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Abstract

Driven by the increasing capacity of integrated circuits, multiprocessor systems-on-chip (MPSoCs) are widely used in modern consumer electronics devices. In this thesis, the performance analysis and implementation methodologies are explored to design predictable streaming applications on MPSoCs computing platforms. The application functionality and concurrency are described in synchronous data flow (SDF) computational models, and two state-of-the-art architecture templates are adopted as multiprocessor architectures, i.e., network-on-chip (NoC) based MPSoC and hybrid reconfigurable CPU/FPGA platforms. Based on the author’s contributions on simulation and formal analytical methods, performance analysis and design space exploration for embedded MPSoCs architectures have been addressed.

An energy efficient design space exploration flow is proposed for streaming applications with guaranteed throughput on NoC based MPSoCs, in which both application throughput analysis and system energy calculation are carried out by simulation on a multi-clocked synchronous modelling framework. On the other hand, based on event models of data streams, a formal analytical scheduling framework for real-time streaming applications with minimal buffer requirement on hybrid CPU/FPGA architectures is exploited. The scheduling problem has been formalized declaratively by constraint base techniques, and solved by a public domain constraint solver. Consecutively, the constraint based method has been extended to solve problems ranging from global computation/communication scheduling and reconfiguration analysis to Pareto efficient design. Finally, a prototype of stream processing system on FPGA based MPSoC is built to substantiate the results from theoretical studies in this thesis.
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INTRODUCTION

For over five decades\(^1\), the advances in silicon technology and the increasing chip density of integrated circuits have followed Moore’s law. As the number of transistors on single chips continues to hit new record high, processor manufacturing has entered the billion-transistor era in recent years. Accordingly, the explosive growth in processor capacity has driven the parallel revolution in modern computers. That is, processing systems, composed of two or more individual processors on a single chip, are widely used across general-purpose and embedded computing systems. For instance, the commercial billion-transistor processors, unveiled by major manufacturers in early 2010, have single-chip core counts ranging from 4 to 16, as illustrated in Table 1.1\(^2\).

Table 1.1: Major billion-transistor processors in February 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>Processor</th>
<th>Transistors (^a)</th>
<th>Cores (^a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Niagara 3</td>
<td>1.0 billion</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBM</td>
<td>POWER7</td>
<td>1.2 billion</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intel</td>
<td>Tukwila</td>
<td>2.0 billion</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Here, the maximal number in specifications is presented.

\(^1\) That is from the invention of the integrated circuit in 1958.

\(^2\) Only three commercial server-class processors presented in IEEE International Solid-State Circuits Conference (ISSCC) [83, 86, 98] are listed out, although Intel has presented another 1.3 billion 48-core experimental processor in ISSCC ‘10 [49].
This thesis aims at embedded systems, which are pervasive computer systems designed to perform one or a few dedicated functions. As parallelism becomes a global trend in semiconductor industry, embedded multiprocessor systems, consisting of multiple components of processors, custom circuits, memories and communication links (dedicated wires or networks-on-chip) on the same silicon, have become increasingly popular [85]. Although the more processing elements to be placed on chips, the more operations chips can do, it is non-trivial to harness parallelism effectively in the current multi-core era, not even to mention the upcoming many-core era. Embedded multiprocessor systems-on-chip (MPSoCs) platforms exhibit extreme complexity from the following perspectives.

- **Heterogeneity.** Multiple computation, storage and communication components with timing varieties interact on a single-chip. Both hardware and software modules are integrated in an appropriate architecture, which is usually chosen and derived from a set of possibly diversified architecture templates to meet the different requirements in design specifications.

- **Customizability.** According to the application specific throughput on demand, energy on demand, and the design cost\(^3\) budget, the system components are fully customizable, e.g., the processor voltage-frequency levels, memory sizes, and communication bandwidth.

- **Parallelism.** The computation scheduling, communication, and synchronization for the distributed processing elements in MPSoCs exhibit inherent parallelism, which has been the major theme of embedded computing. However, how to manage the parallelism to deliver high computation power and predictable performance as required by embedded applications is yet to be exploited.

- **Programmability and Reconfigurability.** Software-programmable multiprocessors and run-time reconfigurable (RTR) field-programmable gate array (FPGA) hardware devices are widely used. Besides improving design flexibility and productivity, they add new design challenges as well.

\(^3\)In this thesis, the design cost is measured by the metric of circuit area, in terms of on-chip buffer memory size or equivalent logic elements.
1.1 Motivation

Compared with traditional systems-on-board, embedded MPSoCs have enhanced computation power, programmability, and reduced communication cost, which make them more suitable for concurrent streaming applications ranging from multimedia, digital signal processing (DSP), and telecommunication to network processing domains. Nevertheless, streaming applications on such platforms always have stringent demands on non-functional properties (e.g., energy dissipation, design cost, and timing), besides functional correctness. A system level design methodology, which considers both application specific performance demands and implementation efficiency needs, is promising for the design and implementation of streaming applications on embedded MPSoCs.

In addition, there are two design aspects which are as important as functionality, performance, and efficiency needs.

- Consumer embedded systems, with low-cost (silicon area), low-power, high-performance and high-portability requirements, always have stringent time-to-market demands.

- On the other hand, each product development involves multiple design processes, such as specification refinement, cost analysis, design optimization, and design iteration. More design flexibility in each process makes system design and decision-making more complex and more time consuming.

It is still a big challenge to capture different design concerns globally and make proper design decisions at an early system level. The systematic design of embedded computing systems demands contributions from different research fields, such as design methodologies, models of computation, system-level modelling and simulation, and formal analysis methods, besides proof-of-concept prototyping.

1.2 System-level design methodologies

Due to the high design complexity and manufacturing cost, new system-level design methodologies for embedded systems have emerged to deal with the increasing time-to-market pressure. Among them, two promising alternatives are the Y-chart scheme [6, 57] and platform-based design [56]. Both of them propose the orthogonalization (i.e., separation of concerns) of application and platform, and use an explicit mapping step to relate application models to architecture platforms. This separation allows designers to map a range of application model instances
onto one architecture platform more effectively, and vice versa. Unlike traditional software/hardware co-design approaches, which start from a single design specification [75], it can be used for broader design space exploration, as illustrated by the Y-chart methodology in Figure 1.1.

![Figure 1.1: Y-chart methodology for design space exploration [57].](image)

In the Y-chart methodology, application models are specified as networks of functional blocks based on models of computation [52, 55, 64]. Independently, architecture platforms are characterized as instances of parameterized architecture templates. To assess the mapping of application models onto architecture platforms, a key performance evaluation tool is exploited, either by means of simulation or analytical methods. From the resulting performance numbers, the designer may propose improvements on three core design issues: platforms, applications, and mapping decisions, which are iconed as light bulbs in the graph. Such a design process is iterative, until the satisfactory criteria are met.

The Y-chart scheme fits various levels of abstraction on applications and platforms. To gain accuracy in performance numbers, the performance evaluation based on more modelling details normally takes longer time. However, too detailed modelling efforts can lead to unacceptable long evaluation time, besides they may not always be available in early design phases. Generally, system-level abstraction is often used in most Y-chart based design flows for embedded systems in the literature, such as Spade [65], Sesame [76], and CASSE [78].

In this thesis, the application and platform specifications have incorporated the conceptions in both Y-chart and platform-based design. Based on the orthogonal-
1.3 OUTLINE AND CONTRIBUTIONS

The focus of this thesis is to explore performance analysis and implementation efficiency for predictable streaming applications on embedded MPSoCs computing platforms, with tight physical (energy, cost, and real-time) constraints. This thesis intends to provide the modelling and design space exploration frameworks for embedded MPSoCs architectures, based on the author’s contributions on both simulation and analytical methods.

- Using a multi-clocked synchronous modelling framework (to be introduced in Section 3.4), a simulation method for energy efficiency design space exploration is proposed in Chapter 3.

- Inspired by the success of solving NP-complete problems with constraint programming techniques, the analytical methods presented in Chapter 4 - 8 exploit the constraint programming paradigm consecutively.
In particular, the workstation used for experiments from Chapter 4 to Chapter 8 is a HP xw4600 Linux workstation with Quad-Core 2.40GHZ processor and 4GB memory.

The author’s contributions have been divided into the respectively chapters. The thesis outline is as follows.

**Chapter 2**

This chapter explains the basics of streaming applications and architecture platforms used in this thesis. Especially, the streaming applications are based on SDF computational model.

**Chapter 3**

This chapter presents a design space exploration flow to achieve energy efficiency for streaming applications on MPSoCs while the specified throughput constraints are met. As the main contributions, the streaming applications are scheduled on a multi-clocked synchronous modelling framework, the application timing properties are guaranteed by throughput analysis, and both processor voltage-frequency levels and memory sizes are customized in the design space to optimize the application pipeline parallelism for energy efficiency.

The public domain simulators Sim-Panalyzer [4] and Cacti [101] are used to estimate the energy dissipations of the parameterized architectural components. Two heuristic algorithms (i.e., greedy and Taboo search) are used during the design optimization process. The experiments show an energy reduction of 21% without any loss in application throughput compared with an ad-hoc approach.

Part of the work was published in


1.3. OUTLINE AND CONTRIBUTIONS

Chapter 4

This chapter addresses the problem of real-time streaming applications scheduling on hybrid CPU/FPGA architectures. The main contribution is a constraint based approach to minimize the buffer requirement for streaming applications on hybrid multiprocessor/FPGA architectures. A novel declarative way of constraint based scheduling for real-time hybrid SW/HW systems is proposed. The event models in analysis are constructed as cumulative functions on data streams, while the application throughput is guaranteed by periodic phases in execution.

Being implemented on the public domain constraint solver Gecode [33], a voice-band modem application is used to exemplify the scheduling capabilities of the proposed method. The experimental results show both less buffer requirement and higher throughput guarantees, compared with traditional scheduling methods without constraints on buffer.

Part of the work was published in


Chapter 5

Based on the extension of the constraint based formalism in Chapter 4, a global computation scheduling and contention-free routing framework for NoC based MPSoCs is proposed. The global scheduling of processors computing and communication transactions are formulated as constraint based problem, to avoid the scheduling overhead in TDMA-like heuristic schemes. Experimental results show that the proposed framework can achieve a high predictable application throughput with minimized buffer cost. For instance, for applications in communication domain, higher throughput (up to 87%) has been observed with less buffer cost, compared to scenarios considering the heuristic scheduling overhead.

Part of the work was published in

Chapter 6

To overcome the limited expressiveness of SDF models, this chapter extends the regular SDF model with run-time adaptivity semantics, and proposes a performance analysis framework for adaptive real-time SDF streaming applications on run-time reconfigurable FPGAs. A novel compile-time analysis approach based on iterative timing phases is exploited capture the varying design concerns during reconfigurations. The capabilities of the proposed framework in reconfigurations analysis and design trade-offs analysis are exemplified with experiments.

Part of the work was published in


Chapter 7

The main contribution is a multi-dimensional design optimization method on state-of-the-art run-time reconfigurable CPU/FPGA platforms. It is a design Pareto-point calculation flow to allocate applications with optimized buffer requirement and software/hardware implementation cost. The capability of the constraint based application allocation, scheduling, and Pareto efficient design has been exemplified by two cases studies on applications from media and communication domains.

Part of the work was published in


Chapter 8

While the author’s theoretical studies have shown the potential of system-level methods on predictable streaming applications design, a FPGA based MPSoCs
1.3. OUTLINE AND CONTRIBUTIONS

prototype is used in this chapter, to fill in the gap between system level design methodology proposed in this thesis and final implementation. The prototyping of streaming applications on MPPSoCs is built on Altera Stratix II FPGA [2], as a realistic projection to evaluate various properties of the design.

Chapter 9

Finally, this chapter concludes the thesis and gives prospective research directions in the future.
In system level design, it is essential to capture the functional behavior and architectural characteristics independently for performance analysis and design space exploration. In this thesis, the application functionality is described as concurrent models of computation (MoCs), and two state-of-the-art architecture templates with implementation parallelism are proposed as heterogeneous multiprocessor architectures.

This chapter introduces preliminaries of the streaming application MoCs, the architecture platforms, and a declarative constraint programming paradigm used in this thesis.

2.1 Application models

A model of computation (MoC) is an abstraction of a computational system. It defines how concurrent computation processes interact. It is possible to use certain MoCs to analyze the system properties of embedded systems [35, 54], such as functional correctness and performance.

In this thesis, the applications are based on synchronous data flow (SDF) models [62].
2.1.1 Synchronous data flow

In SDF graphs, processes execute in a data driven manner, and communicate with each other via FIFO channels. The concurrency in the application is explicitly expressed. A SDF application model with three-stage pipeline is depicted in Figure 2.1, which is used as the tutorial example in this thesis. In the graph, nodes denote the concurrent computation processes, and edges associated with FIFOs denote the communication channels with buffer storage. In each execution or firing, processes read tokens from the input-side FIFOs, operate (compute) on the data within a specified amount of time, and emit the resulting tokens to the output-side FIFOs. The amount of input (output) tokens is fixed in each firing of a process, and is called input (output) rate. For instance, when process \( p_j \) fires, it reads rate \( m_{i,j} \) tokens from \( FIFO_{i,j} \) via signal \( s_2 \) and writes rate \( n_{j,k} \) to \( FIFO_{j,k} \) via signal \( s_3 \). Obviously, as the signal source or sink, process \( p_i \) or \( p_j \) does not need the corresponding input- or output-side FIFOs. When all the input (output) rates are 1 in the graph, such a special SDF model is called homogeneous SDF (HSDF) model. A general SDF model can be converted into an equivalent HSDF model [85], but this transformation dramatically increases the number of processes. In this thesis, the general SDF models, which are also called multi-rate SDF models, will be considered in later chapters.

![Figure 2.1: An example streaming application model.](image)

In SDF semantics, processes use blocking read and non-blocking write, i.e., SDF models implicitly assume infinite buffer space. However, finite buffer storage is always utilized in implementation. A process is enabled and ready for execution, only when both the input-side FIFO(s) has sufficient data tokens and the output-side FIFO(s) has enough vacant space. While a process is computing, the data tokens remain on the input-side FIFO(s) until the computation is completed [88]. At the end of each execution, the output results are available in the output-side FIFO(s). Furthermore, multiple instances of a process are not allowed to execute concurrently as in [43, 88], which is called auto-concurrency avoidance. In implementation, a process executes only when it is enabled and allowed by the scheduling policy.
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In this thesis, a consistent subset of SDF models are considered, which can run indefinitely with bounded buffers [61]. Given the communication channel \( c_{i,j} \) between process \( p_i \) and \( p_j \) with the input rate \( n_{i,j} \) and output rate \( m_{i,j} \), for consistent SDF models, \( p_i \) and \( p_j \) can run in a repetitive pattern with non-trivial (non-zero) firing times\(^1\) \( r_i \) and \( r_j \), where \( r_i \) and \( r_j \) are the minimum integer solutions of a set of balance equations

\[
r_i \cdot n_{i,j} = r_j \cdot m_{i,j}
\] (2.1)

for all the communication channels. This subset of SDF models are also known to be live and bounded [38]. SDF models provide the suitability for streaming applications scheduling and buffer dimensioning at compile time, and are often used to design predictable parallel embedded systems [61].

To distinguish from regular untimed SDF MoC [61], a timed-SDF model [43, 88] has been proposed to analyze timing related properties. Especially, a process computation latency list \( T \), which contains the time \( t_{C,x} \) in time slots (abstract clock cycles) to execute each process \( p_x \) once, can be used to quantify the process computation. A FIFO size list \( \Gamma \), which contains the storage capacity \( \gamma_{y,z} \) in amount of tokens for each buffer \( \text{FIFO}_{y,z} \), is used to quantify the FIFO storage capabilities. For instance, the three-stage pipelined example application in Figure 2.1 has \( T = [t_{C,i}, t_{C,j}, t_{C,k}] \) and \( \Gamma = [\gamma_{i,j}, \gamma_{j,k}] \).

2.1.2 Simulation based scheduling and analysis

![Figure 2.2: A self-timed schedule (on the right) of the example application in Figure 2.1 with specified specification parameters.](image)

\(^1\)A vector of the non-trivial firing times for each process in the model is called repetition vector.
For SDF streaming applications, simulation based scheduling can be used to analyze the essential timing and buffer properties. Here, the self-timed scheduling \[85\] is used, which means a process executes as soon as it is enabled; otherwise, it stalls. The example application specification is instantiated with computation latency list \( T = [2, 2, 2] \), storage size list \( \Gamma = [6, 2] \), and process input/output token numbers \( n_{i,j} = 2 \), \( m_{i,j} = 3 \), \( n_{j,k} = 1 \) and \( m_{j,k} = 2 \), as illustrated on the left of Figure 2.2. Thus, the application process repetition vector is \( \langle r_i, r_j, r_k \rangle = (3, 2, 1) \).

The corresponding self-timed schedule based on simulation is illustrated on the right side, in which the process and FIFO status are listed in separated rows. The time evolution is depicted in corresponding columns and advances 1 per column. At each time tag, a process in executing (shadowed) state has a number to denote the remaining execution time slots, a stalling (non-shadowed) process status is denoted as 0, and a FIFO status is denoted as the occupied storage space (existing tokens plus self-timed reservation) in number of tokens.

At time tag 0, the process status list is \( T'_0 = [2, 0, 0] \), in which \( p_i \) is executing with 2 time slots left and \( p_j \) and \( p_k \) are stalled; in the meantime the FIFO status list is \( \Gamma'_0 = [2, 0] \), with only 2 tokens space reserved at \( FIFO_{i,j} \). At time tag 2, \( p_i \) finishes the previous computation, emits 2 tokens into \( FIFO_{i,j} \), and reserves another 2 tokens space from \( FIFO_{i,j} \) for a new execution; thus, \( T'_2 = [2, 0, 0] \) and \( \Gamma'_2 = [4, 0] \). At time tag 4 \((T'_4 = [2, 2, 0] \) and \( \Gamma'_4 = [6, 1] \), besides the similar status changes in \( p_1 \) and \( FIFO_1 \), \( p_2 \) is enabled and starts to compute. As the schedule advances to time tag 10, the application encounters the same process and FIFO status list (\( T' \) and \( \Gamma' \)) as at time tag 4 (i.e., \( T'_{10} = T'_4 = [2, 2, 0] \) and \( \Gamma'_{10} = \Gamma'_4 = [6, 1] \)), and enters a periodic phase. The periodic phase extends from time tag 4 to 9, with length \( L_{\text{period}} = 6 \), in which the process \( p_i, p_j \), and \( p_k \) are guaranteed to run 3, 2, and 1 times respectively. The unroll factor \( J \), which is defined as how many repetition vector cycles form a periodic phase, of this SDF schedule is 1.

Consequently, the schedule guarantees an average output throughput \( \rho_k = \frac{1 - m_{j,k}}{L_{\text{period}}} = \frac{1}{3} \) at process \( p_j \) and requires buffer storage \( \Gamma = [6, 2] \), which are the maximum buffer usages at each FIFO.

In this thesis, the scheduling policies are restricted to be non-preemptive, to reduce the preemption overhead in implementation for real-time embedded systems. For pre-emptive scheduling of streaming applications, the work in \[99\] is referred.
2.1.3 Resource constrained scheduling on multiprocessor

In general, the problem of scheduling with resource constraints (limited number of processors) is NP-complete [32]. Here, a heuristic method to construct periodic admissible parallel schedule (PAPS) proposed in [61] is presented. For simplicity, a tightly coupled parallel architecture is assumed, in which the communication time is negligible.

![Figure 2.3: A cyclic SDF model.](image)

![Figure 2.4: Precedence graphs and PAPS schedules of the cyclic SDF model in Figure 2.3. (a-1) precedence graph for $J = 1$; (a-2) precedence graph for $J = 2$; (b-1) PAPS for $J = 1$; (b-2) PAPS for $J = 2$.](image)
First, an acyclic precedence graph needs to be constructed for the SDF model. A cyclic SDF model, with a repetition vector \( \langle r_i, r_j, r_k \rangle = \langle 2, 1, 1 \rangle \) and computation latency list \( T = [t_{C,i}, t_{C,j}, t_{C,k}] = [1, 1, 2] \), is shown in Figure 2.3^2. Figure 2.4(a-1) shows the precedence graph of this SDF model with unroll factor \( J = 1 \). Because of the initial token conditions, process \( p_i \) can fire twice and \( p_k \) can fire once, without depending on any other processes. Hence, the precedence graph shows two instances of \( p_i \) and one instance of \( p_k \) at the very left without incoming arcs. The superscript \( k \) in \( p_k^k \) denotes the \( k \)th firing of \( p_k \). However, \( p_j \) requires \( p_i \) to fire twice before it is enabled, and has one incoming arc from the second firing of \( p_i \). There is a weak precedence between \( p_k^k \) and \( p_k^{k+1} \), denoted by a dotted arc. Similarly, Figure 2.4(a-1) shows the precedence graph of this SDF model with unroll factor \( J = 2 \).

Given two homogeneous processors (\( \mu p_1 \) and \( \mu p_2 \)), processes can run on either processor with the same computation latency. A PAPS for \( J = 1 \) with a time-span of three time units is illustrated in Figure 2.4(b-1), in which \( p_i \) and \( p_k \) can run concurrently and \( p_j \) fires once \( p_k \) finishes. For \( J = 2 \), the PAPS has a time-span of five time units and delivers a higher throughput, as illustrated in Figure 2.4(b-2). Since both processors are always busy in this case, no schedule with higher throughput exists.

Although the throughput of PAPS may increase by increasing \( J \), there are no guarantees that such an optimal schedule can be found for all SDF models with finite \( J \) [61]. In addition, the cost to implement the schedule also increases with \( J \). In this thesis, the throughput and buffer properties of PAPS will be further studied, and be compared with the proposed methods in Chapter 4 and 5.

### 2.2 Architecture Platforms

A number of heterogeneous SoC architectures have been proposed in recent years [5, 8, 48, 59, 80, 92, 102]. In this thesis, the author will consider two state-of-the-art SoC architecture templates, i.e., multiprocessor systems-on-chip (MPSoCs) with network-on-chip (NoC) communication [106, 109] and hybrid multiprocessor/FPGA with run-time reconfigurability [107, 108, 110, 111]. Based on these two generic templates, the designer can derive different architecture instances by assigning parameters and constraints to physical resources, such as number and frequency of processors, memory capacities, and interconnection bandwidth.

---

^2 For clarity in the graph, the FIFO modules on communication channels are omitted. Also, a number of dots are used to denote the initial buffer token numbers.
2.2.1 NoC based MPSoC

The NoC based MPSoC architecture consists of on-tile resources and a packet switched NoC communication [25, 49]. The example architecture template with $4 \times 4$ tiles on a 2D mesh NoC topology is illustrated in Figure 2.5.

