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ABSTRACT
The Program State Machine (PSM) Model of Computation offers a rich set of modeling elements to describe behavioral and structural hierarchy, concurrency, synchronization, state transitions and timing. With the rising software complexity of today’s embedded systems, the use of Real-Time Operating Systems (RTOS) has become state-of-the-art for nearly all System-on-Chip designs. Regrettably, the PSM model itself has insufficient support for the specification of the preemptive dynamic scheduling behavior of an RTOS. In this paper, we propose a model for dynamically dispatching PSM models on a virtual processing element. Our model aims to abstract from the targeted RTOS and the processor core through execution time annotations and a flexible preemptive scheduler model. Mapping a PSM model to a set of scheduled virtual processing elements only requires minor model transformation and enables early exploration of different processing element mappings and scheduling policies. Our virtual processing model for PSMs is realized on top of the SystemC library. We evaluate the proposed virtual processing model using a Canny edge detection filter.

1. INTRODUCTION
The development process of state-of-the-art embedded systems is complex and affects many different disciplines. Among others, the design process requires hardware and software design decisions. Today’s system complexity of embedded Multi-Processor System-on-Chip (MPSoC) designs is continuing at an almost exponential rate [2]. The strongly growing complexity includes the integration of the functionality as well as the associated software complexity. The development of hardware is associated with immense costs. Consequently, whenever possible, designers prefer software solutions and realize algorithms on software processors.

To cope with the increasing complexity and the time-to-market pressure, new design methodologies are required. One design challenge for embedded system designers is mapping the functionality on the individual processing elements while meeting the required extra-functional properties (e.g. timing and power consumption) at minimal cost. To support this challenge, System-Level Design Languages (SLDLs) enable to raise the level of abstraction and support early design decisions. In [3], different abstraction levels have been proposed. The specification level enables untimed modeling of functionality and causality between behaviors in an executable model. Behaviors can be statically composed in a sequential order, as finite-state machine or parallel. Communication between functions is described using double handshake channels with message passing and shared variables. The architecture level introduces processing elements (PE) that execute behaviors in sequential order. Behaviors are annotated with delays to specify the estimated execution times on the PEs. Communication between PEs is described through message passing communication with annotated delays. The implementation level adds instruction and cycle accurate timing for PEs and signal protocol with cycle accurate communication times.

In this work we focus on systems that implement their behavior in software, which can be mapped and executed on different PEs of an MPSoC. Fig. 1 (a), (c) and (d) show the layers for executable MPSoC models proposed in [4]. All models are executed on top of a SLDL e.g. SpecC or SystemC. The Application is user-defined behavior to be executed on the MPSoC. The layers between Application and SLDL introduce communication, scheduling and timing techniques to enable a stepwise refinement from the specification level down to the implementation.

The design step from a non-scheduled specification model (a) to a complete RTOS scheduled architecture model (c) is a complex refinement step. It requires to transform the application or behavioral description into a process- or thread-based model and to use the configuration and scheduling primitives of the selected RTOS. At this time the choice of the task granularity and the supported scheduling primitives have usually been taken. At this level, the comparison of different task granularities and different scheduling policies, supported by different RTOSs induces major redesign effort. In this paper, we introduce a virtual processing model (b) to support a smoother refinement from the unscheduled specification to an RTOS scheduled architecture model for PSMs.

Our approach supports PSM modeling at the specification layer and enables early estimation of dynamic scheduling.

Figure 1: Extension of a virtual processing model (see [4])
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effects when mapping parallel behaviors on the same PE. This step can be performed without any behavior to process or RTOS specific refinements. This way, designers can profit from simple specification model modifications in combination with early estimated execution time annotations, thus enabling early decisions regarding PE allocation, behavior to process refinement granularity, process to PE binding and scheduling policy selection.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we analyze related work. Next, we discuss the design of the virtual processing model in Section 3. Followed by a brief description of the implementation in Section 4, we evaluate the new virtual processing model using a Canny filter for still image edge detection in Section 5. Finally, we conclude our work in Section 6.

2. RELATED WORK

An early proposal of a generic RTOS model based on SystemC has been published in [11]. The presented abstract RTOS model achieves time-accurate task preemption via SystemC events and models time passing via a delay() method. The RTOS overhead can be modeled as well. Two different task scheduling schemes are studied: the first one uses a dedicated thread for the scheduler, while the second is based on cooperative scheduling, avoiding this overhead. Although in this approach explicit inter-task communication resources are required (message queue, ...), the simulation time advances simultaneously as the tasks consume their delays.

