Code generation from synchronous languages a short survey

Nicolas Halbwachs

Verimag/CNRS Grenoble, France

Parallel description

Parallel description

Sequential code





Synchronous programming Abstract synchronous behavior

sequence of reactions to input events:



Composition of behaviors:



Synchronous programming

Concrete behavior



Synchronous programming

Concrete behavior



Valid abstraction as long as $\delta_i < \Delta_i$

Synchronous data-flow

Generalized Mealy machines



Behaviour: $(\vec{S}_0, \vec{X}_0, \vec{Y}_0), (\vec{S}_1, \vec{X}_1, \vec{Y}_1), \dots, (\vec{S}_n, \vec{X}_n, \vec{Y}_n), \dots,$ with $Y_n = f_Y(\vec{X}_n, \vec{S}_n)$ and $\vec{S}_{n+1} = f_S(\vec{X}_n, \vec{S}_n)$ Deterministic!

Synchronous data-flow

Parallel composition:



Synchronous data-flow

Parallel composition:



 $(ec{S}',ec{Y})=f(ec{X},ec{S},ec{Z})$ $(ec{T}',ec{Z})=g(ec{W},ec{T},ec{Y})$

(deterministic, provided there is no combinational loop)

The absence of combinational loop ensures that there exists a sequential order (topological order)



The absence of combinational loop ensures that there exists a sequential order (topological order)



 $S = S_0; T = T_0;$ forever do read (X, W); $Z = g_Z(W, T);$ $Y = f_Y(X, Z, S);$ $T = g_T(W, Y, T);$ $S = f_S(X, Z, S);$ done

Standard way of compiling Lustre and Scade

What about imperative languages (Esterel, Synccharts)?

What about imperative languages (Esterel, Synccharts)?

By translation into data-flow [Berry 1992, Esterel on Hardware]



[Scaife& Caspi, ECRTS 2004] Periodic tasks, with different periods

Purely synchronous behavior:



[Scaife& Caspi, ECRTS 2004] Periodic tasks, with different periods

Purely synchronous behavior:



The desired behavior:





Communication can be non deterministic!































Generation of distributed code

- for fault-tolerance (redundancy)
- to improve the performances (??)
- because of physical constraints (position of sensors and actuators)

Generation of distributed code

- for fault-tolerance (redundancy)
- to improve the performances (??)
- because of physical constraints (position of sensors and actuators)

Solutions preserving functional semantics

- Implementation of Lustre on top of TTA [Caspi-Curic-Maignan-Sofronis-Tripakis-Niebert, LCTES03]
- Distributing sequential code [Caspi-Girault-Pilaud, TSE 1999]
- Deterministic desynchronization using "endochrony" [Benveniste-Caillaud-LeGuernic, CONCUR 1999] [Potop-DeSimone-Sorel, EMSOFT 2007]

Distributing sequential code

[Caspi-Girault-Pilaud, TSE 1999] Starting point:

- the sequential code compiled from a synchronous program
- An (abstract) architecture, made of *n* sites (processors), communicating pointwise through FIFOs
- An assignment of variables to sites

Result: The code for each site Correctness: The distributed code is functionally equivalent to the centralized automaton

Distributing sequential code

[Caspi-Girault-Pilaud, TSE 1999] Starting point:

- the sequential code compiled from a synchronous program
- An (abstract) architecture, made of *n* sites (processors), communicating pointwise through FIFOs
- An assignment of variables to sites

Result: The code for each site Correctness: The distributed code is functionally equivalent to the centralized automaton The distribution algorithm:

- (1) code replication and pruning
- (2) insertion of communications
- (3) insertion of synchronizations

Distributing sequential code - Principles Initial code, with assignment of variables to sites (X1, Y1 computed on site 1, Y2 on site 2)



Distributing sequential code - Principles

Code replication and pruning

Site 2 Site 1 X1 = . . . X1 = X2 = . . . X2 = if (X1) { if (X1) { Y1 = F(X2);Y1 = F(X2);} ł

Distributing sequential code - Principles

Code replication and pruning

Site 1







Distributing sequential code - Principles

Site 2

Insert communications

Site 1

Site 2 Site 1 X1 = put(X1, Q12); X2 = . . . put(X2, Q21); . . . Q12 Q21 get(X1, Q12); if (X1) { if (X1) { . . . get(X2, Q21); . . . Y1 = F(X2);ł

