-effort basis (e.g. using priorities).
- Priorities are widely misused in practice

Alternative Concurrency Models: Fourth example: Simulink

Typical usage pattern:
- model the continuous dynamics of the physical plant
- model the discrete-time controller
- code generate the discrete-time controller

Discrete signals semantically are piecewise constant. Discrete blocks have periodic execution with a specified "sample time."
Observations about Simulink

- Bounded stack sizes
- Deterministic (no race conditions)
- Timing behavior is explicitly given
- Efficient code generator (for periodic discrete-time)
- Supports concurrent tasks
- No threads or processes visible to the programmer
  - But cleverly leverages threads in an underlying O/S.

- But rather specialized
  - Periodic execution of all blocks
  - Accurate schedulability analysis is difficult

Two Distinct Component Interaction Mechanisms

Method-call based:

- nesC/TinyOS
- Click

Actor oriented:

- Lustre/SCADE
- Simulink

What flows through an object is sequential control

What flows through an object is streams of data

Input data  Output data
Terminology Problem

- Of these, only nesC is recognized as a “programming language.”

- I will call them “platforms”
  - A platform is a set of possible designs:
    - the set of all nesC/TinyOS programs
    - the set of all Click configurations
    - the set of all SCADE designs
    - the set of all Simulink block diagrams

Abstraction

These four “platforms” offer distinct alternative abstractions (*models of computation*).

They are highly concurrent, and very different from the traditional threads and processes.
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## How Many More (Useful) Models of Computation Are There?

Here are a few actor-oriented platforms:

- Labview (synchronous dataflow)
- Modelica (continuous-time, constraint-based)
- CORBA event service (distributed push-pull)
- SPW (synchronous dataflow)
- OPNET (discrete events)
- VHDL, Verilog (discrete events)
- SDL (process networks)
- ...

---

## Many Variants – Consider Dataflow Alone:

- Computation graphs [Karp & Miller - 1966]
- Process networks [Kahn - 1974]
- Static dataflow [Dennis - 1974]
- Dynamic dataflow [Arvind, 1981]
- K-bounded loops [Culler, 1986]
- Synchronous dataflow [Lee & Messerschmitt, 1986]
- Structured dataflow [Kodosky, 1986]
- PGM: Processing Graph Method [Kaplan, 1987]
- Synchronous languages [Lustre, Signal, 1980’s]
- Well-behaved dataflow [Gao, 1992]
- Boolean dataflow [Buck and Lee, 1993]
- Multidimensional SDF [Lee, 1993]
- Cyclo-static dataflow [Lauwereins, 1994]
- Integer dataflow [Buck, 1994]
- Bounded dynamic dataflow [Lee and Parks, 1995]
- ...

Many tools, software frameworks, and hardware architectures have been built to support one or more of these.
How to Choose a Platform: Tools Focus

Is this a good tool?
- How easy is it to use?
- How well supported is it?
- Does it run fast?

These are the Secondary Questions!

How to Choose a Platform: Abstraction Focus

Is this a good way to do design?
- Does it express the important properties of a design?
- Does it support abstraction and modularity?
- Do the design abstractions scale?
- Can it compile/code generate to cost-effective solutions?
- Are designs built using it understandable/analyzable?

These are the Primary Questions!
The Meta Question

How can we objectively evaluate the alternatives?

Meta Platforms
Supporting Multiple Models of Computation

- Ptolemy Classic and Ptolemy II (UC Berkeley)
- GME (Vanderbilt)
- Metropolis (UC Berkeley)
- ROOM (Rational)
- SystemC (Synopsys and others)

To varying degrees, each of these provides an abstract semantics that gets specialized to deliver a particular model of computation.

ROOM is evolving into an OMG standard (composite structures in UML 2)
Conclusion

- Embedded software is an immature technology
- Focus on “platforms” not “languages”
- Platforms have to:
  - expose hardware (with thin wrappers)
  - embrace time in the core semantics
  - embrace concurrency in the core semantics
- API’s over standard SW methods won’t do
- Ask about the “abstractions” not the “tools”
- Many questions remain…