

When the worst-case execution time estimation gains from the application semantics *

A. Bonenfant², F. Carrier¹, H. Cassé², P. Cuenot⁴, D. Claraz⁴, N. Halbwachs¹, H. Li³,
C. Maiza¹, M. De Michiel², V. Mussot², C. Parent-Vigouroux¹, I. Puaut³, P. Raymond¹,
E. Rohou⁵, and P. Sotin²

¹Univ. Grenoble Alpes, Verimag, France, first.last@imag.fr

²Univ. Toulouse, IRIT, first.last@irit.fr

³Université de Rennes 1/IRISA, first.last@irisa.fr

⁴Continental, first.last@continental-corporation.com

⁵Inria/IRISA, first.last@inria.fr

1 Introduction

Critical embedded systems are generally composed of repetitive tasks that must meet drastic timing constraints, such as termination deadlines. Providing an upper bound of the worst-case execution time (WCET) of such tasks at design time is necessary to guarantee the correctness of the system. Test based methods give realistic but unsafe results: they are never guaranteed to pinpoint the worst-case execution. On the contrary, static timing analysis methods compute safe WCET upper bounds, but at the cost of a potentially large over-approximation.

Over-approximation will lead to an over-calibration of the application resources, and even lead to defeat the scheduling of the tasks.

In static WCET analysis, a main source of over-approximation comes from the complexity of the modern hardware platforms: their timing behavior tends to become more unpredictable because of features like caches, pipeline, test prediction etc. Another source of over-approximation comes from the software itself: WCET analysis may consider as potential worst-cases executions that are actually infeasible, because of the semantics of the program and/or because they correspond to unrealistic inputs. For instance, in the automotive application (Engine Management System : EMS) of Continental Corporation the modules of the application are mostly implementing generic algorithms that used calibration data for possible adaptation. Moreover a theoretical worst case scenario could correspond to an unrealistic system state like high engine speed

with low injection set point.

In the classical WCET estimation framework, the *data-flow analysis* is in charge of discovering infeasible execution paths. It must at least provide constant bounds for all the loops in the program, otherwise the WCET is not even guaranteed to be finite. Apart from loop-bounds, control-flow analysis usually identify simple semantics properties such as tests exclusions, that may prune infeasible execution paths when computing the WCET. These solutions remain largely ad-hoc, and there is no clear answer to the important questions raised by infeasible executions: What is the nature of such pruning properties? How to find them? (e.g., on the binary or the source code?) How to integrate them in a WCET estimation?

The goal of the W-SEPT project¹ is to define and prototype a complete semantic-aware WCET estimation workflow. It gathers researchers in the domain of timing and program analysis, together with an industrial partner from the real-time domain. The project mainly focuses on the semantic aspects, and thus, the pruning of infeasible paths. As far as possible, the idea is to extend and adapt the classical WCET estimation workflow, in particular, all that concerns the hardware analysis is inherited from previous work, namely the tool OTAWA².

Figure 1 depicts the proposed workflow. It retains the general organization of classical existing tools [16]. The bottom block is the WCET computation tool itself, organized in three steps: Control-Flow graph (CFG) construction, micro-architecture analysis, and worst-path search on the CFG. Gen-

*This work was funded by the Agence Nationale de la Recherche, project W-SEPT ANR-12-INSE-0001

¹wsept.inria.fr

²www.otawa.fr




Figure 1: Work-flow and general organization of a semantic aware WCET estimation tool

erally, this last step uses the classical Implicit Path Enumeration Technique (IPET)[9]. This tool is fed by the binary code of the program, and a set of semantic informations classically named *annotation* file, and containing at least the loop bounds.

The (binary) annotations come from the data-flow analysis (we use here the more general term of *program analysis*). This analysis is generally performed at the source level (C language most of the time) rather than the binary level. Indeed, analyzing C code is technically much simpler than analyzing binary code, but more importantly, the analysis often requires extra information that only the human user can provide (e.g., inputs ranges, exclusion, implications). The user can probably express these properties in terms of the C variables, but it would be much harder or even impossible to do it in terms of the (compiled) binary code. This two-layers description raises the well known problem of *traceability* of annotations when transferring information between layers.

