

ARTES Project Extension Application

TATOO

Test And Testability Of Distributed Real-time Systems

Hans Hansson, Henrik Thane

Mälardalen Real-Time Research Centre
www.mrtc.mdh.se/projects/tatoo
Department of Computer Engineering
Mälardalen University
hte@mdh.se

Introduction

This is a request for an extension of the funding for the TATOO project with one year for one graduate student. The project has previously been granted funding for one year, and started October 1st, 1998.

The project deals with fundamentals for deterministic testing of distributed real-time systems (DRTS). Theoretical and practical results with regard to testing and testability of DRTS are next to nonexistent. Research is therefore of significance to both academia and Industry. During the first phase of the project we have developed: Methods for achieving deterministic testing of DRTS, testability metrics, and tools that implements the results. We have specifically addressed task sets with recurring release patterns, executing in a distributed system, where the scheduling on each node is handled by a priority driven preemptive scheduler. This includes statically scheduled systems that are subject to preemption and interrupts, as well as strictly periodic fixed priority systems.

Industrial exploitations

If the project is fruitful the prospects of commercializing the results are promising. There is a dire need in the industry for methods, metrics, and tools for testing of (distributed) real-time systems. Since the theoretical results of the project's first phase indicate that testing methods for sequential programs can be utilized even for DRTS, there are apparent cost saving benefits for the industry, while yet having the possibility to achieve high levels reliability for DRTS. This will be further investigated in cooperation with the industrial partners: Datex-Ohmeda, Volvo Construction Equipment, and Enator Teknik Mälardalen.

Project Plan and Results

The project is performed by Henrik Thane, and supervised by Hans Hansson. The project is expected to span an 18-24 months period (support from ARTES for the first half of the project has been granted).

- Month 1-10: Project commenced in October 1998 and this period has passed (Oct. – July). Related work has been studied and collected. Two papers have been produced, one has been accepted for publication at the IEEE Real-Time Systems Symposium conference in December 1999, and the other has been submitted to the RTCSA conference in December 1999. Two technical reports are in the works. A master's level exam project (with separate funding) with two students designing and implementing a real-time kernel with monitoring mechanisms has commenced and is expected to complete before September 1999.
- Month 11-17: (Aug.- Feb. 1999) Thesis work begins. Extend theory with critical regions. As soon as the experimental real-time kernel is available begin experimenting with the monitoring mechanisms described in one of the technical reports, as well as trying to empirically validate the theoretical claims in produced papers, including the application of results to real industrial applications obtained from our industrial partners. 1-2 conference articles will be submitted.
- Month 18-22: (Mar.- Jul. 2000) Writing the PhD thesis.
- Month 23-24: (Aug.-Sep. 2000) Prepare and wait for dissertation day; write a journal article.

More information

For more information about the project see appended documents: (1) ARTES project status report August '99, (2) the previous ARTES project proposal, (3) the original suggestions by the ARTES board and our comments to these, the conference papers, (4) RTCSA99, and (5) RTSS99, and (6) the C.V. of Henrik Thane.

Appendix (1)

ARTES project status report August '99 TATOO

Test And Testability Of Distributed Real-time Systems

Hans Hansson and Henrik Thane

Department of Computer Engineering
Mälardalens University College
Box 883, 721 23 Västerås
han@idt.mdh.se

1 Summary

This is a report of the achievements and plans of the TATOO project which started October 1st, 1998, and which has been granted support from ARTES for one graduate for one year. An application for extending the support for a second year will be submitted to ARTES in August 1999.

The goal of the research is to develop methods, metrics, design rules, and tools for testing of distributed real-time systems (DRTS). Theoretical and practical results with regard to testing and testability of DRTS are next to nonexistent. Research is therefore of significance to both academia and Industry. During the first phase of the project we have developed: Methods for achieving deterministic testing of DRTS, testability metrics, and tools that implements the results. We have specifically addressed task sets with recurring release patterns, executing in a distributed system, where the scheduling on each node is handled by a priority driven preemptive scheduler. This includes statically scheduled systems that are subject to preemption [15] and interrupts [8], as well as strictly periodic fixed priority systems [1][5].

2 Problem Statement

Achieving deterministic testing of sequential programs is easy because we need only control the sequence of inputs and the start conditions, in order to guarantee reproducibility [6]. That is, given the same initial state and inputs, the sequential program will deterministically produce the same output on repeated executions, even in the presence of systematic faults [7]. Reproducibility is essential when performing regression testing or cyclic debugging [9], where the same test cases are run repeatedly with the intent to validate that either an error correction had the desired effect, or simply to make it possible to find the error when a failure has been observed [3]. However, trying to directly apply test techniques for sequential programs on distributed real-time systems is bound to lead to non-determinism and non-reproducibility, because control is only forced on the inputs, disregarding the significance of order and timing of the executing and communicating tasks. Any intrusive observation of a DRTS will in addition incur a temporal probe-effect [2][4] that subsequently will affect the system's temporal and functional behavior.

In order to achieve systematic testing of DRTS there are three major problems that need to be addressed:

- (1) Reproducing the inputs with respect to contents, order, and timing
- (2) Deterministically observing or reproducing the order and timing of the execution of the parallel programs as well as their communication with each other and the environment
- (3) Eliminating the probe-effect.

In the TATOO project we target problems (2) and (3). For a description of related research regarding these problems see Thane and Hansson [11].

3 Main Ideas

The main ideas of TATOO are to:

1. Facilitate deterministic testing of DRTS by transforming the non-deterministic DRTS testing problem into a set of deterministic sequential programs testing problems. This can be achieved by deriving all the possible execution orderings of the distributed real-time system and regarding each of them as a sequential program. We intend to specifically address task sets with recurring release patterns, executing in a distributed system,

where the scheduling on each node is handled by a priority driven preemptive scheduler. This includes statically scheduled systems that are subject to preemption [15] and interrupts [8], as well as strictly periodic fixed priority systems [1][5]. Together with an accompanying testing strategy this approach could allow test methods for sequential programs to be used, since each identified ordering can be regarded as a sequential program. We intend to take into account the effects of interrupts, preemption, clock synchronization, and varying start and execution times of the involved tasks.

2. Develop testability metrics that gives criteria on when to stop testing, and what to test. This is important since any criteria less than exhaustive testing must be justifiable. A metric is also useful for analysis, and comparison between different design solutions and architectures, so that sound design rules can emerge.
3. Eliminate the probe effect through the allocation of sufficient resources and then letting the probes remain in the target system. This includes allocating resources for the probes' execution time, memory, communication bus bandwidth and accounting for the probes when designing and scheduling. In order to guarantee consistent observations of the global state in the DRTS we assume that the system is globally scheduled. Which means that the release and execution times can be related to a global synchronized time base with a known precision.

Since research into this field, in the real-times systems community, has been meager we intend to adapt, where possible, results from testing of sequential programs and testing of concurrent programs (which is quite meager too), and fill in the blanks where there are no relations what so ever.

4 Scientific merits

The result will be a set of methods, and tools, for testing distributed real-times systems, addressing what current test methods for sequential programs cannot test. Corresponding to the set of methods there will be a set of testability metrics, and tools, for finding out how many test-cases are necessary in order to find all errors in the code with a certain confidence. In close relation to the testability metrics there will be methods for identification of the actual test-cases that must be executed in order to satisfy the coverage criteria defined by the test methods and testability metrics.

The prospects of finding such methods and metrics are quite good when the semantical restrictions on distributed real-time systems, based on static scheduling or fixed priority scheduling, are significantly greater than those for concurrent systems where no notion of real-time exists.

There is very little done (next to nothing) in this field, so if the project is fruitful the impact will be considerable both to Academia (potentially opening up a new field of research) and to the Industry where there is a dire need for methods and tools.

5 Project Plan and Results

The project is performed by Henrik Thane (a Ph.D. student that has previously studied the problem area in his Licentiate thesis [12]), and supervised by Hans Hansson. The project is expected to span an 18-24 months period (support from ARTES for the first half of the project has been granted).

Month 1-10: Project commenced in October 1998 and this period has passed (Oct. – July). Related work has been studied and collected. Two papers have been produced [10][11], and two technical reports are in the works [13][14]. The paper [11] has been accepted for publication at the IEEE Real-Time Systems Symposium conference in December 1999. The other paper[10] has been submitted to the RTCSA conference in December 1999. A tool that implements the results in the papers has been produced. A master's level exam project with two students designing and implementing a real-time kernel with monitoring mechanisms has commenced and is expected to complete before September 1999.

Month 11-17: (Aug.- Feb. 1999) Thesis work begins. Extend theory in [10][11] with critical regions. As soon as the experimental real-time kernel is available begin experimenting with the monitoring mechanisms described in [14] as well as trying to empirically validate the theoretical claims in [10][11][13], including the application of results to real industrial applications obtained from our industrial partners. 1-2 conference articles will be submitted.

Month 18-22: Writing the PhD thesis.

Month 23-24: Prepare and wait for dissertation day; write a journal article.

6 Related Research

See produced paper [11] for related research.

7 Industrial relevance and exploitation expectations

Our proposed research aims at solving real-time problems stemming from industrial demand. It is carried out in co-operation with the industrial partners *Volvo Construction Equipment Components AB*, *Datex-Ohmeda AB*, and *Enator Teknik Mälardalen AB*. The research will provide us with insights in concrete, application specific, real-time engineering practices and broaden the scientific foundation for industry.

Christer Eriksson and Kristian Sandström at Mälardalen University have developed a scheduling tool that takes real-world constraints into consideration. This tool is in use at Volvo Construction Equipment Components AB. The experiences gained from that project have been very positive. However, integrating this work with testing methods and testability analysis tools could be of benefit for the designers by providing criteria on when to stop testing, what to test, how to test and how to design for high testability.

In TATOO we expect to learn how to design and test real-world real-time systems by analyzing the actual problems, their requirements and used industrial practice, and by providing solutions and research to meet the encountered industrial demands.

8 References

- [1] Audsley N. C., Burns A., Richardson M.F., and Wellings A.J. Hard Real-Time Scheduling: The Deadline Monotonic Approach. IFAC/IFIP Workshop, Atlanta, Georgia, pp. 127-132, May, 1991
- [2] Gait J. A Probe Effect in Concurrent Programs. *Software – Practice and Experience*, 16(3):225-233, Mars, 1986.
- [3] Laprie J.C. Dependability: Basic Concepts and Associated Terminology. *Dependable Computing and Fault-Tolerant Systems*, vol. 5, Springer Verlag, 1992.
- [4] LeDoux C.H., and Parker D.S.. Saving Traces for Ada Debugging. In the proceedings of Ada int. conf. ACM, Cambridge University press, pp. 97-108, 1985.
- [5] Lui C. L. and Layland J. W.. Scheduling Algorithms for multiprogramming in a hard real-time environment. *Journal of the ACM* 20(1), 1973.
- [6] McDowell C.E. and Hembold D.P. Debugging concurrent programs. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 21(4), pp. 593-622, December 1989.
- [7] Rushby J. Formal methods and their Role in the Certification of Critical Systems. 12th Annual CSR Workshop, Bruges 12-15 September 1995. Proceedings, pp. 2-42. Springer. ISBN 3-540-76034-2.
- [8] Sandström K., Eriksson C., and Fohler G. Handling Interrupts with Static Scheduling in an Automotive Vehicle Control System. In proceedings of the 5th Int. Conference on Real-Time Computing Systems and Applications (RTCSA'98). October 1998, Japan.
- [9] Schütz W. Fundamental Issues in Testing Distributed Real-Time Systems. *Real-Time Systems*, vol. 7(2), pp. 129-157, 1994.
- [10] Thane H, Hansson H. Towards Deterministic Testing of Distributed Real-Time Systems. *Real-Time Computing Systems and Applications conference (RTCSA'99)*, Hong Kong China, December, 1999. (Submitted)
- [11] Thane H, Hansson H. Towards Systematic Testing of Distributed Real-Time Systems. To appear in *Real-Time Systems Symposium*, Phoenix U.S.A, December, 1999.
- [12] Thane H. Safety and Reliability of Software in Embedded Control Systems, Technical Licentiate thesis, Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Oct. 1997.
- [13] Thane H. Towards exact minimum and maximum response time analysis for preemptive strict periodic fixed priority scheduled distributed real-time systems using execution ordering graphs. Technical report, Mälardalen Real-Time Research Centre, Dept. Computer Engineering, Mälardalen University, 1999.
- [14] Thane H. Towards predictable instrumentation of distributed real-time systems. Technical report, Mälardalen Real-Time Research Centre, Dept. Computer Engineering, Mälardalen University, 1999.
- [15] Xu J. and Parnas D. Scheduling processes with release times, deadlines, precedence, and exclusion, relations. *IEEE Trans. on Software Eng.* vol. 16, pp. 360-369, 1990.

Appendix (2)

Proposal to ARTES TATOO

Test And Testability Of Distributed Real-time Systems

Hans Hansson
Department of Computer Engineering
Mälardalens University College
Box 883, 721 23 Västerås
henrik.thane@mdh.se

1 Summary

The goal of the proposed research is to develop metrics for testability, test methods, tools and design rules for high testability in distributed real-time systems (DRTS). Theoretical and practical results with regard to testing and testability of distributed real-time systems are next to nonexistent. Research is therefore of significance to both academia and Industry. We propose here a project for development of methods and metrics for testing and measurement of testability of software in distributed real-time systems.

2 Problem Statement

There is a lack of methods and techniques for testing and measuring testability of software in distributed real-time systems. Bluntly put, it is a black hole. Current theory and practice for testing sequential programs are simply not good enough, due to complex issues like: probe effects and race conditions – intrinsic to all concurrent systems, and lack of synchronized global clocks, that lead to non-reproducible behavior and higher complexity. Still, for safety-critical computer control systems (which all are real-time systems) we must design and verify the reliability and safety of the software to very high standards – but have no means to do so without great expense (and still no guarantees.)

A Stoppage Criteria

The question of when to stop testing has never been adequately answered. One answer is "test until you cannot test any further", either due to lack of time or money. Others argue that we must satisfy 100% of some structural coverage criterion. For example, attempt 100% branch coverage which is terminated when it is satisfied. Only exhaustive testing is truly thorough, so any stoppage criteria that is applied before exhaustive testing is satisfied must be justifiable – that is for reasons better than "we ran out of time and money" [Voas1995].

With the help of a testability metric and a corresponding testing methodology we can give an answer to when to stop testing. That is, the testability metric should give an indication on how many test-cases are necessary to find all the errors of types limited by the ability of the testing methodology.

If we, with the help of a testability metric, finds out that the number of test-cases needed are simply too many to execute, we can apply some other form of verification, like reviews or formal verification. But, we can also deem if it is more suitable to redesign the system for higher testability.

Design for High Testability

Software does not wear out over time. It is therefore reasonable to assume that as long as faults are uncovered – reliability increases for each fault that is eliminated [Littlewood1973]. A problem with this method is that it would take years to remove a sufficient amount of errors to achieve a critical standard of reliability. For safety-critical systems where the failure rate is required to be lower than 10^{-9} failures per hour this is an intractable task since testing has to be performed for at least 115 000 years [Fenton1995].

It is therefore imperative to design for high testability in order to decrease the number of test cases needed for verifying that the software is of ultra-reliable or safety-critical standards (10^{-9}).

Iterative Design Process

What makes matters even worse is the fact that more than half of the errors in a system are due to ambiguous or incomplete requirement specifications [Leveson1995, Lutz1992, DeMarco1978, Ellis1995]. The intention of testing is to verify that a specific input will yield a specific output, defined by the *specification*. Thus the confidence gained by testing software is limited. That is, we can by testing not reveal errors in the requirements.

Requirements are the main obstacle when designing and verifying software. This has led to an iterative development process where the requirements are refined for each iteration and prototypes produced – which then are validated against the customer. Using this scheme, the portion of failures related to inadequate requirements can be decreased.

However, for each iteration and prototype we must re-test the system. High testability is then of utmost importance in order to decrease the testing effort for every iteration. That is, it is desirable to design for high testability.

Currently no test methods and testability metrics for distributed real-time systems

With all these arguments at hand, we are back to what we stated in the first paragraph in this section: there are no testability metrics and testing methods that addresses the specifics of distributed real-time systems. So before we have them we cannot design for high testability and not test safety-critical systems software to the standards demanded by the customers, the public and the legislators.

