

## Software Design for Cyber-Physical Systems

Edward A. Lee

## Module 6: Parallel Execution

Technical University of Vienna Vienna, Austria, May 2022



University of California, Berkeley



ForkJoin.lf X 19/\*\* \* Each instance of TakeTime takes 200 ms wall clock time to 2 **Multicore** \* transport the input to the output. Four of them are 3 \* instantiated. Note that without parallel execution, there is 4 5 \* no way this program can keep up with real time since in every execution \* 200 msec cycle it has 800 msec of work to do. Given 4 workers, 6 \* however, this program can complete 800 msec of work in about 7 preserves \* 225 msec. 8 9 \*/ deterministic 10<sup>o</sup>target C { 11 timeout: 2 sec, workers: 1, // Change to 4 to see speed up. 12 semantics. 13 }; 14 main reactor(width:int(4)) { 15 a = **new** Source(): t = new[width] TakeTime(); 16 17 (a.out)+ -> t.in; 18 b = new Destination(width = width); 19 t.out -> b.in; 20 } 🧏 Diagram 🗙 📮 Console Error Log 🛷 Search 🛛 🖏 Progress ForkJoin Source Destination TakeTime level: 0 level: 1 level: 2 out in[4] out in (0, 200 msec)













To get parallelism, the pipeline pattern requires careful attention to tags.

Pipeline

## Pipeline.lf × 10/\*\* \* Basic pipeline pattern where a periodic source feeds \* a chain of reactors that can all execute in parallel 3 \* at each logical time step. 4 5 \* 6 \* The workers argument specifies the number of worker 7 \* workers, which enables the reactors in the chain to \* execute on multiple cores simultaneously. 8 9 10 \* This uses the TakeTime reactor to perform computation. \* If you reduce the number of worker workers to 1, the 11 12 \* execution time will be approximately four times as long. 13 \* 14 \* @author Edward A. Lee \* @author Marten Lohstroh 15 16 \*/ 17⊝ target C { 18 workers: 4, 19 } 20 21 main reactor { r0 = new SendCount(period = 100 msec); 22 23 rp = new[4] TakeTime(approximate\_time = 100 msec); r5 = **new** Receive(): 24 25 // Comment the "after" clause to eliminate parallelism. 26 r0.out, rp.out -> rp.in, r5.in after 100 msec; 27 } 🧏 Diagram 🗙 🖳 Console 🦉 Error Log 🛷 Search 🛛 🖏 Progress 🍠 Terminal Pipeline SendCount TakeTime Receive

/100 msec/

out

level: 0

/100 msec/

out

in

level: 0

(0, 100 msec)

/100 msec/

in

level: 0



Sporadic events are assigned a time stamp based on the local physical-time clock

Computations have logically zero delay.

Every reactor handles events in time-stamp order. If time-stamps are equal, events are "simultaneous" Actuators can have a deadline D. An input with time stamp t is required to be delivered to the actuator before the local clock hits t + D.







When a sporadic sensor triggers (or an asynchronous event like a network message arrives), assign a time stamp based on the local physicaltime clock.

- Sort reactions topologically based on precedences.
- Global notion of "current tag" g.
- Event queue containing future events.
- Choose earliest tag g' on the event queue.
- Wait for the real-time clock to match the timestamp of *g*.
- Execute reactions sequentially in topological sort order.



- Change containing future events.
- Choose earliest tag g' on the event queue.
- Wait for the real-time clock to match the timestamp of *g*.
- Execute reactions in parallel where possible.





The level is the depth in a directed acyclic graph of reactions that have dependencies at a tag.

Reactions with the same level can always execute in parallel.





Reactions with the same level can always execute in parallel.



Actuators will now execute between 9 and 10 msec after sensors, unless a deadline violation occurs.

What could cause a deadline violation?

Notice that the level is now 0. Combine with EDF scheduling, and actuator execution has highest priority.



This strategy is closely related to the notion of **Logical Execution Time** (**LET**) but generalizes that concept to permit zero execution time and to allow deadline violation handlers.



Classical real-time systems scheduling and execution-time analysis determines whether the specification can be met.

[Buttazzo, 2005] [Wilhelm et al., 2008]



Determinism does not imply a cost in performance.

Parallel execution (multicore) does not imply nondeterminism.

Christian Menard (TU Dresden)







Christian Menard (TU Dresden)







- More aggressive parallel execution.
- Reducing contention for reaction queue.
- Supporting parallel execution at multiple tags.
- Direct support for Logical Execution Time (LET)
- Leveraging lock-free concurrency.