So far, the principles depicted in Figure 1 are rather classical. The project proposes first to take into account a third layer in the design flow: the use of high-level design languages tends to become common in the domains of (critical) real-time applications. Classical examples of high level design tools

are Scade suite³, used in avionics, energy or transportation, and Simulink/Stateflow⁴ widely used in control engineering systems. These high-level design tools provide automatic code generation to C, which is no longer the source code, but only an intermediate code. A consequence is that user annotations and program analysis can be expressed and performed at the design level. Once defined this third layer, the project proposes to focus on three main issues depicted by enclosing boxes in the Figure 1 :

- Program analysis, that can be performed at design, C or binary level, and may take into account information provided by the user.
- Annotations and traceability between the language levels, strongly involve the compilers: as far as possible, the compilation process should be annotation-aware, in the sense that the program transformations performed by the compiler should be reflected as annotation transformations.
- (Worst) Path Search, must be adapted to take into account the (richer) kind of annotations produced by the workflow.

In this summary, we briefly introduce each step

³www.esterel-technologies.com/products/scade-suite

⁴mathworks.com/products/simulink/

of our workflow.

In section 2, we present how, at any stage, we can take into account annotations (from expert or automatically extracted) in order to produce a set of new ones. Then we automatically translate them when changing level, for instance loop unrolling, while keeping their validity regarding the code transformation/compilation.

In section 3, we describe how we adapted an WCET estimation tool in order to simplify, guide and even iterate the expert annotation process and exploit new kind of annotations.

One of the industrial goal is to prevent as early as possible in the development process the timing issues. In section 4 we detail the development cycle of an automotive application, and how some of the proposed solutions were experimented on a case study.

2 Find and trace useful information

In this section, we explain what kind of semantic properties may help to enhance the WCET estimation: where do they come from, which step of the application development do they refer to (binary, code, design), how are they transferred from one level to the next one. We consider two sources: annotations/feedback from expert and automatically extracted properties.

In order to express most of the properties, we use (and extend) FFX, an annotation language [20]. It is an open, portable and expandable annotation format. It allows combining flow fact information from different high-level tools. It is used as an intermediate format for WCET analysis.

2.1 Hypothesis and/or information from Expert

Some properties are known by the expert when considering the context of execution of the program: parameter domains, values for specific executions, parameters dependency... In classical tools^{5 6} [10] the expert input permits to reduce loop bounds. We use these precisions, called scenarios, in order to eliminate infeasible paths, in the execution context described by the expert.

Scenarios are used to give precisions on use cases: manual/automatic modes, context conditions like temperature, speed, height... Precisions that only

an expert can provide because related to the context of execution of the program/application.

For these particular cases, when the expert wants to obtain a WCET estimation, it is possible to reduce the overestimation by taking into account constraints and conditions of execution. In most cases, information on these constraints allow to eliminate infeasible paths or bound more accurately the number of execution of certain part of the program. Indeed, when expert provides domain of certain parameters, our tools integrate these inputs and tighten our analysis.

The language FFX has been extended to express properties given by the expert. Limitations are due to the difficulties to make the expert write constraints in FFX. In order to resolve this issue, the expert expresses constraints in C and more recently the plug-in delta, describe in Sec 3.2, provides an interface. In a further work, we will define a format allowing the expert to address constraints directly in the code via comments.

2.2 Propagation and/or extraction of properties

2.2.1 Low-level

Looking for infeasible paths at binary level allows to benefit from the exact matching of the program with the hardware and to inject found properties immediately in the WCET computation. The price is an increase of analysis time caused by the program size and the loss of expressivity implied by machine instructions. Consequently, existing analyses either look for very simple infeasible paths [5, 15], or design a new WCET computation method [15]. Our approach tries to get rid of these limitations by using SMT solvers (Satisfiability Modulo Theories) to generate infeasible path properties.