3 Main Ideas

We propose to:

1. Develop a testability metric that gives criteria on when to stop testing, and what to test. This is important since we must know when we have tested an application enough, or rather when we have not. A metric is also imperative for enabling analysis, and comparisons between different design solutions and architectures, so that sound design rules can emerge.

The metric will be based on a model that takes into account the effects, that different execution and communication strategies for DRTS, have on testability. For example, the consequences of the use of time-triggered or event-triggered architectures, or what the effects are if preemption, interrupts and jitter are allowed, or what happens when you mix different architectures, like time triggered nodes in a system which is interconnected by an even-triggered network – leading to a non homogeneous DRTS.

2. Develop test methods, for systems run by static (off-line) or fix priority (on-line) scheduling principles, that addresses the specific problems of testing concurrent and time dependent systems.

Since research into this field, in the real-times systems community, has been meager we intend to adapt, where possible, results from testing of sequential programs and testing of concurrent programs (which is quite meager too), and fill in the blanks where there are no relations what so ever.

4 Expected Results and Impact

The result will be a set of methods, and tools, for testing distributed real-times systems, addressing what current test methods for sequential programs cannot test. Corresponding to the set of methods there will be a set of testability metrics, and tools, that state how many test-cases are necessary – that is, giving stoppage criteria, stating the minimum number of test-cases needed for finding all the errors in the code, with a certain confidence. In close relation to the testability metrics there will be methods that identify the actual test-cases that must be executed in order to satisfy the coverage criteria defined by the test methods and testability metrics.

The prospects of finding such methods and metrics are quite good when the semantical restrictions on distributed real-time systems, based on static scheduling (foremost) or fix-priority scheduling (to a lesser extent), are significantly greater than those for concurrent systems where no notion of real-time exists.

To the authors' big surprise there is very little done (next to nothing) in this field, so if the project is fruitful the impact will be considerable both to Academia (potentially opening up a new field of research) and to the Industry where there is a dire need for methods and tools.

6 Project Plan

This project will be conducted by a Ph.D. student with 25% of department duties and supervised by Hans Hansson and Christer Eriksson. This means that the project will span over a 30-33 months period.

- Month 1-6: Start of project. Formalize why it is difficult to test concurrent systems in general, and distributed real-time systems especially. Begin state-of-the-art paper addressing testing and testability-metrics for DRTS, by collecting related work. Make preliminary model for testability metric of statically scheduled DRTS, and define preliminary testing methods as well as methods for test-case generation. Start building prototypes.
- Month 7-10: Analysis of prototypes. Apply prototypes to Industrial software, collect data, and document case-study. Refine metrics, test methods, and test-case generation. Define suitable design rules for high testability.
- Month 11-17: Make preliminary model for testability metric of fix priority scheduled DRTS, and define preliminary testing methods as well as methods for test-case generation. Start building prototypes for fixed priority scheduling.
- Month 18-20: Analysis prototypes for fix priority scheduled DRTS. Apply prototypes to Industrial software, collect data, and document case-study. Refine metrics, test methods, and test-case generation. Define suitable design rules for high testability.
- Month 21-30: Write Ph.D. thesis. Including state of the art, state of the practice, models and methods, case-studies with data, analysis of how different architectures affect testability, define suitable design rules for high testability and define future work.

This schedule will be extended with a 1-3 months research stay at a highly ranked international institution. During the 30 months the Ph.D. student will also gather about 20 points of graduate courses in relevant areas.

Henrik Thane has studied the problem area, which was part of his Licentiate thesis work, and has expressed interest to work on the project for his Ph.D. thesis. His CV is included in the appendix.

7 Preliminary Budget

We estimate the total project budget to amount to 1.2 MSEK. This sum is comprised of funding for

- one Ph.D. student salary for 2.5 years, considering departmental duties of 0.5 years
- supervision cost
- research stay for Ph.D. student at international institution (1-3 months)
- One big screen PC, for design and evaluation of test and metrics tools
- conference travels for presentation of results
- a 20% department overhead is added to the above listed items

8 Related Research

The knowledge and research into testing of sequential programs have been considerable. Theory and practice for testing sequential programs is however not applicable to concurrent programs [Helmbold1996] and for distributed real-time systems [Schütz1992], due to race conditions, probe effects and lack of synchronized clocks. The work by Schütz is the sole one that describes the intrinsic problems of testing DRTS.

Promising work on testability for sequential programs, that might to some extent be possible to utilize in testability metrics for DRTS, has been done by Voas [Voas1992, Voas1993], by providing statistical methods for evaluating the testability of sequential programs, and providing a testing stoppage criteria.

Work related to testing of concurrent programs (ADA) that enable reproducible behaviors of the programs has been done by Tai [Tai1991]. This is done by forcefully synchronizing the concurrent processes in the system according to specific scenarios. Tai's work does however, affect the timing in the system, and is as such not directly applicable to real-time systems. The method has however potential to, with modifications, be applicable to fix priority scheduled systems.

Work related to monitoring of distributed real-time systems has been done by [Dodd1992, Tsai1996], which mostly covers how to record events in distributed real-time systems for later off-line analysis, and playback.

9 Relation to Profile and Industry

Our proposed research aims at solving real-time problems stemming from industrial demand. It will be carried out in co-operation with the industrial partners. The research will provide us with insights in concrete, application specific real-time engineering practices and broaden the scientific foundation for industry.

We expect to learn how to design and test real-world real-time systems by analyzing the actual problems, their requirements and used industrial practice, and by providing solutions and research to meet the encountered demands.

The testability metrics acknowledge the demands for objective measurements of how, for example, architectures for DRTS affect the testability. This can in the end be used for devising rules on how to design and specify DRTS. Methods for testing DRTS acknowledge the demand for reliable and safe systems.

10 Context

10.1 The research group

The proposed research will be carried out at the Computer Engineering Department (IDt) at Mälardalen University, Västerås, in co-operation with Volvo construction equipment, Datex-Engström, and Enator. It is intended to fit with other successful research efforts at IDt for Volvo, in particular the already developed scheduling tool by Christer Eriksson and Kristian Sandström.

Real-time Systems research was established at MdH around 1990 by three persons as a glue between academia and industry. It has since then been the most active and fastest growing research area, as well as a strong educational profile, at MdH. The real-time research at MdH is supported by a number of regional and national authorities, foundations and companies. As a result, real-time systems has been identified (by the university board) as the research area of highest priority at MdH. It has grown to approximately 30 people providing 400 full time student equivalents, 17 people are involved in research.

10.2 Complementary activities

4 student exam projects are currently being defined to aid in developing technology and experimental prototypes.

10.3 Research and industrial co-operation

During the last year Christer Eriksson and Kristian Sandström at Mälardalen University have developed a scheduling tool that takes real-world constraints into consideration. This tool is in use at Volvo Construction Equipment Components AB. The experiences gained from that project have been very positive. However, integrating this work with testability metrics and testing methods could be of benefit for the designer by providing criteria on when to stop testing, what to test, how to test and how to design for high testability.

Contact person at Volvo Construction Equipment Components AB:

Nils-Erik Bånkestad
Dept. TUE
Volvo Construction Equipment Components AB
631 85 Eskilstuna
vcecmp.neb@memo.volvo.se

Contact person at Datex-Engström AB:

Joakim Fröberg
Datex-Engström
Box 20109
161 02 Bromma
Joakim.Froberg@se.datex-engstrom.com

Contact person at Enator:

Mikael Gustafsson
Enator
Västerås
vcecmp.mikaelg@memo.volvo.se

11 References

- [DeMarco1978] T DeMarco. Structured Analysis and System Specification. Yourdon Press 1978. ISBN 0-917072-07-3
- [Dodd1992] P. S. Dodd, et. al. *Monitoring and debugging distributed real-time programs*. Software-practice and experience. Vol. 22(1), pp. 863-877, October 1997.
- [Ellis1995] A. Ellis. Achieving Safety in Complex Control Systems. Proceedings of the Safety-Critical Systems Symposium. Pp. 2-14. Brighton, England, 1995. Springer-Verlag. ISBN 3-540-19922-5
- [Fenton1995] N E Fenton. The Role of Measurement in Software Safety Assessment. 12th Annual CSR Workshop, Bruges 12-15 September 1995. Proceedings, pp. 217-248. Springer. ISBN 3-540-76034-2.
- [Helmbold1996] D.P. Helmbold, C.E. McDowell. *A Taxonomy of race conditions*. Journal of parallel and distributed computing. Vol. 33(2), pp. 159-164, March 1996.
- [Leveson1995] N. G. Leveson. Safeware System, Safety and Computers. Addison Wesley 1995. ISBN 0-201-11972-2.
- [Littlewood1973] B Littlewood et. al. A Bayesian Reliability Growth Model For Computer Software. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series C, No. 22, p 332-346, 1973
- [Lutz1992] R. R. Lutz. Analyzing software requirements errors in safety-critical, embedded systems. In software requirements conference, IEEE, January 1992.
- [Schütz1992] W. Schütz. The testability of Distributed Real-Time Systems. Ph.D. dissertation. Technische Universität Wien, 1992.
- [Tai1991] K.C Tai, et. al. *Debugging concurrent Ada programs by deterministic execution*. IEEE transactions on software engineering. Vol. 17(1), pp. 45-63, January 1991.
- [Tsai1996] J.P. Tsai, et. al. *A system for visualizing and debugging distributed real-time systems with monitoring support*. Journal of Software engineering and Knowledge engineering. Vol. 6(3), pp. 355-400, 1996.
- [Voas1992] J.M. Voas *PIE: A Dynamic Failure-Based Technique*. . IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering, Vol.18(8), pp.1261-1269, August 1992.
- [Voas1993] J.M. Voas, et.al. Designing programs that are less likely to hide faults. Journal of systems and software. Vol. 20, pp. 93-100, 1993.
- [Voas1995] J M Voas, et.al. Software Assessment: Reliability, Safety, testability. Wiley Interscience, 1995. ISBN 0-471-01009-x.

12 Appendices

- Appendix A: C.V. of Hans Hansson
- Appendix B: C.V. of Henrik Thane
- Appendix C: Supporting letters

Appendix (3)

Suggestions by the ARTES board 1998 and follow up 1999

Suggestions by the ARTES board

Date: June 12th 1998

“ARTES styrelse beslutade om stöd för en ettårig förstudie (max 500kSEK) med anledning av projektförslaget "TATOO - Test And Testability Of Distributed Real-Time Systems". Under denna förstudie ska (bl.a.) kontakter med datorteknik på Chalmers (.) samt IDA vid LiTH (Mary Helander mfl.) tas. Littlewoods arbeten och existerande kommersiell programvara ska också beaktas. Kontakta Bertil Emmertz på ABB ISY (numera Industrial Productions; tror jag) för information om det senare.”

Contact or consider the work by:

- (1) Martin Hiller, et. al. At the department of Computer engineering, Chalmers
- (2) Mary Hellander, et al. At Lindköping University
- (3) Bertil Emmertz, ABB Industrial Productions. Consider the work by Littlewood as well as existing commercial software for testing

Follow up on the suggestions

Date: August 18th 1999

The work by (1), and (2), have been considered, although any concrete relevance to the TATOO project could however not be found. Contact with Bertil Emmertz has occurred. The work by Littlewood has been studied earlier by Henrik Thane for his Licentiate thesis. With respect to existing commercial software, the theoretical results of the first phase (year one) of the TATOO project has shown that existing methods and techniques for testing of sequential software can be used after serialization of the distributed real-time system into a set of sequential programs.

Appendix (4)

A NOTE TO THE REVIEWERS

A paper related to this submission has been submitted to the RTSS 99 conference.

Although similarities between the papers exist, there are significant new contributions in this paper. In addition to a complete rewriting of the overlapping parts the following is new:

- Treatment of the effects of global clock synchronization on testing of distributed real-time systems.
- The algorithm for deriving all execution orderings has been improved.
- A new set of examples has been provided.
- The testing strategy is extended.

Best regards,

Henrik Thane and Hans Hansson.

July 1, 1999

TOWARDS DETERMINISTIC TESTING OF DISTRIBUTED REAL-TIME SYSTEMS

Henrik Thane, Hans Hansson

Mälardalen Real-Time Research Centre

www.mrtc.mdh.se

Department of Computer Engineering

Mälardalen University

P.O. Box 883, S-721 23, Västerås, Sweden

Tel. +46 21 103157, Fax. +46 21 103110

henrik.thane@mdh.se

July 1, 1999

ABSTRACT

Reproducible and deterministic testing of *sequential* programs can in most cases be achieved by controlling the sequence of inputs to the program. The behavior of a distributed real-time system, on the other hand, not only depends on the inputs but also on the *order* and *timing* of the concurrent tasks that execute and communicate with each other and the environment. Hence, sequential test techniques are not directly applicable, since they disregard the significance of order and timing. In this paper we present a method for identifying all the possible orderings of task starts, preemptions and completions for tasks executing in distributed real-time systems. Together with an accompanying testing strategy this method allows test methods for sequential programs to be used, since each identified ordering can be regarded as a sequential program. In the presented analysis, and testing strategy, we take into account the effects of interrupts, clock synchronization, and varying start and execution times of the involved tasks.

Keywords: Testing, distributed real-time systems, determinism, reproducibility, testability.

1 INTRODUCTION

The main contribution of this paper is a technique for achieving deterministic testing of distributed real-time systems. We will specifically address task sets with recurring release patterns, executing in a distributed system, where the scheduling on each node is handled by a priority driven preemptive scheduler. This includes statically scheduled systems that are subject to preemption [35] and interrupts [23], as well as strictly periodic fixed priority systems [2][18].

Achieving deterministic testing of sequential programs is easy because we need only control the sequence of inputs and the start conditions, in order to guarantee reproducibility [19]. That is, given the same initial state and inputs, the sequential program will deterministically produce the same output on repeated executions, even in the presence of systematic faults [22]. Reproducibility is essential when performing regression testing or cyclic debugging [24], where the same test cases are run repeatedly with the intent to validate that either an error correction had the desired effect, or simply to make it possible to find the error when a failure has been observed [16]. However, trying to directly apply test techniques for sequential programs on distributed real-time systems is bound to lead to non-determinism and non-reproducibility, because control is only forced on the inputs, disregarding the significance of order and timing of the executing and communicating tasks. Any intrusive observation of a distributed real-time system will in addition incur a temporal probe-effect [9][17] that subsequently will affect the system's temporal and functional behavior.

The method presented in this paper, aims at transforming the non-deterministic distributed real-time systems testing problem into a set of deterministic sequential programs testing problems. This is achieved by deriving all the possible execution orderings of the distributed real-time system and regarding each of them as a sequential program. A formal definition of what actually constitutes an execution order scenario will be defined later in the paper. The following small example presents the underlying intuition:

Consider *Figure 1a*, which depicts a schedule for the duration equal to the Least Common Multiple (LCM) of the period times of the involved tasks *A*, *B* and *C*, which are generated by a static off-line scheduler and which have fixed execution times, i.e. the worst and best-case execution times coincide ($WCET_i=BCET_i$, for $i \in \{A,B,C\}$). A task with later release

time is assigned higher priority. These non-varying execution times have the effect of only yielding one possible execution scenario during the LCM. However, if for example, task A had a minimum execution time of 2 ($BCET_A=2$; $WCET_A=6$) we would get three possible execution scenarios, depicted in figures 1a -1c, i.e., in addition to the execution order scenario in Figure 1a, there are now possibilities for A to complete before B is released (Figure 1b), and for A to complete before C is released (Figure 1c).




Figure 1. Three different execution order scenarios when task A has $BCET_A=2$ and $WCET_A=6$.

Given that these different scenarios yield different system behaviors for the same input, due to the order or timing of the produced outputs, we would by using regular testing techniques for sequential programs get non-deterministic results.

Addressing this problem we suggest a testing strategy consisting of the following:

1. Identify all possible execution order scenarios for each scheduled node in the system during a single instance of the release pattern with duration T ; typically equal to the LCM of the period times of the involved tasks.
2. Test the system using any regular testing technique of choice, and monitor for each test case which execution order scenario is run during $[0, T]$, i.e., which, when and in what order jobs are started, preempted and completed. With jobs we mean single instances of the recurring tasks during T .
3. Map test case and output onto the correct execution ordering, based on observation.
4. Repeat 2-3 until sought coverage is achieved.

