Author manuscript, published in "3rd Workshop on: Rapid Simulation and Performance Evaluation: Methods and Tools (2011)"

inria-00546228, version 1 - 20 Sep 2011

Designing a CPU model: from a pseudo-formal document to fast code

F. Blanqui[1,2], C. Helmstetter[1,2,†], V. Joloboff[1,2], J.-F. Monin[1,3,4] and X. Shi[1,4]

[1]*LIAMA-FORMES,* [2]*INRIA,* [3]*CNRS,* [4]*Université de Grenoble 1*

[†]claude.helmstetter@inria.fr

***Abstract*— For validating low level embedded software, engineers use simulators that take the real binary as input. Like the real hardware, these full-system simulators are organized as a set of components. The main component is the CPU simulator (ISS), because it is the usual bottleneck for the simulation speed, and its development is a long and repetitive task. Previous work showed that an ISS can be generated from an Architecture Description Language (ADL). In the work reported in this paper, we generate a CPU simulator directly from the pseudo-formal descriptions of the reference manual. For each instruction, we extract the information describing its behavior, its binary encoding, and its assembly syntax. Next, after automatically applying many optimizations on the extracted information, we generate a SystemC/TLM ISS. We also generate tests for the decoder and a formal specification in Coq. Experiments show that the generated ISS is as fast and stable as our previous hand-written ISS.**

I. Introduction

Developing a new System-on-Chip (SoC) for some embedded systems requires the design of *abstract models* [1]. These models ease the design and the validation by providing a global view of the future system, allowing to certify protocols, simulate the embedded software, and decide the correctness of hardware executions.

Like the real hardware, a model of a full system is organized as a set of components. When a system is simulated, most of the computation time is spent in the component modeling the processor. This component is called an *ISS* (Instruction Set Simulator). Fast simulations require to implement many optimizations techniques in the ISS, such as *dynamic translation* [2]. Even without optimizations, writing an ISS is a long, tedious then error-prone task because functional specifications of processors are generally over 500 pages long.

Reference manuals of processors are mainly written in natural language, but some parts are described with pseudo-formal descriptions that can be automatically parsed and interpreted. In this work, we present how to take advantage of these pseudo-formal sections in order to generate automatically most of the code of a CPU model.

In addition of automatic extraction of the pseudo-formal sections, we take the most of the intermediate representation, which can be handled easily by software, to apply many kinds of analysis and optimizations. Our goal is to generate an ISS that is as good as an hand-written one, without any manual modification of the generated code.

We consider the ARMv6 architecture, which is implemented by the ARM11 processor family. The reference manual [3] of the CPU part (i.e., excluding the memory management part) counts 617 pages. This manual is mainly written in natural language, but each instruction is described by three elements that can be automatically parsed:

- a table describing the instruction binary encoding
- a piece of *pseudo-code* describing its behavior
- the syntax of the instruction in assembly code.

We have developed a tool chain that extracts the pseudo-formal parts of the ARMv6 manual, to an easy-to-use intermediate representation. In this intermediate representation, the instruction behavior is represented by *abstract syntax trees* (ASTs). Next, we developed a set of back-ends. In addition to a formal specification and unit tests, we generate a fast C/C++ ISS, which is part of the SimSoC open-source project since the 0.7 release.

Note that the PowerPC, MIPS, and SH2 architecture reference manuals use a similar structure to describe the instructions (i.e., encoding plus syntax plus pseudo-code). The PowerPC and MIPS may be a little more complicated to parse because they use non-ASCII characters inside the pseudo-code. On the contrary, parsing SH2 documentation should be easier because it uses a simple subset of C to describe the instruction behavior.

Our generated ISS uses the same optimization techniques as classic hand-written ISSes, such as dynamic translation. Dynamic translation means that the result of the decoder is stored, to avoid the decoding time if the same instruction is executed again. The dynamic translation technique we use is described in [4]. Generating such an optimized ISS requires to translate the pseudo-code to C/C++, but also to collect new data, such as the lists of parameters and local variables, and to combine data from different sources (see for example the `may_branch` function discussed in section III-C).

This article is structured as follows. Section II is devoted to related work. Extraction of interesting parts from the manual, code transformations needed for correctness and better performance, and code generation are described in section III. Section IV presents the results.

II. Related Work

Previous work proposed solutions to generate an ISS from an Architecture Description Language (ADL), mainly for retargetability issues. In the JACOB system [5] a processor is described with the MIMOLA language, a low level description. From the MIMOLA input, a C program is generated that simulates the processor. The MIMOLA compiler generates C macros using the basic functions have been manually coded however.

inria-00546228, version 1 - 20 Sep 2011

In [6] the processor is described using a *Processor Description File*, but this is more a kind of pre-processor, as the language contains C macros like constructs. This work is doing static compiling simulation, it does not generate a simulator, it generates a native program for the host computer simulating the binary on the target processor.

The FACILE language [7] can be used to generate simulators. The generated simulator has optimization using partial evaluation techniques similar to the specialization optimization described in the next section. However, they target a low abstraction level, more suitable to performance evaluation than functional validation. Similarly, using the MADL language, the authors of [8] have generated a cycle accurate simulator for several architectures.