2.2.2 Code level

The discovery of bounds and relations on numerical variables is a classical goal in program analysis [3, 4], the results of which can obviously be used to restrict the set of feasible paths considered in WCET evaluation. This can be helped by adding some counters to the code of the program: of course, adding a loop counter may result in finding a bound to this counter, and thus to the iteration number. Moreover, adding block counters, and finding relations between these counters can reveal subtle restrictions in the possible executions of the program. We illustrate this approach on a small example.

⁵www.absint.com

⁶www.bound-t.com

Program	LOC	#Cntr	#Inv	WCET init	WCET fin.	Improv.
selector	134	14	14	1112	528	52.6%
roll-control	234	25	19	501	501	0%
cruise-control	234	35	31	881	852	3.3%
even	82	9	8	2807	2210	23.3%
rate-limiter	35	2	2	43	29	32.6%
break	114	4	5	820	820	0%

Table 1: Improvement of OTAWA results with counter-based analysis at code level

Consider the following program fragment where x is not modified in block B1:

```

x = 0;
while c1 {
  if(x < 10){ B1: ...
  }
  if(c2){B2: x++; ...
  }
}

```

Let's add counters at important program points, e.g., counting the number of iterations in the loop (α) and the numbers of executions of blocks B1 (β) and B2 (γ):

```

x = 0;  $\alpha = \beta = \gamma = 0$ ;
while c1 {  $\alpha++$ ;
  if(x < 10){B1:  $\beta++$ ;...
  }
  if(c2){ B2:  $\gamma++$ ;  $x++$ ;...
  }
}

```

An analysis of this instrumented program using an analyser of linear relations (here, we used the tool PAGAI [7]), automatically discovers that the following relations are always satisfied at the end of the program:

$$\gamma = x, \beta + \gamma \leq \alpha + 10, \gamma \leq \alpha, \beta \leq \alpha$$

The inequality $\beta + \gamma \leq \alpha + 10$ is especially interesting, since it means that there are at most 10 iterations of the loop which execute both blocks B1 and B2.

Experiments: This approach has been implemented in a prototype tool [1], and applied in combination with OTAWA to several examples. Table 1 compares the results to those returned by OTAWA alone, for a set of small or medium-size programs. For each program it gives the number of lines of code, the number of introduced counters, the number of useful properties found by Pagai, the WCET evaluated by OTAWA alone, the WCET evaluated by OTAWA taking into account the properties, and the percentage of improvement.

2.2.3 High-level




Figure 2: A typical high-level dataflow design

Critical embedded systems are often designed using a high level modeling language, such as Scade or Simulink. The system is then automatically compiled into classical imperative code (C in general), and then into binary code (cf. Fig 1).

Figure 2 shows a typical high-level data-flow design. For the sake of simplicity, it is represented as a diagram, while the actual program is actually written in Lustre [6], the academic textual language which is the ancestor of the industrial Scade language. This application consists of two sub-modules, A and B, each of them consisting in two parts: a control part and a data processing part. The data processing part has different computation modes (e.g. A0, A1 and A2), controlled by a *clock* (e.g. *idle*, *low* and *high*). An important property of such a design is that these modes are exclusive: at each reaction exactly one of the modes is activated. This information, obvious at the design level, may or may not be obvious at the C or binary level: depending on the compilation process, the (high level) mode exclusion may result or not into structurally exclusive pieces of code. In a more subtle way, we also know, for this particular program, that it exists a logical exclusion between the modes of the two sub-modules: if A is not *idle* (A1 or A2), then B is necessarily in degraded mode (B1). This property is neither structural nor obvious: it is an *invariant* of the infinite cyclic behavior of the application, and, as a consequence, it is almost impossible to

discover it at the low-level.