Each on tile resource (R) contains one processor ($\mu$P) and one local distributed SRAM memory (mem). Each processor has a single-cycle access to the local SRAM memory, and no cache is needed. Each on tile resource can be a signal producer, consumer, or both, and is decoupled from the communication network through the network interface (NI). The on tile resources interact with each other via the 2D mesh on-chip communication network.

Here, the multiple processor and memory modules are heterogeneous, in the sense that they have customizable running speed and buffer sizes respectively. The NoC communication provides guaranteed bandwidth and bounded latency, which can be achieved by a hard real-time communication backbone with resource reservation strategies, such as Æthereal [41] and Nostrum [69].

The multiple processors provide programmability as well as high performance, and are suitable to process concurrent streams of data associated with signal processing or multi-media services. The NoC based communication architecture provides scalability, flexibility, and high bandwidth, compared with the traditional bus-based communication. However, a systematic way to customize these system resources efficiently, while the design cost budget and timing related requirement
(e.g., energy minimization and throughput guarantees) are still met, becomes crucial.

### 2.2.2 Hybrid reconfigurable multiprocessor/FPGA

![Diagram of a partially RTR hybrid multiprocessor/FPGA using JIT reconfiguration](image)

Figure 2.6: Overview of a partially RTR hybrid multiprocessor/FPGA using JIT reconfiguration.

A FPGA platform offers many potential advantages, including high performance, high integration, short time to market and easy field upgrades. Now with the advent of large, fast, and cheap FPGAs, it is possible to place multiple CPUs and custom circuits on the same FPGA die. The so-called hybrid CPU/FPGA or multiprocessor/FPGA architecture provides an excellent platform for developing custom MPSoCs [5]. The example platforms are Xilinx [103] Virtex and Altera [2] Stratix FPGAs, embedded with either PowerPC processors and MicroBlaze soft cores [103] or Nios soft cores [2].

FPGAs, which are partially run-time reconfigurable (RTR), are also very popular in today’s embedded systems, such as Xilinx [103] Virtex-4. The architecture template of such a partially RTR hybrid multiprocessor/FPGA platform is illustrated in Figure 2.6.

On this platform, the applications can be implemented as software running on the host CPUs, while the critical portions are migrated into custom hardware circuits. The hybrid software (CPU) and hardware (FPGA) parts can use direct communication channels to communicate and buffer data, e.g., the Stratix multichannel shared memory FIFO core. It combines the merits of cost and energy efficiency of FPGAs and the easy programmability of CPUs.

For discussion, the reconfiguration-related FPGA area is divided into two parts, excluding the non-reconfigurable area.
2.3 DISCUSSIONS

1. The configuration memory is used to store the bit stream of all configurations in different working modes in a compressed (with the ratio $k_C$) format. It can either be a local on-chip memory, or an external memory (Flash, DDRAM, and SDRAM).

2. The reconfigurable area is the space for configurations that are only needed for a limited amount of time at run-time. It can be used to store several configurations at the same time. However, this thesis focuses on a “just-in-time” (JIT) approach, in which a single configuration slot is shared by different configurations at run-time. Every time a new system function is needed, the configuration controller enables the reconfiguration, and the bit stream of the new hardware implementation is loaded from the configuration memory into the reconfiguration slot.

With the run-time reconfigurability, RTR FPGAs allow part of their hardware tasks to be loaded dynamically, and they can be used to built cost-effective hardware platform for stream processing with high flexibility [58]. However, the hybrid CPU/FPGA architecture demands not only new design paradigms [5], but also novel scheduling polices typically found on real-time operation systems (RTOS). Furthermore, the performance analysis for reconfigurable FPGAs is more complex compared with methodologies on traditional non-reconfigurable systems and adds new challenges.

2.3 Discussions

Using deterministic scheduling policies, such as self-timed execution, the simulation based way in Section 2.1.2 can construct schedules at design time for SDF applications without computation resource constraints (i.e., each process is mapped onto an individual dedicated processing element). From the periodic phases (see the schedule in Figure 2.2), the application throughput can be guaranteed [39, 43]. Accordingly, the buffer requirement can be analyzed in a finite length of time\(^4\), without everlasting simulation.

However, in the implementation process, i.e., mapping applications onto platforms, the designers still need to deal with the scheduling on multiprocessor archi-

\(^3\)For some applications with predictable MCR, it may be possible to use multiple configuration slots and pre-load the useful configurations to overcome the JIT reconfiguration stall. Such a mechanism prefetch adaptation, which remains to be addressed.

\(^4\)For the Proposition and Proof, see Section 3.4.4
tectures within resources constraints, including the computation, communication, and storage physical limits. A systematic way to find application schedules according to different design concerns, such as energy efficiency and buffer minimization, is still lacking, especially when multi-clocked domains or run-time reconfigurations on the heterogeneous platforms need to be considered.

2.4 Constraint programming

Constraint programming is a paradigm to model and solve constraint satisfaction and optimization problems, in which the relations between variables are declared as constraints. Compared with imperative methods, the declarative constraint programming methods only specify what are the properties of a solution to be found, but rather how to find.

In this thesis, the mapping and scheduling of streaming applications on MPSoCs can be represented by timing variables (e.g., the event models to be proposed in Section 4.4.1), possibly constrained by precedence dependencies, resource constraints, routing decisions, and other restrictions. They are typical constraint satisfaction and optimization problems.

Definition 1. (CSP) A constraint satisfaction problem (CSP) is defined as a triple \( \langle \text{Var}, \text{Dom}, \text{Con} \rangle \), where \( \text{Var} \) is a finite set of variables, \( \text{Dom} \) is a corresponding set of domains, and \( \text{Con} \) is a finite set of constraints. A constraint \( \text{con} \) with an arity \( n \) is a pair \( \langle \text{var}, \text{sol} \rangle \), in which \( \text{var} \in \text{Var}^n \) are the variables of \( \text{con} \) and \( \text{sol} \in \text{Dom}^n \) are the solutions of \( \text{con} \).

Definition 1 can be extended to a constraint optimization problem.

Definition 2. (COP) A constrained optimization problem (COP) is defined as a CSP extended with an additional objective function \( \text{Obj}(\text{var}) \), such that the value of \( \text{Obj}(\text{var}) \) is minimized.

In this thesis, a constraint programming Gecode [33] has been used in as the constraint solver, which is an open source C++ library. Gecode supports variables with different data types, such as integer, Boolean, and set domains where each value is a set. Correspondingly, there are various constraints for each variable type, such as

- arithmetic constraints for integer variables, e.g., \( \text{min}, \text{max}, \text{mult}, \) and \( \text{div} \);
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- simple relation constraints for integer variables (e.g., $>$, $<$, $=$, $\neq$, $\geq$, and $\leq$) and Boolean variables (e.g., $\neg$, $\land$, and $\lor$);

- linear constraints for integer and Boolean variables;

- set relation constraints, e.g., $\supseteq$, $\subseteq$, and $=$.

The readers are referred to [21] for an overview on modelling issues in Gecode.

Besides some modelling techniques, such as branching and exploration techniques as introduced in Section 4.5, the solution finding process relies on the propagation-based constraint solver. The underneath constraint propagation in Gecode is out the scope of this thesis and is referred to [91]. In this thesis, the analytical methods are represented as constraint based mapping and scheduling problems. Moreover, a multi-objective optimization (instead of the regular single-objective COP as in Definition 2) design flow based on Gecode has been proposed in Chapter 7.
Multiprocessor systems-on-chip (MPSoCs) based on network-on-chip (NoC) communication have been increasingly adopted as the physical architectures for streaming applications [42, 97]. In streaming applications, a process corresponds to the given computation running on processors. Processes are connected with each other through communication channels, and operate on data streams in a pipelined fashion. The processors can be heterogeneous, each customized for specific tasks, and are running simultaneously to obtain high computation power.

However, performance is not the only concern in a streaming environment and processors are not required to run as fast as possible. Processors, running faster than demanded by the application requirements, will only produce data streams ahead of time and lead to consequent redundant storage buffers [28]. Instead, processors often run at a potentially slower frequency according to the throughput requirements and avoid otherwise higher energy consumption. Nevertheless, to achieve extreme energy efficiency on MPSoCs is non-trivial. The architectural computation, storage, and communication components, which are fully customizable, all contribute to the system energy dissipation. To take all their impacts into consideration in the energy efficiency design, appropriate system models are needed to capture both the parallel nature of streaming applications and the inherent heterogeneous timing properties of MPSoCs as well.
CHAPTER 3. ENERGY EFFICIENCY OF MULTI-CLOCKED MPSoCs

The author’s main contribution in this chapter is a design space exploration flow with the following characteristics.

1. The streaming applications are scheduled on a multi-clocked synchronous modelling framework.

2. Timing properties are guaranteed by application throughput analysis.

3. High system energy efficiency on MPSoCs architectures is achieved with customized processor and memory components using optimized pipeline parallelism.

3.1 Related work

Various models of computation (MoCs) [53, 64] have been developed for streaming applications. They are distinguished by their individual formalisms on how processes interact and how or whether time is represented. One is the Kahn process network (KPN) [63]. In [31], a design space exploration framework based on KPN investigates the performance and power trade-offs in MPSoC systems. However, limited by the unbounded FIFO channels in the KPN semantics, it cannot dimension the memory modules and analyze the effects on the system energy cost that arise from parameterized memories.

In the synchronous data flow (SDF) MoC, the static input/output computation tokens allow for the construction of periodic schedules with bounded memory size at compile time [61]. Based on the static memory allocation for digital signal processing (DSP) applications in the SDF MoC, the energy consumption is exploited at the algorithmic level [9]. However, the SDF MoC is untimed, which means the trade-offs between different timing related properties, such as throughput and energy, cannot be explored.

A timed extension has been applied to SDF in [43, 88]. Using the timed SDF MoC, a method to minimize the memory size by scheduling the processes appropriately for maximal application throughput is introduced in [43]. In [88], the trade-offs between any specified throughput constraints and the corresponding minimal memory requirements are further studied. However, memory is only one of several factors to impact the total system energy cost, besides computation and communication logics. Nevertheless, the single-unit time assumption in timed SDF [43, 88] does not suit to model the heterogeneous computation and communication timing on MPSoCs systematically.
The synchronous MoC has an explicit global order of events [53]. It has met industrial success to program safety critical reactive systems in Esterel [16], Lustre [45] and Signal [60]. Especially, Lustre and Signal/Polychrony [44] define multi-clocked models for heterogeneous embedded systems. In this chapter, a multi-clocked synchronous MoC framework is proposed in Section 3.4 to analyze timing related properties at the system level in the design space exploration for multi-clocked heterogeneous MPSoCs.

Recently, systematic methods for mapping and scheduling streaming applications with real-time requirements onto a MPSoC platform, where communication happens via NoC backbone, have been addressed by several research groups [47, 66, 89]. In contrast to existing work, this chapter leverages the degrees of customizability of both processor voltage-frequency levels and memory sizes, captures the heterogeneous timing on a multi-clocked synchronous MoC framework, and investigates the minimal energy consumption of streaming applications. High system energy efficiency is achieved without losing throughput guarantees, as confirmed in the experiments.

### 3.2 Motivation

Here the streaming application model in Figure 2.1 is instantiated with input and output rates $n_{i,j} = 2$, $m_{i,j} = 3$, $n_{j,k} = 1$, and $m_{j,k} = 2$. Different design options are explored to motivate the energy efficiency design upon some assumed energy models\(^1\). For clarification, the problem is motivated in a single domain synchronous MoC, i.e., using one clock with the same time-scale.

#### 3.2.1 Design exploration

In design option a), the computation latency list is assigned as $T = [1, 2, 2]$. Using the memory minimization techniques in [88], the self-timed schedule achieved, with $\Gamma = [6, 2]$, is shown in Figure 3.1.a). Using the unit abstract clock, the time tag advances 1 per column.

As the schedule advances to time tag 9, the application encounters the same process and FIFO status list as at time tag 3 ($T'_9 = T'_3 = [0, 1, 0]$ and $\Gamma'_9 = \Gamma'_3 = [6, 1]$) and enters a periodic phase. The periodic phase extends from time tag 3 to 8, with the length 6 time slots and process firing times vector $(3, 2, 1)$. To make both

---

\(^1\)Some more practical energy models based on instruction set simulation are adopted in the proposed design space exploration flow in Section 3.3
Figure 3.1: Self-timed schedules and energy efficiency analysis for different design options on an instance of the example application (\( i, j = 2 \), \( m_{i,j} = 3 \), \( j,k = 1 \), and \( m_{j,k} = 2 \)).
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the process computation latency and FIFO size customizable, the design space is extended to explore another two design options b) and c). Compared with a), b) is just to run $p_i$ at half speed as $T = [2, 2, 2]$ and keeps the same FIFO sizes $\Gamma$; c) uses $T = [2, 2, 4]$ and $\Gamma = [6, 3]$ to run both $p_i$ and $p_k$ at half speed and assign one more storage element to $FIFO_{i,j}$. Accordingly, their individual self-timed schedules are shown in Figure 3.1.b) and c). Both schedules encounter a periodic phase, with the same length and the same processes firing times vector, as a) does. In this sense, all the design options can deliver the same guaranteed application throughput.

3.2.2 Energy efficiency evaluation

In the periodic phase, the energy efficiency of different design options is evaluated, based on the following assumed computation latency and energy models (only the dynamic energy is considered).

1. Each process $p_x$ is bound to one individual processor $\mu p_y$. Each processor operating voltage $v_y$ is set at two voltage levels $v_H$ and $v_L$ ($v_L$ is half of $v_H$) to explore the design space. The processor operating frequency $f_y$ changes proportionally to $v_y$ ($f_y \propto v_y$); thus, $f_L$ is at half speed of $f_H$. The computation latency $t_x$ of $p_x$ changes accordingly to $t_x \propto f^{-1}_y$.

2. For each executing time slot of $p_x$ the dynamic power consumption on $\mu p_y$ is $\hat{P}_{\mu p_y, p_x} (v_y, f_y) = \alpha \cdot v^2_y \cdot f_y$, where $\alpha$ is the average switching capacitance. Since $f_y \propto v_y$ is known, $\hat{P}_{\mu p_y, p_x} \propto f_y^3$ is attained as a cubic function of $f_y$. For $n$ computation time slots the processor energy consumption $E_{\mu p_y}$ is $E_{\mu p_y} = n \cdot \hat{P}_{\mu p_y, p_x} (v^2_y, f_y)$.

3. Each $FIFO_x$ is bound to one individual memory $mem_y$, and the memory size equals to the FIFO size $\gamma_x$. Within a fixed accessing pattern, the memory energy consumption is $E_{mem_y} = \hat{E}_{mem_y} (\gamma_x) \propto \gamma_x$, where the memory dynamic energy function $\hat{E}_{mem_y}$ is proportional to memory size.

4. As the baseline, in design option a) all the processor voltage-frequency levels are set to $(v_H, f_H)$, and for each time slot the processor dynamic power consumption is normalized to 1, as shown in column 4 of Figure 3.1.d);

\footnote{For the formal definition, see Section 3.4.4} \footnote{Here, the assumed models are only used for illustration. In practical experiments, the computation latency and energy dissipation are derived from simulation (see Section 3.3).}
the memory energy consumption in the periodic phase is assigned to 1 per storage element, as shown in Figure 3.1.e).

Thus, the computation latency, computation energy and memory energy characteristics of other design options have been derived in Figure 3.1.d-e). There are three processors and two memory modules in the physical architecture. For design option a) \((T = [1, 2, 2], \Gamma = [6, 2] \text{ and } \langle r_i, r_j, r_k \rangle = \langle 3, 2, 1 \rangle)\), the total processor energy \(E_U\) and total memory energy \(E_M\) are

\[
E_U = E_{\mu p_1} + E_{\mu p_2} + E_{\mu p_3} = \sum_{\forall \mu p_y} t_x \cdot r_x \cdot \hat{P}_{\mu p_y,p_x}(v_H,f_H) \\
= 1 \cdot 3 \cdot 1 + 2 \cdot 2 \cdot 1 + 2 \cdot 1 \cdot 1 = 9
\]

\[
E_M = E_{\text{mem}_1} + E_{\text{mem}_2} = \sum_{\forall \text{mem}_y} \hat{E}_{\text{mem}_y}(\gamma_j) \\
= 1 \cdot 6 + 1 \cdot 2 = 8
\]

The total system energy consumption is \(E_{\text{Sum}} = E_U + E_M = 17\). Similarly, the energy consumptions for design options b) and c) are calculated, as shown in Figure 3.1.f).

Design option c) has the most efficient system energy \(E_{\text{Sum}}\). In addition, it achieves the highest average processor utilization \(\eta\) (ratio of the shadowed part in the periodic phase of process schedules), which means the best pipelined parallelism. However, higher pipelined parallelism does not always mean lower system energy dissipation, as demonstrated in Section 3.6.

### 3.3 Design space exploration flow

For streaming applications with guaranteed throughput, an energy efficiency design space exploration flow is proposed, as shown in Figure 3.2. The inputs of the design exploration flow (three boxes on the top) are the application benchmark C program, the static mapping from the application onto the MPSoC architecture and the architectural design options in the configuration file.

The C program for each computation process is cross-compiled into a binary using the ARM gcc toolchain [1]. From the application to architecture mapping and the resource constraints defined in the configuration file, implementation model instances with different architectural parameters are initialized. The design space is explored by customizing both the processor voltage-frequency levels and memory sizes, as discussed in Section 3.2.1.

Instead of using the assumed latency and energy models in the previous section, the process binary computation timing and energy dissipations on the architectural
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Component instances are estimated on Sim-Panalyzer [4] and Cacti [101] simulators. Based on the individual process timing and energy profiles, the application throughput and system energy dissipations on MPSoC architecture are analyzed systematically in the multi-clocked synchronous MoC framework. The performance of the application can be determined and optimized at design-time based on the following assumptions:

- Predictable NoC with guaranteed bandwidth and bounded latency.
- Predictable Network Interface (NI).
- Bounded computation time of each process on processing elements.

The design objective is to minimize the total system energy dissipation while meeting the application throughput requirement. As the design space increases exponentially with the problem size, heuristic algorithms (greedy and Taboo [26] search) are used during the design options searching until the design goals are met.

3.4 Multi-clocked synchronous MoC framework

Here, a synchronous MoC framework, which preserves the static computation input/output rates in the SDF MoC, is adopted for timing related properties analysis, e.g., application throughput analysis and system energy evaluation. Furthermore,
multi-clocked domains are considered and exploited to relate the heterogeneous timing in different system domains (similar to Lustre [45]), which suit different clocks in heterogeneous MPSoCs well.

### 3.4.1 Synchronous MoC framework

Preserving the static producing and consuming token rate properties, the SDF models can be transformed into synchronous models [67, 106], in which the timing of process firing and timing-related properties can be captured. In the synchronous MoC, systems are described as a set of concurrent processes, which communicate through synchronous signals.

**Stream models**

A signal (data stream) $s$ with clock $clk_s$ is an indexed\(^4\) set of events,

$$s = \bigcup \{ e_{i(n)} \}^{clk_s} = \{ e_{i(0)}, e_{i(1)}, \cdots, e_{i(n)}, \cdots \}^{clk_s}, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}_0. \tag{3.1}$$

The signal clock $clk_s \in \mathbb{Q}^+$ is the abstract cycle (time slot) period between two adjacent events. It is the elementary time unit, in which time is measured and for which timing related properties (e.g., throughput and energy) are evaluated. Each event $e_{i(n)} = (g_{i(n)}, \vec{v}_{i(n)})$ has a time tag $g_{i(n)}$ and a value $\vec{v}_{i(n)}$.\(^5\) Time tags are used to model the global order of events, and are implicitly given by the event indexes in the signal, with $g_{i(n)} = n \cdot clk_s$; thus, a signal can be simply denoted as $s = \bigcup \{ \vec{v}_{i(n)} \}^{clk_s}$. The timing relation of the events in signals with different clocks is visualized in Figure 3.3. Two signals $s_1$ and $s_2$ have the clock timing relation $\\frac{clk_{s_1}}{clk_{s_2}} = \frac{3}{2}$. The global order of the events in both signals are maintained by time tags.

**Process**

To capture the input (output) rate in process executing cycles\(^6\) and absents in stalling cycles, values are a vector $\vec{v}$ of regular tokens, extended with a pseudo value $\bot$. $\vec{v}_{i(n)}$ is $\vec{v}$ when the required tokens are present, or $\bot$ when absent. The number of the regular tokens contained in $\vec{v}$ is fixed. For instance, a synchronous

---

\(^{4}\)In this chapter, the subscripted numbers in parentheses are used especially for indexing purpose.

\(^{5}\)It is an event model both for performance analysis and for functional correctness analysis.

\(^{6}\)It is the worst case execution time (WCET) of the process, which is the maximum length of time takes to execute on a specific hardware platform by analysis of a process program flow [20].
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Value \( \vec{v}_{1(0)} \) \( \vec{v}_{1(1)} \) \( \vec{v}_{1(2)} \) \( \vec{v}_{1(3)} \) \( \cdots \)

Time tag 0 1 2 3

Index 0

\( s_1 = \bigcup \{ \vec{v}_{1(n)} \} \)

Value \( \vec{v}_{2(0)} \) \( \vec{v}_{2(1)} \) \( \vec{v}_{2(2)} \) \( \vec{v}_{2(3)} \) \( \vec{v}_{2(4)} \) \( \vec{v}_{2(5)} \) \( \cdots \)

Time tag 0 \( \frac{2}{3} \) \( \frac{4}{3} \) \( \frac{2}{3} \)

Index 0 1 2 3 4 5

\( s_2 = \bigcup \{ \vec{v}_{2(n)} \} \)

Figure 3.3: Timing relations of events in signals with different clocks.

Signal \( s_1 = \{ \bot, (1, 1, 2), (2, 3, 4), \cdots \} \) has integer token number 3 and clock period \( \frac{1}{2} \).

Processes operate on signals. For a set of processes with the same clock of signals, they are said to be in a single domain; otherwise, they are in different multi-clocked domains, which is to be introduced in Section 3.4. In each evaluation cycle, processes consume one event from the input signals and output one event to the output signals. In perfect synchrony \([53]\), the computation and communication are executed in zero time and the computation states are maintained in explicit delay process statements. A synchronous model is composed of combinational processes \( p_{\text{comb}}(f) \) and unit-cycle delay processes \( p_{\Delta}(\vec{v}_{(0)}) \), in which function \( f \) specifies the mapping from input events to output events and the given initial state \( \vec{v}_{(0)} \) is the output event at time tag 0 to defer the input events one cycle.