In [8], an RTOS modeling tool is presented. Its main purpose is to accurately model an existing RTOS on top of SystemC. A system designer cannot directly use it. In this approach, the next RTOS “event” (interrupt, scheduling event, etc.) is predicted during run-time. This improves simulation speed, but requires deeper knowledge of the underlying system.

An RTOS based scheduling approach with focus on precise interrupt scheduling has been proposed in [17]. For this purpose, a separate scheduler is introduced to handle incoming interrupt requests. Timing annotations and synchronization within user tasks are handled by a replacement of the SystemC wait(). In [16] an annotation method for time estimation has been presented that supports flexible simulation and validation of real-time constraints for task migration between different target processors. The concept allows preemptive scheduling in the context of priority-based scheduling, supporting nested interrupts.

All mentioned solutions above work on architecture level models and allow to create and handle processes and interrupts on an RTOS specific abstraction. Our solution addresses scheduling at a higher abstraction level and keeps communication at specification abstraction, thus no need for interrupts.

Several approaches based on abstract task graphs [9, 10, 12, 15] have been proposed as well. In this case, a pure functional SystemC model is mapped onto an architecture model including an abstract RTOS. The mapping requires an abstract task graph of the model, where estimated execution times can be annotated on a per-task basis only, ignoring control-flow dependent durations. This reduces the achievable accuracy.

The proposed RTOS model in [4] can be implemented on top of any SLDL (see Fig. 1) that supports the concepts of process handling and time modeling. An extension of this approach [13] presents a high-level, host-compiled multi-core RTOS simulator. This multi-core processor model can run more than one process simultaneously which can be organized by a separate ready queue per core (Asymmetric Multi-Processing) or one global ready queue (Symmetric Multi-Processing) used for dynamic process to core dispatching. The proposed extension supports the concept of Transaction Level Modeling (TLM) for intra-core communication. Both solutions focus on a process level RTOS abstraction at the architecture and implementation level including features like process creation and interrupt handling. In contrast, our proposed approach avoids process-level RTOS operations and operates on an estimated execution time annotated specification model. Moreover, our solution keeps communication abstract and each processing element has its own ready queue. After exploration, based on our virtual platform model, we can transform the scheduled specification model into an RTOS model on the architecture level.

The timing accuracy and therefore the simulation performance of [4, 13] is limited by the fixed minimal resolution of discrete time advances. An extension deploying techniques with respect to preemptive scheduling models has been presented in [6, 7]. The design starts with an Application Layer (AL) model, which describes the functionality in terms of software tasks, hardware modules and shared communication objects. These modeling elements are mapped on modeling elements of the Virtual Target Architecture Layer (VTAL); software processing elements with an RTOS model similar to [14], hardware processing elements with fixed static scheduling, memories and SystemC TLM for modeling shared buses and point-to-point communication channels. Communication is realized via Remote Method Invocation (RMI) via shared buses or dedicated point-to-point channels. The individually mapped software tasks can be annotated with Estimated Execution Time (EET) blocks that represent computation time. The design flow is supported with preemptive and cooperative scheduling strategies, as well as deadline driven strategies. This approach covers specification and architecture level modeling. The main difference to our approach is that the RTOS model works with explicit tasks (i.e. processes). Our model could be refined as well to [6, 7] after PSM scheduling exploration.

3. VIRTUAL PROCESSING MODEL

3.1 Basic Modeling Elements

We use an expressive subset of the program state machine (PSM) model of computation (MoC) to describe the functionality of a system. A hierarchical PSM model with the corresponding thread graph is shown in Fig. 2(a) and (b). A sequential composition of $n$ behaviors describes a total execution order, denoted as a $n$ dimensional tuple: $(beh_1, ..., beh_n)$. The execution starts with $beh_1$ and finishes with $beh_n$. A parallel composition of $n$ behaviors describes a partial execution order, denoted as a set of $n$ behaviors $\{beh_1, ..., beh_n\}$. The parent behavior of a parallel composition of child behaviors will not finish until all child behaviors have completed (Fork-Join semantics). The finite-state machine behavior composition is a special case of a sequential execution from a start state to an end state. The execution order is defined by state transitions.