The contributions of this paper are suggestions on: how to identify the execution order scenarios for each node in the distributed system, how to compose them into global execution order scenarios, how to make use of them when testing (the test strategy), and how to reproduce the scenarios.

Yang, et al., have done similar work by identifying synchronization sequences (rendezvous) in concurrent Ada programs [36] and made use of a similar testing strategy where the number of synchronization sequences, and execution paths, exercised are used to define coverage. Pursuing this line of work, Hwang, et al. also attempt deterministic replay, i.e., not only observing synchronization sequences but also trying to enforce them [11]. To ensure *Deterministic replay* [6][28][34] the tasks' run-time behavior is recorded in a log over a period of time. The execution of the system can then be deterministically replayed off-line. The system cannot be suspended during run-time, but the off-line replay can be suspended and examined. The disadvantages with deterministic replay are [24]:

- (a) One can only replay what has previously been observed, and no guarantees that every significant system behavior will be observed accurately can be provided. Also, if the inputs or the program has been modified (e.g., corrected) completely new traces have to be recorded.
- (b) Dedicated special hardware has to be used in order to eliminate (or minimize) the probe-effect.
- (c) Since replay takes place at machine level the amount of information required is usually large. All inputs and intermediate events, e.g. messages, must be kept.

Deterministic replay could also be used in our approach by using standard techniques [33], however we have in addition the possibility to reproduce specific execution order scenarios during run-time without introducing any probe-effects. Since we do not need to do the "record on-line and examine off-line" procedure we can easily facilitate systematic testing via automation. In contrast with [6][11][28][34][36] we take a more holistic approach by consistently handling time, distribution, clock synchronization, interrupts and scheduling, where they only consider parts of or few of these topics.

When it comes to dealing with the probe-effect in distributed real-time systems we follow the philosophy that the probe-effect can only be eliminated through the allocation of sufficient resources and then letting the probes remain in the target system. This includes allocating resources for the probes' execution time, memory, communication bus bandwidth and accounting for the probes when designing and scheduling [30]. In order to guarantee consistent observations of the global state in the distributed real-time system we assume that the system is globally scheduled. Which means that the release and execution times can be related to a global synchronized time base with a known precision.

Other approaches to eliminating the probe effect are: (1) Use of *Special hardware* (co-processors and shared memory, etc.) for transparent monitoring of the system [10][20][33][34], or application specific hardware using FPGAs and

VHDL [4] with dedicated monitoring mechanisms. (2) Use of *Software for instrumentation* by including instrumentation code in the software [6][32].

Paper outline: *Section 2* presents our system model. *Section 3* formalizes the concept of execution orderings and presents the algorithm for identifying all the possible execution orderings of a distributed real-time system. We also give some examples, and extend the analysis to consider the effects of interrupts. *Section 4* suggests a testing strategy for achieving deterministic and reproducible testing in the context of the execution order analysis. Finally, in *Section 5*, we conclude and give some hints on future work.

2 THE SYSTEM MODEL

We assume a distributed system consisting of a set of nodes, which communicate via a broadcast network, that is temporally predictable, i.e., upper bounds on communication latencies are known or can be calculated [8][13][31]. Each node is a self sufficient computing element with CPU, memory, network access, a local clock and I/O units for sampling and actuation of the external system. We further assume the existence of a global synchronized time base [8][14] with a known precision d , meaning that no two nodes in the system have local clocks differing by more than d .

The software that runs on the distributed system consists of a set of concurrent tasks, communicating by message passing. Functionally related, and cooperating, tasks, e.g., sample-calculate-actuate loops in control systems are defined as transactions. Each transaction has a precedence relation (execution order), interactions (data-flow), and a period time. The tasks are geographically distributed over the nodes, typically with more than one task on each node, and consequently transactions can span several nodes. All synchronization is resolved before run-time and therefore no action is needed to enforce synchronization in the actual program code. Different release-times and priorities guarantee mutual exclusion and precedence. The distributed system is globally scheduled, which results in a set of specific schedules for each node. At run-time we need only synchronize the local clocks to fulfill the global schedule [13].

Task model

We assume a set of jobs (i.e. invocations of tasks) J that are released in a time interval $[0, J^{MAX}]$, where J^{MAX} is typically equal to the LCM of the involved tasks. Each job $j \in J$ has a release time r_j , worst case execution time ($WCET_j$), best case execution time ($BCET_j$), a deadline D_j and a unique priority p_j . J represents one instance of a recurring pattern of job executions with period J^{MAX} , i.e., job j will be released at time $r_j, r_j + J^{MAX}, r_j + 2J^{MAX}$, etc. We further assume that the schedule is feasible, i.e., each job j does always complete within its deadline D_j .

We additionally assume a set of interrupts I , where each interrupt $k \in I$ has a minimum, and maximum inter-arrival time (T_k^{min} and T_k^{max}), priority p_k (interrupts can preempt each other), and known worst and best case execution times of the interrupt routines ($WCET_k$ and $BCET_k$, respectively). We further assume that the system is preemptive (both by jobs and interrupts) and that jobs may have identical release-times.

The task model is fairly general since it includes both preemptive scheduling of statically generated schedules [23][35] and fixed priority scheduling of strictly periodic tasks [2][18].

Related to the task model we assume that the tasks may have functional and temporal side effects due to preemption, message passing and shared memory. We assume however, that interrupts have only temporal side effects and no functional side effects. Furthermore, we assume that data is sent at the termination of the sending task (not during its execution), and that received data is available when tasks start (and is made private in an atomic first operation of the task) [7][15][21].

Fault hypotheses

Note that, although synchronization is resolved by the off-line selection of release times and priorities, we cannot dismiss unwanted synchronization side effects. The schedule design can be erroneous, or the assumptions about the execution times might not be accurate due to poor execution time estimates, or simply due to design and coding errors.

Inter-task communication is restricted to the beginning and end of task execution, and therefore we can regard the transactions interior to tasks as atomic. With respect to access to shared resources, such as shared memory and I/O interfaces, the atomicity assumption is only valid if synchronization and mutual exclusion can be guaranteed.

Depending on pessimism we can therefore identify two fault hypotheses:

1. Errors can only occur due to erroneous outputs and inputs to jobs, and/or due to synchronization errors, i.e., jobs can only interfere via specified interactions.

-
2. In addition to (1) jobs can corrupt each others shared memory and I/O interfaces, i.e., they may interfere via unspecified side-effects.

The only possibility to guarantee (1) in a shared memory system is to use a hardware memory protection scheme, or to by design eliminate shared resources. The analysis of execution orderings in Section 3 corresponds to fault hypothesis (2), but we also show how the analysis can be abstracted to a less discriminating model corresponding to fault hypothesis (1).

3 EXECUTION ORDER ANALYSIS

In this section we present a method for identifying all the possible orders of execution for sets of jobs conforming to the task model introduced in Section 2. We will also show how the model and analysis can be extended to accommodate for multiple nodes by considering clock-synchronization effects, and how to account for the interference caused by interrupts.

3.1 Execution Orderings

In identifying the execution orderings of a job set we will only consider the following major events:

- The start of execution of a job, i.e., when the first instruction of a job is executed. We will use $S(J)$ to denote the set of start points for the jobs in a job set J ; $S(J) \subseteq J \times [0, J^{MAX}] \times J \cup \{_ \}$, that is $S(J)$ is the set of triples $(j_1, time, j_2)$, where j_2 is the (lower priority) job that is preempted by the start of j_1 at $time$, or possibly “_” if no such job exists.
- The end of execution of a job, i.e., when the last instruction of a job is executed. We will use $E(J)$ to denote the set of end points (termination points) for jobs in a job set J ; $E(J) \subseteq J \times [0, J^{MAX}] \times J \cup \{_ \}$, that is $E(J)$ is a set of triples $(j_1, time, j_2)$, where j_2 is the (lower priority) job that resumes its execution at the termination of j_1 , or possibly “_” if no such job exists. We will use $e(j_1, time, j_2)$ to denote an event $(j_1, time, j_2)$ in E .

We will now define an execution to be a sequence of job starts, job terminations and job preemptions, using the additional notation that

- $ev.time$ denotes the time of the event ev ,
- $Ev \setminus I$ denotes the set of events in Ev that occur in the time interval I ,
- $prec(Ev, t)$ are the event in Ev that occurred most recently in the past at time t (including events that occur at t).
- $t_nxt(Ev, t)$ denotes the time of the next event in Ev after time t .
- $Nxt(Ev, t)$ denotes the next event in Ev after time t .
- $First(E)$ and $Last(E)$ denote the first and last events in E , respectively,

Definition. An *Execution* of a job set J is a set of events $X \subseteq S(J) \cup E(J)$, such that

1. For each $j \in J$, there is exactly one start and termination event in X , denoted $s(j, X)$ and $e(j, X)$ respectively.
2. For each $(j_1, t, j_2) \in S(J)$, $p_{j_1} > p_{j_2}$, i.e., jobs are only preempted by higher priority jobs.
3. For each $j \in J$, $s(j, X).time \geq r(j)$, i.e., jobs may only start to execute after being released.
4. After its release, the start of a job may only be delayed by intervals of executions of higher priority jobs, i.e., using the convention that $X \setminus [j, j) = \emptyset$, for each job $j \in J$: each event $ev \in X \setminus [prec(X, r(j)).time, s(j, X))$ is either
 - A start of the execution of a higher priority job, i.e. $ev = s(j', X)$ and $p_{j'} > p_j$
 - A job termination, at which a higher priority job resumes its execution, i.e., $ev = (j', t, j'')$, where $p_{j'} > p_j$
5. The sum of execution intervals of a job $j \in J$ is in the range $[BCET(j), WCET(j)]$, i.e.,

$$BCET(j) \leq \sum_{ev \in \{s(j, X)\} \cup \{e(j', t, j)\}} t_nxt(X, ev.time) - ev.time \leq WCET(j)$$

We will use $EX_t(J)$ to denote the set of executions of the job set J . Intuitively, $EX_t(J)$ denotes the set of possible executions of the job set J within $[0, J^{MAX}]$. Assuming a dense time domain $EX_t(J)$ is only finite if $BCET(j) = WCET(j)$ for

all $j \in J$. However, if we disregard the exact timing of events and only consider the ordering of events we obtain a finite set of execution orderings for any finite job set J .

Using $ev\{x/t\}$ to denote an event ev with the time element t replaced by the undefined element “ x ”, we can formally define the set of execution orderings $EX_o(J)$ as follows:

Definition. The set of *Execution orderings* $EX_o(J)$ of a job set J is the set of sequences of events such that $ev_0\{x/t\}, ev_1\{x/t\}, \dots, ev_k\{x/t\} \in EX_o(J)$ **iff** there exists an $X \in EX_t(J)$ such that

- $First(X) = ev_0$
- $Last(X) = ev_k$
- For any $j \in [0..(k-1)]$: $Nxt(X, ev_j.time) = ev_{j+1}$

Intuitively, $EX_o(J)$ is constructed by extracting one representative of each set of equivalent execution orderings in $EX_t(J)$, i.e., using a quotient construction $EX_o(J) = EX_t(J) \setminus \sim$, where \sim is the equivalence induced by considering executions with identical event orderings to be equivalent. This corresponds to our fault hypothesis (2), with the relaxation that we only keep track of the timing of preemptions, not exactly where in the program code they occur. If we assume fault hypotheses (1), the set of execution orderings can be reduced further, since the preemptions are of no significance in this case, i.e., we can define $EX_o(J) = EX_t(J) \setminus \approx$, where \approx is the equivalence induced by considering executions with identical start and stop event orderings to be equivalent. Even further reductions could be of interest, for instance to only consider orderings among tasks that are functionally related, e.g., by sharing data.

In the remainder we will use the terms *execution scenario* and *execution ordering* interchangeably.

3.2 Calculating $EX_o(J)$

This section outlines a method to calculate the set of execution orderings $EX_o(J)$ for a set of jobs J . We will later (in section 3.2.2) present an algorithm that performs this calculation. In essence, our approach is to make a reachability analysis by simulating the behavior during one $[0, J^{MAX}]$ period for the job set J .

3.2.1 The Execution Order Graph (EOG)

The algorithm we are going to present generates, for a given schedule, an Execution Order Graph (EOG), which is a finite tree for which the set of possible paths from the root contains all possible execution scenarios.


But before delving into the algorithm we describe the elements of an EOG. Formally, an EOG is a pair $\langle N, A \rangle$, where

- N is a set of nodes, each node being labeled with a job and a continuous time, i.e., for a job set J : $N \subseteq J \cup \{“_”\} \times I(J^{MAX})$, where $\{“_”\}$ is used to denote a node where no job is executing and $I(J^{MAX})$ is the set of continuous intervals in $[0, J^{MAX}]$.
- A is the set of directed arcs (edges; transitions) from one node to another node, labeled with a continuous time interval, i.e., for a set of jobs J : $A \subseteq N \times I(J^{MAX}) \times N$.

Intuitively,

- An **edge**, corresponds to the transition (task-switch) from one job to another. The edge is annotated with a continuous interval of when the transition can take place, as illustrated in Figures 2 and 3. The interval $[a', b']$ is defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} a' &= \text{MAX}(a, r_A) + \text{BCET}_A \\ b' &= \text{MAX}(b, r_A) + \text{WCET}_A \end{aligned} \quad (3-1)$$



That is, a' is the earliest start time of job B . Which is the immediately preceding job's (in this case A 's) earliest start time, a or A 's earliest scheduled release time, r_A , added with A 's minimum execution time, BCET_A .

The b' represents the latest possible release-time for job B , obtained by adding the latest possible release time for job A with WCET_A , the maximum execution time for A .

The MAX functions are necessary because the calculated release times a and b can be earlier than the scheduled release of the job A .

- A **node**, is a job annotated with a continuous interval of its possible execution, as illustrated by figure 4.

We define the interval of execution, $[a, b)$ by:

$$a = \text{MAX}(a, r_A) \quad (3-2)$$

$$b = \text{MAX}(b, r_A) + \text{WCET}_A$$

The interval, $[a, b)$, specifies thus the interval when A can be preempted.




Figure 4 A job annotated with its possible execution and start time.

- From each node there can be one or more transitions, representing one of four different situations:
 - 1) That the job is the last job scheduled in this branch of the tree. In this case the transition is labeled with the interval of finishing times for the node, and has the empty job “_” as destination node.
 - 2) That the job has a *WCET* such that it definitely completes before the release of any preempting job. In this case there is a single outgoing transition labeled with the interval of finishing times for the job, $[a', b')$.
 - 3) That the job has a *BCET* such that it definitely is preempted by another job. In this case there is a single outgoing transition labeled with the interval when the preemption may occur, $[t, t]$, where t is the preemption time.
 - 4) That the job has a *BCET* and *WCET* such that it may either be preempted or completes before any preempting job is released. In this case there can be two or three possible outgoing edges depending on if there are any lower priority jobs ready. One branch representing the preemption, labeled with the preemption time $[t, t]$, and depending on if there are any lower priority jobs ready for execution we have two more transition situations:
 - a) *Lower priority jobs ready*. If $b > a$ then there is one branch labeled $[a', t)$ representing the immediate succession of a lower priority job, and one labeled $[t, t)$ representing the completion immediately before the release of the preempting job.
 - b) *No jobs ready*. Then there is one branch labeled $[a', t)$ representing the possible completion prior to the release of the higher priority job.

Example 1

Figure 5 gives an example of how an EOG could look like, using the above notation and the attributes in table 1.

Job	Release Time	BCET	WCET
A	0	1	3
B	2	1	3

Table 1




Figure 5 The resulting execution order graph.

3.2.2 The EOG algorithm

In defining the execution order analysis algorithm we use the following auxiliary functions and data structures:

1. rdy – the set of jobs ready to execute.
2. $Next_release(I)$ – returns the earliest release time of a job $j \in J$ within the interval I . That is, using $I.l$ and $I.r$ to denote the extremes of I . If no such job exists then ∞ is returned
3. $P(t)$ – Returns the highest priority of the jobs that are released at time t . Returns -1 if $t = \infty$.
4. $Make_ready(t, rdy)$ – adds all jobs that are released at time t to rdy . Returns \emptyset if $t = \infty$, else the set.
5. $X(rdy)$ extracts the job with highest priority in rdy .
6. $Arc(n, I, n')$ creates an edge from node n to node n' and labels it with the time interval I .
7. $Make_node(j, XI)$ creates a node and labels it with the execution interval XI and the id of job j .