While \( p_{\text{comb}}(f) \) fits to describes algorithmic function flow, its combination with \( p_{\Delta}(\vec{v}_{(0)}) \) can be used to construct control logic and more complex components. For instance, the \( \tau \)-cycle (\( \tau \in \mathbb{N} \)) delay process is a combination of \( \tau \) unit delay process with \( p_{\Delta, \tau}(\bot) = p_{\Delta}(\bot) \circ \cdots \circ p_{\Delta}(\bot) \); a combinational pro-

\footnote{The process composition operator \( \circ \) has the formal definition \( p_1 \circ p_2(s_1) = p_1(p_2(s_1)) \)}
cess with $\tau$-cycle computation latency is $p_{comb, \tau}(f) = p_{comb}(f) \circ p_{\Delta, \tau}(\bot)$; and a *mealy* state machine, with the state function $f_{state}$ and output function $f_{out}$, has the process skeleton shown in Figure 3.4. The *mealy* state machine is the base to construct the control logic of a finite size FIFO [81].

### 3.4.2 Multi-clocked synchronous domains and domain interfaces

In the synchronous model, processes using the same abstract clock are said to be in the same synchronous domain. To model the heterogeneous timing properties in embedded systems, such as the parallel computation on several processors running at different frequency levels, multi-clocked synchronous domains are introduced.

When multi-clocked domains exist, i.e., different domain clocks have a rational ratio to each other, asynchronous domain interfaces (DI) are needed to maintain the global timing. In the upper-left part of Figure 3.5, two domains $D_A$ and $D_B$, with different clock periods $clk_A$ and $clk_B$, have a rational clock ratio $\lambda_{A:B} = \frac{clk_A}{clk_B}$, $\forall m_A, m_B \in \mathbb{N}, m_A \neq m_B$, and $m_A$ and $m_B$ are relatively prime.

The domain interface $DI_{A:B}$, which establishes the clock ratio $\lambda_{A:B}$ from $A$ to $B$ is defined as $DI_{A:B} = downDI(m_B) \circ upDI(m_A)$.

As the start point at index 0, all the signal events have the consistent time tag $0$. Thus, at tag 0 $upDI(m_A)$ and $downDI(m_B)$ output the value $\vec{v}(0)$ from the input signal. Otherwise, $upDI(m_A)$ is up-sampling the input signal clock $m_A$ times by inserting $m_A - 1$ absent events before each event; and $downDI(m_B)$ is down-sampling the input signal clock $m_B$ times by merging every $m_B$ events. They have the following definitions:

\[
upDI(m_A)(\{\vec{v}(0), \vec{v}(1), \vec{v}(2), \ldots \}^{clk_x}) = \\{\vec{v}(0), \bot, \ldots, \bot, \vec{v}(1), \bot, \ldots, \bot, \vec{v}(2), \ldots \}^{\frac{clk_x}{m_A}}_{m_A-1}
\]

\[
downDI(m_B)(\{\vec{v}(0), \vec{v}(1), \ldots, \vec{v}(m_B), \vec{v}(m_B+1), \ldots \}^{clk_x}) = \{\vec{v}(0), \vec{v}(1), \ldots, \vec{v}(m_B), \vec{v}(m_B+1), \ldots \}^{\frac{clk_x}{m_B}}_{m_B}
\]

where $\langle \bot, \ldots, \bot \rangle$ is reduced to $\bot$

In Figure 3.5.a.1) and b.1-2), the functionalities of several different instances of up- and down-sampling components are illustrated by a unit rate input signal $s_A$ and two instances of output signal $s_B'$ and $s_B''$, in which $s_B''$ has the slowest...
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Figure 3.5: Multi-clocked synchronous domains and domain interfaces.
clock with \( \text{clk}_B = \frac{4}{3} \) (simply denoted as \( s''_B \)). The signal events are listed in the ascending order of time tags. Without losing or gaining data tokens, the specified input events (shadowed) of \( s_A \) are mapped to the output events (shadowed) of \( s'_B \) or \( s''_B \) in a different clock domain. When \( \lambda_{A:B} = \frac{3}{2} > 1 \) and \( \text{clk}_B \) is faster than \( \text{clk}_A \), the output data token pattern is getting more sparse, but the original rate (the number of the non-absent values in \( \vec{v} \)) is kept. Otherwise, \( \lambda_{A:B} = \frac{3}{4} < 1 \) and it leads to increased token rate; especially, when \( m_B \neq 1 \), the rate of the output events can vary, as shown in Figure 3.5.b.2). However, as the output data stream is always buffered by a FIFO, it does not violate the static token rate assumption for process computation. As shown in the upper-right part of Figure 3.5, the output signal \( s_A \) of the FIFO always provide a constant input rate \( 2 \) required by \( p_4 \). To ensure consistent timing, \( DI_{B:A} \) from domain \( D_B \) to \( D_A \) has the reversed sampling ratio \( \lambda_{B:A} \).

Domain interfaces act as the glue processes between different synchronous domains. When a domain clock time changes, only the domain interface sampling ratios need to be reconfigured, which greatly facilitates the modelling and design space exploration on heterogeneous MPSoCs.

**Domain interface causality**

Although the domain interface has asynchronous features, its input and output signals do not violate the causality condition of the demand driven simulation.

**Proposition 1.** Domain interface \( DI_{A:B} \) has input signal \( s_A \) at domain \( D_A \) and output signal \( s_B \) at domain \( D_B \), as shown in Figure 3.6. For all \( a_1 \in \mathbb{N}_0 \), \( b_1 \in \mathbb{N}_0 \),

\[
DI_{A:B}(\{\cdots, \vec{v}_A(a_1), \cdots\})_{\text{clk}_A} = \{\cdots, \vec{v}_B(b_1), \cdots\}_{\text{clk}_B},
\]

where \( \{\vec{v}_B(b_1)\}_{\text{clk}_B} = \{\langle\cdots, \vec{v}_A(a_1), \cdots\rangle_{\text{clk}_A}\} \). s.t. the timing relation \( \text{Tag}(\vec{v}_B(b_1)) \geq \text{Tag}(\vec{v}_A(a_1)) \) exists, in which the operator \( \text{Tag} \) is to get the time tag \( g(n) \) for a specified signal value \( \vec{v}(n) \). Hence, \( DI_{A:B} \) preserves causality between its input and output signals.

**Proof.** In case of \( a_1 = b_1 = 0 \), \( \text{Tag}(\vec{v}_B(0)) \equiv \text{Tag}(\vec{v}_A(0)) \equiv 0 \) meets the timing relation. Otherwise, \( a_1 \geq 1 \) and \( b_1 \geq 1 \). From the definition of \( \text{up}DI(m_A) \) in (3.2), it is known that \( \text{clk}_{T_{\text{tmp}}} = \frac{\text{clk}_A}{m_A} \). From the definition of \( \text{down}DI(m_B) \) in (3.3), it is
known that $\forall b_1 \in \mathbb{N}_0$

$$\{\vec{v}_{B(b_1)}\}^{clk_B} = \{\vec{v}_{A(a_1)}, \cdots\}^{clk_B} = downDI(m_B)$$

$$(\{\vec{v}_{Tmp(m_B \cdot b_1)}, \vec{v}_{Tmp(m_B \cdot b_1-1)}, \cdots\}^{clk_{Tmp}})$$

$Tag$ is monotonically increasing, thus

$$Tag(\vec{v}_{A(a_1)}) \leq Tag(\vec{v}_{Tmp(m_B \cdot b_1)})$$

From the definition of $Tag$, it is known that

$$Tag(\vec{v}_{B(b_1)}) = b_1 \cdot clk_B$$

$$Tag(\vec{v}_{Tmp(m_B \cdot b_1)}) = m_B \cdot b_1 \cdot clk_{Tmp} = b_1 \cdot (m_B \cdot \frac{clk_A}{m_A})$$

Thus, it concludes $Tag(\vec{v}_{B(b_1)}) \geq Tag(\vec{v}_{A(a_1)})$. 

---

### 3.4.3 Scheduling state and cross domain analysis

As discussed in Section 3.2, in a single synchronous domain $D_N$, at time tag $g(n)$ ($n \in \mathbb{N}_0$) the process status list $T'_{N(n)}$ associates with each process the remaining number of time slots when it *executes*, or 0 when it *stalls*; meanwhile, the FIFO status list $\Gamma'_{N(n)}$ associates with each channel the amount of FIFO storage space used. The scheduling state in $D_N$ is a tuple $(T'_{N(n)}, \Gamma'_{N(n)})$.

A multi-clocked application consists of a set of synchronous domains $D$, in which domain $D_N$ with the slowest domain clock $clk_N$ is chosen as the logic mold domain. Each component (process or FIFO) status signal in $D_K$ ($\forall K \in D$) can be cast across domain boundary into the single $D_N$ via $DI_{K:N}$, where $\lambda_{K:N} \leq 1$. 

---

**Figure 3.6: Domain interfaces $DI_{A:B}$.**
Such a single component status signal casting ($\lambda_{K:N} = \frac{3}{4}$) can be illustrated by Figure 3.5.a.1 and b.2). $s_A$ is looked as the status signal in $D_K$ and $s''_B$ the status signal in the mold domain $D_N$. Each value at time tag $g(n)$ in $s''_B$ is called a scheduling pattern.

To be consistent with the scheduling state definition in the single domain, the scheduling patterns are encoded into incrementing numbers starting from 0, and the same numbers are used to denote the revisited patterns. The functionality of such a encoding module $patternEnc$ is shown in Figure 3.7. In $s_{patternSt}$, the scheduling patterns at time tags 1 and 4 are duplicated, and are encoded as the same 1 in $s_{encSt}$. In this way, the timing properties for multi-clocked applications can be analyzed by casting the system scheduling states in multi-clocked domains into the single mold domain $D_N$.

### 3.4.4 Application throughput analysis and throughput guarantees

**Proposition 2.** (Throughput guarantees) For a consistent SDF streaming application (see Section 2.1.1), a periodic phase in its schedule always exists. The required application throughput is guaranteed by the output periodic properties during this period.

**Proof.** A consistent SDF streaming application could run indefinitely. However, the application scheduling status (process and FIFO status, see Section 2.1.2) space is always finite. Thus, some scheduling status will be re-visited in a non-terminating schedule. As only deterministic scheduling policies are considered, the application schedule enters a periodic phase when a repeated scheduling status is met. The output throughput during this period could sustain indefinitely, which guarantees the application throughput. \[\square\]
In the logic mold domain $D_N$, when the scheduling state $(T'_{N(n_2)}, \Gamma'_{N(n_2)})$ for the application at time tag $g(n_2)$ meets a repeated one as at $g(n_1)$ ($n_1 < n_2$, $T'_{N(n_2)} = T'_{N(n_1)}$, $\Gamma'_{N(n_2)} = \Gamma'_{N(n_1)}$), the application schedule enters a periodic phase with length $g_\Delta = g(n_2) - g(n_1)$. In this periodic phase, the process throughput of $p_n$ is defined as

$$Thru(p_n) = \frac{r_n \cdot n_{p_n} \cdot Sz_{token}}{g_\Delta}$$

(3.4)

in which $r_n$ is the firing times of $p_n$, $n_{p_n}$ the output rate considered and $Sz_{token}$ the data size per token. When $Sz_{token}$ in bit and the corresponding physical time to $g_\Delta$ are known, equation (3.4) defines the process throughput in bit/s. Caused by the static token rates, the throughput of various processes in the models have a fixed ratio. The throughput of the sink process is simply used as the application throughput, which is the speed the application delivers outputs.

### 3.5 Energy efficiency design on MPSoCs

The design objective is to minimize the system energy dissipation while meeting the required application throughput.

#### 3.5.1 Implementation model

The architecture model is an MPSoC template, which consists of on-tile components and a packet switched communication network-on-chip (NoC), as shown in the lower part of Figure 3.8. Each tile contains one processor ($\mu$P) and one local SRAM memory ($mem$), and is decoupled from the communication network through the network interface ($NI$). Each processor has a single-cycle access to the local SRAM memory, and no cache is needed.

Given an architecture model with a set of processors $U$ and a set of memories $M$, the implementation model (a resource-aware refinement of the application model) has the mappings from a set of computation processes $P$ onto $U$ and a set of FIFOs $F$ onto $M$. For simplicity, FIFOs are assumed to be mapped to disjoint memory regions. The techniques in [43], which allow buffer sharing among the FIFOs mapped to the same memory module, are not considered.

As the mapping optimization on the NoC communication has been studied in [50] and is out of the scope of this work, a static mapping strategy is used as the start of the work in this chapter. Furthermore, the design flexibility in the communication backbone is not investigated and the design option in the NoC communi-
The mapping of the implementation model of the example application (Figure 2.1) onto a two-tile NoC based MPSoC architecture is shown in Figure 3.8. The MPSoC architectural characteristics are captured in the implementation model, with the following strategies.

1. Each process $p_x$ is mapped to one on-tile processor $\mu p_y$, each FIFO $FIFO_x$ to one memory $mem_y$, and inter-tile channels to NoC communication.

2. Each tile and the NoC communication are modeled in individual domains, and they interact via domain interfaces. In Figure 3.8, the sampling ratios of $DI_{A:C}$ and $DI_{C:B}$ correspond to the heterogeneous timing between different architecture modules.

3. When multiple processes are mapped onto one processor (see domain $D_A$), their executions are scheduled sequentially according to the non-preemptive assignments in a priority queue ($PQ$). Thus, the scheduling decision on a single processor only changes when data dependency changes.
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4. When multiple FIFOs are mapped onto one memory (see domain $D_A$), they use independent logic addresses without space sharing, and the memory size is the summation of the FIFO sizes.

5. The NoC logic is assumed to provide a guaranteed bandwidth based on a hard real-time communication backbone [69] between different tiles. In Figure 3.8, the inter-tile data token transmission delay quantified by process $p_{\Delta, \tau_{\text{NoC}}}$ is predictable, with

$$\tau_{\text{NoC}} = \left\lceil m_{\Delta} \cdot \frac{S_{\text{token}}}{w_{\text{NoC}}} + t_{\text{hop}} \right\rceil$$

(3.5)

in which $m_{\Delta}$ is the input rate of $p_{\Delta, \tau_{\text{NoC}}}$, $w_{\text{NoC}}$ the reserved NoC bandwidth and $t_{\text{hop}}$ the network hop delay.

3.5.2 Design objective: energy efficiency

The architectural design options on the processor voltage-frequency levels are customized by the domain interface configurations, and memory sizes by the parameterized FIFOs. For each instance of the implementation model, the processes computation timing and energy properties are profiled by the cycle-accurate processor energy simulator Sim-Panalyzer [4] and the memory simulator Cacti [101]. As shown in Figure 3.9, Sim-Panalyzer is configured with certain voltage-frequency levels, and provides the computation timing and dynamic energy dissipation for the gcc cross-compiled binary of each process. It is assumed that the static power of the processor during customization is constant and is ignored in calculation. Meanwhile, the memory accessing patterns are profiled in an execution trace file, based on the static and dynamic energy dissipations of the specified memory estimated with Cacti.

With each process computation latency resolved from the computation timing profiles and each communication delay from the guaranteed bandwidth NoC communication logic, the timing of each process on the implementation model is specified. While the processes bounded on the same tile are scheduled sequentially, the application self-timed schedule is determined by its scheduling state. The same techniques as introduced in Section 3.4.4 are used for the resource-aware application throughput analysis.

Within a given throughput requirement, the amount of stream data transmitted via the NoC communication is fixed during some period of time. In [50], the bit energy model reveals that the average energy consumption to send one bit on NoC
is proportional to the Manhattan distance between two tiles. From this metric, the NoC energy dissipation for streaming applications with guaranteed throughput is static, since a static mapping strategy is used. Thus, the NoC energy dissipation is not counted in the system energy analysis.

The process and memory energy dissipations are estimated for each time slot in a state based way. When all the processes mapped onto a processor \( \mu_p \) are stalled, the processor is in idle mode and only consumes the static energy \( \dot{E}_{\mu_p} \) (to be ignored as mentioned), so does the local memory \( \text{mem}_y \) consumes \( \dot{E}_{\text{mem}_y} \); otherwise, the processor and memory are in active mode, they also consume the dynamic energy (\( \dot{E}_{\mu_p} \) and \( \dot{E}_{\text{mem}_y} \)) of the executing process profiled by Sim-Panalyzer and Cacti.

While satisfying a given application throughput requirement \( \text{Thru}_0 \) upon the sink process \( p_{\text{sink}} \), the aim is to minimize the overall system energy \( E_{\text{Sum}} \), which is the energy summation of all the processor and memory modules. The design objective and constraints are formalized as the following:

\[
\begin{align*}
\min \quad & E_{\text{Sum}} = \\
& \sum_{\forall \mu_p \in U} \dot{E}_{\mu_p} \\
& + \sum_{\forall \text{mem}_y \in M} (\dot{E}_{\text{mem}_y} + \dot{E}_{\text{mem}_y}) \\
\end{align*}
\]  

(3.6)
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where 
\[
\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\mu p y} = \sum_{\forall p y \in \mathcal{P}} (t_x \cdot r_x \cdot \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{\mu p y} \cdot \gamma_{x,y}^2 \cdot \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{\mu p y} \cdot \varphi_{\mu p y})
\]
\[
\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\text{mem} y} = \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\text{mem} y} (\sum_{\forall \text{FIFO} \in \mathcal{F}} (\gamma_{x} \cdot \varphi_{\text{FIFO}, \text{mem} y}))
\]
\[
\dot{\mathcal{E}}_{\text{mem} y} = g(\Delta) \cdot \dot{\mathcal{P}}_{\text{mem} y} (\sum_{\forall \text{FIFO} \in \mathcal{F}} (\gamma_{x} \cdot \varphi_{\text{FIFO}, \text{mem} y}))
\]

subject to 
\[
\text{Thru}(p_{\text{sink}}) \geq \text{Thru}_0
\]
\[
\sum_{\forall \mu p y \in \mathcal{U}} \varphi_{\mu p y} = 1, \quad \forall \varphi_{\mu p y} \in \{0, 1\}
\]
\[
\sum_{\forall \text{mem} y \in \mathcal{M}} \varphi_{\text{FIFO}, \text{mem} y} = 1, \quad \forall \varphi_{\text{FIFO}, \text{mem} y} \in \{0, 1\}
\]

in which \(\varphi_{\mu p y}\) and \(\varphi_{\text{FIFO}, \text{mem} y}\) are the decision variables (equals to 0 or 1) to determine the mapping from \(\mathcal{P}\) onto \(\mathcal{U}\) and \(\mathcal{F}\) onto \(\mathcal{M}\), \(\mathcal{P}_{\text{mem} y}\) the static power function of the specified \(\text{mem} y\), and \(g(\Delta)\) the length of the periodic phase.

The design space exploration has the complexity \(O(n|\mathcal{U}|+|\mathcal{F}|)\), which is NP-hard regarding the problem size. Thus, the widely used heuristic algorithms (i.e., greedy and Taboo [26] search) are used for the design options optimization.

3.6 Experimental results

To evaluate the potential of the proposed design flow in energy efficiency design, experiments have been applied on a software FM radio application (presented in [42]) on a NoC based 4 × 4 mesh tiles MPSoC.

The application model has 44 concurrent processes, which are clustered into 14 partitions in a five-stage pipeline, as illustrated on the left side of Figure 3.10. The pipeline consists of a signal source, a low-pass filter (LPF), a demodulator (Dem), an equalizer (Equ) with 10 children modules over a range of frequencies, and a signal sink. The arrows marked with numbers show the logic connections and data rates between different partitions.

With each partition allocated to one tile, an empirical mapping from the clustered application to the 14 tiles (the other two are left unused) is shown in Figure 3.10. Each pipeline stage of the application is modeled in one individual synchronous clock domain, so is the network logic. The dashed-lines between each pipeline stage stand for the implicit NoC communication and domain interfaces. With the static clock abstraction in the network communication domain, it is taken
as the logic mold domain in the multi-clocked synchronous model. To decrease the problem size, symmetrical on-tile resources and NoC communication configurations are used for the 10 children modules in stage 4.

Each on-tile processor is a StrongARM SA-1100 with the customizable voltage-frequency levels shown in Table 3.1, and each local memory is SRAM with the size given by the FIFO buffers to be implemented on this tile. The C program task of each process is compiled into binary using the ARM gcc toolchain and used as the input of Sim-Panalyzer and Cacti for architectural energy estimations. To make the energy dissipations estimated from Sim-Panalyzer and Cacti consistent, the same .18µm technology node is used in the configurations for both simulators.

In addition, as the energy results for each customizable module is independent of each other, they could be simulated off-line in a linear time proportional to the problem size, and saved in a look-up table for design exploration.

At the application sink process, a unit data token is a compound data type containing 512 32-bit values. According to the sink process throughput, design optimizations have been performed based on three different application workloads. They have the required application throughput 640 kb/s (Thru-1), 533 kb/s (Thru-2) and 400 kb/s (Thru-3) respectively.
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Table 3.2: Experimental results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Thru-1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Thru-2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Thru-3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$E_U$</td>
<td>$E_M$</td>
<td>$E_{Sum}$</td>
<td>$\delta$</td>
<td>$\eta$</td>
<td>$E_U$</td>
<td>$E_M$</td>
<td>$E_{Sum}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad-hoc</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>181.2</td>
<td>209.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>174.4</td>
<td>205.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min-memory</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>152.3</td>
<td>186.2</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>152.4</td>
<td>185.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greedy</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>159.0</td>
<td>168.3</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>158.8</td>
<td>168.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taboo</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>155.6</td>
<td>165.8</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>152.4</td>
<td>165.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The unit of energy is mJ.

As the baseline, an Ad-hoc design method\(^8\) is served as the reference. The minimal memory requirements (Min-Memory) technique in [88] does not have constraints on the energy consumption of the whole, but only optimize the design in memory usage. Both heuristic Greedy and Taboo [26] search are implemented in the design exploration flow for design optimizations based on customizable voltage-frequency levels and memory sizes. The termination criteria of both methods are a specified number of iterations, e.g., 10 iterations, during which the objective function Eq. 3.6 has no improvements on its value.

Within all the workloads, the computation schedules on multiple processors achieved by the design options with different methods are shown in Figure 3.11. Being aware of the global timing, the schedules modeled in different clock domains are elaborated on a normalized time axis. Each processor $\mu p_i$ corresponds to the processor on the tile marked with $i$ in Figure 3.10. In addition, the computations on all the $\mu p_{4,n}$ ($0 \leq n \leq 9$) in the pipeline stage 4 are symmetrical and have the same scheduling behaviors. Only one sample is used in this stage to evaluate the system energy and processor computation efficiency. All the design options meet the application throughput requirements. The heavier the workload is, the denser the periodic execution pattern is. The design options, which require the processors to run at a relatively lower frequency, get the higher computation efficiency (the average executing ratio in the processor schedules), as shown in the $\eta$ columns of Table 3.2.

