Institut Supérieur de l'Aéronautique et de l'Espace



TASTE Multi-core

ISAE / ONERA



Jérôme Hugues / Claire Pagetti

December 2016



General information

> Duration of the project: 12 months

> Consortium

- Combined expertise in TASTE toolset, programming of multicore systems, including RTEMS and Xtratum
- J. Hugues, ISAE: member of the TASTE project since its inception, expert on AADL, lead of the Ocarina project
- » C. Pagetti, ONERA: expertise in the design and implementation of safety-critical applications on multicore systems
- » E. Noulard, ONERA: expertise in low-level programming and RTOS, expertise in many/multicore systems

> Global effort of 2.5 man months

1. Introduction

- » Reminder on TASTE
- » Objectives of TASTE-multi-core

2. Project inputs

- » Executive layers: RTEMS & XtratuM
- » Use cases: ROSACE & GCU

3. TASTE multi-core

- » AADL extensions
- » Tool chain
- » Experiments

4. Conclusion & perspectives

TASTE process in a nutshell



TASTE process in a nutshell



All these steps are **automated**, thanks

- Languages with good power of expression
 - AADL for architecture, ASN.1 for data typing,
 - SDL, Simulink, SCADE, C, Ada, etc. for behavior
- Tool to support this approach
 - TASTE toolchain (editors, code generators, orchestrator)

In the following, we focus in the Concurrency view level, leveraging AADL



to put everything together on a real-time operating system

Research on AADL @ ISAE

Architecture helps you focusing on the actual system



AADL covers many parts of the V cycle: model checking, scheduling, safety and reliability and code generation

Lead on the Ocarina toolset **Development of AADL:** 4 books, tutorials, 30+ papers **Code generation :** Ada, C (POSIX, ARINC653, RTEMS) TRL 6-7 with ESA (ECSS E-40) SPARK, ACSL TRL 2-3 Scheduling: Cheddar, MAST **External metrics:** stack usage (gnatstack), WCET (Bound-T) **TRL 4-5 with ESA Architectural Constraints/Requirements** checks TRL 6, being standardized Model checking: Petri Nets, LNT TRL 2 (PhD contributions) System engineering: SysML, Capella TRL 2-3 (with IRT-SE)

😚 🗛 ADL

Ocarina: an AADL code generator http://www.openaadl.org

- > Ocarina is a stand-alone tool for processing AADL models
 - » Free Open Source Software (as in *Free* speech and *Free* beer)
 - » Command-line, or integrated third-party tools
 - OSATE (CMU/SEI), TASTE (ESA), AADL Inspector (Ellidiss)
- > Code generation facilities target PolyORB-HI runtimes
 - » Ada HI integrity profiles, with Ada native and bare board runtimes
 - » C POSIX or RTEMS, for RTOS & Embedded
 - » C ARINC653 for avionics systems
- > Generated code quality tested in various contexts
 - » For WCET exploration, support for device drivers, ...
- > Written to meet most High-Integrity requirements
 - Follow Ravenscar model of computations, static configuration of all elements (memory, buffers, tasks, drivers, etc.)
- > Contributions from PhD students, partners (SEI, ESA, ENIS)

- 1. Introduction
 - » Reminder on TASTE
 - » Objectives of TASTE-multi-core
- 2. Project inputs
- 3. TASTE multi-core
- 4. Conclusion & perspectives

Objectives

- > Main objective: provide an implementation strategy to support multicore systems in TASTE, for both regular and Time/Space Paritionning OS
 - » Evaluate extenstions to core technologies (AADL) and editors
 - » Use cases as driving example

> Inputs

- » TASTE: Support for mono-core demonstrated, for POSIX, RTEMS
- » AADL: Support for multicore in discussion, TSP supported (ARINC653 annex)

> Leverage public use cases

- » Adapt them for AADL,
 - code generation for RTEMS + POSIX
 - Generation of configuration files for XtratuM
- » Provide manual implementation for XtratuM
- » Discuss modeling patterns for TASTE graphical tools

1. Introduction

2. Project inputs

- » Executive layers: RTEMS & XtratuM
- » Use cases: ROSACE & GCU
- 3. TASTE multi-core
- 4. Conclusion & perspectives

