Embedded Systems



Arijit Mondal

Dept. of Computer Science & Engineering Indian Institute of Technology Patna arijit@iitp.ac.in

Verification

Introduction

• The goal of verification

- To ensure 100% correct in functionality and timing
- Spend 50 \sim 70% of time to verify a design

• Functional verification

- Simulation
- Formal proof
- Timing verification
 - Dynamic timing simulation (DTS)
 - Static timing analysis (STA)

Verification vs Test

Verification

- Verifies correctness of design i.e., check if the design meets the specifications.
- Simulation or formal methods.
- Performed once prior to manufacturing.
- Required for reliability of design.

Test

- Checks correctness of manufactured hardware.
- Two-stage process:
 - Test generation: CAD tools executed once during design for ATPG
 - Test application: TPs tests applied to ALL hardware samples
- Test application performed on every manufactured device.
- Responsible for reliability of devices.

Simulation

- Need to drive the circuit with the stimulus
 - Exhaustive simulation
 - Drive the circuit with all possible stimulus
 - Non-exhaustive simulations
 - Drive the circuit with selected stimulus
 - To find appropriate subset is a complex problem
 - May not cover all cases
- Number of test cases may be exponential

Verification of Combinational Circuits





- Are Y1 and Y2 equivalent?
 - $Y1 = \overline{(a \land \neg sel)} \land \overline{(b \land sel)}$
 - Y2 = $(a \land \neg sel) \lor (b \land sel)$
- Canonical structure of Binary Decision Diagram can be exploited to compare Boolean functions like Y1 & Y2

Verification of Sequential Circuits



- Properties span across cycle boundaries
- Example: Two way round robin arbiter
 - If the request bit r1 is true in a cycle then the grant bit g1 has to be true within the next two clock cycles

Verification of Sequential Circuits



- Properties span across cycle boundaries
- Example: Two way round robin arbiter
 - If the request bit r1 is true in a cycle then the grant bit g1 has to be true within the next two clock cycles
- Need temporal logic to specify the behavior

Verification of Sequential Circuits



- If the request bit r1 is true in a cycle then the grant bit g1 has to be true within the next two clock cycles
- $\forall t[r1(t) \rightarrow g1(t+1) \lor g1(t+2)]$
- In propositional temporal logic time (t) is implicit
 - always r1 \rightarrow (next g1) \lor (next next g1)

Temporal logic

- The truth value of a temporal logic is defined with respect to a model.
- Temporal logic formula is not statically true or false in a model.
- The models of temporal logic contain several states and a formula can be true in some states and false in others.
- Example:
 - I am always happy.
 - I will eventually be happy.
 - I will be happy until I do something wrong.
 - I am happy.

Kripke Structure



- $M = (AP, S, S_0, T, L)$
 - AP Set of atomic proposition
 - S Set of states
 - S₀ Set of initial states
 - T Total transition relation ($T \subseteq S \times S$)
 - L Labeling function (S $\rightarrow 2^{AP}$)

Path

- A path $\pi = s_0, s_1, \ldots$ in a Kripke structure is a sequence of states such that $\forall i, (s_i, s_{i+1}) \in T$
- Sample paths
 - $SO, S1, S2, S4, S1, \ldots$
 - $SO, S3, S4, S0, \ldots$
 - $SO, S1, S4, S1, \ldots$
 - $\pi = \underbrace{s_0, s_1, \dots, s_k}_{\text{prefix of } \pi_k \text{ in } \pi}, s_{k+1} \dots$ • $\pi = s_0, s_1, \dots, \underbrace{s_k, s_{k+1} \dots}_{\text{suffix of } \pi^k \text{ in } \pi}$



Temporal operators

- Two fundamental path operators
 - Next operator
 - Xp property p holds in the next state
 - Until operator
 - p U q property p holds in all states up to the state where property q holds
- Derived operators
 - Eventual/Future operator
 - Fp property *p* holds eventually (in some future states)
 - Always/Globally operator
 - Gp property p holds always (at all states)
- All these operators are interpreted over the paths in Kripke structure under consideration
- All Boolean operators are supported by the temporal logics

The next operator (X)



- p holds in the next state of the path
- Formally
 - $\pi \models Xp \text{ iff } \pi^1 \models p$

The until operator (U)



- q holds eventually and p holds until q holds
- Formally
 - $\pi \models p \cup q$ iff $\exists k$ such that $\pi^k \models q$ and $\forall j, 0 \le j < k$ we have $\pi^j \models p$

The eventual operator (F)



- p holds eventually (in future)
- Formally
 - $\pi \models \operatorname{Fp} \operatorname{iff} \exists k \operatorname{such} \operatorname{that} \pi^k \models p$
 - This can be written as true U p

The always operator (G)



- p holds always (globally)
- Formally
 - $\pi \models \text{Gp iff } \forall k \text{ we have } \pi^k \models p$
 - This can be written as \neg (true U \neg p) or \neg F \neg p

Branching Time Logic

• Interpreted over computation tree



Path Quantifier

• A: "For all paths ..."