Based on these remarks, we have developed a prototype for discovering such properties, propagate them through the compilation process, and exploit them to enhance the WCET estimation. This prototype uses:

- an existing model-checker (Lesar [13]) to check the validity of properties at the Lustre level,
- a traceability module that can relate high level control variables (`idle`, `degr` etc.) to control points in the C code, and then control points in the binary; this traceability is partial (but safe): depending on compiler optimizations, some relations between high and low level maybe lost. However we had good results on this particular program, even with the higher level of optimization (option `-O2` of the gcc compiler)
- the OTAWA tool-chain for the binary analysis and the construction of IPET (Implicit Path Enumeration Technique) problems, together with lp-solve to solve the IPET problems.

We have tried two strategies for enhancing the WCET.

Iterative algorithm:

- OTAWA is called for building an initial IPET problem, and lp-solve is called to find a first WCET control path candidate;
- according to the traceability information, the validity of this path is translated (if possible) into a logical condition on the high level variables (e.g. $\neg \text{idle} \wedge \text{low} \wedge \text{nom}$);
- Lesar is called to check this condition; if the condition is unsatisfiable, the WCET path candidate is proven unfeasible, the corresponding constraint is added to the IPET problem, and lp-solve is called again to find a new candidate, and so on. If the condition is satisfiable, the process stops with the current WCET.

Pairwise algorithm:

- The high level code is analyzed to find a set of interesting control variables, according to a simple heuristic: any Boolean variable that control computation modes (often called the *logical clocks*) are likely to control big pieces of binary code, and thus, have a big influence on the computation time. In the example, the five control variables are selected.
- We “blindly” search for all possible pairwise relations (either exclusions or implications) between these variables. For n variables, there are $4(n * (n - 1)/2) = 2n(n - 1)$ such (potential) relations (40 in the example). For each relations proven by Lesar, we generate the corresponding constraints at the binary level thanks to the traceability information; in the example,

optim.	reference		iterative		pairwise	
	wcet	cost	wcet	cost	wcet	cost
-O0	4718	64s	2371	163s	2372	67s
-O2	758	1s	457	5s	457	2s

Table 2: Exploiting high level properties: WCET improvement and computation cost (cpu second on a i7 workstation).

5 over 40 relations are proven.

- OTAWA is called once with these constraints, and generate directly an enhanced WCET estimation.

The whole experiment is presented in details in [14]; quantitative results are summarized and commented in Table 2 where two optimization levels and two strategies are experimented; enhancement is important for both level (-50% and -40%), and similar for both strategies. Iterative algorithm may be relatively costly, pairwise strategy has a constant overhead.

2.3 Traceability

Knowledge of semantic properties helps tighten WCET estimates. Such information is usually known at the design or source code level, whereas WCET estimation must be computed at the binary code level.

From design level to source code, we transfer the properties by tracing them in the code generator (by inserting additional comments in the C code).

From C to binary, hundreds of compiler optimizations may have a strong impact on the structure of the code, making it impossible to match source-level and binary-level control flow graphs. This ends up in a loss of useful information. For this reason, the current practice is to turn off compiler optimizations, resulting in low average-case and worst-case performance. To safely benefit from optimizations, we propose a framework to trace and maintain flow information up-to-date from source code to machine code [8].

The transformation framework, for each compiler optimization, defines a set of formulas, that rewrite available semantic properties into new properties depending on the semantics of the concerned optimization. Supported semantic properties are *loop bounds* and linear inequations constraining the execution counts of basic blocks. Consider, for example, loop unrolling, that replicates a loop body k times to reduce loop branching overhead and increase instruction level parallelism. The associated rewriting rule divides the initial loop bound by k , and introduces constraints on the execution counts




Figure 3: Impact of optimizations (-O1) on WCET. The y-axis represents the WCET with optimizations, normalized with respect to the WCET without optimization (-O0)

of the basic blocks within the loop (see [8] for details).