Distributing sequential code - Principles

else get(X2, Q21);

Insert communications

Asynch./Synch. distributed programming

The border of synchronous world



Asynch./Synch. distributed programming

The border of synchronous world



Asynch./Synch. distributed programming

The border of synchronous world













Continuous signals



Discrete signals

The border of synchronous world Input sampling



The border of synchronous world Input sampling



Control theory provides standard ways for keeping this non-determinism under control

- bounding the error on continuous signals thanks to uniform continuity
- using confirmation on Boolean signals (ignoring short variations)

Asynch./synch. programming [Caspi-Salem, FTRTFT 2000] [Caspi-Mazuet-Reynaud, SAFECOMP 2001] Implement a synchronous program as an asynchronous composition of synchronous processes



No need to preserve the synchronous (deterministic) semantics, as long as the overall (non-deterministic) semantics is preserved

Asynch./synch. programming [Caspi-Salem, FTRTFT 2000] [Caspi-Mazuet-Reynaud, SAFECOMP 2001] Implement a synchronous program as an asynchronous composition of synchronous processes



No need to preserve the synchronous (deterministic) semantics, as long as the overall (non-deterministic) semantics is preserved

- ${\ensuremath{\, \bullet }}$ the same output is sampled twice ${\ensuremath{\, \to }}$ duplication
- an output is not sampled \rightarrow data loss



- ${\ensuremath{\, \bullet }}$ the same output is sampled twice ${\ensuremath{\, \to }}$ duplication
- an output is not sampled \rightarrow data loss



- ${\ensuremath{\, \bullet }}$ the same output is sampled twice ${\ensuremath{\, \to }}$ duplication
- an output is not sampled \rightarrow data loss



- ${\ensuremath{\, \bullet }}$ the same output is sampled twice ${\ensuremath{\, \to }}$ duplication
- an output is not sampled \rightarrow data loss



- ${\ensuremath{\, \bullet }}$ the same output is sampled twice ${\ensuremath{\, \to }}$ duplication
- an output is not sampled \rightarrow data loss



- ${\ensuremath{\, \bullet }}$ the same output is sampled twice ${\ensuremath{\, \to }}$ duplication
- an output is not sampled \rightarrow data loss



- ${\ensuremath{\, \bullet }}$ the same output is sampled twice ${\ensuremath{\, \to }}$ duplication
- an output is not sampled \rightarrow data loss



- ${\ensuremath{\, \bullet }}$ the same output is sampled twice ${\ensuremath{\, \to }}$ duplication
- an output is not sampled \rightarrow data loss



- ${\ensuremath{\, \bullet }}$ the same output is sampled twice ${\ensuremath{\, \to }}$ duplication
- an output is not sampled \rightarrow data loss



- ${\ensuremath{\, \bullet }}$ the same output is sampled twice ${\ensuremath{\, \to }}$ duplication
- an output is not sampled \rightarrow data loss



- ${\ensuremath{\, \bullet }}$ the same output is sampled twice ${\ensuremath{\, \to }}$ duplication
- an output is not sampled \rightarrow data loss



- ${\ensuremath{\, \bullet }}$ the same output is sampled twice ${\ensuremath{\, \to }}$ duplication
- an output is not sampled \rightarrow data loss



- ${\ensuremath{\, \bullet }}$ the same output is sampled twice ${\ensuremath{\, \to }}$ duplication
- an output is not sampled \rightarrow data loss



- ${\ensuremath{\, \bullet }}$ the same output is sampled twice ${\ensuremath{\, \to }}$ duplication
- an output is not sampled \rightarrow data loss



A special, very common case: Quasi-synchrony

All processes assumed to share the same clock. But, without clock synchronization, clocks may have some drift.

Quasi-synchrony assumption: for any pair (c_1, c_2) of clocks,

- between 2 ticks of c₁ there are at most 2 ticks of c2
- and conversely



Quasi-synchrony (cont)



- at most one data lost in a row
- at most one data duplicated in a row

Consequences:

- a data sent twice is surely transmitted
- be sensitive to data change rather than data read

Conclusion

Conclusion

What shall we do now that Paul Caspi is retired ??