• E: "There exists a path ..."



Universal Path Quantification





In all the next states **p** holds.

Along all the paths **p** holds forever.

Universal Path Quantification





Along all the paths **p** holds eventually.

Along all the paths **p** holds until **q** holds.

Existential Path Quantification





There exists a next state where p holds.

there exists a path along which **p** holds forever.

Existential Path Quantification





There exists a path along which p holds eventually.

There exists a path along which **p** holds until **q** holds.

Duality between Always & Eventual operators

- $Gp = p \land (\text{next } p) \land (\text{next next } p) \land (\text{next next next } p) \dots$ $= \neg (\neg (p \land (\text{next } p) \land (\text{next next } p) \land (\text{next next next } p) \land \dots))$ applying De Morgan's law $= \neg (\neg p \lor (\text{next } \neg p) \lor (\text{next next } \neg p) \lor (\text{next next next } \neg p) \lor \dots)$ $= \neg (F \neg p)$
- Therefore we have
 - $Gp = \neg F \neg p$
 - $Fp = \neg G \neg p$

Computation Tree Logic (CTL)

• Syntax:

- Given a set of Atomic Propositions (AP):
 - All Boolean formulas of over AP are CTL properties
 - If f and g are CTL properties then so are $\neg f$, AXf, A(f U g), EXf and E(f U g),
- Properties like AFp, AGp, EGp, EFp can be derived from the above
- Semantics:
 - The property *Af* is true at a state *s* of the Kripke structure iff the path property *f* holds on all paths starting from *s*
 - The property *Ef* is true at a state *s* of the Kripke structure iff the path property *f* holds on some path starting from *s*

Nested properties in CTL

- AX AGp
 - From all the next state p holds forever along all paths
- EX EFp
 - There exist a next state from where there exist a path to a state where p holds
- AG EFp
 - From any state there exist a path to a state where p holds





• From *S* the system always makes a request in future:



• From S the system always makes a request in future: AF req



- From S the system always makes a request in future: AF req
- All requests are eventually granted:



- From S the system always makes a request in future: AF req
- All requests are eventually granted: $AG(req \rightarrow AFgr)$



- From S the system always makes a request in future: AF req
- All requests are eventually granted: $AG(req \rightarrow AFgr)$
- Sometimes requests are immediately granted:



- From S the system always makes a request in future: AF req
- All requests are eventually granted: $AG(req \rightarrow AFgr)$
- Sometimes requests are immediately granted: $EF(req \rightarrow EX gr)$



- From S the system always makes a request in future: AF req
- All requests are eventually granted: $AG(req \rightarrow AFgr)$
- Sometimes requests are immediately granted: $EF(req \rightarrow EX gr)$
- Requests are held till grant is received:



- From S the system always makes a request in future: AF req
- All requests are eventually granted: $AG(req \rightarrow AFgr)$
- Sometimes requests are immediately granted: $EF(req \rightarrow EX gr)$
- Requests are held till grant is received: $AG(req \rightarrow A(req Ugr))$

Real Time properties

• Real time systems

- Predictable response time are necessary for correct operation
- Safety critical systems like controller for aircraft, industrial machinery are a few examples
- It is difficult to express complex timing properties
 - Simple: "event *p* will happen in future"
 - Fp
 - Complex: "event p will happen within at most n time units"
 - $p \lor (Xp) \lor (XXp) \lor \dots ([XX \dots n \text{ times}]p)$

Bounded Temporal Operators

- Specify real-time constraints
 - Over bounded traces
- Various bounded temporal operators
 - $G_{[m,n]}p p$ always holds between mth and nth time step
 - $F_{[m,n]}p p$ eventually holds between mth and nth time step
 - $X_{[m]}p p$ holds at the mth time step
 - *p* U_[m,n] *q q* eventually holds between mth and nth time step and *p* holds until that point of time