The execution order graph for a set of jobs J is generated by a call $Eog(ROOT, \{\}, [0, 0], [0, J^{MAX}])$, i.e., with a root node, an empty ready set, and the release interval RI , plus the considered interval SI .

// n- previous node, rdy- set of ready jobs, RI – release interval, SI – the considered interval.

```

Eog(n, rdy, RI, SI)
{
    t = Next_release(SI) //When is the next job(s) released ?
    if (rdy =  $\emptyset$ ) // Are there no more jobs to execute?
        rdy = Make_ready(t, rdy) //Make more jobs ready to execute
    if (rdy  $\neq \emptyset$ )
        Eog(n, rdy, RI, (t, SI.r]) //More jobs are ready for execution
    else Arc(n, RI, _) //No more jobs to execute – simulation done
// There is set of ready jobs for execution
    T = X(rdy) // extract the highest priority job in rdy.
    [a, b] = [max(rT, RI.l), max(rT, RI.l) + WCETT] //Calculate the execution interval for T. (*A)
    a' = a + BCETT //Earliest completion time. (*B)
    b' = b //Latest completion time. (*C)
    n' = Make_node(T, [a, b]) // Create a node for T and label it with the execution interval [a, b ].
    Arc(n, RI, n') // Create an arc from the previous node to the node representing T.

    if (pT < P(t)  $\wedge$  t < b) // Does the next scheduled job preempt T?
        if (t > a') // Can T complete prior to the release of the next job at t?
            Eog(n', rdy, [a', t], [t, SI.r]) // T completes.
            if (rdy  $\neq \emptyset$ ) //If lower priority jobs after T make branch
                Eog(n', Make_ready(t, rdy), [t, t], (t, SI.r]) // for completion immediately before t
            else if (t = a') // Does T complete immediately before t?
                Eog(n', Make_ready(t, rdy), [t, t], (t, SI.r]) // T completes

            rdy = Make_ready(t, rdy) //Add all jobs that are released at time t.
            BCETT = max(BCETT - (t - (max(rT, RI.l)), 0) //Best case execution prior to preemption? (*D)
            WCETT = max(WCETT - (t - (max(rT, RI.l)), 0) // Worst case... (*E)
            Eog(n', rdy + {T}, [t, t], (t, SI.r])

        else //Next high priority job starts later than T's latest completion time

            if (t  $\neq \infty$ )
                Eog(n', rdy, [a', b'], [t, SI.r]) //Next higher priority job
            else // t =  $\infty$  no more jobs to execute
                Eog(n', rdy, [a', b'], [∞, ∞])
} //End

```

Example 2

Based on the data in Table 2 we here give an example of the resulting execution order graph generated by the EOG algorithm. Table 3 gives a trace of the recursive calls to the EOG algorithm until it terminates. Figure 6 depicts the resulting graph. The “: number” after each transition interval refers to the number of the recursive EOG algorithm call in Table 3.

Schedule <i>J</i>				
Job	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>BCET</i>	<i>WCET</i>
A	0	2	1	3
B	0	1	1	3
C	2	3	1	3

Table 2 The jobs of schedule *J*.




Figure 6 The resulting execution order graph.

Recursive call sequence	
1. Eog(<i>ROOT</i> , {}, [0,0], [0, J^{MAX}])	9. Eog(node(A), {C,B}, [2,2], (2, J^{MAX}))
2. Eog(<i>ROOT</i> , {B,A}, [0,0], (0, J^{MAX}))	10. Eog(node(C), {B}, [3,5], [∞ , ∞])
3. Eog(node(A), {B}, [1,2], [2, J^{MAX}])	11. Eog(node(B), {}, [4,8], [∞ , ∞])
4. Eog(node(B), {C}, [2,2], (2, J^{MAX}))	12. Eog(node(A), {A,C,B}, [2,2], (2, J^{MAX}))
5. Eog(node(C), {}, [3,5], [∞ , ∞])	13. Eog(node(C), {A,B}, [3,5], [∞ , ∞])
6. Eog(node(B), {B,C}, [2,2], (2, J^{MAX}))	14. Eog(node(A), {B}, [3,6], [∞ , ∞])
7. Eog(node(C), {B}, [3,5], [∞ , ∞])	15. Eog(node(B), {}, [4,9], [∞ , ∞])
8. Eog(node(B), {}, [3,8], [∞ , ∞])	

Table 3 A trace of the recursive calls to the EOG algorithm.

Completion times

An interesting property of the EOG is that we can easily find the worst and best-case completion-times for any job. We only have to search the EOG for the smallest and largest finishing times for all terminated jobs. The response time jitter (the difference between the maximum and minimum response times for a job) can also be quantified both globally for the entire graph and locally for each path, as well as for each job during an LCM cycle. This can be utilized for schedulability analysis of strictly periodic fixed priority scheduled systems.

Complexity

The complexity of the algorithm (the number of recursion calls and the number of different execution orderings) is a function of the scheduled set of jobs, *J*, their preemption pattern, and their jitter. From an $O(n)$ number of operations for a system with no jitter (just one scenario) to exponential complexity in cases with large jitter. This is not really inherent to the algorithm but rather a reflection of the system it simulates.

3.2.3 Adding interrupts

We will now incorporate the temporal side effects of interrupts, by regarding them as sporadic jobs with a known minimum and maximum inter-arrival time. If we were interested in addressing the functional side effects of the interrupts, we would have to model each interrupt as a job. This would however make EOG practically intractable, since we do not know the release times (or phases) of the interrupts, and must therefore consider all possible release times within their periodicity. We will here make use of standard response time analysis techniques [1][12] for calculating the execution- and completion intervals. This is rather pessimistic when the duration between releases of tasks are non-harmonious with the inter-arrival times of the interrupts. We use this pessimistic method of calculating the interrupt interference to simplify the presentation. Thane [29], presents how to exactly calculate the interrupt interference on the execution order graph.

Execution interval

The execution interval $[a, b]$ (location *A in the algorithm) changes to:

$a = \text{MAX}(r_A, a)$, i.e., keeps the same value as in (3-2).

$b = \text{MAX}(r_A, b) + w$, where w is the sum of $WCET_A$ and the maximum delay due to the preemption by sporadic interrupts, given by.

$$w = WCET_A + \sum_{k \in \text{interrupts}} \left\lfloor \frac{w}{T_k^{\min}} \right\rfloor \cdot WCET_k \quad (3-3)$$

Just as Response Time Analysis (RTA) calculations [12] calculates the response times for jobs that are subjected to interference by preemption of higher priority jobs, we here calculate the interrupt interference on the preemption intervals.

Release time interval

When adding interrupts, the upper bound b' of the release time interval $[a', b']$ is still equal to b , whereas a' (location *B in the algorithm) changes to:

$$a' = a + w_a \quad (3-4)$$

Where w_a is defined as:

$$w = BCET_A + \sum_{k \in \text{interrupts}} \left\lfloor \frac{w}{T_k^{\max}} \right\rfloor \cdot BCET_k \quad (3-5)$$

This equation captures that the minimum interference by the interrupts occur when they have their maximum inter-arrival time and execute with their minimum execution time, and when they have their lowest possible number of hits within the interval. The latter is guaranteed by the use of the floor function ($\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$).

Execution times

In EOG we decrease a preempted job j 's maximum and minimum execution time with how much it has been able to execute in the worst and best cases before the release time t of the preempting job. Affected parts in the algorithm are (*D) and (*E).

Since we are now dealing with interrupts, the effective time that j can execute prior to the preemption point will decrease due to interrupt interference. The remaining minimum execution time $BCET_j'$ is given by:

$$BCET_j' = BCET_j - (t - \text{MAX}(a, r_j) - \sum_{\forall \text{interrupts } k} \left\lfloor \frac{t - \text{MAX}(a, r_j)}{T_k^{\max}} \right\rfloor \cdot BCET_k) \quad (3-6)$$

Note that the sum of interrupt interference is not iterative, but absolute, because we are only interested in calculating how much the job j can execute in the interval, minus the interrupt interference.

Likewise we can calculate the remaining maximum execution time, $WCET_j'$:

$$WCET_j' = WCET_j - (t - \text{MAX}(b, r_j)) - \sum_{k \in \text{interrupts}} \left\lceil \frac{t - \text{MAX}(b, r_j)}{T_k^{\min}} \right\rceil \cdot WCET_k \quad (3-7)$$

Example 3

Here we assume that the system is subjected to preemption by interrupts. The attributes are described in tables 4 and 5. The side effects of the interrupts are solely of temporal character. Figure 7 depicts the EOG without interrupt interference, and Figure 8 with interrupts accounted for. The “: number” after each transition interval in figure 8 denotes the corresponding recursive EOG call number described in Table 6.

Schedule, J				
Job	r	p	$BCET$	$WCET$
A	0	1	1	3
B	3	2	1	3

Table 4 The job attributes.

Interrupts				
Interrupt	T^{\max}	T^{\min}	$BCET$	$WCET$
I	∞	3	1	1

Table 5 The Interrupt attributes.




Figure 7 Not considering interrupts.




Figure 8 With interrupts

Recursive call sequence	
1. Eog($ROOT$, { }, [0,0], [0, J^{MAX}])	5. Eog(node(B), { }, [4,8], [∞ , ∞])
2. Eog($ROOT$, {A}, [0,0], (0, J^{MAX}))	6. Eog(node(A), {A, B}, [3,3], (3, J^{MAX}))
3. Eog(node(A), { }, [1,3], [3, J^{MAX}])	7. Eog(node(B), {A}, [4,8], [∞ , ∞])
4. Eog(node(A), {B}, [1,3], (3, J^{MAX}))	8. Eog(node(A), { }, [4,10], [∞ , ∞])

Table 6 A trace of the recursive calls to the EOG algorithm.

3.3 The global EOG

In a distributed system with multiple nodes (and schedules) we generate one EOG for each node. From these, a global EOG describing all globally possible execution orderings can be constructed. In the case of perfectly synchronized clocks this essentially amounts to performing a parallel composition of the individual EOGs, using standard techniques for composing timed transition systems [26]. In other cases, we first need to introduce the timing uncertainties caused by the non-perfectly synchronized clocks in the individual EOGs.

Since the progress of local time on each node keeps on speeding up, and slowing down in order to accommodate for the local physical clocks mutual clock drift, the inter-arrival time of the clock ticks vary. The effect is such that for an external observer the scheduled release times and completion times according to a nominal (non-varying) tick inter-arrival time will change. Locally in the node the effect will manifest itself as a differential in the actual $BCET$ and $WCET$ from the estimated ditto. As the inter-arrival time between ticks increases, the $BCET$ will decrease because of the possibility to execute more machine code instructions due to the longer duration. Likewise the $WCET$ increases due to the decrease in the inter-arrival time of ticks.

When scheduling the distributed real-time system it is essential to accommodate for the clock synchronization effects by time-wise separating the completion time of preceding, or mutually, exclusive tasks from the release time of a succeeding task with a factor d , corresponding to the precision of the global time base.

When deriving the execution orderings we need thus change the estimations of the $BCET$ and $WCET$:

$$BCET_{new} = \text{MAX}(BCET - d/2 * K(BCET), 0)$$

$$WCET_{new} = WCET + d/2 * K(WCET)$$

Where the function $K()$ is derived from the clock synchronization control loop implementation, and where the argument states how much of the clock synchronization interval is under consideration. The $K()$ function substantially increases the precision, since it would be overly pessimistic to add, or subtract, $d/2$ when it is possible that the $BCET$ and $WCET$ will only be fractions of the synchronization interval.

Calculating GEX_o – the Global EOG.

After having generated EOGs for each node that accommodate for the effects of global clock synchronization we can construct the global EOG. The set of global execution order scenarios, GEX_o , is defined by the product of the individual sets of execution orderings on each node. That is, a set of tuples, $GEX_o \subseteq EX_o(node_1) \times \dots \times EX_o(node_n)$, consisting of all possible permutations of the local execution orderings.

Example 4

Assume that we have two nodes, A and B , with corresponding schedules (job sets) J_A and J_B , and derived execution orderings of the schedules $EX_o(J_A) = \{a1, a2\}$ and $EX_o(J_B) = \{b1, b2\}$. The resulting set GEX_o , is then equal to $\{(a1,b1), (a1,b2), (a2,b1), (a2,b2)\}$.

3.4 Jitter

In the presented algorithms we take the effects of several different types of jitter into account:

- *Schedule jitter*, i.e., different instances of the same task in an LCM may have different relative release times for each period. This is specifically the case in statically scheduled systems.
- *Release jitter*, i.e., the inherited and accumulated jitter due to varying execution times for preceding higher priority jobs.
- *Completion jitter*, i.e., the response-time jitter due to schedule jitter, release jitter and the variation of the execution time for the job (*Execution time jitter*).
- *Interrupt induced jitter*, i.e., execution time variations induced by the preemption of interrupts.
- *Clock synchronization jitter*, i.e., the local clocks keep on speeding up, and down, depending on the global time base, leading to varying inter-arrival times between clock ticks.

An interesting conclusion that can be drawn from these types of jitter, and their effect on the execution order graph, is that:

1. Minimizing the execution time jitter minimizes the preemption and release intervals, with the positive effect of reducing the preemption “hit” window, and thus reducing the number of execution order scenarios.
2. By reducing the release jitter we reduce the execution order graph. This can be achieved by doing (1) or having fixed release-times.
3. Even though the $BCET$ and $WCET$ for all tasks are equal we will still have release and completion jitter if interrupts interfere.

Suggested actions for reducing jitter:

- Padding – the execution time for each execution path through a task is equalized by “no operation” instructions. Other possibilities are to make use of delays in the code, or having a kernel that does not release a lower priority task until a preceding higher priority task has used up its scheduled $WCET$.
- Interrupt induced jitter can be minimized by eliminating interrupts by hardware design or minimizing the difference between minimum and maximum inter-arrival time for the interrupts.

- Clock synchronization jitter, must be accommodated for by adjusting the release times of the tasks in the schedule design.

The conclusion is that less jitter gives better testability. In general, real-time systems with tighter execution time estimates and WCET \approx BCET, as well as interrupt inter-arrival times of $T_k^{max} \approx T_k^{min}$, and better precision of the clock synchronization yields better testability than systems with larger jitter.

4 TOWARDS SYSTEMATIC TESTING

We will now outline a method for deterministic integration testing of distributed real-time systems, based on the identification of execution orderings. Testing of sequential programs (like single tasks) can be performed with regular unit testing [3][27], using a black-box or white-box approach [3]. We assume that some method for testing of sequential programs is used. Exactly which one is not an issue here, since our focus is on serializing the distributed real-time system into a set of sequential programs.

Assumptions

In order to perform integration testing of distributed real-times systems the following is required:

- A feasible global schedule, including probes.
- Kernel-probes on each node that monitors task-switches. This information is sent to dedicated tasks (probe-tasks) that identify execution orderings from the task-switch information and correlate it to run test cases.
- A set of in-line probes that instrument tasks, as well as probe-nodes, which output and collect significant information to determine if a test run was successful or not.
- Control over, or at least a possibility to observe, the input data to the system with regard to contents, order, and timing.

Strategy

The test strategy consists of the following steps:

1. Identify the set of execution orderings by performing execution order analysis for the schedule on each node.
2. Test the system using any testing technique of choice, and monitor for each test case which execution ordering is run during $[0, J^{MAX}]$.
3. Map test case and output onto the correct execution ordering, based on observation.
4. Repeat 2-3 until sought coverage is achieved.

Coverage

Depending on what we want to test: the entire system, multiple transactions (running over several nodes, single transactions (running over several nodes), multiple transactions (single node), single transactions (single node) or parts of transactions, we need different levels of coverage.

- *Distributed coverage.* When we test transactions that run over more than one node we need to consider the global EOG which can be represented by a set of tuples consisting of all possible permutations of the execution orderings on each node, as introduced in Section 3.3. If we test the system and observe, for each node, which execution scenario was run, we could classify every test run into a specific tuple. The coverage criteria could then be defined by specific subsets of all the possible tuples. The correspondence between observations on each node will be limited by the granularity of the global time base. That is, the global state has a granularity of d , defined by the precision of the clock synchronization [30].
- *Node coverage.* When we test transactions that run on a single node, we simply follow the test strategy. However the coverage needs to be defined, and related to the transactions tested. A transaction may run several times during a $[0, J^{MAX}]$ period, and it might therefore be necessary to give special attention to which instance gets which input.