The results of the experiments, to deliver a specified amount of application output data in the periodic schedules, are summarized in Table 3.2, in which $\delta$

\(^8\)From 100 randomly selected design choices with satisfied application throughput, the one with median energy consumption is chosen as the Ad-hoc design option, similar to the approach Hu and Marculescu [50] adopt.
Figure 3.11: Periodic schedules of the FM radio application on multiple processors, in which the three workloads considered are Thru-1=640 KB/s, Thru-2=533 KB/s and Thru-3=400 KB/s. The schedule of µp\_n (0 \leq n \leq 9) represents the symmetrical computations in the pipeline stage 4.
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denotes the energy saving ratio achieved by each other design method according to the Ad-hoc approach. In all the experiments, the heuristics methods get the optimized design option in $10^3$ searches, which is trivial compared to the searching space, i.e., $> 5 \times 10^9$. Analyzing the experiments the following results can be derived:

1. With minimal memory usage, the Min-Memory method consumes the smallest memory energy $E_M$. However, it ignores the customizability of processors, and achieves only a limited energy saving at around 10%.

2. Higher computation efficiency $\eta$ does not always mean higher system energy efficiency $E_{Sum}$. Instead, an energy efficient design assigns the minimum energy budget on both processor and memory modules with a properly pipelined parallelism. For example, in workload Thru-2 of Table 3.2 Taboo gets the $\eta$ of 40.7%, which is lower than 53.0% of Greedy, but its design option is more energy efficient in $E_{Sum}$ (3.3 mJ less).

3. The proposed design flow with Greedy search shows the energy savings $\delta$ at around 19%. Furthermore, using the proposed design flow with Taboo search, which could escape from the local optima in the searching space, even better solutions at 21% can be found.

It is concluded that the proposed design flow with the Taboo search takes the advantage of the customizable computation and storage modules, and can be used to design energy efficient streaming applications with guaranteed throughput on MPSoCs.

3.7 Concluding remarks

This chapter proposes an energy efficient design exploration flow for streaming applications with guaranteed throughput on MPSoCs. Both application throughput analysis and system energy calculation have been carried out on a multi-clocked synchronous MoC framework. Instead of only analyzing the memory efficiencies or processor utilizations, the design intent is to minimize the overall energy cost. The degrees of customizability of both processor voltage-frequency levels and memory sizes have been leveraged to investigate the minimal energy consumption of streaming applications. High system energy efficiency is achieved without losing throughput guarantees, as illustrated in experiments.
The investigations suggest that focusing on either best memory efficiencies or processor utilisations is more likely to result in less optimized implementations. Using the heuristic Taboo search, better solutions in terms of total energy cost can be found, which is also supported by experiments.
The current trend toward systems-on-chip (SoCs) consisting of several modules of processor, custom circuit and memory (e.g., the hybrid CPU/FPGA architecture [5]) makes the global analysis of heterogeneous software/hardware (SW/HW) systems essential.

To map the tutorial example application model (see Figure 2.1) onto the hybrid CPU/FPGA architecture below, as illustrated in Figure 4.1, process $p_i$ and $p_k$ are implemented as SW and scheduled sequentially by the real-time operating system (RTOS) on the same CPU, and process $p_j$ is implemented as HW custom circuit. The computation modules (both SW and HW) communicate via dedicated FIFO channels for data buffering. Needless to mention, the general architecture platform considered may have multiple CPU or custom circuit modules.

Due to the static nature of SDF models, sophisticated algorithms can be used to compute optimized schedules at compile-time. This chapter proposes a constraint based scheduling methodology for real-time streaming applications with minimal buffer requirements on such a hybrid SW/HW platform.
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4.1 Related work

Lee and Messerschmitt [61] present techniques to construct periodic admissible sequential schedules (PASS) on single-processors or periodic admissible parallel schedules (PAPS) on multi-processors. Later, Bhattacharyya et al. [12] have taken buffer minimization into consideration using heuristics in PASS (but not PAPS) construction.

To provide timing guarantees, Govindarajan et al. [43] and Stuijk et al. [88] exploit a timed-SDF model. Govindarajan et al. address the buffer minimization of SDF applications to obtain schedules with maximal throughput. Furthermore, Stuijk et al. investigate the buffer minimization of applications upon different specified throughput requirements. Nevertheless, neither of the techniques considers the computation resource constraints when multiple processes mapped onto a single processing element (processor), and can handle the global optimization of both sequential SW and parallel HW scheduling on a hybrid CPU/FPGA architecture.

The proposed constraint formulation in this chapter is close in spirit to the work in [43], in which the authors establish their linear constraints based on process start execution time and data dependency. However, they relax the integer constraints on buffer sizes (the integer formulation is NP-complete) in implementation to utilize the efficiency of linear programming. It is argued to dimension the correct minimal buffer requirement. Furthermore, they use heuristics to estimate buffer requirement before a valid schedule is found, and need iterations to finalize the scheduling. In
this chapter, the proposed constraint based scheduling framework constructs the event models as cumulative functions on the number of tokens in data streams, similar as in [24]. The streaming application execution semantics on a limited number (less than the number of processes) of processing resources and design concerns on throughput requirement, buffer properties and scheduling decisions are globally captured as a constraint satisfaction problem with composable constraints. The constraint solver (Gecode) is utilized to solve the NP-complete scheduling problem [32], without the relaxation of integer variables.

In [68], Madsen et al. validate the sanity of several existing scheduling policies (rate monotonic and earliest deadline first) of the multi-processor RTOS on a SystemC model. However, a systematic way to explore and find out an optimal schedule according to the required throughput is still an open issue.

The author aims to provide buffer minimized schedules for real-time SDF streaming applications on hybrid CPU/FPGA architectures. Different from all the previous work mentioned, this chapter focuses on describing the constraint based scheduling problems in a declarative way, and apply the existing successful constraint optimization techniques [33] for problem solving. The optimal schedules found have preserved sanity and minimized buffer requirement.

4.2 Motivation

The work in this chapter is motivated by several schedules with varying buffer requirements and throughput guarantees.

4.2.1 Schedules with varying buffer requirements

Here, the example application in Figure 4.1 is instantiated with computation latency list \( T = [1, 4, 2] \) and process input/output token numbers \( n_{i,j} = 1, m_{i,j} = 2, n_{j,k} = 3 \) and \( m_{j,k} = 1 \). Thus, the process repetition vector (see Section 2.1.1) is \( \langle r_i, r_j, r_k \rangle = (2, 1, 3) \) for the instance of the example application. It is assumed that there are some initial tokens in buffers \( FIFO_{i,j} \) and \( FIFO_{j,k} \), which are denoted as \( B_{i,j}^{0} = 2 \) and \( B_{j,k}^{0} = 0 \) respectively.

Using the application to architecture mapping as shown in Figure 4.1, three valid periodic schedules are illustrated in Figure 4.2. Figure 4.2a is the PAPS [61] with unroll factor (see Section 2.1.2) \( J = 1 \). As the schedule advances to time tag 10, the application encounters the same status lists as at time tag 0 (i.e., \( T_{10}^0 = T_0^0 \) and \( \Gamma_{10}^0 = \Gamma_0^0 \)), and enters a periodic phase. The periodic phase has length \( L_{\text{period}} = 10 \), in which the sink process \( p_k \) always runs 3 times. Consequently, the
Figure 4.2: Comparison of different schedules of an instance of the example application, in which $p_i$ and $p_k$ are mapped onto the same processor and can only be scheduled sequentially.
schedule guarantees an average output throughput \( \rho_{out} = \frac{3 \cdot m_{i,k}}{T_{\text{period}}} = \frac{3}{10} \) at process \( p_j \) and requires buffer storage \( \Gamma = [4, 3] \), which are the maximum buffer usages at each FIFO.

However, a periodic parallel schedule (not the PAPS in [61]) with minimized buffer (i.e., \( \Gamma = [2, 4] \)), which guarantees the same throughput \( \rho_{out} = \frac{3}{10} \), does exist in Figure 4.2b. Furthermore, a schedule with 10\% higher throughput guarantee \( \rho_{out} = \frac{3}{10} \) can still be achieved in Figure 4.2c, which has the same buffer cost \( \Gamma = [3, 4] \).

Although the application throughput can be improved by increasing \( J \) in PAPS, the implementation cost of the periodic phase and buffer requirement both increase accordingly (see the case study in Section 4.6), and a systematic way is still lacking [61]. This chapter intends to construct optimal schedules systematically with minimal buffer requirement and higher throughput guarantees.

4.3 Work flow

In Figure 4.3, a generic scheduling work flow is proposed. The work flow inputs are the application and architecture specifications, e.g., the application model, specified application and architecture mapping, required throughput, an initial time

![Figure 4.3: Generic constraint based scheduling work flow.](image)
period $\tau$ considered for scheduling. It is generic from the sense that it can be used for different design purposes with customizable constraints and objectives.

The work flow can be described as follows.

**Step 1:** When the constraint based scheduling problem is feasible, a pending schedule with minimized buffer is got; otherwise, the specifications need to be revised (which is out of the scope of this thesis).

**Step 2:** The throughput guarantees are checked for the pending schedule (whether a periodic phase could be found). If the throughput guarantee or maximum execution time is met, it stops and outputs the valid schedule with minimal buffer sizes $\Gamma_{\text{min}}$; otherwise, it increases the considered $\tau$ with $\Delta_{\tau}$ and goes back to **Step 1**.

Apparently, only when the throughput guarantees are met in Step 2, the output results are valid. The initial values of $\tau$ and $\Delta_{\tau}$ are application dependent and are given empirically. In this chapter, this work flow is adopted for streaming applications scheduling with minimal buffer and throughput guarantees.

### 4.4 Streaming application scheduling

In this section, the event models for streaming data flows are illustrated. Subsequently, constraint based scheduling problems are formalized. The time tag $t$ in the following formulation is a discrete number with $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$, when it is not otherwise clarified.

#### 4.4.1 Event models

The data stream $s$ is captured as a timed indexed synchronous signal as defined in Section 3.4.1. The event models are constructed as cumulative functions on the number of tokens in data streams, i.e., only the number information of the symbolic tokens is considered in performance analysis but not their values.

Without loss of generality, the input/output workloads of each communication channel and the processing capabilities of the computation processes are characterized based on the example application in Figure 4.1 as follows.

**Definition 3.** (Arrival function) The arrival function $R_{i,j}(t)$ of the communication channel $ch_{i,j}$ is defined as the sum of tokens arriving from the input data stream during the time interval $[0, t]$. 
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For instance, \( R_{i,j}(t) = \sum_{0}^{t} s_{1} \) in Figure 4.1.

**Definition 4.** (Output function) The output function \( R'_{i,j}(t) \) from process \( p_{i} \) to the communication channel \( ch_{i,j} \) equals to the arrival function \( R_{i,j}(t) \) of \( ch_{i,j} \).

For instance, \( R'_{i,j}(t) = \sum_{0}^{t} s_{1} = R_{i,j}(t) \) in Figure 4.1. This equivalence forms the basis of compositional analysis for cascaded processes.

**Definition 5.** (Service function) The service function \( C_{i,j}(t) \) of the communication channel \( ch_{i,j} \) by process \( p_{j} \) is defined as the sum of tokens served and removed from the buffer \( FIFO_{i,j} \) via the data stream by \( p_{j} \) during the time interval \([0, t]\).

For instance, \( C_{i,j}(t) = \sum_{0}^{t} s_{2} \) in Figure 4.1.

4.4.2 Buffer properties

While a process is executing, the extra buffer space reservation in scheduling test (see the schedule in Section 2.1.2) can be modelled with the demand function:

**Definition 6.** (Demand function) The demand function \( D_{i,j}(t) \) of the communication channel \( ch_{i,j} \) is defined as the sum of \( R'_{i,j}(t) \) and the demanding space \( d_{i,j}(t) \) at time tag \( t \) on \( FIFO_{i,j} \) from the producer process \( p_{i} \), i.e., \( D_{i,j}(t) = R'_{i,j}(t) + d_{i,j}(t), d_{i,j}(t) \in \{0, n_{i,j}\} \).

For instance,

\[
D_{i,j}(t) = \begin{cases} 
\sum_{0}^{t} s_{1} + n_{i,j} & \text{if } p_{i} \text{ is executing} \\
\sum_{0}^{t} s_{1} & \text{if } p_{i} \text{ is stalling}
\end{cases}
\]

in Figure 4.1.

A graphical interpretation of the definitions of \( R_{i,j}(t) \), \( C_{i,j}(t) \) and \( D_{i,j}(t) \) is illustrated in Figure 4.4, which is consistent with the schedule in Figure 4.2a. \( R'_{i,j}(t) \) is ignored for its equivalence to \( R_{i,j}(t) \) (see Definition 4).

Consequently, the following buffer properties can be derived.

**Property 1.** (Backlog) The backlog \( B_{i,j}(t) \) (tokens arrived but not yet served) in buffer \( FIFO_{i,j} \) is the vertical distance between \( R_{i,j}(t) \) and \( C_{i,j}(t) \) plus an offset of the initial buffer tokens \( B_{i,j}^{0} \) at time tag 0.

\[
B_{i,j}(t) = R_{i,j}(t) - C_{i,j}(t) + B_{i,j}^{0} \tag{4.1}
\]
Property 2. (Buffer usage) The buffer space in use $B'_{i,j}(t)$ for $FIFO_{i,j}$ (equals to $B_{i,j}(t) + d_{i,j}(t)$) is the vertical distance between $D_{i,j}(t)$ and $C_{i,j}(t)$ plus an offset of the initial buffer tokens $B_{i,j}^0$ at time tag 0.

$$B'_{i,j}(t) = D_{i,j}(t) - C_{i,j}(t) + B_{i,j}^0$$ (4.2)

### 4.4.3 Streaming application execution semantics

Based on the definitions and properties above, a full list of constraints to formalize the execution semantics of SDF streaming applications are listed out as follows. These constraints hold during the whole life-time of streaming applications ($\forall t \in \mathbb{N}_0$). Meanwhile, the designers can specify some specification dependent parameters, e.g., the initial (tokens) offset $B_{i,j}^0$ for $B'_{i,j}$.

**Constraint 1.** (Token ratios) For process $p_j$, the static input and output token rate ratios can be formalized by $R'_{j,k}(t)$ and $C_{i,j}(t)$ as the following.

$$R'_{j,k}(t) \cdot m_{i,j} = C_{i,j}(t) \cdot n_{j,k}$$ (4.3)
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**Constraint 2.** (Computation latency) Process $p_j$ has computation latency $t_{C,j}$ in each execution instance.

\[
C_{i,j}(t + t_{C,j}) - C_{i,j}(t) = m_{i,j} \cdot K_j(t + t_{C,j}) \tag{4.4}
\]
\[
D_{j,k}(t + t_{C,j}) - D_{j,k}(t) = n_{j,k} \cdot K_j(t + t_{C,j}) \tag{4.5}
\]
where $K_j(t + t_{C,j}) \in \{0, 1\}$

in which $K_j(t + t_{C,j})$ denotes the incremental properties of $C_{i,j}(t + t_{C,j})$ and $D_{j,k}(t + t_{C,j})$, i.e., $K_j(t + t_{C,j})$ has value ‘1’ if process $p_j$ finishes one instance of execution exactly at time tag $t + t_{C,j}$, otherwise it has value ‘0’.

**Constraint 3.** (Space reservation) In the communication channel $ch_{j,k}$, the demand function of process $p_j$ reserves vacant space $t_{C,j}$ slots in advance, which corresponds to the semantics that the process can only execute when there are enough space in output-side FIFO(s).

\[
D_{j,k}(t) = R_{j,k}(t + t_{C,j}) \tag{4.6}
\]

**Constraint 4.** (Asynchronous buffer) The incoming tokens in buffer $FIFO_{i,j}$ takes at least $t_{C,j}$ slots to be served by process $p_j$, which models the buffering behavior determined by the consumer process(es).

\[
R_{i,j}(t) - C_{i,j}(t + \Delta_t) \geq 0, \quad \forall \Delta_t \in [1, t_{C,j}] \tag{4.7}
\]

**Constraint 5.** (Buffer requirement) The buffer size $\gamma_{i,j}$ of buffer $FIFO_{i,j}$ meets the maximum buffer space requirement, which guarantees a conservative buffer dimensioning.

\[
\gamma_{i,j} \geq B_{i,j}'(t) \tag{4.8}
\]

4.4.4 Resource limits and throughput requisites

Instead of describing the actual algorithms (the how) used to find the solution, the declarative method in this chapter formalizes the properties (the what) of the desired solution as constraints.

**Constraint 6.** (Sequential execution) In a set of processes $P_a$ mapped onto the same processor $CPU_a$, at any time at most one can execute (sequentially) accord-
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\[ \sum_{p_j \in P_a} W_j(t) \in \{0, 1\}, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{N}_0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.9)

where \( W_j(t) = \max(L_{i,j}(t), L_{i,j}(t + \Delta_t)), \forall \Delta_t \in [1, t_{C,j}] \)

\[ L_{i,j}(t + 1) = \frac{C_{i,j}(t + 1) - C_{i,j}(t)}{m_{i,j}} \in \{0, 1\} \]

in which \( W_j(t) \) denotes the computing or stalling 1-0 status of process \( p_j \) (different from the fine-grained process status exemplified in Figure 4.2), \( L_{i,j}(t + 1) \) denotes the incremental properties (step) of the service function \( C_{i,j}(t + 1) \).

In scheduling, a predetermined application throughput needs to be met and guaranteed, as formalized in Constraint 7 and 8.

**Constraint 7.** (Application output throughput) After a transient phase \( \tau_0 (\tau_0 > 0) \) with no stable output tokens, a specified output throughput \( \rho_{\text{out}} \) should be sustained at the application sink process \( p_j \), which is guaranteed by a periodic phase (see Figure 5.1) with length \( L_{\text{period}} \).

\[ C_{j,k}(\tau_0 + c \cdot L_{\text{period}}) - C_{j,k}(\tau_0) = c \cdot J \cdot r_k \cdot m_{j,k}, \hspace{1cm} (4.10) \]

\[ L_{\text{period}} = \left\lceil \frac{J \cdot r_k \cdot m_{j,k}}{\rho_{\text{out}}} \right\rceil, \quad J \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{\infty\}, \quad c \in \mathbb{N}_0 \]

in which \( c \) specifies the iteration number of periodic phases, \( r_k \) is the repetition firing rate of process \( p_k \) (see Eq. 3.1), and \( J \) (called unroll factor) denotes how many cycles processes fire as stated in the repetition vector in one periodic phase.

For a consistent SDF streaming application, a periodic phase in its schedule always exists (see Section 3.4.4). The required application throughput is guaranteed by the periodic properties during this period. However, the problem to determine the length of \( L_{\text{period}} \) which can provide optimal buffer cost in this formulation is NP-complete itself. Its length is determined by a designer specified \( J \), and an incremental \( q \) leads to an increasing \( L_{\text{period}} \).
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**Constraint 8.** (Periodic phase) The repeated process and FIFO status at time tag $t'$ and $t' + L_{\text{period}}$ determines a periodic phase between them with length $L_{\text{period}}$.

\[
B_{i,j}'(t') = B_{i,j}'(t' + L_{\text{period}}), \quad \forall \text{FIFO}_{i,j}
\]

\[
W_j'(t') = W_j'(t' + L_{\text{period}}), \quad \forall p_j (4.12)
\]

where \[ W_j'(t') = \sum_{k=1}^{L_{\text{period}}} \frac{C_{i,j}(t' + k) - C_{i,j}(t' + k - 1)}{m_{i,j}} \]

In which variables $W_j'(t')$ and $W_j'(t' + L_{\text{period}})$ are process status (denoted as numbers for each process in Figure 4.2).

In implementation, Constraint 7 and 8 can only guarantee that the buffer cost is minimized (optimal) using the given length of $L_{\text{period}}$. On the other hand, the length of $L_{\text{period}}$ can be pre-specified (if validly) by the designer, which corresponds to the cost to implement a periodic static schedule.

The **scheduling objective** is to find the minimal total buffer sizes, subject to the corresponding Constraint 1 - 8, as the following.

\[
\min : \gamma_{\text{Sum}} = \sum_{\forall \text{FIFO}_{i,j} \in F} \gamma_{i,j} (4.13)
\]

in which $F$ is the set of the buffers being considered and $\gamma_{i,j}$ is the size of buffer $\text{FIFO}_{i,j}$.

### 4.4.5 Extension to MIMO and cyclic models

![Figure 4.5: A cyclic MIMO application model.](image)

The proposed formulation does not take into account models with multiple input and multiple output (MIMO) processes or cyclic models. However, the extension of the proposed reconfiguration analysis methodology to such models is
intuitive. Without loss of generality, the MIMO process $p_j$ in Figure 4.5 is used for illustration.

For MI channels $c_{i,j}$ and $c_{l,j}$ of process $p_j$, the service functions are associated with each other caused by the static input data token rate $m_{i,j}$ and $m_{l,j}$ of the same consumer process $p_j$. They have the linear relations as follows.

**Constraint 9. (MI linear relation)**

$$\frac{C_{i,j}(t)}{m_{i,j}} = \frac{C_{l,j}(t)}{m_{l,j}}$$ (4.14)

Similarly, the MO channels $c_{j,k}$ and $c_{j,l}$ have the linear relations on the output and demand functions according to output data token rate of the same producer process $p_j$ as follows.

**Constraint 10. (MO linear relation)**

$$\frac{R'_{j,k}(t)}{n_{j,k}} = \frac{R'_{j,l}(t)}{n_{j,l}}, \quad \frac{D_{j,k}(t)}{n_{j,k}} = \frac{D_{j,l}(t)}{n_{j,l}}$$ (4.15)

A MIMO model can be analyzed by traversing it with a set of paths, where each path is a sequence of communication channels such that the output channels of a process always succeed its input channels.

A set of paths are complete only when all the communication channels are covered. For instance, the paths (“$c_{i,j} \rightarrow c_{j,k}$” and “$c_{j,l} \rightarrow c_{l,j}$”) in dashed lines complete the MIMO model in Figure 4.5. Based on the complete set of paths, the scheduling methodology fits the MIMO application models well.

For directed cyclic graphs as shown in Figure 4.5, the data tokens required for loop initialization can be explicitly captured as the initial token offsets in Eq. 4.1 and 4.2. For instance, two initial tokens of communication channel $c_{j,l}$ are denoted as $B_{j,l}^0 = 2$ and the actual backlog of $c_{j,l}$ is $B_{j,l}(t) + B_{j,l}^0$.