Executive layers: RTEMS & XtratuM

> RTEMS supports SMP architecture as part of RTEMS4.12

- » No direct support for neither AMP (except through explicit multi-processing calls), nor TSP configurations
- » Support for drivers extensive, through direct contributions form Gaisler who also implement the corresponding IP blocks
 - Same drivers adapted from GR-RASTA, GR712RC and GR740 systems
 - Support for: UART, Ethernet, SpaceWire, MIL1553 and CAN

XtratuM

> TSP (time and space partitioning) & multi-core for LEON3MP & NGMP

- » support for TSP mode by construction, in mono or multi-core;
- » drivers support is separated from kernel, on demand from FENTISS

> Programming

- » Application = one or several partitions
- » Partition = one or several slots, each with a start time and a length.
- » Slot = execution of several tasks

> Configuration (or plan)

- » MAF, length of repetition
- » a set of slots
- » static mapping

c1		
c2		
	MAF Major Frame	\rightarrow



1. Introduction

2. Project inputs

- » Executive layers: RTEMS & XtratuM
- » Use cases: ROSACE & GCU
- 3. TASTE multi-core
- 4. Conclusion & perspectives

Two use cases

> ROSACE (Research Open-Source Avionics and Control Engineering)

- » C. Pagetti, D. Saussié, R. Gratia, E. Noulard and P. Siron. "The ROSACE Case Study : From Simulink Specification to Multi/Many-Core Execution". In : 20th IEEE RTAS 2014
- » Repository URL: https://svn.onera.fr/schedmcore/branches/ROSACE_CaseStudy
- » Content
 - the SIMULINK specification (folder simulink)
 - a checker to verify that an implementation fulfills the high level properties (folder checker)
 - several implementations

> GCU (Gestionnaire de Charge Utile / Payload Data Management System)

- » Spacify consortium, « Etude de cas CNES : Modélisation Synoptic de la partie Commande / Contrôle du GCU (Gestionnaire de Charge Utile) », report 2010.
- » Content
 - Partial specification in Synoptic

Implementation for TASTE multi-core

> Implementation

- » Common functional C code for all multi-core implementations
- » Manual computation of off-line mapping
- » Specific C code encapsulation for each paradigm model

> Execution settings

- » Targets: Zynq board, LEON3MP
- » Test case

Avionic use case: Longitudinal Flight Controller

- > Longitudinal motion of a medium-range civil aircraft in *en-route* phase
 - » *Cruise:* maintains a constant altitude h and a constant airspeed Va
 - » Change of cruise level subphases:

commands a constant vertical speed Vz (rate of climb)

- Ex: FL300 \rightarrow FL320 \rightarrow FL340 \rightarrow FL360
- FL300 = pressure altitude of 30000 ft

> Test case

- » Change flight level to 11 000 feet
- » Expected results
 - -P1 settling time: ≤ 10s
 - **−P2 overshoot:** ≤ 10%
 - **−P3 rise time:** ≤ 6s





Longitudinal flight controller architecture

engine 20	0 Hz T airc	200 Hz	Environment simulation	Flight con h =	ndition: 10000	m, Va = 230 m/s
elevat	50 Hz Vz	<u>10</u> H h_c	z Controller 100 Hz	Outputs	$ \begin{array}{c c} V_z \\ V_a \\ h \\ a_z \\ q \end{array} $	vertical speed true airspeed altitude vertical acceleration pitch rate
Vz_con	rol alti	tude_hold h _f	h_filter h_ion Hz h_az_filter h_az_filter	Filtered outputs	$\begin{array}{c c} \bar{V}_{z_f} \\ V_{a_f} \\ h_f \\ a_{z_f} \\ q_f \end{array}$	vertical speed true airspeed altitude vertical acceleration pitch rate
		· -1	Vz_filter Vz	Reference inputs	$egin{array}{c} h_c \ V_{a_c} \end{array}$	altitude command airspeed command
Va_con	50 Hz	qf	q_filter q	Commanded inputs	$ \begin{array}{c c} V_{z_c} \\ \delta_{e_c} \\ \delta_{th_c} \end{array} $	vertical speed command elevator deflection command throttle command
O _{thc}	U Hz	Va _f	Va_filter	Aircraft inputs	$\begin{bmatrix} \delta_{e_c} \\ T \end{bmatrix}$	elevator deflection engine thrust