We implemented this traceability in the LLVM compiler infrastructure. Each LLVM optimization was modified to implement the rewriting rules corresponding to the optimization. Semantic information is initially read from a file in the FFX format [18] and then represented internally in the LLVM compiler and transformed jointly with the code transformations. Optimizations that do not modify the control flow graph can safely preserve the semantic information. Others must update the information to reflect the new graph. Note that, if a transformation happens to be too complex to trace the information, it can be disabled. This is a much better situation than the current practice which is disabling all optimizations.

Figure 3 reports the reduction of WCET estimates for codes from the Mälardalen benchmark suite ⁷, resulting from optimizations of level O1. In this experiment, only loop bounds are traced.

The experiments first show that it is technically feasible to transform all semantic information from C code to binary without loss of information. This is shown by the fact that we can compute the WCET of all benchmarks (a single missing loop bound would make the computation impossible). Secondly, we observe that option -O1 yields an important reduction of estimated WCETs: 60% in average, and up to 86% (optimized WCET is 14% of unoptimized) for benchmark *ludcmp*, which contains deeply-nested loops.

⁷ www.mrtc.mdh.se/projects/wcet

2.4 Heuristic for targeting the “interesting” properties

In order to lower the real WCET, some approaches compute the criticality of piece of codes [2] or generate a static profile using probabilities for decisions at branching points [17]. The delta tool [19] aims at identifying the conditional statements that are unbalanced in terms of execution time weight (obtain so far by a naive account of instructions). This highlights, to the expert or the program analyzers, the parts of code where a semantic analysis or expert annotation should focus to gain more accuracy on the WCET estimation.

The following experiment is detailed in [19].

In the context of the case study, the expert initially provided a scenario of 30 parameter initializations (over 85 identified parameters). 54 Δ -conditions have been identified. 20 of the 30 parameters initialized in the provided scenario appear in the list of the Δ -conditions, 18 of them exhibiting the highest 10 Δ -values (difference of weight between the two branches) the list. 19 of the 54 Δ -conditions have low Δ -values (218 and less than 11) and no correspondence to the parameters in the scenario. As we rely on the parameter names to appear as operands in the Δ -conditions, a parameter may be linked to several Δ -conditions and vice versa.

Table 3 shows the result of WCET analysis of the module: column 1 lists the provided scenario, column 2 lists the number of specified parameters in the scenario and column 3 to 6 list the WCET estimate and improvement compared to the global WCET for an ARM7 lpc2138 platform, without and with a 1KB direct mapped data cache.

WCET analysis of the module without scenario, (1) global, reports 2553 as WCET estimate. WCET analysis of the expert-provided scenario, specifying 30 parameters, (2) full scenario, yields an improvement of 5%. Rows, (3)-(6), list the estimate and gain when specifying only those parameters involved in the i highest valued Δ -conditions.

To validate that specifications for parameters not contained in the list of Δ -conditions have little impact on the estimate, we supply the 10 parameter initializations that do not appear in any Δ -conditions, row (7).

Summarizing, branching statement analysis identified 20 of 80 parameters as important due to their high Δ -values in the list and they coincide with specified values in the expert-provided scenario. 10 parameters specified in the expert-provided scenario do not appear in the Δ -condition list and have almost no impact on the WCET estimate, while specifying only parameters identified in the

10 highest Δ -conditions still improves the estimate.

The experiment shows that our branching statement analysis can help system-experts focus on the relevant parameters from the vast number of possible parameters.

scenario	# param.	no cache	
(1) global, no scenario	0	2553	gain
(2) full scenario	30	2426	5%
(3) 3 highest Δ	3	2553	0%
(4) 8 highest Δ	10	2479	3%
(5) 9 highest Δ	14	2463	3.5%
(6) 10 highest Δ	18	2448	4%
(7) none of Δ	10	2551	0.08%

Table 3: WCET computation depending on parameters provided in scenarios

3 Integration in WCET estimation tool

In this section we explain how the information extracted in previous section may be exploited to enhance the WCET estimation. We show how they are taken into account into the WCET tool and how the expert or user may interact and get feedback from the WCET.