• p holds always between 2nd and 4th time step



• p holds eventually between 2nd and 4th time step



• p holds in the 3rd time step



• q holds eventually between 2nd and 4th time step and p holds until q holds

Timing properties

- Whenever request is recorded grant should take place within 4 time units
 - $AG(posedge(req) \rightarrow AF_{[0,4]} posedge(gr))$
- The arbiter will provide exactly 64 time units to high priority user in each grant
 - AG(posedge(hpusing) \rightarrow
 - $A(\neg negedge(hpusing) U_{[64,64]} negedge(hpusing)))$

Formal Verification



Formal Property Verification

- The formal method is called "Model Checking"
 - The algorithm has two inputs
 - A finite state state machine (FSM) that represents the implementation
 - A formal property that represent the specification
 - The algorithm checks whether the FSM "models" the property
 - This is an exhaustive search of the FSM to see whether it has any path / state that refutes the property

Example: Explicit State Model









































- Represents set of transition as function $\delta(\text{old}, \text{new})$
 - Yields 1 if there is a transition from old to new
 - Can be represented as Boolean function by encoding the states with Boolean variables

- Represents set of transition as function $\delta(\text{old}, \text{new})$
 - Yields 1 if there is a transition from old to new
 - Can be represented as Boolean function by encoding the states with Boolean variables



- Represents set of transition as function $\delta(\text{old}, \text{new})$
 - Yields 1 if there is a transition from old to new
 - Can be represented as Boolean function by encoding the states with Boolean variables



- o_1, o_2 Old state variables
- n_1, n_2 New state variables

- Represents set of transition as function $\delta(\text{old}, \text{new})$
 - Yields 1 if there is a transition from old to new
 - Can be represented as Boolean function by encoding the states with Boolean variables



- o_1, o_2 Old state variables
- n_1, n_2 New state variables
- $\delta = \bar{o}_1 \bar{o}_2 \bar{n}_1 n_2 \vee \bar{o}_1 \bar{o}_2 \bar{n}_1 \bar{n}_2 \vee \bar{o}_1 o_2 n_1 n_2 \vee o_1 \bar{o}_2 n_1 \bar{n}_2$

 $\vee o_1\bar{o}_2n_1n_2 \vee o_1o_2\bar{n}_1\bar{n}_2 \vee o_1o_2\bar{n}_1n_2$

- Represents set of transition as function $\delta(\text{old}, \text{new})$
 - Yields 1 if there is a transition from old to new
 - Can be represented as Boolean function by encoding the states with Boolean variables



- o_1, o_2 Old state variables
- n_1, n_2 New state variables
- $\delta = \bar{o}_1 \bar{o}_2 \bar{n}_1 n_2 \vee \bar{o}_1 \bar{o}_2 \bar{n}_1 \bar{n}_2 \vee \bar{o}_1 o_2 n_1 n_2 \vee o_1 \bar{o}_2 n_1 \bar{n}_2$

 $\vee o_1\bar{o}_2n_1n_2 \vee o_1o_2\bar{n}_1\bar{n}_2 \vee o_1o_2\bar{n}_1n_2$

• New states = $\exists \langle o_1 o_2 \rangle [S(\langle o_1 o_2 \rangle) \land \delta(\langle o_1 o_2 \rangle, \langle n_1 n_2 \rangle)]$



- R_i is the set of states that can be reached in *i* transitions
- Reaches fix point when $R_n = R_{n+1}$
 - Fix point always exists as it has finite number of states



- R_i is the set of states that can be reached in *i* transitions
- Reaches fix point when $R_n = R_{n+1}$
 - Fix point always exists as it has finite number of states



- R_i is the set of states that can be reached in *i* transitions
- Reaches fix point when $R_n = R_{n+1}$
 - Fix point always exists as it has finite number of states



- R_i is the set of states that can be reached in *i* transitions
- Reaches fix point when $R_n = R_{n+1}$
 - Fix point always exists as it has finite number of states


- R_i is the set of states that can be reached in *i* transitions
- Reaches fix point when $R_n = R_{n+1}$
 - Fix point always exists as it has finite number of states



- R_i is the set of states that can be reached in *i* transitions
- Reaches fix point when $R_n = R_{n+1}$
 - Fix point always exists as it has finite number of states