Other issues

For a system that keeps state between periods, we must monitor or control, the jobs' internal variables, and not only the legal inputs defined by the jobs' interfaces, in order to guarantee determinism and coverage.

Reproducibility

To facilitate reproducible testing we must identify which execution orderings, or parts of execution orderings that can be enforced without introducing any probe effect. From the perspective of a single transaction this can be achieved by controlling the execution times of preceding and preempting jobs that belong to other transactions, these have no functional relation to the transaction under test. This of course only works in its entirety if we adhere to fault hypothesis (1), that the jobs have no unwanted functional side effects via unspecified interfaces, otherwise we would miss such errors. Control over the execution times in other transactions can easily be achieved by incorporating delays in the jobs, or running dummies, as long as they stay within each job's execution time range [BCET, WCET].

Testability

The number of execution orderings is an objective measure of system testability, and can thus be used as a metric for comparing different designs, and schedules. Given that testability is an important system characteristic, we can use this measure, as a new optimization criterion in the heuristic search used to generate static schedules[35], thereby generating schedules that are more testable.

5 CONCLUSION

In this paper we have given a description of a technique for achieving deterministic testing of distributed real-time systems. We have specifically address task sets with recurring release patterns, executing in a distributed system, where the scheduling on each node is handled by a priority driven preemptive scheduler, and were a global synchronized time base exists. The results can be summed up to:

- We have provided a method for finding all the possible execution scenarios for a DRTS with preemption, interrupts, and jitter.
- We have proposed a testing strategy for deterministic and reproducible testing of DRTS.
- A benefit of the testing strategy is that it allows any testing technique for sequential software to be used to test DRTS.
- Jitter increases the number of execution order scenarios, and jitter reduction techniques should therefore be used when possible to increase testability.
- The number of execution orderings is an objective measure of the testability of DRTS, which can be used as a new scheduling optimization criteria for generating schedules that are easier to test.
- If we relax the requirement on having feasible schedules to begin with, we can use the execution order analysis to calculate exact best-case and worst-case response-times for jobs, as well as calculating response-time jitter of the jobs.

Future pursuits include to experimentally validate the usefulness of the presented results, extend and refine the testing strategy and coverage criteria, devise testability increasing design rules for DRTS, and extend the technique to also handle critical regions with the ambition to obtain tighter response-times for fixed priority scheduled systems. Another pursuit would be to investigate the benefits of using the testability measure as a new heuristics in the generation of highly testable static schedules.

6 REFERENCES

- [1] Audsley N. C., Burns A., Davis R. I., Tindell K. W. *Fixed Priority Pre-emptive Scheduling: A Historical Perspective*. Real-Time Systems, The Int. Journal of Time-Critical Computing Systems, Vol. 8(2/3), March/May, 1995.
- [2] Audsley N. C., Burns A., Richardson M.F., and Wellings A.J. *Hard Real-Time Scheduling: The Deadline Monotonic Approach*. IFAC/IFIP Workshop, Atlanta, Georgia, pp. 127-132, May, 1991
- [3] Beizer B. *Software testing techniques*. Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1990.
- [4] Calvez J.P., and Pasquier O. *Performance Monitoring and Assessment of Embedded HW/SW Systems*. In Design Automation for Embedded Systems, vol. 3, pp. 5-22, 1998.
- [5] DeMillo R. A., McCracken W.M., Martin R.J., and Passafiume J.F.. *Software Testing and Evaluation*. Benjamin/Cummings Publications. Co., 1987.
- [6] Dodd P. S., Ravishankar C. V. *Monitoring and debugging distributed real-time programs*. Software-practice and experience. Vol. 22(10), pp. 863-877, October 1992.

-
- [7] Eriksson C., Mäki-Turja J., Post K., Gustafsson M., Gustafsson J., Sandström K., and Brorsson E.. *An Overview of RTT: A design Framework for Real-Time Systems*. Journal of Parallel and Distributed Computing, August, 1996.
- [8] Eriksson C., Thane H. and Gustafsson M. *A Communication Protocol for Hard and Soft Real-Time Systems*. In the proceedings of the 8th Euromicro Real-Time Workshop, L'Aquila Italy, June, 1996.
- [9] Gait J. *A Probe Effect in Concurrent Programs*. Software – Practice and Experience, 16(3):225-233, Mars, 1986.
- [10] Haban D. and Wybraniec D. *A Hybrid monitor for behavior and performance analysis of distributed systems*. IEEE Trans. Software Engineering, 16(2), pp. 197-211, Feb., 1990.
- [11] Hwang G.H, Tai K.C and Huang T.L. *Reachability Testing: An Approach to Testing Concurrent Software*. Int. Journal of Software Engineering and Knowledge Engineering, vol. 5(4), pp. 493-510, 1995.
- [12] Joseph M. and Pandya P. *Finding response times in a real-time system*. The Computer Journal – British Computer Society, 29(5), pp.390-395, October, 1986.
- [13] Kopetz H. and Grünsteidl H. *TTP - A Protocol for Fault-Tolerant Real-Time Systems*. IEEE Computer, January, 1994.
- [14] Kopetz H. *Clock Synchronisation in Distributed Real-Time Systems*. IEEE Trans. Computers, Aug. 1987.
- [15] Kopetz H., Damm A., Koza Ch., Mulazzani M., Schwabl W., Senft Ch., and Zainlinger R.. *Distributed Fault-Tolerant Real-Time Systems: The MARS Approach*. IEEE Micro, no. 9, pp. 25- 40, 1989.
- [16] Laprie J.C. *Dependability: Basic Concepts and Associated Terminology*. Dependable Computing and Fault-Tolerant Systems, vol. 5, Springer Verlag, 1992.
- [17] LeDoux C.H., and Parker D.S.. *Saving Traces for Ada Debugging*. In the proceedings of Ada int. conf. ACM, Cambridge University press, pp. 97-108, 1985.
- [18] Lui C. L. and Layland J. W.. *Scheduling Algorithms for multiprogramming in a hard real-time environment*. Journal of the ACM 20(1), 1973.
- [19] McDowell C.E. and Hembold D.P. *Debugging concurrent programs*. ACM Computing Surveys, 21(4), pp. 593-622, December 1989.
- [20] Plattner B. *Real-time execution monitoring*. IEEE Trans. Software Engineering, 10(6), pp. 756-764, Nov., 1984.
- [21] Rubus OS. *Real-Time Operating System, Tutorial*. Arcticus Systems AB Datavägen 9A, 175 62 Järfälla, Sweden 1995.
- [22] Rushby J. *Formal methods and their Role in the Certification of Critical Systems*. 12th Annual CSR Workshop, Bruges 12-15 September 1995. Proceedings, pp. 2-42. Springer. ISBN 3-540-76034-2.
- [23] Sandström K., Eriksson C., and Föhler G. *Handling Interrupts with Static Scheduling in an Automotive Vehicle Control System*. In proceedings of the 5th Int. Conference on Real-Time Computing Systems and Applications (RTCSA' 98). October 1998, Japan.
- [24] Schütz W. *Fundamental Issues in Testing Distributed Real-Time Systems*. Real-Time Systems, vol. 7(2), pp. 129-157, 1994.
- [25] Shin K. G. *HARTS: A distributed real-time architecture*. IEEE Computer, 24(5), pp. 25-35, May, 1991.
- [26] Sifakis J. and Yovine S. *Compositional specification of timed systems*. In Proc. 13th Annual Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science, STACS'96, Grenoble, France, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 1046, pp. 347-359. Springer Verlag, February 1996.
- [27] Sommerville I. *Software Engineering*. Addison-Wesley, 1992. ISBN 0-201-56529-3.
- [28] Tai K.C, Carver R.H., and Obaid E.E. *Debugging concurrent Ada programs by deterministic execution*. IEEE transactions on software engineering. Vol. 17(1), pp. 45-63, January 1991.
- [29] Thane H. *Towards exact minimum and maximum response time analysis for preemptive strict periodic fixed priority scheduled distributed real-time systems using execution ordering graphs*. Technical report, Mälardalen Real-Time Research Centre, Dept. Computer Engineering, Mälardalen University, 1999.
- [30] Thane H. *Towards predictable instrumentation of distributed real-time systems*. Technical report, Mälardalen Real-Time Research Centre, Dept. Computer Engineering, Mälardalen University, 1999.
- [31] Tindell K. W., Burns A., and Wellings A.J. *Analysis of Hard Real-Time Communications*. Journal of Real-Time Systems, vol. 9(2), pp.147-171, September 1995.
- [32] Tokuda H., Kotera M., and Mercer C.W. *A Real-Time Monitor for a Distributed Real-Time Operating System*. In proc. of ACM Workshop on Parallel and Distributed Debugging, Madison, WI, pp. 68-77, May, 1988.
- [33] Tsai J.P., Bi Y.-D., Yang S., and Smith R.. *Distributed Real-Time System: Monitoring, Visualization, Debugging, and Analysis*. Wiley-Interscience, 1996. ISBN 0-471-16007-5.
- [34] Tsai J.P., Fang K.-Y., Chen H.-Y., and Bi Y.-D. *A Noninterference Monitoring and Replay Mechanism for Real-Time Software Testing and Debugging*. IEEE Trans. on Software Eng. vol. 16, pp. 897 - 916, 1990.
- [35] Xu J. and Parnas D. *Scheduling processes with release times, deadlines, precedence, and exclusion, relations*. IEEE Trans. on Software Eng. vol. 16, pp. 360-369, 1990.
- [36] Yang R-D and Chung C-G. *Path analysis testing of concurrent programs*. Information and software technology. vol. 34(1), January 1992.
-

Appendix (5)

TOWARDS SYSTEMATIC TESTING OF DISTRIBUTED REAL-TIME SYSTEMS

Henrik Thane, Hans Hansson

Mälardalen Real-Time Research Centre

www.mrtc.mdh.se

Department of Computer Engineering

Mälardalen University

P.O. Box 883, S-721 23, Västerås, Sweden

Tel. +46 21 103157, Fax. +46 21 103110

henrik.thane@mdh.se

ABSTRACT

Reproducible and deterministic testing of sequential programs can in most cases be achieved by controlling the sequence of inputs to the program. The behavior of a distributed real-time system, on the other hand, not only depends on the inputs but also on the *order* and *timing* of the concurrent tasks that execute and communicate with each other and the environment. Hence, sequential test techniques are not directly applicable, since they disregard the significance of order and timing.

In this paper we present a method for identifying all the possible orderings of task starts, preemptions and completions for tasks executing in distributed real-time systems. This allows test methods for sequential programs to be used, since we can regard each identified ordering as a sequential program.

The number of identified execution orderings can be used as an objective measure of the testability of the distributed real-time system. Such a measure is an important quality attribute, which can be utilized as a new scheduling optimization criterion for generating static schedules of high testability.

Keywords: Testing, distributed real-time systems, determinism, reproducibility, testability.

1 INTRODUCTION

A real-time system is per definition correct if it performs the correct *function* at the correct *time*. Using real-time scheduling theory we can provide guarantees that each task in the system will meet its timing requirements [Liu1973,Audsley1995,Xu1990], providing that the basic assumptions hold during run-time, e.g., task execution times and periodicity. However, scheduling theory does not give any guarantees for the system's functional behavior, i.e., that the computed values are correct. To assess the functional correctness other types of analysis are required. One possibility is to use formal methods to verify certain functional and temporal properties of a model of the system. The formally verified properties are then guaranteed to hold in the real system, as long as the model assumptions are not violated. When it comes to validating the underlying assumptions (e.g., execution times, synchronization order and the correspondence between specification and implemented code) we must use dynamic verification techniques which explore and investigate the run-time behavior of the real system, i.e., testing [Rushby1995a]. Testing can also be used as a complement to, or to replace formal methods, in the functional verification.

When a sequential program is tested, it is necessary to control the sequence of inputs, and the start conditions, in order to guarantee reproducibility [McDowell1989]. That is, given the same initial state and input, the sequential program will deterministically produce the same output on repeated executions, even in the presence of systematic faults [Rushby1995b]. Reproducibility is essential when performing regression testing or cyclic debugging [Schütz1994], where the same test cases are run

repeatedly with the intent to validate that either an error correction had the desired effect, or to simply make it possible to find the error when a failure has been observed.

The behavior of a concurrent program, on the other hand, is not only dependent on the sequence of inputs but also on the *order* in which the concurrent programs execute and communicate. In real-time systems the behavior of the system is also dependent on *when* the inputs arrive and *when* the programs execute and communicate with each other, and with the environment. Trying to apply test techniques of sequential programs to distributed real-time systems is therefore bound to lead to non-determinism (and non-reproducibility), because control is only forced on the inputs, disregarding the significance of order and timing. For instance, in a real-time system with shared resources different inputs may lead to different execution paths. These paths will in turn lead to different execution times for the tasks, which depending on the design may lead to different *orders* of access to the shared resources. As a consequence there may be different system behaviors if the outcome of the operations on the shared resources depend on the ordering of the accesses. Hence, in order to facilitate systematic testing of distributed real-time systems we must, in addition to observing inputs and outputs, observe (or control) the timing and order of the sequence of inputs, as well as the timing and order of program executions.

In a system with race conditions, which naturally occur in many real-time systems, the act of intrusively observing the system will always change the odds for the outcome of the race, because the probes will add to the execution times of the racing tasks. The outcome of a race could therefore be dependent on the presence, or absence, of a probe. If we later remove the probes after observation, we do not only decrease the observability, but also change the execution times again – which affects the races, and this time we do not have the probes in place to observe how the system behaves. This act of intrusively observing a system is called the *probe-effect* [McDowell1989, Gait1985] or the *Heisenberg uncertainty in software* [LeDoux1985].

There are thus three main problems that need to be solved to make systematic testing of distributed real-time systems possible: (1) reproducing the inputs with respect to contents, order, and timing, (2) reproducing the order and timing of the execution of the parallel programs as well as their communication with each other and the environment, and (3) eliminating the probe-effect.

We are briefly going to discuss (1) and (3), but the focus of this paper is on (2) by presenting a method for deriving all the possible execution orderings for preemptive periodic real-time systems with fixed priorities, that are subjected to interrupts and jitter. Each identified execution order constitutes a scenario, which can be regarded as a single sequence of subroutine calls, where each continuous execution of a task corresponds to a subroutine, and thus a scenario could be viewed as a sequential program. We can thus test each scenario with traditional sequential testing methods.

We consider task sets with recurring release patterns, executing in a distributed system, where the scheduling on each node is handled by a priority driven preemptive scheduler. This includes statically scheduled systems that are subject to preemption [Xu1990], as well as strictly periodic fixed priority systems [Liu1973, Audsley1991]

If we run the system for a duration equal to the entire schedule (i.e., a single instance of the release pattern; typically equal to the Least Common Multiple (LCM) of the period times of the involved tasks) for a specific test case, and observe the actual execution scenario, we can identify the input and the produced outputs, including their timing, to be a test in the observed execution scenario, i.e., for the sequential program it represents. Hence, by classifying tests to belong to different scenarios we can, given that each scenario yields a deterministic execution (which is our hypothesis) achieve *deterministic testing*. The number of tested scenarios can be used as coverage criteria for testing of the system's behavior during an LCM period. This is all under the assumption that we can consistently observe the global state in the distributed real-time system. In order to guarantee this consistency we assume that the system is globally scheduled, i.e., the release and execution times can be related to “the global time”, and has a global synchronized time base with a known precision.

If we also have the possibility to control the parameters: input, output, time and synchronization, not only observe them, we can enforce specific execution scenarios thereby achieving *reproducible testing*. Reproducibility increases the effectiveness of testing by eliminating redundant test cases, and by making it easier to achieve the desired level of coverage.

Paper outline: *Section 2* provides a discussion on the main problems in testing of distributed real-time systems, and how to deal with them. *Section 3* presents our system model. *Section 4* formalizes the concept of execution order and presents the algorithm for identifying all the possible execution

orderings in distributed real-time systems. We also give some examples, and extend the analysis to consider the effects of interrupts. *Section 5* suggests a testing strategy for achieving deterministic and reproducible testing in the context of execution order analysis. Finally, in *Section 6*, we conclude and give some hints on future work.