Scenarios and properties are given in FFX. The tool OTAWA is used to integrate all annotated program property in the WCET estimation.

3.1 Exploitation through automata

In previous works, infeasible paths properties are encoded into integer linear programming constraints and taken into account at the last WCET estimation step [5]. In the project, we propose a general, versatile and non-intrusive process for integration of the paths properties[11, 12]. This process assumes that the WCET tool internally handles CFGs and integer linear constraints, which is the case of every IPET-based WCET analysers. The internal representation of the program is extracted, improved according to the annotations and set back in the tool. The transformation relies on a novel automata formalism that can represent both the program CFG and the annotations. The transformation itself is an automata product; its result is an automaton that allows only paths both existing in the original CFG and being valid with respect to the annotations. The analysis performed on the enriched CFG delivered a WCET improvement up to 10% on the benchmarks of the WCET Tool Challenge.




Figure 4: Path Property Automaton

The formalism, called Path Property Automata (PPA) offers the following features:

1. State based acceptance. Like in finite state automata, one can forbid some transitions according to the history of the execution.
2. Counter based acceptance. Before being accepted, a path must satisfy numerical constraints on the transitions it took.
3. Context of validity. The restrictions expressed using Features 1 and 2 can be subject to a context of validity. The notion of context is expressed in the formalism by hierarchical states.

Figure 4 contains two PPA. On the left, the PPA isomorphic to the program CFG. On the right, the PPA reflects the annotation “in each iteration of the loop starting with E and ending with X, at most one of A or B can be taken”.

3.2 Iterative process from WCET tool to the user

Based on the delta tool, we have developed a graphical tool.

Figure 3.2 shows the iterative process: given a C program and a scenario, the delta tool provides annotations (in FFX format) and a list of δ -conditions. The Eclipse Delta Plugin, allows to easily visualize these δ -conditions and the parameters involved. The expert can re-define a scenario by visualizing the relevant parameters, obtain the consequent new unbalanced conditionals caused by the scenario, and iterate this process by refining properties on parameters in order to gain accuracy on the WCET estimate.

Figure 3.2 is an overview of the Eclipse Delta Plugin. In the center, the code is loaded. Lines corresponding to the selected δ -condition are highlighted. A list of related parameters is provided, allowing to refine the initial value. The adapted scenario is then automatically created as a FFX file. Either it is reloaded in order to identify other relevant branchings, either it is given to Otawa in order to compute the WCET estimate.

This plugin can also be used as an assistant to




Figure 5: Scenario Refining Iterative Process




Figure 6: Delta Eclipse Plug In

create scenario.

4 An industrial case study

This section presents the application of some of the proposed techniques to a case study given by the industrial partner of the project, Continental. Only a part of the experiments are presented, because on one hand, the case study does not match some of the techniques — for instance, it is given in C, so the techniques devoted to higher-level code (§2.2.3) don't apply — and on the other hand, some further experiments are still to come.

The industrial case study for the experimentation of the new WCET method is an automotive application extracted for Continental industrial portfolio.

The Engine Management System (EMS) appli-

cation is a complex real time application. The software application is an assembly of multiple sources:

- C Code generated from Simulink model using model based approach. A one to one relationship is established between Simulink subsystem and C source file.
- Manual C code for other functions.
- Third party software from customer. It can be a Simulink model, a source code or an object file.
- AUTOSAR execution platform (BSW) with either code developed internally or library code bought as third party software form the market.

The software is executed on dedicated micro-controller for embedded automotive (even Engine Systems) market. It requires the use of "specific" target compiler (unlike usual GCC or LLVM compiler), using an internal standardized configuration options (optimization scheme, in lining, cache control, memory allocation strategy ...).