The virtual processing model supports communication between behaviors via double handshake channels (synchronized) and shared variables (unsynchronized). A double handshake channel operates in rendezvous fashion (see Fig. 9). When the data is transferred from the sender to the receiver, both behaviors resume their execution at the same time. A
3.2 Processing Elements

A PE maintains a single thread of execution (i.e., a single core processor). We use the terms simulated time and simulation time to express the amount of task execution time currently simulated. The terms simulation execution time and execution time refer to the amount of time the simulator requires on the host computer. Fig. 2(c) shows the scheduler S which is assigned to PE1 and associated with the fixed priority scheduling strategy. In this case all behaviors mapped on PE1 need a specific fixed priority, such that the scheduler can make a scheduling decision. Furthermore, we assume that computation is only in leaf behaviors (C1, C2, C3, E, G, H, and J in Fig. 2), and hierarchical behaviors (B1, B2, and F in Fig. 2) describe the causal chain of execution in the model that must be followed by the scheduler.

3.3 Scheduling

We describe now the concept of scheduling for PSM models for the two requested fixed priority and round robin scheduling algorithms. We decided to provide these two fundamental strategies because more complex strategies can be easily derived from them.

3.3.1 Fixed Priority

The fixed priorities are statically defined. The scheduler always executes the behavior that has the highest priority and is ready to execute. We are interested in making the process of priority assignment to the behaviors on the virtual processing model as simple as possible. The designer assigns fixed priorities only to leaf behaviors. A hierarchical behavior cannot hide the priority of a leaf behavior.

3.3.2 Round Robin

All mapped behaviors on a processing element get time slices of the same length. If a behavior has terminated, the scheduler selects immediately the next running behavior. The scheduler executes the behaviors in a circular order. If a behavior is not ready to execute, the next ready behavior with respect to the circular iteration is chosen. Fig. 5 depicts a round robin scheduling example. The parallel behaviors G and H are mapped on the same processing element. The behaviors G and H are scheduled by round robin and the time slice is 5 time units. In the following, we keep the focus on behavior G that requests once 3 and once 12 time units. The start behavior is arbitrary because the model in the figure does not define one; we assume the simulation starts with behavior F. Behavior G requests 3 time units, computes, and requests 5 more time units. The request of 3 time units can be consumed completely in one time slice; however, the following request is too complex. 2 more time units can be consumed after behavior H preempts behavior G and can start executing. At time 10, behavior G is active again and continues consuming the remaining 10 time units.

![Figure 2: PSM model (a), which is mapped on a PE (c), with corresponding thread graph (b) and nesting tree (d).](image)

![Figure 3: Double handshake protocol](image)

![Figure 4: Differentiation between the priority of inner and leaf behaviors (example based on Fig. 2)](image)

![Figure 5: Round robin scheduling](image)
nunication status, a behavior can have one of the following states (see Fig. 6): ready, running, communicating and waiting. A ready behavior can be selected by the scheduler and executed on the associated processing element. A behavior has the state running, if it is currently executing on the mapped processing element. A running behavior can be preempted in two different ways: (a) end of the time-slice, as defined by the scheduling algorithm (waiting state), (b) blocking communication request on double handshake channel (communicating). If a behavior has completed, its status is terminated. Fig. 6 shows all possible transitions between the described states.

![State automaton of a behavior](image_url)

Figure 6: State automaton of a behavior

4. IMPLEMENTATION

4.1 Processing Element

The class osss_processing_element represents a PE and inherits from the osss_behaviour. Fig. 7 shows the extension of the OSSS-Behaviour class diagram [5]. The designer derives a class from osss_processing_element class and defines in the constructor the execution order of the mapped behaviors on the highest hierarchical level.

![Class extensions](image_url)

Figure 7: OSSS-Behaviour class extensions (bold boxes)

In the following, we describe how the basic scheduling algorithms are designed to support preemption and communication.

4.2 Simulation of Time

Fig. 8 shows an example where the behaviors B1 and B2 are mapped on the same PE under fixed priority scheduling strategy. Thread t1 is associated with behavior B1 and thread t2 with behavior B2. We assume behavior B2 is running and B1 ready (see Fig. 6) at the beginning and neither B1 nor B2 have consumed any time. Thread t2 starts executing the main() function of B2 and enters the 3 milliseconds estimated waste_time() function of the scheduler, see Alg. 1. The while loop runs until the entire requested time of a timing annotation has been consumed. At the beginning of the loop, thread t2 calls the function available_time(requested_time), which asks the scheduling strategy how much of the totally requested time can be consumed. In our example, the scheduling strategy is fixed priority and the current behavior has the highest priority. In this case, the fixed priority scheduler accepts the complete time (i.e. 3 milliseconds).