2 TESTING DISTRIBUTED REAL-TIME SYSTEMS

In this section we further discuss the handling of inputs, probe effects and reproducibility in testing of distributed real time systems.

2.1 Inputs

The problem with reproducing the inputs with respect to contents, order and timing has been addressed [Glass1980, DeMillo1987, Somerville 1992] specifically through the use of environment simulators. This is a problem inherent in all software testing. For example, the levels of reliability that can be assessed using experimental statistical methods for sequential programs is limited to about 10^{-4} failures/hour because of the difficulty to represent very rare events accurately [Rushby1995b]. The outlook of statistical assessment of real-time software does therefore look quite grim due to even more complex input data profiles. This is however an issue which we will not consider further in this paper.

2.2 Probe-effects

When it comes to dealing with the probe-effect in distributed real-time systems there are basically two approaches:

- Use special hardware (dual-port memories, etc.) that allows for transparent monitoring of the system [Plattner1984, Haban1990, Tsai1990, Tsai1996]. This has the severe drawback of being expensive and only enabling observations of certain aspects of the systems behavior, such as those related to the external interfaces of the micro-controller, shared resources (such as dual-port memories) and broadcast communication busses. The ever-increasing integration of functionality in general-purpose micro-controllers makes it even harder to observe the internal behavior of the system. The viability of this approach is therefore limited. However, the current trend of making application specific hardware using FPGAs and VHDL [Calvez1998] gives an opportunity to conveniently integrate non-intrusive monitoring mechanisms in the hardware.
- Use software for instrumentation [Dodd1992, Tokuda1988]. By including instrumentation code in the software (application and operating system), we can observe more than possible with the hardware approach. The main problem here is to eliminate the probe-effect. For a distributed real-time system we must allocate resources for the probes, including execution time, memory, communication bus bandwidth and account for the probes when scheduling [Thane1999]. Probes can be placed at several levels, including [Thane1999]:
 - *Kernel-probes* – that collect information from within the kernel, task-switches, execution times, etc.
 - *Inline-probes* – that are inserted into application tasks
 - *Probe-tasks* – that are tasks dedicated to collecting data from kernel-probes, inline-probes and other probe-tasks, and
 - *Probe-nodes* – which are dedicated nodes that collect data from probe-tasks, and which can monitor communication busses.

By allocating resources for observation and then leaving them in place when the system is delivered, we eliminate the probe effect – any other approach will lead to probe-effects, or very limited observability. Some execution strategies, e.g., statically scheduled real-time systems, allow us to remove probes without temporal side-effects if they are situated within *temporal firewalls* [Schütz1994]. That is, as long as we do not change the start-times of tasks, and their times of output (communication or access to shared resources), we can remove the probes.

In this paper we assume that the probe-effect has been eliminated by allocating sufficient resources for probes (kernel-, in-line-, task- and node-level ones), and by scheduling the system with the probes as part of the design.

2.3 Reproducibility

For reproducing the execution order and timing of the tasks in a distributed real-time system the two main approaches are:

- *Deterministic replay*. Here the tasks' run-time behavior is recorded in a log over a period of time. The execution of the system can then be deterministically replayed off-line. The system cannot be suspended during run-time, but the off-line replay can be suspended and examined. If any modifications have been made to the tasks or to the inputs the logging must be repeated.

A deterministic replay method for concurrent Ada programs is presented in [Tai1991]. They log the synchronization sequence (rendezvous) for a concurrent program P , with input X . The source code is then modified to facilitate replay; forcing certain rendezvous so that P follows the same synchronization sequence for X . This approach can reproduce the synchronization orders for concurrent Ada programs, but not the duration between significant events, because the enforcement (changing the code) of specific synchronization sequences introduces gross temporal probe-effects. The replay scheme is thus not suited for real-time systems, neither does it consider the effects of interrupts, and it is unclear how the method can be extended to handle interrupts.

[Tsai1990] presents a hardware monitoring and replay mechanism. Their approach can replay significant events with respect to order, access to time, and asynchronous interrupts. Monitoring is apt for real-time systems because it minimizes the probe-effect. Although replay can be performed accurately it may be slower than real execution. The main disadvantages are that the approach needs special hardware and is intended for single-processor systems only. Adapting the approach to distributed real-time systems requires extensive hardware support and rework.

Another software-based approach is *HMON* [Dodd1992], which is designed for the HARTS distributed (real-time) system multiprocessor architecture [Shin1991]. A general-purpose processor is dedicated to monitoring in each multiprocessor. The probe-effect due to monitoring is eliminated by modifying system service calls to incorporate monitoring mechanisms, and by letting these be present also in the final system. The events monitored are system calls, context switches, interrupts, shared variables references, and application specific events (chosen by the programmer). The recorded events can then order wise be deterministically replayed, in logical-time [Lampert1978], but not in real-time. The system can thus not actually monitor a consistent global state and then reproduce its real-time behavior.

There are a few disadvantages with all the above approaches [Schütz1994]:

- One can only replay what has previously been observed, and no guarantees that every significant system behavior will be observed accurately can be provided. Also, if a program has been modified (e.g., corrected) completely new traces have to be generated.
- Dedicated (special) hardware has to be used in order to eliminate (or minimize) the probe-effect.
- Since replay takes place at machine level the amount of information required is usually large. All inputs and intermediate events (e.g. messages) must be kept.
- *Deterministic testing*. A distributed real-time system can usually be described by a set of *use-cases*, which are sets of cooperating tasks that jointly perform specific functions, e.g., a sample-calculate-actuate loop in a control system. A precedence relation (execution order), interactions (data-flow), and a period time [Eriksson1996a] typically define each use-case. To test a use-case, we need to control the inputs and observe (or control) the execution order.

Because a distributed real-time system may contain several use-cases that run on the same processor, there might be many different execution orderings, due to variations in preemption points, varying execution times, and interrupts.

The method presented in this paper, aims at transforming the non-deterministic distributed real-time systems problem to a set of deterministic sequential program testing problems. This is

achieved by deriving all the possible execution orderings of the distributed system, and regarding each of them as a sequential program.

Related work can be found in [Yang1992], where all possible synchronization sequences (rendezvous) for Ada programs are identified, similar to [Tai1991], but [Yang1992] do not attempt deterministic replay, instead they test the system and consider the actual synchronization sequence as being part of the output. The number of synchronization sequences, and execution paths, exercised are used to define coverage. Similar work can be found in [Hwang1995] where they also attempt deterministic replay, though with the same side effects as [Tai1991]

3 THE SYSTEM MODEL

We assume a distributed system consisting of a set of nodes, which communicate via a broadcast network, that is assumed to be temporally predictable, i.e., upper bounds on communication latencies are known or can be calculated [Kopetz1994, Tindell1995, Eriksson1996b]. Each node is a self sufficient computing element with CPU, memory, network access, a local clock and I/O units for sampling and actuation of the external system. We further assume the existence of a global synchronized time base [Kopetz1987, Eriksson1996b] with a known precision d , meaning that no two nodes in the system have local clocks differing by more than d .

The software that runs on the distributed system consists of a set of concurrent tasks, communicating by message passing. The tasks are geographically distributed over the nodes, typically with more than one task on each node. All synchronization is resolved before run-time. As a consequence no action is needed to enforce synchronization in the actual program code. Mutual exclusion and precedence is guaranteed by the different release-times. The distributed system is globally scheduled, which results in a set of specific schedules for each node. At run-time we need only synchronize the local clocks to fulfill the global schedule [Kopetz1994].

Task model

We assume a set of jobs (i.e. invocations of tasks) J that are released in a time interval $[0, J_{max}]$. Each job $j \in J$ has a release time r_j , worst case execution time ($WCET_j$), best case execution time ($BCET_j$), a deadline D_j and a unique priority p_j . J represents one instance of a recurring pattern of job executions with period J_{max} , i.e., job j will be released at time $r_j, r_j + J_{max}, r_j + 2J_{max}$, etc. We further assume that the schedule is feasible, i.e., that each job j is always completed within its deadline D_j .

We additionally assume a set of interrupts I , where each interrupt $k \in I$ has the following attributes

- Minimum, and maximum inter-arrival time (T_k^{max} and T_k^{min} , respectively), priority p_k (interrupts can preempt each other), as well as worst and best case execution time of the interrupt routines ($WCET_k$ and $BCET_k$, respectively).

We finally assume that the system is preemptive (both by jobs and interrupts) and that jobs may have identical release-times.

Relation to other task models

The above task model is fairly general since it includes both preemptive scheduling of statically generated schedules [Xu1990] and fixed priority scheduling of strictly periodic tasks [Liu1973, Audsley1991].

To see how static periodic scheduling can be mapped to our task model consider a static schedule for a set of periodic tasks T , where each task $T_i \in T$ has the following attributes and relations to other tasks:

- Period (T_i), release time (r_i ; start time relative period start), deadline (D_i ; latest completion time relative r_i), worst case execution time ($WCET_i$), best case execution time ($BCET_i$), and priority (p_i ; each priority is unique).
- Relations between tasks can be specified by precedence relations ($T_i \rightarrow T_j$; the execution of T_i precedes that of T_j), mutual exclusion relations ($T_i \# T_j$; the execution of T_i does not overlap with that of T_j) and communications ($T_i \gamma T_j$; at the end of its execution T_i sends a message to T_j).

The length of the generated schedule will be the least common multiple of the period times of the involved tasks, $LCM(T)$; corresponding to J_{max} in our task model. For tasks with periods less than

$LCM(T)$, multiple releases will be made in the interval $[0, J_{max}]$, e.g., for a task i with $2T_i = LCM(T)$ there will be two corresponding jobs in our task model, released at r_i and $r_i + T_i$.

The static schedule fulfills the temporal requirements by construction. Schedules with different properties and for different task models can be constructed, e.g., allowing preemption [Xu1990], giving each task a fixed start time [Xu1990], assigning the same start time to several tasks [Xu1990], and taking interrupts into account [Sandström1998].

We assume that the tasks may have functional and temporal side effects due to preemption, message passing and shared memory. We assume however, that interrupts have only temporal side effects and no functional side effects.

Furthermore, we assume that data is sent at the termination of the sending task (not during its execution), and that received data is available when tasks start (and is made private in an atomic first operation of the task) [Kopetz1989, Rubus1995, Eriksson1996a].

Fault hypotheses

Note that, although synchronization is resolved by the off-line selection of release times, we cannot dismiss unwanted synchronization side-effects, because the schedule design can be erroneous, or the assumptions about the execution times might not be accurate due to poor execution time estimations, or simply due to design and coding errors.

Inter-task communication is restricted to the beginning and end of task execution, and therefore we can regard the transactions interior to tasks as atomic. With respect to access to shared resources, such as shared memory and I/O interfaces, the atomicity assumption is only valid if synchronization and mutual exclusion can be guaranteed.

Depending on pessimism we can therefore identify two levels of fault hypotheses:

1. Errors can only occur due to erroneous outputs and inputs (messages) to jobs, and/or due to synchronization errors, i.e., jobs can only interfere via specified interactions.
2. In addition to (1) jobs can corrupt each others shared memory and I/O interfaces, i.e., they may interfere via unspecified side-effects.

The only possibility to guarantee (1) in a shared memory system is to use a hardware memory protection scheme, or to by design eliminate shared resources.

The analysis of execution orderings in Section 4 corresponds to fault hypothesis (2), but we also show how the analysis can be abstracted to a less discriminating model corresponding to fault hypothesis (1).

4 EXECUTION ORDER ANALYSIS

In this section we present a method for identifying all the possible orders of execution for job sets conforming to the task model introduced in Section 3. We will also show how the model and analysis can be extended to account for the interference caused by interrupts.

We will first present analysis for the single node case and then in Section 4.7 indicate how this analysis can be extended to the multi-node distributed system case.

4.1 Execution Orderings

In identifying the execution orderings of a job set we will only consider the following major events:

- The start of execution of a job, i.e., when the first instruction of a job is executed. We will use $S(J)$ to denote the set of start points for the jobs in a job set J ; $S(J) \subseteq J \times [0, J^{MAX}]$, that is $S(J)$ is a set of pairs of jobs and possible starting times, e.g., $(j, time) \in S(J)$.
- The end of execution of a job, i.e., when the last instruction of a job is executed. We will use $E(J)$ to denote the set of end points (termination points) for jobs in a job set J ; $E(J) \subseteq J \times [0, J^{MAX}] \times J \cup \{_ \}$, that is $E(J)$ is a set of triples $(j_1, time, j_2)$, where j_2 is the (lower priority) job that resumes its execution at the termination of j_1 , or possibly “ $_$ ” if no such job exists.

- Job preemptions, i.e., the points in time when jobs are preempted by other jobs. We will use $Pp(J)$ to denote the set of job preemptions when executing J ; $Pp(J) \subseteq [0, J^{MAX}] \times J \times J$, where each triple $(time, j_1, j_2) \in Pp(J)$ denotes a point in time when job j_1 is preempting job j_2 .

We will now define an execution to be a sequence of job starts, job terminations and job preemptions, using the additional notation that

- $ev.time$ denotes the time of the event ev ,
- $E \setminus j$ denotes the set of events in the execution E related to job j ,
- $E \setminus I$ denotes the set of events in E that occur in the time interval I ,
- $First(E)$ and $Last(E)$ denote the first and last events in E , respectively,
- $nxt(E, ev, t)$ denotes the next occurrence of event ev in E after time t ; $nxt(E, _ , time)$ denotes the next occurrence of any event in E after time t , and
- $prec(E, t)$ denotes the event in E that occurred most recently in the past at time t (including events that occur at t).

Definition. An *Execution* of a job set J is a set of events $E \subseteq S(J) \cup E(J) \cup Pp(J)$, such that

1. For each $j \in J$, there is exactly one start and termination event in E , denoted $s(j, E)$ and $e(j, E)$ respectively.
2. For each $(t, j_1, j_2) \in E \cap Pp(J)$, $p_{j_1} > p_{j_2}$, i.e., jobs are only preempted by higher priority jobs.
3. For each $j \in J$, $s(j, E) \geq r(j)$, i.e., jobs may only start to execute after being released.
4. After its release, the start of a job may only be delayed by intervals of executions of higher priority jobs, i.e., using the convention that $E \setminus [j, j] = \emptyset$, for each job $j \in J$: each event $ev \in E \setminus [prec(r(j)), s(j, E))$ is either
 - A start of the execution of a higher priority job, i.e. $ev = s(j', E)$ and $p_{j'} > p_j$
 - A preemption, where a higher priority job preempts a high priority job, i.e. $ev = (t, j', j'')$, $p_{j'} > p_j$ and $p_{j''} > p_j$
 - A job termination, at which a higher priority job resumes its execution, i.e., $ev = (j', t, j'')$, where $p_{j''} > p_j$
5. The sum of execution intervals of a job $j \in J$ is in the range $[BCET(j), WCET(j)]$, i.e.,

$$BCET(j) \leq \sum_{ev \in E \setminus [e(j, E)]} nxt(E, ev, ev.time) - ev.time \leq WCET(j)$$

We will use $EX_t(J)$ to denote the set of executions of the job set J . Intuitively, $EX_t(J)$ denotes the set of possible executions of the job set J within $[0, J^{MAX}]$. Assuming a dense time domain $EX_t(J)$ is only finite if $BCET(j) = WCET(j)$ for all $j \in J$. However, if we disregard the exact timing of events and only consider the ordering of events we obtain a finite set of execution orderings for any finite job set J .

Using $ev\{x/t\}$ to denote an event ev with the time element t replaced by the undefined element “ x ”, we can formally define the set of execution orderings $EX_o(J)$ as follows:

Definition. The set of *Execution orderings* $EX_o(J)$ of a job set J is the set of sequences of events such that $ev_0\{x/t\}, ev_1\{x/t\}, \dots, ev_k\{x/t\} \in EX_o(J)$ **iff** there exists an $E \in EX_t(J)$ such that

- $First(E) = ev_0$
- $Last(E) = ev_k$
- For any $j \in [0..(k-1)]$: $nxt(E, _ , ev_j.time) = ev_{j+1}$

Intuitively, $EX_o(J)$ is constructed by extracting one representative of each set of equivalent execution orderings in $EX_t(J)$, i.e., using a quotient construction $EX_o(J) = EX_t(J) \setminus \sim$, where \sim is the equivalence induced by considering executions with identical event orderings to be equivalent. This corresponds to our fault hypothesis (2), with the relaxation that we only keep track of the timing of preemptions, not exactly where in the program code they occur. If we assume fault hypotheses (1), the set of execution

orderings can be reduced further, since the preemptions are of no significance in this case, i.e., we can define $EX_o(J) = EX_s(J) \approx$, where \approx is the equivalence induced by considering executions with identical start and stop event orderings to be equivalent. Even further reductions could be of interest, for instance to only consider orderings among tasks that are functionally related, e.g., by sharing data.