The software module complexity and consequence on timing bound effects are managed by:

- applying encapsulation, modularity and portable design principle with focus on module reuse,
- defining generic module algorithm and use calibration data for possible adaptation. A calibration is a constant ROM which is configurable during development, and frozen for software production,
- applying MISRA-C coding rule that prevents use of dangerous coding (limitation of the use of pointer, implementing loop with bound,),
- abstracting hardware dependencies by a Hardware Abstraction Layer (hardware platform and compiler independence).

Moreover, the today software is designed and implemented to support multi-core architecture, but first we decided to ignore this constraint in the study.

The definition and sizing of the software architecture is driven by resource consumption limitation and safety related constraints. The co-engineering with customer requires defining common methodologies to be able to manage the resource such as: component split, memory control, timing control, OS and AUTOSAR services integration...

The timing resource is the one of most critical one. It needs to be estimated to organize a sound

scaling of processor resource and for the task timing allocation. So, a generic schema for task scheduling is defined by an architecture team and feed by the project with all software module runnable units (executable part of a software module). This is the integration work. Such configuration shall be evaluated for the prediction of scheduling of the application and then verified by measurement on real HW target. Today schedulability design and evaluation are based on measurement data, stored in a database. At integration time, it is necessary to evaluate the runtime of runnable units integrated in the Tasks, in order to properly configure the Task / the integration. Usually, this evaluation is based on the measurements done at the end of the previous V-cycle. As real measurements on bench can only be done sporadically (e.g. once/month) compared to the continuous integration work (e.g. several steps / day), the measurement data from the database becomes rapidly obsolete, and needs to be replaced by estimation. In addition, software configurations and timing measurement conditions are very difficult to standardized and therefore to compare and reuse. The actual orientation for use of heuristics for prediction is then limited in term of granularity.

In addition, the strong reuse strategy is based on reusable software components out of the hardware development context. So, the timing performance of these components needs to be provided (and reused) with an abstract timing estimation (hardware dependence limited). Moreover, the WCET is important to determine, but not always represents a realistic execution due to software interactions complexity.

Continental in this project aims to find a solution for the early estimation of the time execution of software and to allow computing realistic WCET values. The sensitivity to the hardware core architecture must be established to validate the results of the estimation. Of course, this approach requires to be supported by a reliable methodology, capable to support customer/client engineering exchange.

A set of software components representative of the EMS were selected to evaluate the technologies represented in the workflow (Fig 1). The expert uses the annotation concept (section 2.1) to capture behavioral scenarios of the application. These scenarios match the operational conditions of execution of the software, which means real engine conditions. As an example, a theoretical worst case scenario could correspond to an unrealistic system state like high engine speed with low injection set point.

The expert is using heuristics (section 2.4) to describe the scenarios. Out of the general condi-

tions, he concentrates his effort on main effect of large branches. In particular, it is not necessary to spend engineering work on determining an active branch, if the two alternatives have an equivalent weight. The runtime estimation is refined using the propagation of the previously defined properties, in addition to the resolution of the own SW code semantics with the help of eventual annotations. The property propagation at C level is mostly used for this estimation.

The property propagation at low level (HW, bin, asm) has been used as verification of the estimated runtime for one specific core architecture. The high level properties propagated from Lustre language (SCADE environment not used for EMS application) is seen as requirement for the Simulink C code generation chain. The tool environment (section 3.2) is used on the selected software module to estimate the timing execution of the runnable units of the software component.

For the selected component, the estimation of the software component timing execution is performed using the tool prototype environment (section 3.2). Finally, the traceability concept (section 2.3) couldn't be applied in our application due to specific target compiler used. It could lead to identification of new requirement for future embedded compiler.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we introduce the workflow implemented in the W-SEPT project to better integrate the application semantics. We show that semantic properties may be found at each language level (design, source and binary), they have to be traced through the compilation steps to be taken into account in the WCET estimation. The current implementation already showed interesting results for benchmarks and real applications, and good feedback from our industrial partner.