### 4.5 Constraint programming techniques

The proposed constraint base scheduling framework has been implemented on the public domain constraint solver Gecode [33]. Both the SDF execution semantics and the scheduling problem on the hybrid multiprocessor/FPGA are encoded. Especially, some modelling techniques have been conducted to improve the computation efficiency in solutions finding:
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- **Domain and constraints reduction.** A lower bound for any FIFO [37] can be computed as

\[
\gamma_{i,j} + \gamma_{i,j} - \gcd(n_{i,j}, m_{i,j}) + B_{i,j}^0 \mod \gcd(n_{i,j}, m_{i,j})
\]  

(4.16)

to prune infeasible (dead-lock) variable value domains. Furthermore, although \( t \in \mathbb{N}_0 \) holds for all timing related constraints, we only implement and evaluate them in time period \([0, T_0 + L_{period}]\) once a periodic phase is found.

- **Branching and exploration.** To construct the search tree, the branching variables are prioritized as follows: \( \gamma_{Sum}, \gamma_{i,j}, \) and \( C_{i,j}. \) Empirically, the exploration starts with minimal values for all variables, which also guarantees that the first solution found has minimized buffer cost \( \gamma_{Sum}. \)

### 4.6 Case study

![Figure 4.6: The modem application partitioned for a multiprocessor/FPGA architecture.](image)

To evaluate the potential of the proposed methodology, an application of voice-band data modem [62], which has 9 processes and 11 FIFOs, is used in the case study. The application model with customized specification parameters is illustrated in Figure 4.6.

The experiments start from a manual mapping from the application to a multiprocessor CPU/FPGA architecture. The labeled processes in the application model...
are partitioned and mapped onto multi-processors, i.e., $p_0$ and $p_2$ mapped onto CPU$_1$, and $p_3$ and $p_5$ mapped onto CPU$_2$. The rest processes are mapped onto parallel executing custom hardware.

The proposed Constraint based Minimal Buffer Scheduling (CMBS) methodology is implemented on Gecode [33]. CMBS is compared with the reference scheduling method, a trivially customized PAPS $^1$. To make this comparison more reasonable, the reference PAPS method is implemented in C++ as well and run both methods on the workstation for experiments (see Section 1.3) to solve the scheduling problems for the modem application. However, both the implementations of the reference PAPS and the constraint based scheduling on Gecode solver are not parallelized, only one core is actually utilized.

The experimental results are shown in Table 4.1, which compares and quantifies the buffer requirement and the experimental execution time achieved by the schedules using PAPS and CMBS.

For PAPS, the application throughput may be improved by increasing the unroll factor $J$, i.e., the cases from #1 to #6. Correspondingly, the results of CMBS are reported with some competitive throughput (no less than in PAPS). However, the implementation cost of the periodic schedule increases with higher $J$ and it is still in lack of a systematic way to find a finite $J$ [61] yielding an optimal schedule. $J$ is simply increased by 1 each time until the throughput improvement is negligible (i.e., less than 1e-4 to the throughput at $J = 1$), which is the ‘optimal’ case #7 of PAPS with $J = 100$. In case #7 of CMBS, the results achieved by a schedule with the maximal throughput guarantees are reported.

$^1$Instead of each process being scheduled onto any of the computation resource, a fixed mapping is adopted, i.e., a process can only be scheduled onto a particular CPU or custom circuit. This customization makes PAPS (proposed in [61]) fit the hybrid CPU/FPGA platform.

Table 4.1: Comparison of scheduling methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PAPS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>CMBS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
<td>throughput</td>
<td>buffer</td>
<td>time$^a$</td>
<td>throughput</td>
<td>buffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8e-2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.8e-2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1e-2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.3e-2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.7e-2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.7e-2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.4e-2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.4e-2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.6e-2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7.7e-2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.1e-2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>8.3e-2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8.3e-2</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>4202</td>
<td>9.1e-2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ It is the execution time (ms) in solutions finding.
4.7. CONCLUDING REMARKS

From the experimental results, some observations made are summarized as follows.

- CMBS always requires less buffer storage space upon the equivalent application throughput guarantees.

- In some case (when required throughput is high), CMBS can achieve higher throughput guarantees than PAPS with much less buffer requirement. For instance, in case #7 CMBS requires 19% of buffer storage demanded by PAPS but gets 8% higher throughput guarantees.

- CMBS is more flexible to meet the specified throughput guarantees. However, the throughput guarantees of PAPS are determined by the chosen $J$, which has quite limited options.

- The execution time in CMBS is not sensitive to different throughput guarantees. In fact, when the throughput requirement is higher, the timing of constraint based analysis is shorter and might lead to less execution time. On the contrary, the execution time of PAPS increases fast when $J$ and throughput are relatively higher.

- PAPS is faster in execution time when $J$ is relatively small. However, CMBS surpasses PAPS upon higher throughput requirement, e.g., in case #7.

4.7 Concluding remarks

This chapter has studied the problem of constructing schedules for real-time streaming applications with minimal buffer requirement on hybrid CPU/FPGA architectures. The problem has been formalized declaratively as constraint base scheduling, and can be effectively solved by constraint solvers. The experimental results show that the proposed CMBS methodology performs significantly better than the traditional PAPS method in terms of buffer requirement. It is also flexible in the sense that it can be used to construct schedules to guarantee the required (feasible) throughput.
Nowadays, multiprocessor systems-on-chip (MPSoCs) are very popular computing platforms for modern embedded systems [102]. To explore the large number of cores built-in, network-on-chip (NoC) communication has been widely used to manage the parallel processing architecture in a scalable manner [27, 41, 69, 92]. While the NoC based MPSoCs enable distributed processing, it is extremely challenging to handle the global computation and communication scheduling of embedded concurrent streaming applications, when different concerns need to be taken into account, e.g., processor availability, interconnection bandwidth, and buffer space.

Given one instance of the tutorial example (see Section 2.1.1) with specified token rates in Figure 5.1(a), it is then mapped onto a dual-processor architecture, as illustrated in Figure 5.1(b). Each process $p_x$ has a worst case execution time (WCET) $t_{C,x}$, and each channel $ch_{x,y}$ is implemented as finite FIFO buffer with token storage $\gamma_{x,y}$. The hard real-time inter-processor communication latency is captured by an identity process $p_\delta$ with delay $t_{C,\delta}$. While processes are enabled when they have enough input data tokens and output buffer space, $p_i$ and $p_j$ can only be scheduled sequentially in one single processor $\mu_{P_1}$. The scheduling problem on such kind of multi-processors with resource constraints has been known to be NP-complete [32]. Recently, heuristic algorithms have been proposed to pro-
Motivation. Let $p_i$ and $p_j$ to be scheduled with a heuristic time-division multiple-access (TDMA) scheme [89], as marked horizontally on the timeline in Figure 5.1(c-1). Each process is not allowed to fire only when it is enabled, but it should also be the process which gets the allocated TDMA time slots. Accordingly, a schedule is built below. The running processes on each processor and the FIFO usage are listed out vertically. At time tag 0, $p_i$ starts the execution and requires 1 unit space on $FIFO_{i,j}$ for one output token. At time tag 1, $p_i$ finishes the previous firing, outputs 1 result token, and starts a new firing. As the scheduling evolves, $p_i$ and $p_k$ execute once they are enabled, and $p_i$ and $p_j$ are scheduled in TDMA scheme. However, the TDMA assigned processes can be stalled, when they violate resource constraints (bounded buffer capacities or no enough input tokens). For instance, $p_j$ is stalled ($\gamma_{j,5} = 3$) at time tag 5, and so is $p_i$ ($\gamma_{i,j} = 2$) at time tag 6 and 7. From time tag 2 to 7, the schedule enters a periodic phase with length $L_{\text{period}} = 6$, in which the application throughput is guaranteed by process firing patterns. On the other hand, in Figure 5.1(c-2), another optimized schedule exists without using TDMA scheme in $\mu p_1$. A 50% throughput gain in this proposed optimized cyclic static schedule is observed, i.e., $L_{\text{period}} = 4$, on the same platform.

Although TDMA-like or list scheduling heuristics can be used to design predictable distributed systems [89, 30], they have the following drawbacks:

- They can not avoid the overhead in time slots allocation, which degrades application performance (Section 5.4);
- They are in lack of global optimization mechanisms on MPSoCs, where numerous processors or communication links are concurrently shared by different processes.

As the contribution in this chapter, the author proposes a new scheduling framework on MPSoCs to build global schedules for both processors computing (process execution) and communication transactions (real-time traffic-flow). While buffer cost is minimized, a high predictable application throughput is guaranteed based on optimized computation and contention-free routing.

5.1 Related work

Eles et al. [30] first address the scheduling on distributed systems with communication protocols optimization. With optimized bus accessing, application through-
Figure 5.1: Allocation and scheduling of an illustrative application. (a) an illustrative application; (b) application instance allocated onto buffer constrained dual-processor; (c-1) Scheduling with TDMA scheme on $\mu p_1$; (c-2) Throughput-optimized scheduling.
put is maximized based on list scheduling (heuristic order) for task graph models. While task graphs can be viewed as special cases of acyclic SDF models with no overlap between different iterations of execution, buffer cost has not been addressed as resource constraints. In [89], Stuijk et al. propose a mapping and TDMA/list scheduling design flow for throughput constrained SDF applications on MPSoCs. As both papers are based on heuristic TDMA or list scheduling, it is argued that there is a lack of global optimization on performance metrics, e.g., the application throughput as motivated in Figure 5.1(c-1).

Inspired by the success of (model-checking, SAT and constraint programming) techniques in solving NP-complete problems, Geilen et al. [37] have used model-checker to determine the minimal deadlock-free buffer cost to schedule SDF models (no computation constraints). Liu et al. [66] use a SAT-solver to explore the mapping and scheduling of homogeneous SDF (HSDF) models. However, a regular SDF model must be transformed (expanded) to a HSDF model to apply their techniques\(^1\), which dramatically increases the problem size [85]. Constraint programming tools are used as well in the scheduling of task graphs on MPSoCs, without violating computation capacity and communication bandwidth [10, 46]. In chapter 4, constraint based paradigm has been proposed for SDF models scheduling on hybrid CPU/FPGA platforms, in which communicate happens via dedicated (not shared) FIFO channels with ignored delay. Yet, all the work above does not consider the global optimization of distributed computing and communication transactions on MPSoCs.

5.2 Architecture platform

The cornerstone of streaming applications with predictable performance is the architecture platform with deterministic real-time properties. In this chapter, the architectural template is a regular 2-D mesh tiled MPSoC (see Section 2.2.1) with the communication happening via hard real-time networks-on-chip (NoCs). Nevertheless, the design method to be proposed is not limited to this particular platform.

As exemplified in Figure 5.2, each tile \(tile_n\) \((n \in \mathbb{N}_0)\) consists of a processor \((\mu p_n)\), an application memory, a token buffer \(buffer_n\), and a network interface (NI). \(tile_n\) is labeled as \((x_n, y_n)\) in the mesh topology, where \(x_n\) and \(y_n\) correspond to the row and column indexing numbers respectively. The work starts with a fixed allocation from processes to tiles. Hence, all application memory modules

---

\(^1\)In [66], models contain up to 30 HSDF processes have been considered, but the equivalent HSDF H263 model in our experiments (Section 5.4) has 4754 processes.
are pre-specified on the mesh. Preferably, the work is on the analysis of routing, scheduling, and buffer properties for the dashed modules in Figure 5.2, i.e., NoC switches, processors, and token buffers.

Tiles are connected to the communication network through switches (s), and communicate with each other via unidirectional communication links.

5.3 Constraint based mapping and scheduling

The mapping of streaming applications onto the target MPSoC architectures is a refinement process with real-time requirements and resource limitations. For streaming applications with real-time constraints, efficient execution means the streaming services are delivered on-demand to the end-user, neither too fast nor too slow. Thus, a predetermined application throughput needs to be guaranteed, as formalized in Chapter 4 (see Constraint 7 and 8).

In this section, the constraint based formulation is used to model the architecture mapping, communication routing, flow control, and computation scheduling. As each (acyclic or cyclic) SDF model can be decomposed into a set of concurrent producer-consumer pairs, the problem is analyzed and formalized based on a general producer-consumer processes pair, as illustrated in the upper part of Figure 5.3.

5.3.1 Mapping

To be aware of the pre-specified mapping decisions, two sets of variables: $\alpha$ and $\omega$ are used. A boolean variable $\alpha_{i,\mu p_n}$ denotes the presence of $p_i$ on a processor $\mu p_n$. Assuming that different instances of a process can only execute on one dedicated processor, this single residence constraint can be formalized as the following.
Figure 5.3: A template of refined producer-consumer pair, in which $\omega_{i,j}$ denotes whether channel $ch_{i,j}$ is implemented as intra-processor communication.

**Constraint 11.** (Single residence) Each process $p_i$ requires one (and only one) specified processor for computation.

$$\sum_{\mu_p \in U} \alpha_{i,\mu_p} = 1, \quad \forall p_i \in P$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.1)

in which $P$ is the set of processes in application models, and $U$ is the set of processors in the architecture platform.

Redundantly, a boolean variable $\omega_{i,j}$ denotes how a channel $ch_{i,j}$ is implemented, as illustrated in Figure 5.3. When $\omega_{i,j} = 0$, $p_i$ and $p_j$ are mapped onto different processors ($\mu_p^n$ and $\mu_p^m$), $ch_{i,j}$ is implemented as inter-processor communication with buffers $FIFO_{i,\delta}$ and $FIFO_{\delta,j}$, and the hard real-time communication is captured by process $p_\delta$ with bounded latency $t_{C,\delta}$ and without packet loss ($m_{i,\delta} = n_{\delta,j}$). Otherwise, $\omega_{i,j} = 1$, $p_i$ and $p_j$ are mapped onto the same tile, and the intra-tile communication $ch_{i,j}$ is implemented as $FIFO_{i,j}$ with negligible latency. Processors in the architecture platform are homogeneous in the sense that they are of the same type and each process $p_j$ has the same WCET $t_{C,j}$ on any processors. $\omega_{i,j}$ can be defined as the following.

**Constraint 12.** (Correlated mapping decision) To be correlated with $\alpha_{i,\mu_p^n}$ and $\alpha_{j,\mu_p^m}$, $\omega_{i,j}$ denotes whether $p_i$ and $p_j$ are mapped onto the same processor.

$$\omega_{i,j} = (x_n = x_m) \land (y_n = y_m), \quad \alpha_{i,\mu_p} = 1, \alpha_{j,\mu_p} = 1.$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.2)

Event models based on cumulative functions have been used to capture the working load and pressing capabilities of stream processing systems, and accordingly the execution semantics of SDF models can be formalized (refer to chapter 4).
5.3. CONSTRAINT BASED MAPPING AND SCHEDULING

In this chapter, the process scheduling status derived from event models needs to be refined to be aware of the mapping decisions.

**Constraint 13.** (Mapping & scheduling association) All the processes assigned to each processor can only execute (be scheduled) sequentially at any time. This mapping and scheduling association is formalized as:

\[ \sum_{p_i \in P} \alpha_{i,\mu p_n} W_j(t) \in \{0, 1\}, \forall \mu p_n \in U, t \in N_0 \quad \text{(5.3)} \]

in which \( W_j(t) \) denotes the 1-0 (computing or stalling) status of each process \( p_j \) (see Constraint 6).

### 5.3.2 Template based Buffering Analysis

Here, some buffer properties and constraints can be formulated from the event models and mapping-aware decisions, based on the refined producer-consumer template in Figure 5.3.

**Property 3.** (Buffer usage) The buffer usages of \( \text{FIFO}_{i,\delta} \), \( \text{FIFO}_{\delta,j} \), and \( \text{FIFO}_{i,j} \) in the template (Figure 5.3) at time tag \( t \) are denoted as \( B_{i,\delta}(t) \), \( B_{\delta,j}(t) \), and \( B_{i,j}(t) \) respectively, which are defined as:

\[
B_{i,\delta}(t) = D_{i,\delta}(t) - \neg \omega_{i,j}(C_{i,\delta}(t) - B_{i,\delta}^0(t)) - \omega_{i,j}(C_{i,j}(t) - B_{i,j}^0(t)) \quad \text{(5.4)}
\]

\[
B_{\delta,j}(t) = -\omega_{i,j}B'_{\delta,j}(t) = D_{\delta,j}(t) - \omega_{i,j}(C_{\delta,j}(t) - B_{\delta,j}^0(t)) \quad \text{(5.5)}
\]

\[
B_{i,j}(t) = \omega_{i,j}B_{i,\delta}(t) \quad \text{(5.6)}
\]

in which \( B_{i,\delta}^0(t) \), \( B_{\delta,j}^0(t) \), and \( B_{i,j}^0(t) \) are the initial data tokens (at time tag 0) in each buffer.

Furthermore, the asynchronous behaviors of the buffers, caused by data buffering or processing latency (computation and communication), are captured as the following.

**Constraint 14.** (Asynchronous buffer) The incoming data tokens in buffers take at least the WCET of the consumer process to be consumed. For buffers \( \text{FIFO}_{i,\delta} \), \( \text{FIFO}_{\delta,j} \), and \( \text{FIFO}_{i,j} \) in the template (Figure 5.3), the asynchronous behaviors can be formalized as:

\[
R_{i,\delta}(t) \geq -\omega_{i,j}C_{i,\delta}(t + t_{e,\delta}) + \omega_{i,j}C_{\delta,j}(t + t_{e,j}) - B_{i,\delta}^0 \quad \text{(5.7)}
\]

\[
R_{\delta,j}(t) = -\omega_{i,j}R_{\delta,j}(t) \geq -\omega_{i,j}C_{\delta,j}(t + t_{e,j}) - B_{\delta,j}^0 \quad \text{(5.8)}
\]

\[
R_{i,j}(t) = \omega_{i,j}R_{i,\delta}(t) \quad \text{(5.9)}
\]
Depending on the buffer organization, there are two measures of buffer requirement when different FIFOs are assigned to the same tile (buffer) [37], i.e., the FIFO implementations of different communication channels are either partitioned disjointly or sharing buffer space. Accordingly, the buffer requirement of these two mechanism can be formalized in the following.

**Property 4. (Buffer cost – disjoint partition)** When FIFOs are organized on each tile as disjoint buffer partitions, the buffer cost $\gamma_{\text{Sum'}}$ in the platform is simply the sum of individual FIFO sizes.

$$\gamma_{\text{Sum'}} = \sum_{i,j,\delta} (\omega_{i,j}\gamma_{i,j} + \neg\omega_{i,j}(\gamma_{i,\delta} + \gamma_{\delta,j})), \quad \forall p_i, p_j \in P$$

(5.10)

where $\gamma_{i,j} \geq B_{i,j}(t)$, $\gamma_{i,\delta} \geq B_{i,\delta}(t)$, $\gamma_{\delta,j} \geq B_{\delta,j}(t)$, $\forall t \in \mathbb{N}_0$

in which $\gamma_{i,j}$, $\gamma_{i,\delta}$, and $\gamma_{\delta,j}$ denote the sizes of the disjoint FIFOs in the template (Figure 5.3).

**Property 5. (Buffer cost – shared partition)** When FIFOs are sharing space on each tile, the buffer cost $\gamma_{\text{Sum''}}$ in the platform is the sum of the shared buffer space on individual tiles.

$$\gamma_{\text{Sum''}} = \sum_n \gamma_{\text{tile}_n}$$

(5.11)

where $\gamma_{\text{tile}_n} \geq \sum_{i,j} (a_{i,\mu_{pn}}B_{i,\delta}(t) + a_{j,\mu_{pn}}B_{\delta,j}(t) + a_{i,\mu_{pn}}\omega_{i,j}B_{i,j}(t)), \quad \forall p_i, p_j \in P, \forall t \in \mathbb{N}_0$

in which $\gamma_{\text{tile}_n}$ denotes the size of the buffer as one shared partition on tile $\text{tile}_n$.

### 5.3.3 Routing and contention-free flow control

When processes in a producer-consumer pair are assigned to different processors, routing is needed for the inter-tile data communication. Here, deterministic $X$-$Y$ routing is assumed on NoC infrastructure. The bidirectional routing decisions are captured by two sets of triple-value ($\pm1$ and 0) variables $\beta^r$ and $\beta^c$ on the direction of rows and columns of physical links respectively, i.e., +1 (-1) represents routing a packet flow on the positive (negative) direction of a link on $X$ or $Y$ axis, and 0 represents no packet flow. $\beta^r$ and $\beta^c$ can be associated with the mapping variables $\alpha$ in the following.
Constraint 15. (X-Y routing) Let $\beta_{ch_{i,j},l_k}$ represent the routing decision on a row link $l_k$ between tiles $(x_k, y_k)$ and $(x_k + 1, y_k)$, i.e., how channel $ch_{i,j}$ is assigned to $l_k$. The routing on the primary X axis is formalized as:

$$\beta_{ch_{i,j},l_k} = \begin{cases} +1, & x_m > x_n, \forall x_k \in [x_n, x_m); \\ -1, & x_n > x_m, \forall x_k \in [x_m, x_n); \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$  \tag{5.12}

Similarly, the subsequent routing decisions $\beta_{ch_{i,j},l_k}$ on column links (Y axis) can be defined.

When a channel $ch_{i,j}$ is assigned to the inter-processor communication network, the communication time needed depends not only on the number of transferred data tokens but also the dynamic link bandwidth during the transaction. In hard real-time NoCs, contention-free routing at the traffic flow level is usually adopted, in which a packet (data token) reserves a circuit switching before the transmission finishes, e.g., in Æthereal [41]. For one application flow (channel), the routing of a packet from source tile to destination tile via NoC switches and links consists of three phases: packet injection, on-the-path transmission, and packet ejection, as illustrated in Figure 5.4. When different application flows are sharing the same NoC resources (switches and links), the packet injections (ejections) congest spatially when multiple producer (consumer) processes are mapped onto the same tile. Similarly, the on-the-path transmissions congest when different application flows are sharing the same links. However, different application flows can be scheduled temporally to avoid the competition on the same links at the same time. Such kind of contention-free scheduling can be formalized as the following.