In the remainder we will use the terms *execution scenario* and execution ordering interchangeably.

4.2 Calculating $EX_o(J)$

This section outlines a method to calculate the set of execution orderings $EX_o(J)$ for a set of jobs J . We will later (in section 4.4) present an algorithm that perform this calculation. In essence, our approach is to make a reachability analysis by simulating the behavior of the kernel during one $[0, J^{MAX}]$ period for the job set J . We use a small example to present the underlying intuition.

Consider *figure 1a*, which depicts an $[0, J^{MAX}]$ schedule generated by a static off-line scheduler and where the execution times for the jobs A , B , and C are fixed, i.e. $WCET_{\{A,B,C\}} = BCET_{\{A,B,C\}}$. Later release time gives higher priority. This has the effect of only yielding one possible execution scenario during $[0, J^{MAX}]$. However, if for example, job A had a minimum execution time of 2 ($BCET_A = 2$; $WCET_A = 6$ as before) we would get three possible execution scenarios, depicted in *figure 1*. The cause is that, in addition to the previous execution scenario, there are now possibilities for A to complete before B is released (*figure 1b*), and for A to complete before C is released (*figure 1c*).




Figure 1. Three different execution order scenarios when job A has $BCET_A = 2$ and $WCET_A = 6$.

4.3 The Execution Order Graph (EOG)


The algorithm we are going to present generates, for a given schedule, an Execution Order Graph (EOG), which is a finite tree for which the set of possible paths from the root contains all possible execution scenarios.

But before delving into the algorithm we describe the elements of an EOG. Formally, an EOG is a pair $\langle N, A \rangle$, where

- N is a set of nodes, each node being labeled with a job and a continuous time, i.e., for a job set J : $N \subseteq J \cup \{“_”\} \times I(J^{MAX})$, where $\{“_”\}$ is used to denote a node where no job is executing and $I(J^{MAX})$ is the set of continuous intervals in $[0, J^{MAX}]$.
- A is the set of directed arcs (edges; transitions) from one node to another node, labeled with a continuous time interval, i.e., for a set of jobs J : $A \subseteq N \times I(J^{MAX}) \times N$.

Intuitively,

- An **edge**, corresponds to the transition (task-switch) from one job to another. The edge is annotated with a continuous interval of when the transition can take place.



Where the interval $[a', b']$ is defined by: (4-1)

$$a' = \text{MAX}(a, r_A) + BCET_A$$


$$b' = \text{MAX}(b, r_A) + WCET_A$$

That is, a' is the earliest start time of job B . Which is the immediately preceding job's (in this case A 's) earliest start time, a or A 's earliest scheduled release time, r_A , added with A 's minimum execution time, $BCET_A$.

The b' represents the latest possible release-time for job B , obtained by adding the latest possible release time for job A with $WCET_A$, the maximum execution time for A .

The MAX functions are necessary because the calculated release times a and b can be earlier than the scheduled release of the job A .

- A **node**, is a job annotated with a continuous interval of its possible execution, as illustrated by the following edge leading to a node:



Using the convention that intervals $[q, q) = [q, q]$, we define the interval of execution, $[a, b)$ by:

$$a = \text{MAX}(r_A, a) \quad (4-2)$$

$$b = \text{MAX}(r_A, b) + \text{WCET}_A$$


The interval, $[a, b)$, specifies thus the interval when A can be preempted

From each node there can be one or more transitions, representing one of four different situations:

1. That the job is the last job scheduled in this branch of the tree. In this case the transition is labeled with the interval of finishing times for the node, and has no destination node.
2. That the job has a $WCET$ such that it definitely completes before the release of any preempting job. In this case there is a single outgoing transition labeled with the interval of finishing times for the job.
3. That the job has a $BCET$ such that it definitely is preempted by another job. In this case there is a single outgoing transition labeled with the interval when the preemption may occur, $[t(\text{preem}), t(\text{preem})]$, where $t(\text{preem})$ is the preemption time.
4. That the job has a $BCET$ and $WCET$ such that it may either be preempted or completes before any preempting job is released. In this case there will be two outgoing edges, one representing the completion (labeled with the time interval when the completion may occur), the other representing the preemption (labeled with the preemption time).

Example 1

Job	Release time	Min execution time	Max execution time
A	0	1	3
B	2	1	3



The graph gives an example of how an EOG could look like, using the above notation, and the attributes in the table.

4.4 The EOG algorithm

In defining the execution order analysis algorithm we use the following auxiliary functions and data structures:

1. rdy – the set of jobs ready to execute.
2. $Next_release(I)$ – returns the earliest release time of a job $j \in J$ within the interval I . That is, using $I.l$ and $I.r$ to denote the end points of I , $\min(\{r_j \mid j \in J \wedge I.l \leq r_j < I.r\})$. If no such job exists then ∞ is returned
3. $Make_ready(t, rdy)$ – adds all jobs that are released at time t to rdy . Returns FALSE if $t = \infty$, else TRUE.
4. $X(rdy)$ denotes the job with highest priority in rdy
5. $Arc(n, I, n')$ creates an edge from node n to node n' and labels it with the time interval I .
6. $Make_node(j, XI)$ creates a node and labels it with the execution interval XI and the id of job j .

The execution order graph for a set of jobs J is generated by a call $Eog(ROOT, \{\}, 0, 0, [0, J^{MAX}])$, i.e., with a root node, an empty ready set, and the release-times a and b set to zero, plus the considered interval SI .

// n- previous node, rdy- set of ready jobs, a to b – release interval, SI – the considered interval.

```

Eog(n, rdy, a, b, SI)
{
    t = Next_release(SI)                //What is the time of the next release ?
    if (rdy =  $\emptyset$ )                  //Then there are no jobs ready for execution
        if (Make_ready(t, rdy) = TRUE) //Make more jobs ready to execute?
            Eog ( n, rdy, a, b, (t, SI.r] ) // Yes there were some jobs
        else Arc(n, [a,b), _ )           //No more jobs to execute – simulation done


    else                                 // We have a set of ready jobs for execution
        T = X(rdy)                       // copy the properties of the highest priority job in rdy.
        [a, b) = [ max( $r_T$ , a), max( $r_T$ , b) + WCET $_T$  ) //Calculate the execution interval for T. (*A)
        a' = a + BCET $_T$                    //Earliest completion time. (*B)
        b' = b                             //Latest completion time. (*C)
        n' = Make_node(T, [a, b) )         // Create a node and label it with the execution interval [a, b ).
        Arc(n, [a, b), n' )               // Create an arc from the previous node to the node representing T.
        if (t < b)                         // Does the next scheduled job have a release time less than T's completion time?
            if (t > a' )                   // Can T complete prior to the release of the next job at t?
                //Yes T can complete.
                Eog ( n', rdy \{T\}, a', t, [t, SI.r] )
                // More jobs to execute
            Make_ready(t, rdy)             //Add all jobs that are released at time t.
            if (T = X(rdy))                //Do the new jobs have lower priority than T?
                Eog ( n', rdy \{T\}, a', b', [t, SI.r] ) // Yes
            else                            // No, they preempt
                rdy = rdy \{T\}
                BCET $_T$  = max(BCET $_T$  - (t - (max( $r_T$ , a))), 0) //Best case execution prior to preemption? (*D)
                WCET $_T$  = max(WCET $_T$  - (t - (max( $r_T$ , b))), 0) // Worst case... (*E)
                Eog ( n', rdy + {T}, t, t, (t, SI.r] )
            else                            //The next higher priority job starts later than T's latest completion time
                if (t  $\neq$   $\infty$ )
                    Eog ( n', rdy \{T\}, a', b', [t, SI.r] ) //Next higher priority job
                else                        // t =  $\infty$  no more jobs to execute
                    Eog ( n', rdy \{T\}, a', b', [  $\infty$ ,  $\infty$  ] )
} //End

```

Example 2

Here we give an example of the resulting execution order graph (EOG) generated by the EOG algorithm for a set of jobs J

Schedule J				
Job	r	p	$BCET$	$WCET$
A	0	1	1	3
B	2	2	1	3



No.	Recursive call sequence
1	$Eog(ROOT, \{\}, 0, 0, [0, J^{MAX}])$
2	$Eog(ROOT, \{A\}, 0, 0, (0, J^{MAX}))$
3a	$Eog(node(A), \{\}, 1, 2, [2, J^{MAX}])$
4a	$Eog(node(A), \{B\}, 1, 2, (2, J^{MAX}))$
5a	$Eog(node(B), \{\}, 3, 5, [\infty, \infty])$
3b	$Eog(node(A), \{A, B\}, 2, 2, (2, J^{MAX}))$
4b	$Eog(node(B), \{A\}, 3, 5, [\infty, \infty])$
5b	$Eog(node(A'), \{\}, 3, 6, [\infty, \infty])$

Table 1 A trace of the recursive calls to the EOG algorithm.

Table 1, gives a trace of the recursive calls to the algorithm $Eog()$ until it terminates. Corresponding to each call that adds to the EOG graph, a graphical trace of how the EOG construction progresses, is shown on the left side of the table.

Completion times

An interesting property of the EOG is that we can easily find the worst and best-case completion-times for any job. We only have to search the EOG for the smallest and largest finishing times for all terminated jobs. The response time jitter (the difference between the maximum and minimum response times for a job) can also be quantified both globally for the entire graph and locally for each path, as well as for each instance of a job that runs several times during an LCM cycle.

Complexity

The complexity of the algorithm (the number of recursion calls and the number of different execution orderings) is a function of the scheduled set of jobs, J , their preemption pattern, and their jitter. From an $O(n)$ number of operations for a system with no jitter (just one scenario) to exponential complexity in cases with large jitter.

4.5 Adding interrupts

We will now incorporate the temporal side effects of interrupts, by regarding them as sporadic jobs with a known minimum and maximum inter-arrival time. If we are interested in addressing the functional side effects of the interrupts, we will have to model each interrupt as a job. This would however make EOG practically intractable, since we do not know the release times (or phases) of the interrupts, and

must therefore consider all possible release times within their periodicity. We would thus end up with an infinite number of paths in practice.

Execution interval

The execution interval $[a, b]$ (location *A in the algorithm) changes to:

$a = \text{MAX}(r_A, a)$, i.e., keeps the same value as in (4-2).

$b = \text{MAX}(r_A, b) + w$, i.e., where w is the sum of WCET_A and the maximum delay due to the preemption by sporadic interrupts.

The formula for calculating w is similar to Response Time Analysis (RTA) calculations [Joseph1986]. As, RTA calculates the response times for jobs that are subjected to interference by preemption of higher priority jobs, we here calculate the interrupt interference on the preemption intervals.

The maximum value of w is defined by (4-3) and is based on the assumption that all the interrupts are ready for preemption exactly at the beginning of the interval – this maximizes the number of times the interrupts can preempt the interval.

$$w = \text{WCET}_A + \sum_{k \in \text{interrupts}} \left\lceil \frac{w}{T_k^{\min}} \right\rceil \cdot \text{WCET}_k \quad (4-3)$$

This equation can be solved using the standard RTA iteration technique [Joseph1986,Audsley1995].

Release time interval

Adding interrupts, the release time interval $[a', b']$ (location *B in the algorithm) changes to:

For the lower bound, a' , we are interested in finding the minimum interference by the interrupts, which can be found by assuming that the interrupts occur with their maximum inter-arrival time and execute with their minimum execution time, and by finding the lowest possible number of hits within the interval. The latter is guaranteed by the use of the floor function ($\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$).

The lower bound a' , is defined by:

$$a' = a + w_a \quad (4-4)$$

Where w_a is defined as:

$$w = \text{BCET}_A + \sum_{k \in \text{interrupts}} \left\lfloor \frac{w}{T_k^{\max}} \right\rfloor \cdot \text{BCET}_k \quad (4-5)$$

The upper bound of the release interval b' , is identical to the new b , (location *C in the algorithm.)

Execution times

In EOG we decrease a preempted job J 's maximum and minimum execution time with how much it has been able to execute in the worst best cases before the release time t of the preempting job.

Affected parts in the algorithm are (*D) and (*E).

Since we are now dealing with interrupts, the effective time that J can execute prior to the preemption point will decrease due to interrupt interference. The remaining minimum execution time BCET_T' is given by:

$$\text{BCET}_T' = \text{BCET}_T - (t - \text{MAX}(a, r_T)) - \sum_{\forall \text{interrupts } k} \left\lfloor \frac{t - \text{MAX}(a, r_T)}{T_k^{\max}} \right\rfloor \cdot \text{BCET}_k \quad (4-6)$$

Note that the sum of interrupt interference is not iterative, but absolute, because we are only interested in calculating how much the job J can execute in the interval, minus the interrupt interference.

Likewise we can calculate the remaining maximum execution time, $WCET_T'$


$$WCET_T' = WCET_T - (t - \text{MAX}(b, r_T)) - \sum_{k \in \text{interrupts}} \left\lceil \frac{t - \text{MAX}(b, r_T)}{T_k^{\min}} \right\rceil \cdot WCET_k \quad (4-7)$$

Example 3

Here we assume that the system is subjected to preemption by interrupts. The side effects of the interrupts are solely of temporal character. We make use of the same parameters as in example 2, and we assume that there is only one interrupt, I interfering.

Schedule, J				
Job	r	p	$BCET$	$WCET$
A	0	1	1	3
B	2	2	1	3

Interrupts				
Interrupt	T^{\max}	T^{\min}	$BCET$	$WCET$
I	∞	3	1	1



No.	Recursive call sequence
1	$\text{Eog}(\text{ROOT}, \{\}, 0, 0, [0, J^{\text{MAX}}])$
2	$\text{Eog}(\text{ROOT}, \{A\}, 0, 0, (0, J^{\text{MAX}}])$
3a	$\text{Eog}(\text{node}(A), \{\}, 1, 2, [2, J^{\text{MAX}}])$
4a	$\text{Eog}(\text{node}(A), \{B\}, 1, 2, (2, J^{\text{MAX}}])$
5a	$\text{Eog}(\text{node}(B), \{\}, 3, 7, [\infty, \infty])$
3b	$\text{Eog}(\text{node}(A), \{A, B\}, 2, 2, (2, J^{\text{MAX}}])$
4b	$\text{Eog}(\text{node}(B), \{A\}, 3, 7, [\infty, \infty])$
5b	$\text{Eog}(\text{node}(A'), \{\}, 3, 10, [\infty, \infty])$

Table 2 A trace of the recursive calls to the EOG algorithm.

Table 2, gives a trace of the recursive calls to the algorithm $\text{Eog}()$ when it incorporates the effects of interrupts. For each call that adds to the EOG graph, there is on the left side of the table a graphical trace of how the EOG construction progresses. Note that the release-times of the jobs are affected by the interrupts, and therefore also affecting the response times.

4.6 Jitter

In the presented algorithms we take the effects of several different types of jitter into account:

- *Schedule jitter*, i.e., different instances of the same job in an LCM may have different relative release times for each period.
- *Release jitter*, i.e., the inherited and accumulated jitter due to varying execution times for preceding higher priority jobs.

-
- *Completion jitter*, i.e., the response-time jitter due to schedule jitter, release jitter and the variation of the execution time for the job (*Execution time jitter*).

One type of jitter that we have not explicitly addressed, is the jitter inherent in global clock synchronization. The local clocks keep on speeding up, and down, depending on the global time base. This jitter could possibly be accommodated for, by adjusting the preemption and release intervals in the EOG.

An interesting conclusion that can be drawn from these types of jitter, and their effect on the execution order graph, is that:

1. Minimizing the execution time jitter minimizes the preemption and release intervals, with the positive effect of reducing the preemption “hit” window, and thus reducing the number of execution order scenarios.
2. By reducing the release jitter we reduce the execution order graph. This can be achieved by doing (1) or having fixed release-times.