References

- [1] Remy Boutonnet and Mihail Asavae. The WCET analysis using counters - a preliminary assessment. In *Proceedings of 8th JRWRTC, in conjunction with RTNS14*, Versailles, France, October 2014.
- [2] Florian Brandner et al. Static profiling of the worst-case in real-time programs. In *RTNS*, pages 101–110, 2012.
- [3] P. Cousot and R. Cousot. Abstract interpretation: a unified lattice model for static analysis

- of programs by construction or approximation of fixpoints. In *4th ACM Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, POPL'77*, Los Angeles, January 1977.
- [4] P. Cousot and N. Halbwachs. Automatic discovery of linear restraints among variables of a program. In *5th ACM Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, POPL'78*, Tucson (Arizona), January 1978.
- [5] Jan Gustafsson et al. Automatic derivation of loop bounds and infeasible paths for WCET analysis using abstract execution. In *RTSS*, 2006.
- [6] N. Halbwachs, P. Caspi, P. Raymond, and D. Pilaud. The synchronous dataflow programming language Lustre. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 79(9):1305–1320, September 1991.
- [7] Julien Henry, David Monniaux, and Matthieu Moy. Pagai: A path sensitive static analyser. *Electr. Notes Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 289:15–25, 2012.
- [8] Hanbing Li, Isabelle Puaut, and Erven Rohou. Traceability of flow information: Reconciling compiler optimizations and WCET estimation. In *22nd International Conference on Real-Time Networks and Systems, RTNS'14, Versailles, France, October 8-10, 2014*, 2014.
- [9] Yau-Tsun Steven Li and Sharad Malik. Performance analysis of embedded software using implicit path enumeration. *IEEE Trans. on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, 16(12), 1997.
- [10] Björn Lisper. SWEET a tool for WCET flow analysis. In *ISOLA*, 2014.
- [11] Vincent Mussot, Armelle Bonenfant, Pascal Sotin, Philippe Cuenot, and Denis Claraz. From relevant high-level properties to WCET computation improvement. In *ERTS2*, 2013.
- [12] Vincent Mussot and Pascal Sotin. Improving WCET analysis precision through automata product. In *21st IEEE International Conference on Embedded Systems and Real-Time Computing Systems and Applications, RTCSA '15*, Hong Kong, August 2015.
- [13] P. Raymond. Synchronous program verification with lustre/lesar. In S. Mertz and N. Navet, editors, *Modeling and Verification of Real-Time Systems*, chapter 6. ISTE/Wiley, 2008.
- [14] Pascal Raymond, Claire Maiza, Catherine Parent-Vigouroux, Fabienne Carrier, and Mikhail Asavaoae. Timing analysis enhancement for synchronous program. *Real-Time Systems*, pages 1–29, 2015.
- [15] Vivy Suhendra et al. Efficient detection and exploitation of infeasible paths for software timing analysis. In *DAC*, pages 358–363, 2006.
- [16] Reinhard Wilhelm et al. The worst-case execution-time problem - overview of methods and survey of tools. *TECS*, 7(3), 2008.
- [17] Youfeng Wu and James R. Larus. Static branch frequency and program profile analysis. In *MICRO*, pages 1–11, 1994.
- [18] Jakob Zwirchmayr, Armelle Bonenfant, Marianne de Michiel, Hugues Cassé, Laura Kovács, and Jens Knoop. FFX: A portable WCET annotation language (regular paper). In *International Conference on Real-Time and Network Systems (RTNS), Pont-à-Mousson, 08/11/2012-09/11/2012*, pages 91–100, <http://portal.acm.org/dl.cfm>, novembre 2012. ACM DL.
- [19] Jakob Zwirchmayr, Pascal Sotin, Armelle Bonenfant, Denis Claraz, and Philippe Cuenot. Identifying relevant parameters to improve WCET analysis. In *WCET*, 2014.
- [20] Jakob Zwirchmayr et al. FFX: A portable WCET annotation language (regular paper). In *RTNS*, pages 91–100, 2012.