Constraint 16. (Contention-free traffic flow scheduling) When communication channels are assigned to inter-tile physical links, the packet injection, ejection, and
inter-tile traffic flow on rows of communication links are scheduled to avoid contention, as formalized in Eq. 5.13, 5.14, and 5.15 respectively.

\[
\sum_{i} \alpha_{i,\mu p_n} W_{\delta}(t) \in \{0, 1\},
\]

(5.13)

\[
\sum_{j} \alpha_{j,\mu p_n} W_{\delta}(t) \in \{0, 1\},
\]

(5.14)

\[
\sum_{i,j} \beta_{\gamma_{n_i,j}} W_{\delta}(t) \in \{0, \pm 1\}, \sum_{i,j} |\beta_{\gamma_{n_i,j}}| W_{\delta}(t) \in \{0, 1, 2\},
\]

(5.15)

\[\forall p_1, p_j \in P, \mu p_n \in U, t \in \mathbb{N}_0\]

with \(W_{\delta}(t)\) (see Eq. 4.9) to denote the data transmission 1-0 (working or idle) status on NoC modeled by \(p_\delta\). Similarly, the scheduling of traffic flow on columns of communication links can be formalized as in Eq. 5.15, which is omitted for clarity.

5.4 Experimental results

The experiments have been done on a few benchmarks to demonstrate how the proposed Constraint based Minimal Buffer Scheduling (CMBS) approach works with Gecode solver in practice. First, the effects of scheduling overhead (OH) which exists in TDMA-like scheduling are evaluated, and then a comparison with the heuristic PAPS [61] in buffer cost is done.

5.4.1 Evaluation of scheduling overhead

Usually, the predictable time slots allocation in TDMA or list scheduling is modeled by increasing the computation or communication latency with the postponed time, i.e., the OH is caused by the improper TDMA time wheel allocation before the computation or communication can happen. Here, the OH is slightly (compared with [89]) specified as 50% in computation and 100% in communication latency. The proposed CMBS approach is then used to estimate the best scheduling quality of heuristics, denoted as CMBS-OH. Two benchmarks from communication domains, i.e., a Modem application from [13], and a Wireless application from [70], are used. The architecture platform is a 3 x 3 mesh-based MPSoC.

Table 5.1 shows the experimental results. Each time two instances of the same applications are allocated onto the MPSoC empirically with specified throughput requirement, and the unroll factor \(J\) (see Constraint 7) is fixed to 1. The search tree
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Table 5.1: Comparison of scenarios with varying OH (3 × 3 platform).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>specification</th>
<th>CMBS-OH</th>
<th>CMBS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>app.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modem</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.125e-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5e-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 
- 
- 
- 

is branched and explored with buffer storage $\gamma_{\text{Sum}}'$ and $\gamma_{\text{tile}_n}$, then $\gamma_{\text{Sum}''}$. (Property 5) is calculated. Compared with CMBS-OH, CMBS can meet much higher (up to 87%) throughput requirement, without much increase in buffer cost. Therefore, it is argued that the OH in heuristic scheduling on MPSoCs can cause performance degradation. Furthermore, buffer costs measured in $\gamma_{\text{Sum}''}$ show a great reduction (55∼65%) on $\gamma_{\text{Sum}''}$. Although, to branch and explore with $\gamma_{\text{Sum}''}$ and $\gamma_{\text{tile}_n}$ has the potency to further reduce $\gamma_{\text{Sum}''}$, it dramatically increase the problem complexity. For instance, using the specification #2 of Wireless, a $\gamma_{\text{Sum}''}$ with value 30 (instead of 49 in Table 5.1) can be found in 3hrs8mins. But all other experiments fail to find a solution in 4 hrs. The memory usages for solutions finding are in 47∼163Mb. Interestingly, the infeasible cases on both applications take the least memory usage and time, which is opposed to the model-checking method in [37].

5.4.2 Comparison with PAPS

Here, another performance metrics (i.e., buffer cost), which has not been well constrained in heuristics for MPSoCs, is evaluated. A PAPS implemented in C++ is used as the reference method, which has no buffer constraints, similar as [89, 30]. A fixed ideal delay (no-contention aware) in inter-tile communication is used in the reference PAPS, as communication protocols was not considered. Three benchmarks are used, i.e., a Bipartite model [13], a Cd2dat rate converter [13], and a H263 decoder [89]. The architecture platform is a 2 × 2 mesh-based MPSoC.

Table 5.2 shows the experimental results. In CMBS, the search tree is branched and explored with two types of buffer measurements. The solutions finding time is reasonable for such a medium problem size. Although a NoC communication protocol is modeled, CMBS shows a significant buffer saving (6% of PAPS in
Table 5.2: Comparison of scheduling methods ($2 \times 2$ platform).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>specification</th>
<th>PAPS</th>
<th>CMBS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$J$</td>
<td>$\gamma_{\text{parent}}(\gamma_{\text{parent}})$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bipartite</td>
<td>1.101e-1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.082e-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cd2dat</td>
<td>2.462e-1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.553e-1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.550e-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H263</td>
<td>2.103e-4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.102e-4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.101e-4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The solutions finding time (ms) branched and explored with two buffer measurements.

the best case), and can provide higher (up to 64%) throughput. Here, the highest memory usage for CMBS in solutions finding is up to 219Mb, caused by a high peak depth 440 in its search tree.

5.5 Concluding remarks

This chapter has presented a constraint based scheduling framework for SDF streaming applications on NoC based MPSoCs. Based on constraint programming techniques, the global scheduling for both processors computing and communication transactions has been achieved. Compared with traditional heuristics scheduling, the proposed method has higher predictable application throughput and less buffer cost.
Partially run-time reconfigurable (RTR) FPGAs, such as the Xilinx Virtex-4 [103], are becoming very popular infrastructures in today’s embedded systems [19]. They allow part of the hardware to be reprogrammed dynamically on the fly while the remaining part continues its operation without being affected. For a number of signal processing and multi-media streaming applications, this reconfigurable property enhances their capability to vary functionalities at run-time in a dynamic environment with varying demands, which significantly reduces the design cost while leveraging the ubiquity of embedded systems. Hence, RTR FPGAs can be used to built cost-effective hardware platform for streaming applications [58], and deliver high flexibility, besides breakthrough performance. However, this combination of flexibility and efficiency does not come for free. Adaptivity adds another dimension of complexity to the design process, while the system performance during reconfiguration still needs to be satisfied. Compared with traditional non-adaptive systems, the reconfigurations in adaptive systems add new challenges in performance analysis and lead to even more complexity.

An run-time reconfigurable streaming application based on adaptive extensions on synchronous data flow (SDF) semantics [61] is illustrated in Figure 6.1, which is used as a tutorial example in this chapter. Besides the regular source and sink processes $p_i$ and $p_k$, there is an adaptive process $p_j$, which has $N$ different working modes from $M_1$ to $M_N$ as illustrated in the dashed box. The mode change is
initiated by the mode change request (MCR) stream, i.e., $s_{M,j}$ for $p_j$. Each mode transition circumstance introduces a temporal overhead, during which $p_j$ does not work in either the old or new mode and is thus stalled.

While the stream source $p_i$ provides a peak throughput $\rho_{\text{in}}$ (to the input of communication channel $ch_{i,j}$ cutting by the dashed-line), an average output throughput $\rho_{\text{out}}$ needs to be guaranteed by the application even during the reconfigurations. Caused by the reconfiguration stalls of adaptive process $p_j$, it is critical that the backlog tokens in the FIFO(s) between $p_j$ and the consumer process(es), the so called playout buffer(s)$^1$, are sufficient to sustain the application throughput. Therefore, to exploit the full potential of RTR adaptive systems, special resource requirements and scheduling techniques are needed when taking the behaviors and properties of reconstructions into consideration. This chapter will address performance analysis and design efficiency for real-time adaptive streaming applications.

### 6.1 Related work

Formal analysis at design time has been widely used in performance analysis of heterogeneous embedded systems, such as timing properties validation, buffer dimensioning, and scheduling policies optimization. It has been a promising option to overcome the limitation of simulation methods in incomplete coverage at corner cases, and can thus provide conservative system properties guarantees. In

---

$^1$In the application in Figure 6.1, the playout buffer is $\text{FIFO}_{j,k}$. 
SymTA/S [79], a compositional way for scheduling analysis has been presented based on standard periodic/sporadic event models of data streams. Network calculus [23] and real-time calculus (RTC) [96, 17] are both a collection of methods in deterministic queuing theories. They formalize the incoming workloads and processing capabilities as cumulative functions of time, and suit system analysis of performance guarantees and buffer dimensioning in network domain [15] and real-time distributed embedded system domain [95, 94] respectively. In the subsequent extension of RTC, Chakraborty et al. [18] and Phan et al. [74] present a mode based RTC to handle the execution dependence between processing resources and buffers caused by their state information (i.e., the fill-level of buffers and its effect on processing resources). However, none of them takes adaptive systems into consideration and do not aim at design cost (area) analysis and buffer dimensioning as the author does.

Schedulability analysis and reconfiguration methods for multi-mode (adaptive) real-time systems has been studied in [84, 77], where each mode consists of a different set of tasks. Mode change protocols have been exploited to ensure that no deadlines are violated during mode transition periods. For adaptive systems with pre-specified (known at compile-time) reconfiguration scenarios, mode transition stages can be modeled and simulated in a similar way as in [82]. However, this chapter aims at adaptive systems with reconfiguration requests known at run-time. The simulation based way has inherent limitations to cover the corner cases which have not been simulated. Therefore, it can lead to too optimistic buffer dimensioning.

Bilsen et al. [14] present the cyclo-static dataflow model, which supports cyclically changing of the number of tokens produced and consumed by processes. Since the mode changing behavior is predefined at compile-time, static schedules can be constructed when the necessary and sufficient conditions for scheduling hold. Furthermore, the buffer requirement is analyzed for cyclo-static dataflow models according to the specified throughput requirement in [90], similar as in SDF models [88]. However, the mode changing problem to be addressed in this chapter is more challenging in the sense that the reconfigurations are only known at run-time (unpredictable at compile-time). Accordingly, the buffer requirement can be analyzed for specified throughput requirement [90], similar as in SDF models [88]. Wiggers et al. [100] propose an algorithm to compute sufficient buffer capacities for task graphs with data dependent execution conditions (consumption token rate), but they do not consider the run-time overhead between the transition of different execution conditions. On the other hand, the adaptive systems to be addressed in this chapter have more flexibility from the sense that the recon-
Figurations are only known at run-time (unpredictable at compile-time). In [93], simulation based techniques have been introduced for the analysis of different performance metrics of scenario-aware SDF models with stochastic mode changes. However, they do not dimension the buffer requirement for RTR applications with throughput guarantees.

This chapter proposes, in contrast to the existing work, a novel approach for run-time reconfigurations analysis based on iterative timing phases, and presents a performance analysis framework for adaptive real-time streaming applications on RTR FPGAs. It is based on the refinement of the author’s previous work [107], which is a hybrid approach combining integer linear programming (ILP) analysis and simulation on synchronous model of computation. In the implementation, the existing successful optimization techniques in constraint programming (CP) domain, i.e., the Gecode [33] solver, has been exploited for problem solving (to get the minimal buffer requirement without losing throughput guarantees).

6.2 Reconfiguration preliminaries

In this section, without losing generality, the reconfiguration preliminaries used in this chapter are defined based on the example application in Figure 6.1.

6.2.1 Definitions and assumptions

First, the reconfiguration definitions and the main assumptions used in this work are introduced.

For the adaptive process \( p_j \), a mode change is triggered by an MCR, i.e., the stream \( s_{M,j} \) in Figure 6.1, which might either come from an external controller or be retrieved from the input data streams. During the mode transition stage, the old configuration is deleted and released for the loading of new ones. The reconfiguration transition from an old mode \( M_1 \) to a new mode \( M_2 \) takes non-zero time \( t_{R,j}^{M_1,M_2} \). \( t_{R,j}^{M_1,M_2} \) depends on the circuit size of different reconfiguration modes and is usually non-ignorable.

For convenience, to avoid the use of \( t_{R,j}^{M_x,M_y} \), \( t_{R,j} \) is simply used to implicitly mean \( t_{R,j}^{M_x,M_y} \) when the mode switching is known from context. Similarly, \( t_{C,j} \) is used to implicitly mean the computation time \( t_{C,j}^{M_1} \) or \( t_{C,j}^{M_2} \) of process \( p_j \) in the respective working modes.

An MCR may occur during the execution of the system in a particular mode, but never during the transition stages. In the worst case, two succeeding configura-
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The input data stream arrives at a peak or average\(^2\) throughput $\rho_{in}$. Meanwhile, a required average output throughput $\rho_{out}$ is applied to the sink process $p_k$, to denote the stable application throughput requirement during the lifetime of adaptive systems even in reconfiguration transition stage.

### 6.2.2 Consistency

The consistency of SDF models (see Section 2.1.1) is known to be a necessary condition to allow them to be executed within bounded memory without deadlock [38]. To execute adaptive SDF streaming applications within bounded memory without deadlock, the model consistency needs to be preserved. Besides the balance equations as defined in Eq. 3.1 for communication channels between non-adaptive processes, furthermore, for each communication channel $ch_{i,j}$ from non-adaptive process $p_i$ to adaptive process $p_j$, the following equation holds.

$$r_i \cdot n_{i,j} = \sum_{x=1}^{n} r_j^{M_x} \cdot m_{i,j}^{M_x} \quad (6.1)$$

in which $r_j^{M_x}$ and $m_{i,j}^{M_x}$ are the firing rate and consumption input rate for process $p_j$ in each working mode $M_x$.

Reconfiguration protocols for adaptive SDF applications, similar as in [77] for task graphs, are needed to guarantee that such an equation holds at run-time. Since the development of such protocols is out of the scope of this chapter, it is simply assumed that all configurations of the same adaptive process have the same input/output token rate which meets Eq. 3.1, i.e., the reconfiguration scenarios addressed always comply with the application consistency requirement. However, the proposed performance analysis approach should be able to handle more general SDF applications, once the reconfiguration protocols are available and can be captured as extra constraints in the analysis framework.

### 6.2.3 Design cost on architecture model

The architecture template is a partially reconfigurable FPGA, as illustrated in Figure 2.6. Since the pre-specified application throughput needs to be sustained during

\(^2\)Both situations will be covered in the proposed analysis approach.
the whole time period of reconfigurations, the consequence may be that there is a
need for extra buffer space, which includes the output buffer to sustain the output
throughput during reconfiguration transitions and possibly the buffer to store input
data tokens. The only unit used for area is logic elements (LEs). Area requirements
in form of memory elements are converted into LEs. Given the hardware implementa-
tions for each mode of the process, the cost of configuration controller $A_{CC}$,
configuration slot $A_C$, and configuration memory $\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{M,i}$ are static (fixed). For
the “just-in-time” (JIT) configuration on RTR FPGAs in Figure 2.6, a single con-
figuration slot is shared by different configurations at run-time. The total design
cost in terms of area is

$$A_{JIT} = A_{CC} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} A_{M,i} + k_C \cdot \max(A_{M,1}, \ldots, A_{M,n}) + A_{Buffer} \quad (6.2)$$

in which $A_{Buffer}$ is the area cost of buffers, i.e., $FIFO_{i,j}$ and $FIFO_{j,k}$ in Figure 6.1.

To design JIT reconfigurable systems efficiently, it is critical to dimension the
minimal conservative buffer size and the corresponding cost $A_{Buffer}$, and to explore
the implementation trade-offs of different design options.

### 6.3 Reconfigurations analysis framework

In the following, a constraint based framework based on iterative timing phases is
to be proposed for reconfiguration analysis. It fits well to capture both the stream-
ing application execution semantics and the varying design concerns during run-
time reconfigurations.

![Figure 6.2: Timing phases of reconfiguration analysis. In this graph, only a partic-
ular mode transition from $M_1$ to $M_2$ is shown.](image)

The staged timing phases in reconfiguration analysis, as illustrated in Fig-
ure 6.2, are the following:

**Prologue.** It is the start-up phase with no throughput guarantees. The length of
the prologue phase is specified by $\tau_0$ in Constraint 7 (see Section 4.4.4).

**Periodic phase** $M_1(M_2, \ldots, M_N)$. They are phases with guaranteed throughput
in working mode $M_1(M_2)$ of the adaptive process $p_j$. While the length
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$L_{\text{period}}$ is throughput relevant, the sustainable throughput requirements can be distinct in different working modes and are specified in Constraint 7-8.

Reconfiguration phase. It starts with an initial working mode $M_1$ upon the reconfiguration request MCR. The mode transmission starting time tag $t'$ (determined by a reconfiguration decision variable $\xi(t)$ to be defined in Section 6.4) is explored in a specified periodic phase $L_{\text{period}}$ to find the optimal reconfiguration with minimized objective function. The reconfiguration stall (working mode transmission to $M_2$) takes $t_{R,j}$ time slots (Constraint 19). The length of this phase is specified to be the worst case $L_{\text{period}} + t_{R,j}$.

Transient phase. It has a length $\tau_1$, in which throughput is met but with no periodic properties in scheduling yet.

Caused by the periodic properties in the scheduling of each working mode, the buffer requirement can be analyzed in a finite length of time, without everlasting analysis. To make the phases in gray (colored) iterative, we can use the timing analysis to traverse all reconfiguration scenarios. The conservative size of each buffer should adopt their worst case dimension respectively.

The design objective is to find the minimal total buffer sizes as defined in Eq. 4.13. In particular, the conservative size $\gamma_{i,j}$ of each buffer $\text{FIFO}_{i,j}$ should adopt their worst case dimension respectively in traversing all the reconfiguration scenarios.

6.4 Constraints on reconfigurable systems

For SDF streaming applications, their execution rules follow the semantics as described in Section 4.4.3, with the application output throughput $\rho_{\text{out}}$ subject to Constraint 7-8. For the input data stream $s_1$ to process $p_j$, a peak or average throughput $\rho_{\text{in}}$ is described as follows.

**Constraint 17. (Source input)** For the source signal process $p_i$ with computation latency $t_{C,i}$, the data stream provides a peak throughput $\rho_{\text{in}}$ according to

$$R_i(t + t_{C,i}) - R_i(t) \leq t_{C,i} \cdot \rho_{\text{in}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (6.3)

\[3\] It is based on the assumption that the worst case reconfiguration response (starting) time is $L_{\text{period}}$ after the run-time MCR.
Otherwise, a stable average throughput $\rho_{in}$ can be verified at specified time instances as follows

$$R_i(t_0 + k \cdot \Delta t_0) - R_i(t_0) = k \cdot \Delta t_0 \cdot \rho_{in}, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N} \quad (6.4)$$

in which the given $t_0$ specifies the starting time instance for average throughput checking, and $\Delta t_0$ determines the interval between different time instances.

To capture the run-time reconfiguration of the reconfigurable process, a boolean function $\xi(t)$ is used to denote the working mode at time tag $t$ of the reconfigurable process $p_j$, i.e., $\xi(t) = 0$ indicates that $p_j$ works in mode $M_1$, otherwise $p_j$ is in (or being reconfigured to) mode $M_2$. Thus, the computation latency $t_{C,j}$ for the adaptive process $p_j$ can be formulated.

**Constraint 18. (Computation latency - adaptive)** To be aware of the reconfiguration decision $\xi(t)$, the computation latency $t_{C,j}$ of the adaptive process $p_j$ is

$$t_{C,j} = -\xi(t) \cdot t_{M_1}^{C,j} + \xi(t) \cdot t_{M_2}^{C,j} \quad (6.5)$$

in which $t_{M_1}^{C,j}$ and $t_{M_2}^{C,j}$ denote the computation latency in working mode $M_1$ and $M_2$ for $p_j$ respectively.

However, Eq. 6.5 can not be implemented in Gecode directly, since $t_{C,j}$ is not an explicit variable in our model. Accordingly, the constraints for adaptive process $p_j$ containing $t_{C,j}$ need to be rewritten correspondingly. For instance, Eq. 4.4 is equivalent to the following constraint applicable in Gecode.

$$-\xi(t) \cdot C_{i,j} (t + t_{C,j}^{M_1}) + \xi(t) \cdot C_{i,j} (t + t_{C,j}^{M_2}) - C_{i,j}(t) = m_{i,j} \cdot (-\xi(t) \cdot K_j (t + t_{C,j}^{M_1}) + \xi(t) \cdot K_j (t + t_{C,j}^{M_2})) \quad (6.6)$$

Especially, the multiplication of two variables in Eq. 6.6 can be captured by a non-linear arithmetic constraint (mult) in Gecode. Similarly, other SDF execution semantics on computation and buffer resources can be extended to be reconfiguration aware (for the reconfigurable process), which are omitted for clarity in the thesis.

Furthermore, in the reconfigurations analysis of the adaptive process $p_j$, its computation stall during the reconfiguration transition stage needs to be considered. Such a stall takes $t_{R,j}$ time, and can be described as a constraint as follows.
Constraint 19. (Reconfiguration stall) The computation of the adaptive process \( p_j \) stalls for \( t_{R,j} \) time period after the reconfiguration starts at time tag \( t' \).

\[
W_j(t) = \sum_{\Delta t} \frac{C_{i,j}(t + \Delta t + 1) - C_{i,j}(t + \Delta t)}{m_{i,j}}, \quad \Delta t \in [0, t_{C,j})
\]

(6.8)

in which \( W_j(t) \) denotes the 1-0 (computing or stalling) status of process \( p_j \) at any time tag \( t \).

6.5 Experimental results

In this section, the proposed reconfigurations analysis framework is implemented on Gecode, and several experiments have been done on both the example application of Figure 6.1 and an industrial application from Thales Communications.

6.5.1 The example application

It is assumed that the adaptive process \( p_j \) in the example application has two different modes, and both configurations have the same properties (i.e., the same input and output rates, computation time and reconfiguration time). Thus, two iterations of the timing phases from Phase I to II (see Figure 6.2) in analysis can traverse all the reconfiguration scenarios.

The specification model shown in Figure 6.1 is instanced with concrete parameters (i.e., \( n_{i,j} = 2, m_{i,j} = 3, n_{j,k} = 1 \) and \( m_{j,k} = 2 \)), with a minimum interval \( t_{\text{inter}R,j} = 50 \) time slots between the two succeeding reconfigurations of \( p_j \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>options</th>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
<th>#6</th>
<th>#7</th>
<th>#8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( t_{R,j} )</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( t_{C,j} )</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( A_M )</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1: Design options for the adaptive process \( p_j \).

First, it is assumed that different design options have varying reconfiguration time \( t_{R,j} \), as listed out in the second row of Table 6.1, but have a fixed latency \( t_{C,j} \) (i.e., \( t_{C,j} = 10 \)), and evaluate the FIFO sizes requirement. Figure 6.3a shows the minimal FIFO sizes needed upon different \( t_{R,j} \), corresponding to different output throughput \( \rho_{out} \). To consider the two design concerns \( t_{R,j} \) and \( \rho_{out} \) separately,
Figure 6.3: Experimental results of the example application.
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apparently, higher $\rho_{\text{out}}$ ($\rho_{\text{out}} = 1/10$ in the graph) demands larger FIFO sizes, so do the design options with higher $t_{R,j}$ caused by the longer computation stall during reconfigurations.