![Scheduling with communication](image_url)

Figure 8: Scheduling with communication

Algorithm 1 function waste_time(requested_time)

1: req_time ← requested_time
2: while req_time > 0 do
3: max_time ← available_time(requested_time)
4: start_time ← current_time
5: behavior_status ← running
6: wait(max_time or registered_communication_events)
7: req_time ← req_time - (current_time - start_time)
8: if req_time = 0 then
9: return
10: else
11: behavior_status ← waiting
12: dispatch()
13: end if
14: end while

Each PE represents a single core processor. For this reason, only one behavior can be ready for the SLDL scheduler. Otherwise, the scheduler would execute multiple behaviors in parallel on the same PE. Communicating behaviors are an exception because they are waiting for their synchronization event. If the process of a communicating behavior would be suspended, the behavior would ignore the synchronization event. The function dispatch() (see Alg. 2) guarantees this requirement. The set of behaviors is stored in two lists, namely a list for inner behaviors and a list for leaf behaviors. The first behavior in the list of ready behaviors defines the next running behavior. In this situation behavior B1 needs to be suspended and behavior B2 should be ready.

4.3 Scheduling Strategy

We decided to separate the scheduler and the scheduling strategies (see Fig. 7). The designer derives a class from osss_scheduler. The function schedule() takes a list of all leaf behaviors as argument. The function moves the next executing behavior to the beginning of the list. The function available_time defines the size of a consumable time quantum.

5. EXPERIMENTS AND EVALUATION

In order to evaluate our proposed virtual processing model, we focus on scheduling different partitions of a specification
Algorithm 2 function dispatch()

1: Unsorted List: inner_behaviors, leaf_behaviors
2: Process successor_process ← null
3: Process current_process ← get_current_process()
4: if inner behaviors = 0 then
5:    schedule(leaf_behaviors)
6:  successor_process ← first_element(leaf_behaviors)
7:  else
8:    successor_process ← first_element(inner_behavior)
9:  end if
10: for all Behavior b in inner_behavior do
11:    if process(b) ≠ current_process and
12:        status(b) ≠ communicating then
13:        suspend(process(b))
14:  end if
15: if current_process ≠ successor_process then
16:    resume(successor_process)
17:  suspend(current_process)
18: end if

Figure 9: Partitioning of the Canny edge detector

![Partitioning of the Canny edge detector](image)

The following models, as shown in Fig. 9, are evaluated: Specification (untimed, without virtual PE), Individual PE (timed blur leaf behaviors, all behaviors mapped on a single PE), BlurX (timed blur leaf behaviors, blurX1 mapped to PE1, synchronization between PE1 and PE2 via double handshake channel (behavior blurX4 on PE2 can only start if behavior blurX_par on PE1 has been entered)), Blur2X (timed blur leaf behaviors, parallel composition of blurX3 and blurX4 mapped to PE2, synchronization of parallel composition like in BlurX) and Blur2X2Y (timed blur leaf behaviors, parallel composition of blurX3 and blurX4 and parallel composition of blurY3 and blurY4 mapped to PE2, synchronization like in Blur2X with additional synchronization barrier between sequential composition of parallel blur behaviors).

When neglecting communication (shared array access), synchronization and scheduling (including context switching) times, our model’s total simulated times, as expected by Amdahl’s law, are shown in Tab. 1. We compare the complexity of the different models using a simple Lines of Code (LoC) metric. The major effort was to allocate new channels and behaviors for synchronization. For instance, for the model BlurX a new PE and three sync behaviors have been instantiated. Furthermore, the double handshake channel was hierarchically bound from the ports of the PE's to the ports of the blur leaf behaviors.

In the following, we discuss the simulation of the four virtual processing models using a round robin scheduler with different time slice granularities from 1ns up to 100,000ns on each individual PE. We measured the number of context switches and associated them with a constant cost of 1 ms. Fig. 10 shows the simulated time of model Blur2X2Y with context switching costs for a round robin scheduling of PE1 and PE2. As expected, we can observe that fine grained time slices < 100 ns have a huge impact on the overall simulated time. On the other hand, the responsiveness (although not necessary for the image filter design) rises.

