Mapping Algorithms onto MPSoC

- Some Results from ARTISTDesign -

Lothar Thiele





Contents

- Overview about DOL
- Heterogeneous Modeling
- Interference Analysis for Multicore Systems
- Experimental Results





DOL Programming Environment

Goal

Automatically generate an optimal mapping of a parallel application onto **MPSoC**

Challenges

- Scalable specification
- Automated synthesis
- Design space exploration
- System-level performance analysis





DOL Programming Model



- Model of computation: Kahn process network
 - Coordination language: XML with performance annotations
 - Functionality of processes: C/C++ with specific programming DOL API
- Scalability: "iterators" for large, multi-tile descriptions



DOL Abstract Platform Modeling



▶ Elements

- Structure: processors, peripherals, memories, buses, etc.
- Interconnects: explicit read and write communication paths
- Performance data: e.g. latency and bandwidth of HW communication channels

5

Specification: XML, including the "iterators" capability



Computer Engineering and Networks Laboratory



DOL Software Synthesis



- MPARM: identical ARM7 tiles connected by AMBA bus
- Atmel Diopsis 940: tile:ARM9+DSP connected by an AMBA bus; several tiles connected via NoC
- Cell BE: PowerPC and 8 DSP-like SPEs connected via ring bus





Mapping Optimization Framework



Modular framework: optimization and performance analysis plug-ins

- **Evolutionary algorithm:** SPEA2 (Strength Pareto Evolutionary Algorithm)
- Performance analysis: MPA (Modular Performance Analysis) analytic model http://www.mpa.ethz.ch
- Control & GUI: EXPO https://www.tik.ee.ethz.ch/expo
- Interface: PISA https://www.tik.ee.ethz.ch/pisa

Swiss Federal Institute of Technology



Performance Analysis using MPA



Design: abstract event streams traversing a network of abstract processing units

> **Output:** worst-case bounds on system properties

- Modular Performance Analysis http://www.mpa.ethz.ch
- (Large) MPSoC extensions: complex activation schemes, timing correlations, blocking semantics, cyclic dependencies



Extension: Distributed Applications



Contents

Overview about DOL

Heterogeneous Modeling

- Embedding into rigorous design flow (VERIMAG)
- Integration of Symta/S (TU Braunschweig)
- Heterogeneous Analysis (UPPAAL)
- Hierarchical Modeling (TU Braunschweig)
- Comparison of Methods (U Cantabria, TU BS)
- Interference Analysis for Multicore Systems
- Experimental Results



DOL Software Synthesis



- MPARM: identical ARM7 tiles connected by AMBA bus
- Atmel Diopsis 940: tile:ARM9+DSP connected by an AMBA bus; several tiles connected via NoC
- Cell BE: PowerPC and 8 DSP-like SPEs connected via ring bus





Rigorous Design Flow (VERIMAG)

The *frontend* transforms networks of processes written in DOL into BIP models

The *backend* applies a series of source-tosource correct-byconstruction transformations over the BIP software model.

The generated system model includes can be validated and analyzed





Global Picture

Mixing time-interval-based and time-based abstractions









Integration by Stream Approximation



Replace RTC component by

- classical single-resource
 real-time analysis
- holistic scheduling analysis (MAST, *Gonzales*, Tindell, Yen, *Eles*, ...)
- Symta/S compositional analysis (*Ernst*)

Benefits

- incorporate advanced analysis methods; adapt analysis method to component characteristics
- reduce analysis complexity

































Analytic vs. State-Based Abstraction





Composition Principle





Linear arrival curves



Swiss Federal Institute of Technology

Structured Event Streams (ETHZ – TU BS)

Relevant design pattern:

Hierarchical Event Model

J. Rox & R. Ernst, *Modeling Event Stream Hierarchies with Hierarchical Event Models*

Limitations: - Method is not transparent to existing component models

Deep processing of HES required by component models

Computer Engineering and

Networks Laboratory

Structured Event Streams

Cyclic Resource Dependencies (ETHZ – UPPSALA)

Acyclic dependency

Cyclic dependency

Cyclic Resource Dependencies

$$\Sigma := (\alpha_{in}, \beta_{in}, \alpha, \beta)$$

$$\Psi : \Sigma \to \Sigma'$$
(reflects MPA transfer functions)
$$\Sigma^{0}, \Psi(\Sigma^{0}), \Psi^{2}(\Sigma^{0}), \dots \xrightarrow{?} \Sigma^{*}$$

Questions:

- Can there be several fixpoints ?
- Is any fixpoint of ψ correct with respect to the system traces ?
- Can the optimal fixpoint be computed with the above sequence ?
- How to choose the initial approximati ∂n^0 ?