Instead, in the following scenario, the design options are chosen according to the reconfiguration properties listed out in Table 6.1. These design options show different implementation strategies in the speed and area trade-offs, e.g., an adder can be implemented as carry-lookahead adder (optimized for speed) or a ripple-adder (optimized for area). We assume $t_{R,j} = k_{R} \cdot A_{M,j}$ with $k_{R} = 10.0$ and $t_{C,j} \propto \lceil \frac{1}{\sqrt{t_{R,j}}} \rceil$. As illustrated in Figure 6.3b, higher $\rho_{\text{out}}$ ($\rho_{\text{out}} = 1/8$) still demands larger FIFO sizes, but the FIFO sizes are not monotonic to $t_{R,j}$ any more, as both $t_{C,j}$ and $t_{R,j}$ can affect the buffer requirement to sustain $\rho_{\text{out}}$ during reconfiguration. The design options with $t_{R,j}$ close to 5 need less buffer.

Using a given compression ratio $k_{C} = 4.0$, the design costs are evaluated, as illustrated in Figure 6.3c. As the design options after #5 simply show a fast monotonically increasing cost, only the design costs of design option #1-5 are shown for clarity in Figure 6.3c. Higher throughput requirement still leads to larger design costs. However, the design costs heavily depend on the $t_{C,j}$ and $t_{R,j}$ trade-off, i.e., the speed and time trade-off, and #2 with $t_{R,i} = 3$ shows the minimum cost.

6.5.2 An industrial application

![Figure 6.4: The adaptive coding and modulation case study synopsis.](image)

An industrial adaptive coding and modulation application from Thales communication, as illustrated in Figure 6.4, is used to evaluate the potential of the proposed methodology. The diagram shows a mix of digital and analogue modules, with a channel Coder preceded by a Cipher block, and followed by a digital modulator, a digital up converter, a digital to analogue converter and an analogue filter. The experiments focus on the reconfigurable part, i.e., the Coder with 3 modes of bursts BR, BL or BT and the Cipher with 3 algorithms 1-3. The input source
for the Cipher algorithm is a packet of bits, and the output stream from the Coder needs to sustain a stable throughput. The design objective in performance analysis is to minimize the buffer requirement without losing the stable output transmission, when either or both of the two modules are in reconfiguration.

The adaptive part of the abstract application model is illustrated in Figure 6.5a, in which the specification parameters are omitted for clarity. There are two adaptive processes (modules): the Cipher \( p_j \) and the Coder \( p_k \). Each of them receives the adaptation control signal \( s_{M,j} \) or \( s_{M,k} \) from the environment, and can change the working modes among three possibilities (i.e., algorithm 1-3 for the Cipher, and BT/BL/BR coder for the Coder). The input date stream has a peak throughput \( \rho_{in} \), and an average output throughput \( \rho_{out} \) is demanded.

It is assumed that the reconfigurations of two adaptive Cipher and Coder are independent of each other. To decouple the analysis, the buffer \( FIFO_{j,k} \) between \( p_j \) and \( p_k \) has been partitioned into two disjoint logic FIFOs \( FIFO'_{j,k} \) and \( FIFO''_{j,k} \), as shown in the dashed box, to be analyzed individually. From the static input (output) rates of the SDF model and \( \rho_{out} \), the average output throughput requirement \( \rho_{out}' \) of the Cipher can be derived, which is also the average input throughput to the Coder. For the Cipher, the peak input throughput and average output throughput are \( \rho_{in} \) and \( \rho_{out}' \) respectively. In this way, the analysis of two reconfigurable modules can be decoupled as follows.

1. To find the minimum buffer sizes for the Cipher buffers \( FIFO_{i,j} \) and \( FIFO'_{j,k} \) to meet the average output throughput requirement \( \rho_{out}' \) upon the peak input throughput \( \rho_{in} \) (subject to Eq. 6.3 in Constraint 17).

2. To find the minimum play-out buffer \( FIFO''_{j,k} \) and \( FIFO'_{k,l} \) for the Coder module to meet the average output requirements \( \rho_{out} \) upon the average input throughput \( \rho_{out}' \) (subject to Eq. 6.4 in Constraint 17).

Although the decoupled analysis (based on disjoint logic FIFOs) has the possibility to over-dimension the physical FIFO size, it is a conservative approach without restrictions on the reconfiguration of different adaptive modules, i.e., independent of reconfiguration protocols. For instance, using this analysis approach, the Cipher and Coder modules can be even reconfigured at the same time, when protocols of the reconfiguration of consecutive modules are still lacking.

For both the Cipher and Coder, all the reconfiguration transition possibilities are traversed (i.e., \( 3 \times (3 - 1) = 6 \)), and the worst cases are chosen as the conservative buffer requirement.
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(a) Abstract model of industrial application (with disjoint logic FIFOs in the dashed box).

(b) Design cost of JIT adaptation on the Coder.

(c) Design cost of JIT adaptation on the Cipher.

Figure 6.5: Industrial application and experimental results.
In both Coder and Cipher modules, the design cost increases with the output throughput, as shown in Figure 6.5b and 6.5c. The design costs of different implementation strategies for the Cipher with varying $t_{R,j}$ are also shown in Figure 6.5c, and the design costs are not monotonic to $t_{R,j}$. It exemplifies that the proposed reconfigurations analysis framework suits design trade-offs analysis in design options exploration, and can be applied on a series of compositional adaptive processes (modules) as well.

Furthermore, the complexity of solution finding increases exponentially with problem size (compared with the example application). For the Coder, the solutions finding time is 247-708 ms and the peak memory is 22.4-54.4 MB. For the Cipher, they are 352-408 ms and 27.7-36.4 MB respectively.

### 6.6 Concluding remarks

This chapter presents a constraint based performance analysis framework for adaptive real-time streaming applications. Based on the implementation on constraint solver, the experimental results show that the proposed framework suits well reconfigurations analysis and design trade-offs analysis. It can be used to exploit the reconfigurability of adaptive real-time streaming applications, without losing efficiency. Especially, the industrial case study illustrates the capability of the proposed methodology to cope with the cascaded composition of adaptive modules.

Meanwhile, the author foresees the possibility to compact the physical buffer size of the disjoint logic FIFOs when the mode change protocols of multiple reconfigurable modules are specified. Such a technique can further reduce the design cost of adaptive systems, which remains to be the future work.
To deliver high performance streaming media applications with reduced design costs and time-to-market, there are trends in embedded system design to use combined components of multi-CPU and custom circuits in commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) FPGAs, the so called hybrid multiprocessor/FPGAs [5].

Usually, free FPGA gates are customized as application specific reconfigurable components for performance critical functions and CPUs as execution engines for software. Such COTS chips can be used as embedded platforms with high throughput and run-time reconfiguration (RTR) requests [7]. One realistic application of them, for instance, is being used in a roaming smart-phone with reconfigurable communication protocols.

Unfortunately, the design space exploration techniques and optimization methodologies on hybrid multiprocessor/FPGAs are still immature. The difficulties exit in two categories:

- Besides application scheduling with resource constraints on multi-processors being NP-complete [32], the reconfiguration analysis even increases the design complexity.
Table 7.1: Extract of Xilinx Virtex-5 FPGAs [103].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Device</th>
<th>BRAM (16kb)</th>
<th>Power PC #</th>
<th>CLB slices</th>
<th>DRAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XC5VFX30T</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,120</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XC5VFX100T</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>1,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XC5VFX200T</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30,720</td>
<td>2,280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• To design systems that use less resources (cost) without losing performance guarantees, the decision-making over diversified COTS platforms remains difficult. For instance, the XC5VFX devices in the Xilinx Virtex-5 family cover a wide range of 380~2280KB reconfigurable logic blocks and up to two PowerPC cores [103], as illustrated in Table 7.1.

While a performance analysis framework has been proposed for reconfigurable systems in Chapter 6, the Pareto efficient design for reconfigurable streaming applications on hybrid multiprocessor/FPGA platforms will be addressed in this chapter.

For an example adaptive synchronous data flow (SDF) application as depicted in Figure 7.1(a), the computation of \( p_j \) is reconfigurable with two working modes. Each process (working mode) has a worst case execution time (WCET) when it is partitioned as either SW or HW. While software (SW) reconfigurations correspond to process context switch on processors, the overhead (OH) is negligible compared with process execution time. The hardware (HW) reconfiguration OH to manipulate reconfigurable logics on FPGAs at run-time is non-trivial, during which the computation is stalled. Assuming a specified number of processors on each chip, the implementation cost of each process is either the size of SRAM storage for SW or the area of logic blocks and (reconfiguration) memory for HW. In Figure 7.1(b), the design specifications (normalized) to implement the illustrative application on a single-CPU/FPGA platform are exemplified.

**Motivation.** Given the example application and its design specifications in Figure 7.1, three design options and their reconfiguration scheduling are explored and analyzed in the following. With design option A (\( p_i \) and \( p_j \) partitioned to HW and \( p_k \) to SW), the schedule is illustrated in Figure 7.2(a). The time range of the scheduling evolves horizontally, while the process and FIFO status are listed out vertically, i.e., at each time tag a process in *executing* state has a number to denote the remaining execution time slots, a FIFO status is denoted as the using storage space in tokens, and processes with *stalled* computation or FIFOs not used
Figure 7.1: An example reconfigurable SDF application model and its design specifications on a CPU/FPGA platform.

have otherwise blank status. At the beginning, the application with the adaptive process $p_j$ working in mode A (with WCET 2 slots) can enter a periodic phase from time tag 4 to 6. From time tag 8, $p_j$ starts the reconfiguration\(^1\) with an OH 2 and switches to working mode B (with WCET 1 slot). Again, the schedule enters another periodic phase from time tag 10 to 12. The application throughput is guaranteed in both periodic phases, since all processes have the same execution iterations in a time period 3. In addition, the application throughput is guaranteed even during mode transition, e.g., between time tags 4, 7, and 10 the sink process $p_k$ always executes once. For each FIFO, the required FIFO size is the maximal buffer usage in scheduling. Similarly, the reconfiguration scheduling of two other design options are illustrated in Figure 7.2(b-c), in which $p_j$ is implemented in SW in design option B with neglected reconfigurable OH. Apparently, all design options have the same application throughput guarantees.

Accordingly, the SW/HW cost, and FIFO buffer requirement of all design options are evaluated in Figure 7.2(d). Although these quantities have a partial order to indicate the precedence of design options, A dominates B in the sense that the former one is always preferred with not worse (bigger) evaluations on all criteria. The set of optimal design options A and C are called Pareto points [36], i.e., either

---

\(^1\)For clarity, the reconfiguration time slot is fixed at 8. But, the method to be presented in Section 7.3 is more general and fits run-time reconfigurations.
one has at least one criteria better than the other (A has less HW cost, and B has less SW and FIFO cost). In this chapter, Pareto points will be used to indicate the trade-offs of multiple criteria in design space exploration, which can not be optimized independently. However, a systematic way to calculate design Pareto points in reconfigurable streaming applications is still lacking.

As the contribution in this chapter, a new Pareto efficient design framework is proposed for reconfigurable SDF streaming applications on hybrid multi-CPU/FPGAs platforms. While the SW cost, HW cost and buffer requirement are characterized as multiple objectives, the pruned Pareto-optimal points found can be used in cost-efficient selection from variably priced CPU/FPGA platforms.

### 7.1 Related work

In [93], simulation based techniques have been introduced for the analysis of different performance metrics of scenario-aware SDF models with stochastic mode changes. Schedulability analysis and reconfiguration methods for multi-mode (adaptive) real-time systems has been studied in [84, 77], where each mode consists of different tasks. They develop mode change protocols in mode transition stages, and exploit analysis techniques to ensure that no deadlines are violated during the transition periods. On RTR hybrid CPU/FPGAs, Yuan et al. [105] address SW/HW
partitioning and scheduling of task graphs with the objective of maximizing application throughput. All these work do not address multi-dimensional optimization on platform resources, as in this chapter.

An inspiring Pareto calculator has been proposed for the optimization of multi-dimensional space of attributes [36], which is a tool for general compositional computations. It has been used to calculate optimized design options for MPEG-4 media on mobile devices via a wireless connection, with the trade-offs on the quality of the video, energy consumption and transmission latency. Based on the author’s previous work on performance analysis of SDF applications on reconfigurable FPGAs in Chapter 6 a design Pareto-point calculation flow for SW/HW and buffer cost efficient design is proposed for SW/HW allocation, scheduling, and run-time reconfiguration analysis on multiprocessor/FPGA platforms.

7.2 Application and Architectural assumptions

In the multiprocessor/FPGA computing platforms as illustrated in Figure 2.6, there are CPUs dedicated to SW processes and custom circuits to HW processes. While the cost of memory (SRAM) and custom circuits on FPGAs is determined by application allocation decision, the buffer requirement depends heavily on scheduling policies (RTOS). Given a reconfigurable process allocated as HW, new functionality can be loaded from the configuration memory into the configuration slot (reconfigurable circuits in FPGA) specified by the reconfiguration control. Since this loading takes time (reconfiguration stall), the system timing might be violated without reconfiguration analysis. On the other hand, processes improperly implemented as SW might degrade system performance, especially when the number of processors is limited. It is critical to find the Pareto efficient design options while the throughput guarantees are met during the run-time reconfiguration transitions.

The Pareto efficient design on partially RTR multiprocessor/FPGAs is based on the following assumptions:

- The reconfiguration of one process does not interfere the working of other running processes on such a partially RTR CPU/FPGAs platform.

- The hard-core multi-processors are homogeneous, on which each process has the same WCET being mapped onto different processors, e.g., PowerPC on Virtex-5.

- The cost to implement processes as either SW or HW is known at design-time in specifications.
7.3 Pareto efficient design framework

Here, the constraint based Pareto efficient design framework is proposed, which includes application allocation, scheduling, and Pareto points calculation, besides reconfiguration analysis.

7.3.1 Allocation and mapping

A set of boolean decision variables $\mu_i$ denote whether each process $p_i$ is allocated to CPUs ($\mu_i = 0$) or FPGAs ($\mu_i = 1$). Assuming different instances (computation iterations) of a process are only allocated onto one processor, a set of boolean variables $\alpha_{i,\mu p_n}$ indicate the presence of $p_i$ on the specified processor $\mu p_n$, with $\alpha_{i,\mu p_n} \equiv 0$ for processes allocated to FPGAs. Processes allocation and mapping can be formalized as the following.

Constraint 20. (Allocation & mapping) While each process $p_i$ can be allocated to CPUs or FPGAs, a process allocated to CPUs needs one (and only one) processor for different process instances.

$$\sum_{\mu p_n \in U} \alpha_{i,\mu p_n} = \neg \mu_i, \quad \forall p_i \in P \quad (7.1)$$

in which $P$ is the set of processes in application models, and $U$ is the set of processors in the architecture platform.

The mapping problem on homogeneous multi-processors contains symmetries, i.e., for some mapping decisions, there are duplicated equivalent solutions in the searching space. Thus, a stronger restriction (Eq. 7.2) is applied to order the processors in allocation to exclude revisiting symmetrically equivalent states.

$$\sum_i 2^i \alpha_{i,\mu p_n} \geq \sum_i 2^i \alpha_{i,\mu p_{n+1}}, \quad \forall \mu p_n, \mu p_{n+1} \in U \quad (7.2)$$

in which the equality holds when neither of the consecutive processors $\mu p_n$ and $\mu p_{n+1}$ has processes allocated.

7.3.2 Extended execution semantics

Here, the execution semantics of SDF applications (see Section 4.4.3) based on cumulative event models is extended to be allocation aware. Besides the allocation decision variables $\mu_i$, we use a boolean function $\xi(t)$ to denote the working mode
at time tag $t$ of the reconfigurable process $p_j$, i.e., $\xi(t) = 0$ indicates that $p_j$ works in mode $A$, otherwise $p_j$ is in (or being reconfigured to) mode $B$. For instance, the process computation latency is formulated in the following constraint.

**Constraint 21. (Computation latency)** While each process can be allocated to CPUs or FPGAs, its WCET in implementation is denoted as $t_{C_{sw},j}$ or $t_{C_{hw},j}$ with the following constraints.

\[
C_{i,j}(t + t_{C,j}) = C_{i,j}(t) + m_{i,j}K_j(t), \quad \forall K_j(t) \in \{0, 1\} \tag{7.3}
\]

where \( t_{C,j} = -\mu_j t_{C_{sw},j} + \mu_j t_{C_{hw},j} \tag{7.4} \)

in which $K_j(t)$ denotes the incremental properties of $C_{i,j}(t)$. Especially, for a reconfigurable process $p_j$, the WCET varies from $t_{A_{C_{sw},j}}(t_{A_{C_{hw},j}})$ to $t_{B_{C_{sw},j}}(t_{B_{C_{hw},j}})$ during the reconfiguration from working mode $A$ to $B$. Thus, $t_{C,j}$ in Eq. 7.3 can be defined:

\[
t_{C,j} = -\xi(t)(-\mu_j t_{C_{sw},j} + \mu_j t_{C_{hw},j}) + \\
\xi(t)(-\mu_j t_{C_{sw},j} + \mu_j t_{C_{hw},j}) \tag{7.5}
\]

However, the constraints in Eq. (7.3-7.5) can not be implemented in Gecode solver directly and need to be rewritten. For instance, Eq. (7.3-7.4) are equivalent to the following constraint applicable in Gecode.

\[
-\mu_j C_{i,j}(t + t_{C_{sw},j}) + \mu_j C_{i,j}(t + t_{C_{sw},j}) \\
= C_{i,j}(t) + m_{i,j}K_j(t), \quad \forall K_j(t) \in \{0, 1\} \tag{7.6}
\]

Without being explicitly mentioned in this chapter, $t_{C,j}$ has the same definitions as in Eq. (7.3-7.5) to be allocation decision and reconfiguration (for the reconfigurable process) aware. Similarly, other SDF execution semantics on computation and buffer resources can be extended, which are omitted for clarity.

Furthermore, the process scheduling with computation and buffer resource constraints is refined to be aware of the allocation and mapping decisions.

**Constraint 22. (Allocation & scheduling association)** While the processes allocated to FPGAs are concurrent in scheduling, the processes allocated to one single processor can only execute sequentially. This mapping and scheduling association is formalized as:

\[
\sum_{p_j \in P} \alpha_{j,mp_n} W_j(t) \in \{0, 1\}, \quad \forall mp_n \in U \tag{7.7}
\]

\[
W_j(t) = \sum_{\Delta_t} \frac{C_{i,j}(t+\Delta_t+1)-C_{i,j}(t+\Delta_t)}{m_{i,j}}, \quad \Delta_t \in [0, t_{C,j}) \tag{7.8}
\]
in which \( W_j(t) \) denotes the 1-0 (computing or stalling) status of process \( p_j \) at time tag \( t \) on CPUs or FPGAs, and \( t_{C,j} \) has the same definitions as in Eq. (7.3-7.5) to be allocation decision and reconfiguration aware.

### 7.3.3 Design Pareto points calculation

In design specifications, the cost to implement each process \( p_i \) in SW (if feasible) on CPUs is measured as the code size \( \pi_i^{SW} \) in SRAM or the area of custom circuits \( \pi_i^{HW} \) in HW. The only unit used for HW area cost is the number of logic elements (LE). The memory cost for a configuration stored in the configuration memory is thus calculated as the equivalent LE cost which is technology dependent. The SW and HW implementation cost on the platform are defined.

**Property 6.** (SW & HW implementation cost) The process allocation determines the total SW cost \( \pi_{\text{Sum}}^{SW} \) and total HW cost \( \pi_{\text{Sum}}^{HW} \).

\[
\pi_{\text{Sum}}^{SW} = \sum_{p_i \in P} \mu_i \cdot \pi_i^{SW} \quad \pi_{\text{Sum}}^{HW} = \sum_{p_i \in P} \mu_i \cdot \pi_i^{HW} \quad (7.9)
\]

Assuming different FIFOs are implemented disjointly, the buffer cost on the platform is formalized.

**Property 7.** (Buffer cost) In scheduling, the buffer cost in total corresponds to the sum of the maximal buffer usage of all FIFOs.

\[
\gamma_{\text{Sum}} = \sum_{\forall ch_{i,j}} \max_{\forall t} B'_{i,j}(t) \quad (7.10)
\]

To evaluate the quality of design options in solutions finding, a constraint on SW/HW implementation cost and buffer requirement is formulated to prune design options.

**Constraint 23.** (Design options pruning) Given a set \( \text{ParetoSet} \) of design Pareto points found in design space exploration. Besides meeting all other constraints formulated above, a solution \( \text{sol} \) should not be dominated (\( \not\preceq \)) by any Pareto points \( \phi \).

\[
\text{sol} \not\preceq \phi \iff \text{sol.}\pi_{\text{Sum}}^{SW} < \phi.\pi_{\text{Sum}}^{SW} \lor \text{sol.}\pi_{\text{Sum}}^{HW} < \phi.\pi_{\text{Sum}}^{HW} \\
\lor \text{sol.}\gamma_{\text{Sum}} < \phi.\gamma_{\text{Sum}}, \quad \forall \phi \in \text{ParetoSet} \quad (7.11)
\]

in which \( \text{sol} \not\preceq \phi \) always holds when \( \text{ParetoSet} = \emptyset \).
To maintain a set of Pareto points in the design space exploration, a calculation flow is presented as in Algorithm 1. In line 4, while all the formulated constraints are used in solutions finding, a $ParetoSet$ is dynamically maintained during exploration and used in Constraint 23. From line 8 to 10, if a $sol$ dominates ($\prec$) a current Pareto point, the dominated design option is moved into another $DominatedSet$.

**Algorithm 1**: Design Pareto-point calculation flow.

Output: $ParetoSet$

1. $ParetoSet \leftarrow \emptyset$;
2. $DominatedSet \leftarrow \emptyset$;
3. /* A dynamic $ParetoSet$ is used in Constraint 23 */
4. while $(sol = solutionsFinding(ParetoSet)) \neq Null$ do
5.  if $|ParetoSet| > 0$ then
6.   for $k \leftarrow 1$ to $ParetoSet.size$ do
7.     /* If $sol$ dominates a Pareto point */
8.     if $sol \prec ParetoSet.at(k)$ then
9.       $DominatedSet.insert(ParetoSet.at(k))$;
10.      $ParetoSet.erase(k)$;
11.     $ParetoSet.insert(sol)$

**Discussion.** The SW/HW and buffer cost in the proposed formulation are based on high-level estimations, e.g., buffer cost based on symbolic token units. However, it is possible to extend this method within a practical design flow, once these vendor and technology dependent factors can be formalized as design constraints. For instance, assuming FIFO buffers are implemented as block RAM (BRAM), a more practical buffer cost $\gamma_{BRAM}^{Sum}$ can be re-formalized from Eq. 7.10.

$$
\gamma_{Sum}^{BRAM} = k_{BRAM} \sum_{\forall \text{ch}_{i,j}} d_{BRAM} \left[ \max_{\forall t} \frac{B'_{i,j}(t)}{d_{BRAM}} \right] \quad (7.12)
$$

in which $k_{BRAM}$ and $d_{BRAM}$ are the cost factor and depth of BRAM.