Other researchers have used a kind of virtual machine approach, where the processor instruction set is described in terms of the basic operations. The LISA language [9] uses this approach. Like FACILE, this work targets a lower abstraction level than us.

The virtual machine approach is also used in the QEMU simulator [10] which has been manually coded.

An approach closer to our work is the EXPRESSION-ADL language [11]. It generates a decoder and static compiled simulator for the target instructions. They report a maximum speed of 15 Mips for ARMv4, whereas we simulates the ARMv6 architecture at 90 Mips or more on several benchmarks.

In the works mentioned above, some of the systems do generate decoders for the target binary, and some do not. In the work presented here, we generate the simulator, the decoder and some additional tests.

Zhu and Gajski [12] have done a static compilation retargetable simulator. The input instructions are first translated into a virtual machine instructions, with an infinite number of registers. Then a back end translates the virtual instructions into host code, using a dedicated register allocator. The result is a compiled program running on the host. Because it is static compilation, it is fast, with benchmarks running at 200 Mips (on a 2004 PC). We use dynamic translation instead of static compilation, because static compilation is not suitable for dynamically loaded code.

III. The ISS Generator

Starting from the ARMv6 architecture reference manual (reference: `ARM DDI 0100I`), we have built a tool chain composed of a front-end that extracts and parses the pseudo-formal parts, and of several back-ends. The main back-end generates a C/C++ ISS suitable for fast simulations. Another back-end generates tests and a last one generates a formal specification in Coq, which can be used to develop proofs. Fig. 1 describes the overall architecture.

A. Extraction and parsing

The very first step is to run the command `pdftotext`. The resulting file is 28500 lines long (excluding parts B, C, and D, which are not related to the CPU). Next, we extract three smaller files, each containing one kind of information: a 2100 lines-long file contains the pseudo-code, another 800 lines-long file contains the binary encoding tables, and the ASM syntax file is 500 lines long. Each extraction is done by a small ad-hoc OCaml program. Before extraction, a patch is applied to the main text file (using the Unix `patch` command). This patch fixes some obvious mistakes coming from the original document, such as misspelling in a function name, unclosed parenthesis (Thumb STMIA instruction), missing line (condition check of the `CLZ` instruction), etc.

Next, each extracted file is parsed with the corresponding parser. The most complicated parser is for the pseudo-code. Two preliminary phases solve issues related to line breaks and indentation, given that indentation defines the blocks in a Python-like way. Then, a classical lexer-parser combination builds the *abstract syntax trees* (ASTs). The whole extraction and parsing task is performed by 1400 lines of code (OCaml, OCamlLex, and OCamlYacc).

As the reader can notice, we extract only 10% of the document. Part of the information that is not extracted is useless, such as the typical use cases for instructions. There are redundancies also. However, important pieces of information must still be taken into account. In particular, many instructions have additional *validity constraints*, which are described only in informal English text. For example, the `Rn` register of the `UXTAH` instruction must not be `R15`. Because this information is required by code generators, we have extracted all validity constraints by hand to an OCaml file (300 lines of data).

Finally, there is some important information that is neither extracted nor needed by the generator; the corresponding C/C++ code is written by hand. Actually, we use a generator only for parts that are related to the instruction list (255 entities described in a same way). Indeed, it is not worth using a generator for something that is not repetitive, because the generator would be longer than the generated code.

B. Transformations and optimizations

Before generating the code for the fast SystemC/TLM ISS, several transformations and analysis are applied to the OCaml internal representation. There are two categories of transformations: some are required for the correctness of the generated code, others improve the simulation speed without modifying the behavior. We present some of these transformations in the remaining of this sub-section: three of each category. All the transformations are implemented by a total of 1200 lines of code.

1) Symbolic expression as parameter: The reference manual contains some pseudo-code that looks like this:

```
V Flag = OverflowFrom(Rn + shift_op + C Flag)
```

This is not a function call taking one integer as a parameter, but a function that takes the symbolic expression `Rn + shift_op + C Flag` as a parameter. Indeed, computing the overflow bit requires to know which operator is used (addition or subtraction), and each operand value. We recognize such calls in the ASTs and replace them by:

```
V Flag = OverflowFromAdd3(Rn, shift_op, C Flag)
```

inria-00546228, version 1 - 20 Sep 2011



Fig. 1. Overall Architecture

Similar transformations are applied to `CarryFrom`, `BorrowFrom`, and `SignedSat`.

2) Addressing mode variants: Many ARM instructions are described in two parts: the instruction body and the *addressing mode* or *shifter operand*. For example, the third argument of an addition can be either an immediate value, a register, or a shifted value. Each addressing mode case is described in the same way as a normal instruction, with an encoding table, a syntax, and a piece of pseudo-code.

One difficulty is that some instructions, such as `SRS` and `RFE`, use a variant of the addressing mode pseudo-code. For example, after extraction and parsing, we know that the pseudo-code of `IA` addressing mode should be:

```
start_address = Rn
end_address = Rn+(NbOfSetBitsIn(reglist)*4)-4
if ConditionPassed(cond) and W==1 then
    Rn = Rn+(NbOfSetBitsIn(reglist)*4)
```

However, the textual description of `SRS` explains that there are some differences in the above code when this code is used with this particular instruction:

- `Rn` is replaced by the banked version of register `R13` for a mode given as parameter.
- the register list length is 2.