RTC Toolbox (www.mpa.ethz.ch/rtctoolbox)

Matlab Command Line	Simulink					
RTC Toolbox						
MPA Library	RTI Library					
Min-Plus/Max-Plus Algebra Library						
Matlab / Java Interface						
Java API						
Min-Plus/Max-Plus Algebra, Utilities						
Efficient Curve Representation						

Contents

- Overview about DOL
- Heterogeneous Modeling
- Interference Analysis for Multicore Systems
 - Joint work with Marco Caccamo (Int. Cooperation)
- Experimental Results

Motivation

- COTS Systems use shared resources (Memory, Bus)
- Multiple entities competing for shared resources
 - waiting for other entities to release the resource
 - accessing the resources

Task / Superblock Model

- Tasks are structured as sequences of superblocks
 - fixed order of execution
 - upper bounds on execution and communication demands
- Dedicated phases for resource access and computation
 - phases have different amount of access requests
 - structure increases predictability (in terms of WCRT)
 - model motivated by industrial applications in the automotive industry

Resource Access Models

- **DS** dedicated sequential phases, sequential superblocks
- **HS** hybrid sequential phases, sequential superblocks
- **HTS** hybrid sequential phases, time-triggered superblocks
- HTT hybrid time-triggered phases time-triggered superblocks
- **GS** general sequential phases, sequential superblocks
- **GTS** general sequential phases, time-triggered superblocks

Contents

- Overview about DOL
- Heterogeneous Modeling
- Interference Analysis for Multicore Systems
- Experimental Results
 - MPARM Simulator Luca Benini (U Bologna)

Integration / Architecture Template

(ETHZ – U BOLOGNA)

Integration / Application Modeling

Algorithm 1 Example of a process with multiple inputs and outputs.

- 1: function FIRE(DOLProcess *p)
- 2: $DOL_read(input[1], buffer_in[1], N_in[1]);$
- 3: $DOL_read(input[2], buffer_in[2], N_in[2]);$
- 4: $DOL_read(input[3], buffer_in[3], N_in[3]);$
- 5: execute;
- $6: \quad DOL_write(output[1], buffer_out[1], N_out[1]);$
- 7: $DOL_write(output[2], buffer_out[2], N_out[2]);$
- 8: end function

Integration / Communication Modeling

intra-processor communication

inter-processor communication

Example: Wave Field Synthesis

Example: Compilation Times

step		duration			
		P–C	MJPEG	WFS	
model calibration (one-time effort)	functional simulation generation	$22\mathrm{s}$	$42\mathrm{s}$	$35\mathrm{s}$	
	functional simulation	$0.2\mathrm{s}$	$3.6\mathrm{s}$	$2.4\mathrm{s}$	
	synthesis (generation of binary)	$2\mathrm{s}$	$4\mathrm{s}$	$3\mathrm{s}$	
	simulation on MPARM	$23\mathrm{s}$	$13550\mathrm{s}$	$740\mathrm{s}$	
	log-file analysis and back-annotation	1 s	$12\mathrm{s}$	$3\mathrm{s}$	
model generation		1 s	$1\mathrm{s}$	$1\mathrm{s}$	
performance analysis based on generated model		$0.2\mathrm{s}$	$2.5\mathrm{s}$	$1.4\mathrm{s}$	

Example: Accuracy

observed estimated										
process	proc.	pr.	delay	backlog	pr.	delay	backlog			
p-c.p1	1	1	$209 \ (\leq 223)$	$5 (\le 6)$	2	$357 \ (\leq 401)$	$6 (\leq 8)$			
p–c.p3	1	2	$329 \ (\leq 371)$	$7 (\le 9)$	1	$37 \ (\leq 43)$	$1 (\leq 2)$			
p–c.p2	2	1	$29 \ (\leq 38)$	$1 \ (\leq 2)$	1	$30 \ (\leq 35)$	$1 \ (\leq 2)$			
mjpeg.ss	1	1	$203 \ (\leq 240)$	$4 \ (\leq 6)$	2	$321 \ (\leq 441)$	$3 (\leq 5)$			
mjpeg.ms	1	2	$694 \ (\leq 781)$	$1 \ (\leq 3)$	1	$133 \ (\le 190)$	$1 \ (\leq 1)$			
mjpeg.sf	2	1	$2591 \ (\leq 3014)$	$5 \ (\le 6)$	2	$3226 \ (\leq 4315)$	$6 \ (\leq 6)$			
mjpeg.mf	2	2	$1881 \ (\leq 2143)$	$2 \ (\leq 4)$	1	$307 \ (\leq 340)$	$1 \ (\leq 2)$			
mjpeg.zii	3	1	$6164 \ (\leq 6762)$	$4 \ (\leq 6)$	1	$5971 \ (\leq 6663)$	$4 \ (\leq 6)$			
wfs.ctrl	1	1	$202 \ (\leq 235)$	$3 \ (\leq 5)$	3	$405 \ (\leq 795)$	$5 \ (\leq 7)$			
wfs.src	1	2	$292 \ (\leq 387)$	$4 \ (\leq 5)$	2	$228 \ (\leq 357)$	$3 \ (\leq 5)$			
wfs.ls	1	3	$4931 \ (\leq 5402)$	$8 \ (\le 12)$	1	$4996 \ (\leq 5512)$	$9 \ (\leq 14)$			
wfs.comp1	2	1	$1606 \ (\le 1919)$	$12 \ (\le 15)$	2	$6157 \ (\leq 7720)$	$26 \ (\leq 30)$			
wfs.comp2	2	2	$5960 \ (\le 6838)$	$25 \ (\leq 26)$	1	$1940 \ (\leq 2156)$	$15 \ (\leq 20)$			