The conclusion is that less jitter gives better testability. Jitter reduction could be achieved by padding; the execution time for each execution path through a task is equalized by “no operation” instructions. Other possibilities, are to make use of delays in the code, or having a kernel that does not release a lower priority task until a preceding higher priority task has used up its scheduled WCET.

4.7 The multi-node case

The presented algorithm generates an EOG for a schedule executed on a single node. In a distributed system with multiple nodes (and schedules) we can use the algorithm to generate one EOG for each node. From these, a global EOG describing all globally possible execution orderings can be constructed.

In the case of perfectly synchronized clocks this essentially amounts to perform a parallel composition of the individual EOGs, using standard techniques for composing timed transition systems [Sifakis1996]. In other cases, we first need to introduce the timing uncertainties caused by the non-perfectly synchronized clocks in the individual EOGs. The details of this are presented in [Thane1999].

5 TOWARDS SYSTEMATIC TESTING

We will now outline a method for deterministic integration testing of distributed real-time systems, based on the identification of execution orderings. Testing of sequential programs (like single tasks) can be performed with regular unit testing [Sommerville1992, Beizer1990], using a black-box or white-box approach [Beizer1990].

We assume that some method for testing of sequential programs is used. Exactly which is not an issue here, since our focus is on handling multiple execution scenarios.

Assumptions

In order to perform integration testing of distributed real-times systems the following is required:

- A feasible global schedule, including probes.
- Kernel-probes on each node, which monitor task-switches. This information is sent to probe-tasks so that they can identify execution orderings from the task-switch information and correlate it to run test cases.
- A set of in-line probes and probe-tasks, as well as probe-nodes, which output and collect significant information to determine if a test run was successful or not.
- Control over, or at least a possibility to observe, the input data to the system with regard to contents, order, and timing.

Test strategy

The test strategy consists of the following steps:

1. Identify the set of execution orderings by performing execution order analysis for the schedule on each node.
2. Test the system using any testing technique of choice, and monitor for each test case which execution ordering is run during $[0, J^{MAX}]$.
3. Map test case and output onto the correct execution ordering, based on observation.
4. Repeat 2-3 until sought coverage is achieved.

Coverage

Depending on what we want to test: the entire system, multiple use-cases (running over several nodes), single use-cases (running over several nodes), multiple use-cases (single node), single use-cases (single node) or parts of use-cases, we need different levels of coverage.

- *Distributed coverage.* When we test use-cases that run over more than one node we need to consider the global EOG, introduced in Section 4.7. When testing the system we can combine observations of local execution scenarios on the different nodes to identify the executed global scenario.
- *Node coverage.* When we test use-cases that run on a single node, we simply follow the test strategy. However the coverage needs to be defined, and related to the use-case(s) tested. A use-case may run several times during a $[0, J^{MAX}]$ period, and it might therefore be necessary to give special attention to which instance gets which input.

Other issues

For a system that keeps state between periods, we must monitor or control, the jobs' internal variables, and not only the legal inputs defined by the jobs' interfaces, in order to guarantee determinism and coverage.

Reproducibility

To facilitate reproducible testing we must identify which execution orderings, or parts of execution orderings that can be enforced without introducing any probe effect. From the perspective of a single use-case this can be achieved by controlling the execution times of preceding and preempting jobs that belong to other use-cases, these have no functional relation to the use-case under test. This of course only works if we adhere to fault hypothesis (1), that the jobs have no unwanted functional side effects, otherwise we would miss such errors. Control over the execution times in other use-cases can easily be achieved by incorporating delays in the jobs, or running dummies, as long as they stay within each job's execution time range [BCET, WCET].

Testability

The number of execution orderings is an objective measure of system testability, and can thus be used as a metric for comparing different designs, and schedules. Given that testability is an important system characteristic, we can use this measure, as a new optimization criterion in the heuristic search used to generate static schedules [Xu1991], thereby generating schedules that are more testable.

6 CONCLUSION

In this paper we have given a description of what constitutes a deterministic and reproducible behavior of a distributed real-time system. Specifically we have addressed testing of Distributed Real-Time Systems (DRTSs). The results can be summed up to:

- We have provided a method for finding all the possible execution scenarios for a DRTS with preemption, interrupts and jitter.
- We have proposed a test strategy for deterministic and reproducible testing of DRTS.
- A benefit of the testing strategy is that it allows any testing technique for sequential software to be used to test DRTSs.

- The number of execution orderings is an objective measure of the testability of DRTS, which can be used as a new scheduling optimization criteria for generating static schedules that are easier to test.
- Jitter increases the number of execution scenarios, and jitter reduction techniques should thus be used when possible to increase testability.
- A positive side effect of the execution order analysis is that we get exact response-times for the jobs, even when interrupts afflict the system.

Future pursuits include to experimentally validate the usefulness of the presented results, extend the testing methodology, devise testability increasing design rules for DRTS, employ the technique for exact calculations of response-times in fixed priority scheduled systems, and to investigate the benefits of using the testability measure as a new heuristics in the generation of highly testable static schedules.

7 REFERENCES

- [Audsley1991] N. C. Audsley, A. Burns, M.F. Richardson, and A.J. Wellings. *Hard Real-Time Scheduling: The Deadline Monotonic Approach*. IFAC/IFIP Workshop, Atlanta, Georgia, pp. 127-132, May, 1991
- [Audsley1995] N. C. Audsley, A. Burns, R. I. Davis, K. W. Tindell. *Fixed Priority Pre-emptive Scheduling: A Historical Perspective*. Real-Time Systems, The Int. Journal of Time-Critical Computing Systems, Vol. 8(2/3), March/May, 1995.
- [Beizer1990] B. Beizer. *Software testing techniques*. Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1990.
- [Calvez1998] J.P. Calvez, and O. Pasquier. *Performance Monitoring and Assessment of Embedded HW/SW Systems*. In Design Automation for Embedded Systems, vol. 3, pp. 5-22, 1998.
- [DeMillo1987] R. A. DeMillo, W.M. McCracken, R.J. Martin, and J.F. Passafiume. *Software Testing and Evaluation*. Benjamin/Cummings Publ. Co., 1987.
- [Dodd1992] P. S. Dodd, C. V. Ravishankar. *Monitoring and debugging distributed real-time programs*. Software-practice and experience. Vol. 22(10), pp. 863-877, October 1992.
- [Eriksson1996a] C. Eriksson, J. Mäki-Turja, K. Post, M. Gustafsson, J. Gustafsson, K. Sandström, and E. Brorsson. *An Overview of RTT: A design Framework for Real-Time Systems*. Journal of Parallel and Distributed Computing, August, 1996.
- [Eriksson1996b] C. Eriksson, H.Thane and M. Gustafsson. *A Communication Protocol for Hard and Soft Real-Time Systems*. In the proceedings of the 8th Euromicro Real-Time Workshop, L'Aquila Italy, June, 1996.
- [Gait1986] J. Gait. *A Probe Effect in Concurrent Programs*. Software – Practice and Experience, 16(3):225-233, Mars, 1986.
- [Glass1980] R. L. Glass. *Real-time: The “lost world” of software debugging and testing*. Communications of the ACM, vol. 23(5), pp. 264-271, May, 1980.
- [Haban1990] D. Haban and D. Wybraniez. *A Hybrid monitor for behavior and performance analysis of distributed systems*. IEEE Trans. Software Engineering, 16(2), pp. 197-211, Feb., 1990.
- [Hwang1995] G.H Hwang, K.C Tai and T.L Huang. *Reachability Testing: An Approach to Testing Concurrent Software*. Int. Journal of Software Engineering and Knowledge Engineering, vol. 5(4), pp. 493-510, 1995.
- [Joseph1986] M. Joseph and P. Pandya. *Finding response times in a real-time system*. The Computer Journal – British Computer Society, 29(5), pp.390-395, October, 1986.
- [Kopetz1987] H. Kopetz. *Clock Synchronisation in Distributed Real-Time Systems*. IEEE Trans. Computers, Aug. 1987.
- [Kopetz1989] H. Kopetz, A. Damm, Ch. Koza, M. Mulazzani, W. Schwabl, Ch. Senft, and R. Zainlinger. *Distributed Fault-Tolerant Real-Time Systems: The MARS Approach*. IEEE Micro, no. 9, pp. 25- 40, 1989.
- [Kopetz1994] H. Kopetz and H Grünsteidl. *TTP - A Protocol for Fault-Tolerant Real-Time Systems*. IEEE Computer, January, 1994.
- [Lamport1978] L. Lamport. *Time, Clocks and the ordering of Events in a Distributed System*. Communications of the ACM, vol. 21, July, 1978.
- [Laprie1992] J.C. Laprie. *Dependability: Basic Concepts and Associated Terminology*. Dependable Computing and Fault-Tolerant Systems, vol. 5, Springer Verlag, 1992.
-

-
- [LeDoux1985] C.H. LeDoux, and D.S. Parker. *Saving Traces for Ada Debugging*. In the proceedings of Ada int. conf. ACM, Cambridge University press, pp. 97-108, 1985.
- [Liu1973] C. L. Lui and J. W. Layland. *Scheduling Algorithms for multiprogramming in a hard real-time environment*. Journal of the ACM 20(1), 1973.
- [McDowell1989] C.E. McDowell and D.P.Hembold. *Debugging concurrent programs*. ACM Computing Surveys, 21(4), pp. 593-622, December 1989.
- [Plattner1984] B. Plattner. *Real-time execution monitoring*. IEEE Trans. Software Engineering, 10(6), pp. 756-764, Nov., 1984.
- [Rubus1995] Rubus OS. *Real-Time Operating System, Tutorial*. Arcticus Systems AB Datavägen 9A, 175 62 Järfälla, Sweden 1995.
- [Rushby1995a] J. Rushby. *Formal Specification and Verification for Critical systems: Tools, Achievements, and prospects*. Advances in Ultra-Dependable Distributed Systems. IEEE Computer Society Press. 1995. ISBN 0-8186-6287-5.
- [Rushby1995b] J. Rushby. *Formal methods and their Role in the Certification of Critical Systems*. 12th Annual CSR Workshop, Bruges 12-15 September 1995. Proceedings, pp. 2-42. Springer. ISBN 3-540-76034-2.
- [Sandström1998] K. Sandström, C. Eriksson, and G. Fohler. *Handling Interrupts with Static Scheduling in an Automotive Vehicle Control System*. In proceedings of the 5th Int. Conference on Real-Time Computing Systems and Applications (RTCSA' 98). October 1998, Japan.
- [Schütz1994] W. Schütz. *Fundamental Issues in Testing Distributed Real-Time Systems*. Real-Time Systems, vol. 7(2), pp. 129-157, 1994.
- [Shin1991] K. G. Shin. *HARTS: A distributed real-time architecture*. IEEE Computer, 24(5), pp. 25-35, May, 1991.
- [Sifakis1996] J. Sifakis and S. Yovine. *Compositional specification of timed systems*. In Proc. 13th Annual Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science, STACS'96, Grenoble, France, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 1046, pp. 347-359. Springer Verlag, February 1996.
- [Sommerville1992] I. Sommerville. *Software Engineering*. Addison-Wesley, 1992. ISBN 0-201-56529-3.
- [Tai1991] K.C Tai, R.H. Carver, and E.E. Obaid. *Debugging concurrent Ada programs by deterministic execution*. IEEE transactions on software engineering. Vol. 17(1), pp. 45-63, January 1991.
- [Thane1999] H. Thane. *Towards predictable instrumentation of distributed real-time systems*. Technical report, Mälardalen Real-Time Research Centre, Dept. Computer Engineering, Mälardalen University, 1999.
- [Tindell1995] K. W. Tindell, A. Burns, and A.J. Wellings. *Analysis of Hard Real-Time Communications*. Journal of Real-Time Systems, vol. 9(2), pp.147-171, September 1995.
- [Tokuda1988] H. Tokuda, M. Kotera, and C.W. Mercer. *A Real-Time Monitor for a Distributed Real-Time Operating System*. In proc. of ACM Workshop on Parallel and Distributed Debugging, Madison, WI, pp. 68-77, May, 1988.
- [Tsai1990] J.P. Tsai, K.-Y. Fang, H.-Y. Chen, and Y.-D. Bi. *A Noninterference Monitoring and Replay Mechanism for Real-Time Software Testing and Debugging*. IEEE Trans. on Software Eng. vol. 16, pp. 897 - 916, 1990.
- [Tsai1996] J.P. Tsai, Y.-D. Bi, S. Yang, and R. Smith. *Distributed Real-Time System: Monitoring, Visualization, Debugging, and Analysis*. Wiley-Interscience, 1996. ISBN 0-471-16007-5.
- [Xu1990] J. Xu and D. Parnas. *Scheduling processes with release times, deadlines, precedence, and exclusion, relations*. IEEE Trans. on Software Eng. vol. 16, pp. 360-369, 1990.
- [Xu1998] J. Xu and D. Parnas. *Priority Scheduling Versus Pre-Run-Time Scheduling*. In Proc. IFAC Real Time Programming, Shantou, Guangdong Province, P.R China, 1998
- [Yang1992] R-D Yang and C-G Chung. *Path analysis testing of concurrent programs*. Information and software technology. vol. 34(1), January 1992.
-

Appendix (6)

CURRICULUM VITAE

Henrik Thane

Wednesday, August 18, 1999

Name: *Henrik Carl Gustaf Thane*
Date of birth: *February 19, 1970*
Place of birth: *Västerås, Sweden*
Citizenship: *Swedish*
Telephone: *+46 21 103157*
Mobile: *+46 70 7768997*
Fax: *+46 21 103110*
E-mail: *henrik.thane@mdh.se*
www: *<http://www.idt.mdh.se/personal/hte/>*

Education

October 1997: **Technical Licentiate** in Mechatronics from the Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm.
Thesis title: "Safety and Reliability of Software in Embedded Control Systems".
November 1995: **Master of Science** in Computer Science from Uppsala University, Uppsala.
Thesis title: "Distributed Real-Time Clock Synchronization on the CAN Bus".
November 1993: **Bachelor of Science** in Computer Engineering from Mälardalen University College, Västerås.
June 1990: High school diploma (4årig teknisk linje), Wenströmska gymnasiet, Västerås
June 1989: High school diploma, Lakeland High school, New York, USA.

Employment record

1997-08 – **Ph.D. Student and Lecturer** at the Department of Computer Engineering, Mälardalen University College, Västerås.
1995-04 – 1997-07 **Ph.D. Student** at the Mechatronics Laboratory, the Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm.
1991-04 – 1994-10 **Programmer and Consultant** of real-time systems software at NST Softech AB, Västerås. Part time employment, with an equivalent total exceeding 2 years of full time work experience.

Selected publications

Refereed publications

- [1] Thane H, Hansson H. Towards Systematic Testing of Distributed Real-Time Systems. Real-Time Systems Symposium, Phoenix U.S.A, December, 1999.
- [2] Thane H, Hansson H. Towards Deterministic Testing of Distributed Real-Time Systems. RTCSA, Hong Kong China, December, 1999. (Submitted)
- [3] Eriksson C., Thane H. and Gustafsson M. *A Communication Protocol for Hard and Soft Real-Time Systems*. In the proceedings of the 8th Euromicro Real-Time Workshop, L'Aquila Italy, June, 1996.
- [4] Thane H. Safe and Reliable Computer Control Systems – an Overview. Safecom Conference, York, UK, 1997

Technical reports

- [5] Thane, H. Safe and Reliable Computer Control Systems - Concepts and Methods. Research Report TRITA-MMK 1996:13, ISSN 1400-1179, ISRN KTH/MMK/R-96/13-SE. Mechatronics Laboratory/Department of Machine Design, the Royal Institute of Technology, S-100 44 Stockholm, Sweden, 1996.
- [6] Thane H. Towards Exact Minimum and Maximum Response Time Analysis for Preemptive Strict Periodic Fixed Priority Scheduled Distributed Real-Time Systems. Technical report, Mälardalen Real-Time Research Centre, Dept. Computer Engineering, Mälardalen University, 1999. *Under completion*
- [7] Thane H. Towards Predictable Instrumentation of Distributed Real-Time Systems. Technical report, Mälardalen Real-Time Research Centre, Dept. Computer Engineering, Mälardalen University, 1999. *Under completion*
- [8] Thane H., Larsson M. The Arbitrary Complexity of Software. Research Report. Mechatronics Laboratory/Department of Machine Design, the Royal Institute of Technology, S-100 44 Stockholm, Sweden May 6, 1997.