---

2To our best knowledge, it is infeasible with ILP modelling techniques.
Table 7.2: Design specifications and experimental results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>application</th>
<th>process #</th>
<th>SDF</th>
<th>HSDF</th>
<th>pre-allocations</th>
<th>thru. req.</th>
<th>mem.</th>
<th>time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0 1 2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.29e3</td>
<td>1.90e3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cd2dat</td>
<td>6 612</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4.18e6</td>
<td>1.05e5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless</td>
<td>24 32</td>
<td>3 15</td>
<td>6 0.028</td>
<td>3.80e6</td>
<td>1.94e4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a The number of SDF processes and equivalent HSDF processes.
b The number of processes pre-allocated as SW or HW on the platform.
c The peak memory consumption (KB) in solutions finding.
d The solutions finding time (ms).

7.4 Experimental results

To demonstrate the potential in Pareto efficient design, the methodology has been used on a Cd2dat [13] application from the media domain, and a Wireless [70] application from the communication domain, besides the example application Figure 7.1(a).

A reconfigurable FPGA platform with two processors, e.g., Xilinx Virtex-5 FPGAs, is adopted. The design specifications of different SDF applications are presented in Table 7.2. For each application, the number of SDF processes and the equivalent HSDF process number are listed out. Especially, part of the SDF processes have been pre-allocated on the platform, either as SW or HW modules. In each application, one process is specified to be reconfigurable with two working modes. Assuming the same specified (feasible) application throughput requirement needs to be sustained (not only in different working modes but also in reconfiguration phases), the application allocation, scheduling, and reconfiguration analysis between mode transitions are explored. However, within the scope of this chapter, the impacts of varying application throughput on design Pareto points are not investigated.

The peak memory and running time on the experimental workstation have been measured in the solver, which are shown in Table 7.2 as well. The memory and time usage increase exponentially with the problem size. The proposed method has been computation efficient to solve the NP-complete allocation and scheduling problem with a reasonable problem size, e.g., in 1.9s for the small example case and 105s for Cd2dat. The design Pareto points for different application specifications are illustrated in Figure 7.3. For the example application, given a lower throughput requirement as specified in Table 7.2 (0.2 instead of 0.33), Pareto points with even less FIFO cost than in Figure 7.2 can be found. To distinguish whether
Figure 7.3: Design Pareto points for different applications.
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to implement the reconfigurable process in SW or HW in the graph, the Pareto points are marked as ‘Pareto point (SW)’ or ‘Pareto point (HW)’ respectively. The buffer costs found are very tight, in the sense that for each application the minimal buffer cost in all Pareto points is the same as the minimal dead-lock avoiding bounds [37]. Another set of temporal Pareto points DominatedSet dominated by new solutions found in design space exploration (line 8 to 10 in Algorithm 1) are presented. However, more design options which are pruned by Pareto points are discarded. For instance, 263 failure nodes are pruned for Wireless, while each node corresponds to a set of pruned design options.

Memory issues. In the experiments, the peak memory usage increases dramatically with the problem size, e.g., 4.18e6KB (very close to the 4GB RAM capacity on our workstation) is used for Cd2dat. On the other hand, memory usage up to 2GB has also been reported in a model checking method in [37], in which a relatively simpler problem (only the scheduling of SDF applications) is considered. In another experiment, the processes allocation is fixed to either SW or HW (i.e., process number allocated to SW/HW is 0 in Table 7.2) for Wireless. A Pareto point has been found in 2.1s with peak memory 414MB. Thus, it might be possible to use heuristics in the constraint based techniques to improve the searching efficiency, in terms of computation time and memory usage.

7.5 Concluding remarks

In this chapter, a Pareto efficient design method for reconfigurable streaming applications on off-the-shelf CPU/FPGA platforms has been presented. The problem is formulated as constraint based application allocation, scheduling, and reconfiguration analysis. A design Pareto-point calculation flow for SW/HW and buffer cost is implemented on a public domain constraint solver Gecode [33], and is exemplified by two case studies from different application domains.

They are throughput and reconfiguration stall $t_{R,j}$ relevant. For Cd2dat and Wireless, we specify $t_{R,j}$ to be 1-2 orders-of-magnitude higher than $t_{C,j}$. 

In Chapter 3-7, the author has proposed performance analysis and design space exploration frameworks for predictable streaming applications on multiprocessor systems-on-chip (MPSoCs) platforms. Using the optimized design options and scheduling policies, the designer can get high efficiency on the non-functional properties of streaming applications, in particular on real-time performance, energy dissipation, and buffer requirements. Although both simulation and formal analysis based approaches in this thesis have shown the potential of compile time optimization techniques, a realistic projection on the final implementation has the added advantage to substantiate the results in theoretical studies. In this chapter, prototyping stream processing systems on FPGA is used as such a method to build a physical platform, which entails the designer to evaluate various properties in implementation.

FPGA is an integrated circuit designed to be configurable after manufacturing, which facilitates the deployment of a multiprocessor platform on a single chip [51]. In this chapter, to ease a rapid prototyping, the Stratix II EP2S60 FPGA in the Altera family [2] is used as the programmable device. With the inherent flexibility to integrate existing intellectual property (IP) components, such as embedded microprocessors, DSP, and interconnect fabric modules, a Stratix II FPGA has simplified the design process of a MPSoC architecture with on-chip interconnections in this chapter. Such a prototype provides a demo platform to fill in the gap between sys-
tem level design methodology and final implementation, and it is used to validate
the compile time design optimization methods on predictable streaming applica-
tions design.

8.1 MPSoC architecture platform

8.1.1 Architecture template

The architecture template of the tile based [8, 25] MPSoC is illustrated in Figure 8.1. A logic tile consists of processor(µp), instruction memory (I-mem), data memory (D-mem), FIFO buffer, and communication assist (CA). The processor has on-chip SRAM based local I-mem and D-mem. As a single-cycle accessing time is needed for the processor to access I-mem or D-mem, no cache is needed. The explicit FIFO channels between different computation processes of streaming applications are allocated onto a local data buffer, and multiple FIFOs on the same tile share a physical buffer in a disjoint way. That is, different FIFOs do not share buffer space with the same memory address. A CA is a controller that assists the inter-tile incoming and outgoing communication operations. That is, each tile is connected with others via CA across the on-chip interconnection.

Figure 8.1: Architecture template of the tile based MPSoC on FPGA.
8.1.2 FPGA based MPSoC

Based on the Altera Quartus II tool suite to configure Stratix II FPGA, various IP cores can be used to build the prototyping architecture platform, including vendor pre-verified cores and custom cores.

- The processor is the Nios II, which is a 32-bit RISC soft-core designed specifically for Altera FPGAs with a Harvard architecture, i.e., it has separated instruction and data buses.
- The I-mem, D-mem, and the circular FIFO based data buffer are all implemented in SRAM on-chip memory. Each Nios processor has dedicated connection from master ports to the slave ports of each module with high memory bandwidth.
- CA is a custom core employed for run-time flow control. It moves data tokens from the producer processes to consumer processes, when their respective output-side FIFOs and input-side FIFOs are mapped onto different tiles. The communication performed via CAs is decoupled from the computation performed on processors by the asynchronous FIFO buffers.
- The JTAG UART core provides the way for programming and debug on the FPGA device via the serial communication connected to the host PC.
- Avalon switch fabric provides a collection of interconnect and logic resource to manage the connection of different components. Here, a common Avalon memory-mapped (Avalon-MM) interface is used for the read/write interfaces on master/slave components. Compared with traditional bus, it provides flexibility and supports multiple masters operations simultaneously, using a slave-side arbitration scheme.

In the FPGA based MPSoC in Figure 8.1, besides the dedicated path in the intra-tile interconnect, the inter-tile interconnect (in dashed line) is based on partial crossbar switch, in which each master has the connectivity to a subset of slaves. When multiple master ports contend for a single slave port, an arbiter grants fare access in a round-robin order with minimum bandwidth guarantee.

8.1.3 Communication model

When an inter-tile logic channel is implemented as a Avalon inter-tile interconnection, the communication delay to be captured needs to be aware of the communica-
CHAPTER 8. PROTOTYPING ON MPSOCs

Figure 8.2: Refinement of two communication processes \( p_{\delta_{L,R}} \) and \( p_{\delta_{L+2,R}} \) based on the latency-rate server model [87].

ation resource sharing. Given two such channels sharing the same communication interconnection, their point-to-point inter-tile communication delay can be modelled by process \( p_{\delta_{L,R}} \) and \( p_{\delta_{L+2,R}} \) respectively on the left side of Figure 8.2. The refined delay based on latency-rate server model [87] consists of two parts, as illustrated on the right side of the graph.

1. The constant contributions from interconnection by process \( p_{\delta_{L,R}} \) and \( p_{\delta_{L+2,R}} \). They are the same as regular computation processes with specified computation latency (see Section 4.4.3).

2. The variable contributions caused by communication resource sharing is explicitly captured by \( p_{\delta_R} \), with bounded communication bandwidth as formalized in Constraint 24.

**Constraint 24.** *(Communication bandwidth)* For all the logic channels sharing the same inter-tile interconnection (shared server \( p_{\delta_R} \)), the communication bandwidth \( \omega \) enforces the bound constraint on the service function \( C_{\delta_{L+2},\delta_R}(t) \) of each channel as the following.

\[
\sum_{\forall \delta_{L,R}} (C_{\delta_{L+2},\delta_R}(t + 1) - C_{\delta_{L+2},\delta_R}(t)) \leq \omega
\]  

8.2 Run-time implementation

Based on a static application to architecture mapping, the run-time implementation process is the scheduling of streaming applications on MPSoCs. In this thesis, the applications do not allow run-time process migration on the platform.
8.2. Scheduling strategies

The scheduling of SDF applications on MPSoCs involves both processes execution order and start-time assignments on each processor. Different implementation strategies are distinguished from the ways to carry out these two assignments, either in a fixed or dynamic manner, as illustrated in Table 8.1 [8].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation strategies</th>
<th>Fixed order?</th>
<th>Fixed start-time?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full static</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static order</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run-time order</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To reduce the run-time computation overhead, it is preferred that both assignments could be fixed at compile-time. However, a fully static schedule is sensitive to the varying computation or communication delays at run-time, which makes it infeasible for distributed systems. In this chapter, two run-time scheduling strategies, static order and run-time order [8], are exploited. Both do not require a global notion of time or clock, when such a global time is not easily known on MPSoCs.

As a subset of Kahn process networks [55], SDF models are deterministic and the model will produce the same output values for the same input streams without being affected by the timing semantics of data streams, i.e., without being affected by the varying run-time computation latencies. When processes execute in a data driven manner on a multiprocessor architecture, the execution requirement on the exact start-time of processes is relaxed.

- In the static order scheduling, the order in which processes execute in each processor is determined at compile time such that all data precedence constraints are met.
- In the run-time order scheduling, the sequential execution order on each processor is determined at run-time based on a static checking list in priority queue.

In each processor, the processes execute consecutively in a non-preemptive manner according to the static assignment, and no operating system is needed. Since the producer-consumer synchronization is performed in an event driven manner,
both scheduling strategies are robust with respect to variances in *communication latencies* as well.

Based on the optimization approaches proposed in this thesis, the static order strategy can be optimized subject to the design objective, which is to minimize the buffer cost according to the specified application throughput requirement. On the other hand, the run-time order scheduling, without optimization on buffer and timing constraints, is used as a reference method.

### 8.2.2 Scheduling algorithms

Without losing generality, the run-time scheduling algorithms are exemplified by an example 4-stage pipelined application mapped onto a 2-core MPSoC platform as shown in Figure 8.3.

![Diagram of Mapping and refinement of a 4-stage pipelined application onto a 2-core MPSoC platform](image)

> Figure 8.3: Mapping and refinement of a 4-stage pipelined application onto a 2-core MPSoC platform, in which the communication delay is captured by process $p_{\delta_L R}$ based on latency-rate model.

Since process $p_j$ and $p_k$ are mapped onto different tiles, the buffer $FIFO_{j,k}$ on the inter-tile channel is decomposed into two on-tile buffers $FIFO_{j,i}$ and $FIFO_{k,i}$, and the communication delay is captured by $p_{\delta_L R}$ as a latency-rate server model.

Given a user specified order or priority, the static order and run-time order schedules on each tile can be constructed respectively. In both strategies, when the producer and consumer processes of a single logic channel are mapped onto different tiles, the inter-tile message passing uses communication primitives for synchronization, and the producer or consumer process needs to check at run-time for input data token availability or output FIFO capacity, as illustrated in the scheduling Algorithm 8.2.1-8.2.4. However, in the static order scheduling, a process executes
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directly according to the user specified execution order, when it does not need to synchronize with inter-tile processes (see Algorithm 8.2.3-8.2.4).

**Algorithm 8.2.1: RUNTimeORDERTile1(c)**

```plaintext
while (1)
  do if (γi,j - B'_{i,j}(t) ≥ ni,j)
      then pi();
  do if (B_{i,j}(t) ≥ mi,j and γj,δ - B'_{j,δ}(t) ≥ nj,k)
      then pj();
```

**Algorithm 8.2.2: RUNTimeORDERTile2(c)**

```plaintext
while (1)
  do if (B_{j,k}(t) ≥ mj,k and γk,l - B'_{k,l}(t) ≥ nk,l)
      then pk();
      do if (B_{k,l}(t) ≥ mk,l)
          then pl();
```

**Algorithm 8.2.3: STATICORDERTile1(c)**

```plaintext
while (1)
  do pi();
  do if (γj,δ - B'_{j,δ}(t) ≥ nj,k)
      then pj();
```

**Algorithm 8.2.4: STATICORDERTile2(c)**

```plaintext
while (1)
  do if (B_{j,k}(t) ≥ mj,k)
      then pk();
      pl();
```

8.3 Experimental results

To evaluate the scheduling capability of static order and run-time order strategies, a prototype of the cd2dat application [13] on a 3-core MPSoC platform is built. The application has 6 pipelined processes, with the process to platform mapping illustrated in Figure 8.4.
For both strategies, the application C code is cross-compiled for release using the optimization level “-Os” to optimize for size. The constraint based method proposed in this thesis is used to optimized the order in the static order scheduling, and the run-time order scheduling with user specified priority queues is used as reference method. In the experiments, the scheduling logic overhead is fixed once the application and scheduling strategy are chosen. However, the process computation latencies imitated by dummy operations can vary, which are controlled by (proportional to) a factor $F$.

To compare different scheduling strategies, the experimental results are shown in Table 8.2. For the run-time order scheduling, two variations are used. That is, ‘Run-time order A’ corresponds to the strategy with the same bounded buffer space and buffer usage as in ‘Static order’, and ‘Run-time order B’ corresponds to the strategy with big enough buffer space\textsuperscript{1}. In the table, $buffer$ denotes the total buffer usage during run-time, and $throughput$ is the guaranteed application throughput obtained. Compared with run-time order scheduling, the static order scheduling optimized by the constraint based scheduling method proposed in this thesis can

\textsuperscript{1}Each buffer space is three times to the corresponding one in ‘Static order’, which turns to be big enough at run-time. In Table 8.2, only the run-time usage of each buffer is reported.
8.4 Concluding remarks

In this chapter, a prototype of streaming applications on FPGA based MPSoC has been built. Using the constraint based performance analysis methods proposed in this thesis, the process execution order in static order scheduling algorithms has been optimized at design-time. Compared with run-time scheduling strategies, the optimized static order scheduling algorithms have shown both throughput gains and buffer cost reduction on the physical platform. This prototyping system has substantiated the theoretical studies on performance analysis and efficient implementation of streaming applications on MPSoCs.

achieve improved throughput with minimized buffer cost. Especially, when the factor of computation latency is small ($\mathcal{F} = 10$), it can get up to 153% throughput gains and down to 51% buffer cost reduction.
CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

9.1 Conclusions

Driven by the increasing capacity of integrated circuits, parallelism has been an architectural theme in embedded computing systems. Multiprocessor systems-on-chip (MPSoCs), consisting of multiple components of computation, storage, and communication elements on the same silicon, are increasing widely used in modern consumer electronics devices. With the enhanced computation power, program-ability, and reduced communication cost, MPSoCs are suitable for concurrent streaming applications ranging from multimedia, digital signal processing (DSP), and telecommunication to network processing domains. However, it is non-trivial to harness the inherent high processing power effectively, when there are both application specific performance demands and implementation (area, energy, and cost) efficiency needs. A systematic way to design efficient streaming applications on embedded MPSoCs in an early design phase is thus required.

This thesis explores performance analysis and implementation efficiency for predictable streaming applications on these MPSoCs computing platforms. The functionality and application concurrency are described in synchronous data flow (SDF) computational models, and two state-of-the-art architecture templates with implementation parallelism are proposed as heterogeneous multiprocessor architectures, i.e., network-on-chip (NoC) based MPSoC and hybrid reconfigurable mul-
tiprocessor/FPGA platforms. Based on the author’s contributions on simulation and formal analytical methods, performance analysis methods and design space exploration workflows for embedded MPSoCs architectures have been proposed.

![Diagram](image)

Figure 9.1: A streaming application mapped onto a NoC based MPSoC in the multi-clocked synchronous modelling framework (see Figure 3.8).

Table 9.1: Results on energy and processor utilization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Thru-H</th>
<th>Thru-L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$E_H$</td>
<td>$E_M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad-hoc</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>181.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taboo</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>155.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* The unit of energy is mJ.

In Chapter 3, a *simulation* based energy efficient design exploration flow is proposed for streaming applications with guaranteed throughput on MPSoCs. Using a multi-clocked synchronous modelling framework, the streaming applications are mapped on NoC based MPSoCs, as illustrated in Figure 9.1. Both application throughput analysis and system energy calculation have been carried out during the scheduling. The degrees of customizability of both processor *voltage-frequency* levels and memory *sizes* have been leveraged to investigate the minimal energy consumption of streaming applications. In experiments on a FM radio application, heuristic search (greedy and Taboo) algorithms are used to find efficient design options in terms of total energy dissipations. Compared with an ad-hoc approach, the
proposed method with Taboo search shows an energy reduction $\delta [%]$ of 21\% with higher processor utilization $\eta [%]$, as shown in Table 9.1.

![Diagram](image)

Figure 9.2: Event models for data streams in SDF models. (a) a producer-consumer pair; (b) the exemplification event models.

Table 9.2: Scheduling a Modem onto CPU/FPGA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAPS</th>
<th>Constraint-based</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$J$</td>
<td>throughput</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* It is the execution time (ms) in solutions finding.

In Chapter 4, a formal analytical scheduling framework for real-time streaming applications with minimal buffer requirement on hybrid CPU/FPGA architectures is proposed. First, event models for data streams in SDF models are proposed, as illustrated in Figure 9.2. Accordingly, the resource constrained scheduling problem

1In the table, Thru-H and Thru-L correspond to application throughput requirements 640 kb/s and 400 kb/s respectively.
has been formalized declaratively, and solved by a public domain constraint solver Gecode [33]. Compared with PAPS, experiments on a Modem application have shown the capability of the proposed Constraint based Minimal Buffer Scheduling (CMBS) approach in constructing schedules with high (feasible) throughput guarantees and minimized buffer requirement, as shown in Table 9.1.

Consecutively, the constraint based method has been extended in the following chapters.

• In Chapter 5, a global scheduling and contention-free routing framework for NoC based MPSoCs is addressed.

• Based on adaptive extensions on SDF semantics, a performance analysis framework with iterative timing phases is proposed in Chapter 6 for adaptive real-time streaming applications on run-time reconfigurable FPGAs.

• In Chapter 7, a design Pareto-point calculation flow is exploited for multi-dimensional design optimization, with optimized buffer requirement and software/hardware implementation cost on run-time reconfigurable multi-processor/FPGA platforms.

Finally, a prototype of stream processing systems on FPGA based MPSoCs is built in Chapter 8 to substantiate the results of theoretical studies in this thesis.

9.2 Future work

Although several issues on performance analysis and implementation of predictable MPSoC computing systems have been address in this thesis, like any other research projects, there are more unfulfilled research problems, which are worthy to be explored in the future.

• The computational models of streaming applications considered in this thesis are mainly based on SDF models, which are quite restrictive in semantics. Based on more expressive extensions of the SDF semantics, the extended models may be used to describe streaming applications with more dynamic properties, such as the adaptive extensions in Chapter 6, cyclo-static data flow [14], extended SDF [73], SDF scenarios [34], heterogeneous SDF (HSDF) [40], and parameterized SDF (PSDF) [11]. Typically, analysis techniques based on more expressive models are preferably to achieve a more efficient design [34]. On the other hand, the model is required to preserve the
9.2. FUTURE WORK

static time analyzability in predictable systems design. It is worth to find a balance between expressiveness and analyzability of computational models, according to the application specific requirement.

• Both heuristics and constraint programming techniques have been exploited to solve the NP-complete problems in this thesis. A comparison between them and some other techniques, such as evolutionary algorithms, model checking and SAT solvers [3, 22, 29], is worthy to be addressed. Besides, to improve the propagation and searching efficiency of the constraint models can help to solve problems with scaled-up problem size or complexity. Preferably, the domain specific knowledge as used in [88, 104] is promising to be considered and modelled.

• From version 3.1.0, the constraint solver Gecode starts to support parallel search in multiple threads. However, the searching speed on multi-thread heavily depends on whether the search tree can be distributed to each thread efficiently, and it takes more memory than single thread searching [33]. To consider using multiple threads in searching with a reasonable peak memory in the exploration of search tree remains the future work.

• Theoretical studies have considered memory sharing between different logic buffers in Chapter 5, similar as in [37, 43, 71, 72]. Compared with disjoint partitioning, it shows a great reduction in memory size. However, a general way to conduct memory sharing is non-trivial in implementation, which has not been seen in the literature and remains to be addressed.

• Based on worst case scenarios, performance analysis in this thesis has been done for hard real-time applications. For applications with soft real-time requirements, techniques based on probabilistic models for average case performance analysis can be done. Potentially, it can lead to more efficient resource usage.

• In Chapter 8, a prototype of streaming applications on Avalon switch fabric based MPSoCs has been built. Another interconnection alternative is the NoC communication, as covered in theoretical studies in Chapter 3 and Chapter 5. When more scalability on the MPSoC platform is required, the prototype can be extended to NoC interconnections.
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