![Simulation with costs for context switches](image)

Table 1: Comparison of selected design metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification time [ms]</th>
<th>Speedup</th>
<th>LoC</th>
<th>∆ [LoC]</th>
<th>∆ [%]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IndividualPE</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1541</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BlurX</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1760</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blur2X</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blur2X2Y</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 11 visualizes the ratio between the simulated time for context switches and computation for a 20 ms leaf behavior timing annotation. When the time slice is very short, almost 70 % of the simulated time is spent on context switches. Fig. 12 shows the measured execution time of the various models on an Intel(R) Core(TM)2 Quad CPU Q9650 @ 3.00 GHz with 4 GB RAM running Fedora 12 Linux using the...
time command. From this measurement, we can observe that the execution time of the individual models is proportional to the number of context switches, as shown in Fig. 10. We traced the individual scheduler calls and compared the execution order of leaf behaviors (i.e. the causal chain) between the specification and the Virtual Processing Models. In the specification model, the blur behavior’s execution order was blur-X1, ..., blur-X4, while in the different VPM models the execution order changed to blur-X4, ..., blur-X1. Even though the ordering is different, validity of causality for parallel compositions (partial order) only requires to be order isomorph, which is the case.

6. CONCLUSION AND OUTLOOK

In this paper, we extended the proposed methodology in [4] and introduced a novel virtual processing model for PSM based models. The existing methodology allowed scheduling of processes using generic RTOS primitives. The design step from a non-scheduled specification model to a process-based RTOS scheduled architecture model is a major refinement step. For this reason, we proposed to introduce an intermediate model, called virtual processing model. This model enables to add a scheduler with user defined scheduling algorithm to a behavior, called virtual processing unit. This flexible scheduling annotation enables fast and easy exploration, regarding scheduling granularities of behaviors and assignments of scheduling policies. After successful exploration, the behavior to process transformation and RTOS configuration for architecture refinement can be performed. We have sketched how to use SystemC to implement our virtual processing model.

Furthermore, we have integrated the virtual processing model into the OSSS-Behaviour library, supporting program state machine (PSM) modeling in SystemC. Our implementation concept allows designers to implement new scheduling strategies. For the evaluation, we used a Canny filter design and created different behavior partitions and scheduler configurations. The evaluation showed that our extension retains the functional causalities of the original PSM model when using a round robin scheduling algorithm to a behavior, called OSSS-Behaviour. This model enables to add a scheduler with user defined scheduling algorithm to a behavior, called virtual processing unit. This flexible scheduling annotation enables fast and easy exploration, regarding scheduling granularities of behaviors and assignments of scheduling policies.

We traced the individual scheduler calls and compared the execution order of leaf behaviors (i.e. the causal chain) between the specification and the Virtual Processing Models. In the specification model, the blur behavior’s execution order was blur-X1, ..., blur-X4, while in the different VPM models the execution order changed to blur-X4, ..., blur-X1. Even though the ordering is different, validity of causality for parallel compositions (partial order) only requires to be order isomorph, which is the case.

6. CONCLUSION AND OUTLOOK

In this paper, we extended the proposed methodology in [4] and introduced a novel virtual processing model for PSM based models. The existing methodology allowed scheduling of processes using generic RTOS primitives. The design step from a non-scheduled specification model to a process-based RTOS scheduled architecture model is a major refinement step. For this reason, we proposed to introduce an intermediate model, called virtual processing model. This model enables to add a scheduler with user defined scheduling algorithm to a behavior, called virtual processing unit. This flexible scheduling annotation enables fast and easy exploration, regarding scheduling granularities of behaviors and assignments of scheduling policies. After successful exploration, the behavior to process transformation and RTOS configuration for architecture refinement can be performed. We have sketched how to use SystemC to implement our virtual processing model.

Furthermore, we have integrated the virtual processing model into the OSSS-Behaviour library, supporting program state machine (PSM) modeling in SystemC. Our implementation concept allows designers to implement new scheduling strategies. For the evaluation, we used a Canny filter design and created different behavior partitions and scheduler configurations. The evaluation showed that our extension retains the functional causalities of the original PSM model when using a round robin scheduling algorithm to a behavior, called OSSS-Behaviour. This model enables to add a scheduler with user defined scheduling algorithm to a behavior, called virtual processing unit. This flexible scheduling annotation enables fast and easy exploration, regarding scheduling granularities of behaviors and assignments of scheduling policies.