- R_i is the set of states that can be reached in *i* transitions
- Reaches fix point when $R_n = R_{n+1}$
 - Fix point always exists as it has finite number of states



- R_i is the set of states that can be reached in *i* transitions
- Reaches fix point when $R_n = R_{n+1}$
 - Fix point always exists as it has finite number of states

CTL Model Checking

• It checks whether a given CTL formula *f* holds on a given Kripke structure *M* i.e., *M* |= *f*

- Need to have modalities for EX, EU and EG
 - Other modalities can be expressed using EX, EU and EG
 - $AFf \equiv \neg EG \neg f$
 - $AGf \equiv \neg EF \neg f$
 - $A(f \cup g) \equiv (\neg EG \neg g) \land (\neg E[\neg g \cup (\neg f \land \neg g)])$
- Basic procedure
 - The set Sat(f) of all states satisfying f is computed recursively
 - $M \models f$ if and only if $S_0 \subseteq Sat(f)$



- $Post(s) = \{s' \in S \mid (s, s') \in T\}$
- $Sat(EXf) = \{s \in S | Post(s) \cap Sat(f) \neq \emptyset\}$

function CheckEX(f)

- 1. $S_f = \{s \in S \, | \, f \in L(s)\}$
- 2. while $S_f \neq \emptyset$
- $\textbf{3.} \quad \textbf{Choose} \ s \in S_f$
- $\textbf{4.} \quad \textbf{S}_{f} = \textbf{S}_{f} \{\textbf{s}\}$
- 5. for all t such that $(t, s) \in T$
- $\textbf{6.} \qquad \textbf{if } f \not\in L(t)$
- 7. $L(t) = L(t) \cup {EXf}$
- 8. endif
- 9. end for
- 10. end while









$$f_2 = p \lor \qquad f_1 = p \lor \qquad f_0 = p \lor \qquad EXf_0$$









• Given a model $M = \langle AP, S, S_0, T, L \rangle$ and S_p the set of states satisfying p in M

```
function CheckEF(S_p)

Q \leftarrow \phi;

Q' \leftarrow S_p;

while Q \neq Q' do

Q \leftarrow Q'

Q' \leftarrow Q \cup \{s \mid \exists s' [T(s, s') \land Q(s')]\}

end while

S_f \leftarrow Q'
```

return Sf

function CheckEF(p)

- **1.** $S_p = \{s \in S \mid p \in L(s)\}$
- 2. for all $s \in S_p$ do $L(s) = L(s) \cup \{EFp\}$
- 3. while $S_p \neq \emptyset$
- $\textbf{4.} \quad \textbf{Choose} \; s \in S_p$
- **5.** $S_p = S_p \{s\}$
- $\textbf{6.} \quad \textbf{ for all } t \textbf{ such that } (t,s) \in T$
- 7. if $\{EFp\} \notin L(t)$
- 8. $L(t) = L(t) \cup \{EFp\}$
- $\mathbf{9.} \qquad \mathbf{S_p} = \mathbf{S_p} \cup \mathbf{t}$
- 10. endif
- 11. end for
- 12. end while















Example: $\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{EF}(\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{c}) \land (\mathbf{a} \oplus \mathbf{b})$






















CTL Model Checking: EGp



CTL Model Checking: f = EG p

• Given a model $M = \langle AP, S, S_0, T, L \rangle$ and S_p the set of states satisfying p in M

```
function CheckEG(S_p)

Q \leftarrow \phi; Q' \leftarrow S_p;

while Q \neq Q' do

Q \leftarrow Q'

Q' \leftarrow Q \cap \{s \mid \exists s'[T(s, s') \land Q(s')]\}

end while
```

```
S_f \leftarrow Q'
return S_f
```

function CheckEG(p)

1.
$$S_p = \{s \in S \mid p \in L(s)\}$$

- 2. SCC = $\{C \mid C \text{ is nontrivial SCC of } S_p\}$
- 3. $R = \bigcup_{C \in SCC} \{s \mid s \in C\}$
- 4. for all $s \in R$ do $L(s) = L(s) \cup \{EGp\}$
- 5. while $R \neq \emptyset$
- $\textbf{6.} \quad \textbf{Choose} \ s \in R$
- **7.** $R = R \{s\}$
- 8. for all t such that $(t, s) \in T$ and $t \in S_p$
- 9. if $\{EGp\} \notin L(t)$
- **10.** $L(t) = L(t) \cup \{EGp\}$
- $\textbf{11.} \qquad \textbf{R} = \textbf{R} \cup \{t\}$
- 12. endif
- 13. end for
- 14. end while



