- 5 filters consolidate the measured outputs provided by the sensors
- 3 controllers track accurately: altitude (h_c), vertical speed (V_{zc}) and airspeed commands (V_{ac})
- rate choices
 - 1. for controllers:
 - − closed-loop system with the continuous-time controller can tolerate a pure time delay of 1 s before destabilizing \rightarrow sampling period ≤ 1 Hz
 - performances \rightarrow sampling period \leq 10 Hz
 - 2. for environment: 200 Hz to model a continuous-time phenomenon

Off-line mapping for ROSACE

> Mono-core schedule

	P1: h_filter, az_filter,]		
PO: Aircraft_dynamics	Vz_filter, q_filter, Va_filter, altitude_hold	P2: Vz_control, Va_control	P0: elevator, engine]
1 ms 2 m	ns 3	3 ms 4	ms 5	ms

> Dual-core scheduling



Specifics in coding

RTEMS >

» POSIX implementation

XtratuM >

Communication between partitions are done via XtratuM sampling ports **》**

```
Code skeleton
》
void PartitionMain (void){
     ... init ... while (1) {
    aircraft_dynamics(delta_e, T, &res);
    send_buf(res.h, porth);
    . . .
    delta_th_c = rec_buf(portdthc);
    T = engine(delta_th_c);
     delta_e_c = rec_buf(portdec);
    delta_e = elevator(delta_e_c);
     XM_idle_self();}
```

log passed the checker >

}

Space use case: Payload Data Management System

- > apply commands from the ground to move in a given mode and to confirm to the ground that requests have been correctly applied
- > event triggered architecture

GCU architecture



Example of GCU test case



Off-line mapping for GCU

> Two mono-core schedules

P0: MISSION	P1: CC, PF	P2: I1, I2, I3	
40) ms 8	0 ms 120) ms
P0: MISSION	P1: CC, PF	P2: I1, I2, I3	P1: CC, PF
40 r	ns 80	ms 120 r	ns 160 ms

> One dual-core schedule

P2: I1,I2	P1: CC	PO: MISSION	P1: CC]
P3: PF		P4: I3		
20	ms 4	0 ms 60) ms 80) ms

Specifics in coding

> RTEMS

» POSIX implementation

> XtratuM

- » Communication between partitions are done via XtratuM sampling ports
- » Code skeleton (similar ROSACE)
- > log compliant with expected behaviours

Response times for the schedules

> Mono-core schedule 1



> Mono-core schedule 2





- 1. Introduction
- 2. Project inputs
- 3. TASTE multi-core
 - » AADL extensions
 - » Tool chain
 - » Experiments
- 4. Conclusion & perspectives

About the TASTE-DV

> The TASTE Deployment View gathers

- » The definition of the hardware platform
- » Binding of functions to this platform
- > Concepts: node (OS), processor, partition (memory space)
 - » Platform read from library of AADL models
 - » Shared patterns between TASTE-*V and Ocarina



Definition of multicore processors: AADL

> Ongoing work as part of AADLv3 work

virtual processor a_core end a_core; virtual processor implementation a_core.impl end a_core.impl; processor implementation POSIX_CPU.Cores4 subcomponents

Cpu0 : virtual processor a_core.impl {Processor_Properties::Core_Id => 0;}; Cpu1 : virtual processor a_core.impl {Processor_Properties::Core_Id => 1;}; ..

end POSIX_CPU.Cores4;

> Add one property to specify id of the core

-- Core #1 binding Actual_Processor_Binding => (reference (Hardware.Cpu1)) applies to Software.Aircraft_Dynamics;

- » TASTE-CV/AADL: support done for POSIX, RTEMS
- » TASTE-DV: needs additional support to capture bindings

Definition of multicore processors: TASTE-*V

> Extensions of existing TASTE-DV concepts

- » One node, multiple cores inside, one partition per core
- > Could be implemented by
 - » Updating parser of TASTE-DV to support AADL pattern
 - » Extending library of AADL models with reference design
 - Natural candidates: GR712RC, NGMP, ARM A9, etc.