Example: $\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{E}\mathbf{G}\mathbf{b}$



Example: $\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{E}\mathbf{G}\mathbf{b}$















Example: $\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{E}\mathbf{G}\mathbf{b}$







$$f_{2} = q \lor \qquad f_{1} = q \lor \qquad f_{0} = q \qquad$$





function CheckEU(p,q)

- **1.** $S_q = \{s \in S \mid q \in L(s)\}$
- 2. for all $s\in S_q$ do $L(s)=L(s)\cup\{E(p\,U\,q)\}$
- **3.** while $S_q \neq \emptyset$
- $\textbf{4.} \quad \textbf{Choose} \ s \in S_q$
- $\textbf{5.} \quad \textbf{S}_{q} = \textbf{S}_{q} \{\textbf{s}\}$
- $\textbf{6.} \quad \textbf{ for all } t \textbf{ such that } (t,s) \in T$
- 7. if $\{E(p \cup q)\} \notin L(t)$ and $p \in L(t)$
- 8. $L(t) = L(t) \cup \{E(p \cup q)\}$
- 9. $S_q = S_q \cup \{t\}$
- 10. endif
- 11. end for
- 12. end while


















Nested CTL query



Verification of RTCTL query

- $A(p \, U_{\leq k} \, q) \equiv q \vee (p \wedge AX \, A(p \, U_{\leq k-1} \, q))$ if k > 1
- $E(p U_{\leq k} q) \equiv q \lor (p \land EX E(p U_{\leq k-1} q))$ if k > 1
- $A(p U_{\leq 0} q) \equiv q \equiv E(p U_{\leq 0} q)$
- Similar fix point characterization of CTL modalities can be used
- For qualative CTL queries k = |S|

RTCTL Model Checking: $f = E(p U_{\leq k} q)$

function CheckEU(p,q,k)

```
1. N_{f}^{0} = \{s \in S \mid q \in L(s)\}
2. for all s \in N_{f}^{0} do L(s) = L(s) \cup \{E(p \cup U_{\leq k} q)\}
3. i = 0:
4. while i < k
 5. TEMP = N_{\ell}^{j}
      while N_{\ell}^{j} \neq \emptyset
 6.
 7.
           Choose s \in TEMP; TEMP = TEMP - \{s\}
8. for all t such that (t, s) \in T
9.
              if \{E(p \cup \leq_k q)\} \notin L(t) and p \in L(t)
                 L(t) = L(t) \cup \{E(p \cup v_{< k} q)\}; N_t^{j+1} = N_t^{j+1} \cup \{t\}
10.
11.
              endif
           end for
12.
      end while
13.
```

14. j = j + 1;

15. end while

Verification of RTCTL query

- $E(p \, U_{[a,b]} \, q) \equiv p \wedge (EX \, E(p \, U_{[a-1,b-1]} \, q)) \,$ if a > 0 and b > 0
- $\bullet \ \mathsf{E}(p \, \mathsf{U}_{[0,b]} \, q) \equiv q \lor (p \land \mathsf{EX} \, \mathsf{E}(p \, \mathsf{U}_{[0,b-1]} \, q)) \quad \text{if } b > 0$
- $E(p U_{[0,0]} q) \equiv q$

Verification of RTCTL query

- $\bullet \ E(p \, U_{[a,b]} \, q) \equiv p \wedge \left(\mathsf{EX} \, E(p \, U_{[a-1,b-1]} \, q) \right) \ \text{ if } a > 0 \text{ and } b > 0$
- $\bullet \ \mathsf{E}(p \, \mathsf{U}_{[0,b]} \, q) \equiv q \lor (p \land \mathsf{EX} \, \mathsf{E}(p \, \mathsf{U}_{[0,b-1]} \, q)) \quad \text{if } b > 0$
- $E(p U_{[0,0]} q) \equiv q$

- Steps:
 - Compute set of states where **p** is true for **a** steps
 - If fix point is reached before a steps, skip to the second case
 - Compute set of states where E(p U q) is true for b steps
 - If fix point is reached before (b-a) steps, skip to the third case

Complexity

- Linear in the size of the model
- Linear in the size of the CTL formula
- Complexity is $O(|F| \times M)$
 - Model size M
 - Formula size |F|