Core #0	Core #1
Partition #0	Partition #0
Partition #0	Partition #0

Definition of TSP: memory

- > Process can be bound to specific memory location
 - » Supported as part of regular AADLv2 language

memory implementation myram.sdram extends myram.stram
subcomponents
segment1 : memory segment.i {Base_Address => 16#40100000#;
Byte_Count => 524_288;};
segment2 : memory segment.i {Base_Address => 16#40180000#;
Byte_Count => 524_288;};

end myram.sdram;

> Impact on TASTE

- » Additional tabular editor to capture parameters for a node
- » Additional legality rules to check configuration is sound
 - Already done use REAL annex language in UML&AADL'10
- » Supported as part of XtratuM configuration backend

Definition of TSP: partitions – AADL

> Follow ARINC653 annex document

processor implementation leon3.xtratum_partitions extends leon3.xtratum subcomponents

```
P0 : virtual processor xtratum_partition.generic
{ Deployment::Execution_Platform => LEON3_XM3;
    ARINC653::Partition_Identifier => 0;
    ARINC653::Partition_Name => "P0"; };
```

-- ...

> Same impact as memory partition on TASTE toolchain

properties

```
ARINC653::Module_Schedule => ( [Partition => reference (P0);
Duration => 2 ms;
Periodic_Processing_Start => true;],
```

-- ...

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Project inputs

3. TASTE multi-core

- » AADL extensions
- » Tool chain
- » Experiments
- 4. Conclusion & perspectives

Definition of TSP: partitions – TASTE-DV

> Extensions of existing TASTE-DV concepts

» One node, one core, no partition (default), capability to add partitions

> Could be implemented by

- » Updating parser of TASTE-DV to support AADL pattern
- Tabular editor to configure TSP parameters, attached to the node (definition of the RTOS abstraction)
- GUI: need a graphical icon for TSP configuration, to distinguish from regular non-TSP

Core #0	
Partition #0	Partition #1

Combining SMP and TSP

> Done as a combination of the previous patterns

- » AADL: use virtual processors for either core or partitions
- » TASTE-DV: combine previous approaches
- > Same recommendations as previously
 - » # of cores is static, one editor per core to time config., one editor per node for memory

ore #0		Core #1	
Partition #0	Partition #1	Partition #2	Partition #3

Other topics

- > For now, focused mostly on modeling TSP/multicore
- > Initial study illustrated needs to constraint designs
 - » Exactly one core per thread
 - » Exactly one core per partition
 - » Verification of TSP configuration
 - » Must add a specific design checker in TASTE. For the moment, it is part of the vertical transformation, too late !
- > Also, need to perform optimizations of designs
 - » E.g. place threads to ensure schedulability
 - » Sequence of partitions to optimize latency
- > Call for a specific TASTE-Configurator tool

Ocarina components for Multicore

> Updated property sets

- » ARINC653 (new release, per AS5506/1A) for TSP
- » Property for specifying cores for multi-core

> Updated PolyORB-HI/C runtime

» Support for multicore for RTEMS and RT-POSIX

> Updated backends

- » New properties
- » PolyORB-HI/C: consider SMP
- » XtratuM configuration: updates for SMP and support of 4.2.1
- > Integrated to GitHub and Gitlab (ESA) master branch

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Project inputs

3. TASTE multi-core

- » AADL extensions
- » Tool chain
- » Experiments
- 4. Conclusion & perspectives

Implementation work

- > For ROSACE and GCU, delivery of
- > XtratuM manual implementation, tested on ARM9 2 cores (ONERA)
- > AADL/TASTE-CV implementation done for the following configurations
 - » RT-POSIX case, 1-core and 4-core: code generation and execution
 - » RTEMS (mono-core + SMP): code generation and execution
 - » XtratuM (mono-core + SMP): configuration generation, compilation of XML generated by XtratuM tools
 - Note: support of a RTEMS BSP for XtratuM in PolyORB-HI/C could not be tested, status unknown
 - » Log reports provided as reference output from XtratuM runs
- Addition of communication: target altitude configured from an external source: delayed due to lack of SpaceWire in RTEMS/SMP
 - » Mitigation solution is to implement these outside of this study, in the scope of PERASPERA once RTEMS 4.11 stabilizes

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Project inputs
- 3. TASTE multi-core
- 4. Conclusion & perspectives

Conclusion

- > Study defined two case studies to evaluate support for SMP and TSP in TASTE
- > Case studies helped to
 - » Derive requirements for TASTE-DV updates
 - Ellidiss confident these could be implemented using the existing technology
 - » Consolidate support of SMP and TSP in TASTE-CV/AADL
 - Front-end, property sets and backends prepared
 - SMP for RTEMS and POSIX;TSP for Xtratum
 - Code generation update for RTEMS and POSIX
 - Generation of configuration for XtratuM
- > All contributions will be integrated to TASTE VM