Thus, we provide a remedial patch function that applies these two transformations. Another patch function fixes the `RFE` instruction. Note that these patch functions are very simple. Indeed, the `SRS` patch function looks like:

```
let code1 = replace_exp code0
 (* replace... *)(Reg (Var "n", None))
  (* ... by... *) (Reg (Num "13", Some (Var "mode")))
in let code2 = replace_exp code1
          (Fun "NbOfSetBitsIn", [Var "reglist"])
          (Num "2") in...
```

3) Register write-back and data aborts: Load and store instructions read the base address from a register. Under some conditions, the contents of this base register is incremented or decremented by an offset. In the extracted pseudo-code, this *write-back* to the base register is done before the memory access itself. However, if the memory access fails and thus raises a *data abort* exception, then the base register must keep its original value. As for addressing mode variants, this rule is only explained using informal text.

Our generated ISS manages *data aborts* using C++ exception mechanism. As a consequence, moving the statement doing the write-back at the end of the instruction code (and so after any possible `throw`) is sufficient to keep the base register unchanged in case of exception. Considering the IA pseudo-code shown above, we need to move this statement:

```
if ConditionPassed(cond) and W==1 then
    Rn = Rn+(NbOfSetBitsIn(reglist)*4)
```

It is not as simple as it looks, because some instructions such as `LDM(3)` modify the processor mode, thus changing the meaning of "`Rn`". In this case, the write-back must affect a banked version of `Rn` instead of the current version.

4) Instruction flattening: The initial intermediate representation contains elements that describe either an instruction or an addressing mode case. For each instruction A that can use an addressing mode B, we generate a new instruction AB, where the data structures of A have been instantiated with the data of B. The benefits are twofold: the following generation steps become simpler; and the generated code is

inria-00546228, version 1 - 20 Sep 2011

faster. After this transformation, called *flattening*, we have slightly more than twice as many instructions.

The flattening step operates on the four elements:

- The mode case pseudo-code is inlined at the beginning of the instruction pseudo-code.
- The validity constraint lists, which have been extracted manually, are appended.
- The ASM syntax of the instruction contains a special parameter that must be replaced by the mode case syntax. For example, the syntax: `ADC{⟨cond⟩}{S} ⟨Rd⟩,⟨Rn⟩,⟨shifter_operand⟩`, combined with the syntax: `⟨Rm⟩,LSL#⟨shift_imm⟩`, yields the flattened syntax: `ADC{⟨cond⟩}{S} ⟨Rd⟩,⟨Rn⟩,⟨Rm⟩,LSL#⟨shift_imm⟩`.
- The encoding tables are merged, keeping the most specific option for each bit: a constant replaces a parameter, short parameters replace long parameters. An example is given by Fig. 2.

5) Pre-computation of static sub-expressions: Because we use dynamic translation, an instruction is generally decoded once and executed many times. So, if a sub-expression depends only upon the instruction parameters but not the processor state, we can accelerate the simulation by moving this sub-expression from the execute function to the decoder.

For example, the `IA` addressing mode contains the sub-expression `NbOfSetBitsIn(reglist)*4`. The variable `reglist` is a 16-bits value stored in the instruction encoding, and `NbOfSetBitsIn` is a pure function (Hamming weight), so it can be pre-computed. An optimization function replaces this expression by a new parameter `nb_reg_x4`, and additional code is generated in the decoder to compute it.

We provide manually a list of patterns to be pre-computed to the OCaml optimizer, which then applies automatically the transformations.

6) Specialization: The ARM instructions accepts generally many options and flags. The `ADC instruction` takes on optional condition and the flag `S` decides whether the status register must be updated. Checking whether the options are present takes a little time at each execution, whereas most of the time the options are absent (i.e., the condition is *"Always"* and `S` is false).

Instead of generating one generic `ADC` instruction, we generate many specialized instructions. Firstly, we duplicate the pseudo-code: in one version, we replace the specialized flag (e.g., `S`) by `1`, and in the other we replace it by `0`. A simple subsequent pass removes the obvious dead code, knowing that more complicated optimizations will be done by the C++ compiler itself. Furthermore, for each conditional instruction, we generate an unconditional variant, in which the condition check is removed.

Specialization can increase dramatically the number of instructions, and thus the size of the generated code. Among the consequences, the compilation time may become huge and the ISS binary load time will increase. To solve this problem, we simulate some benchmarks on the generated ISS, record how many time each instruction is executed, and inject these data back into the ISS generator. Thus, the specialization pass knows each instruction weight and whether it is worth to specialize it.

C. Code generation

The following elements are generated and included in the final ISS:

1) The types used to store an instruction after decoding.
2) Two decoders: one for the main ARM instruction set and another for the Thumb instruction set.
3) The semantics function, corresponding to the extracted and optimized pseudo-code. This is quite straightforward because pseudo-code ambiguities have been solved before.
4) The `may_branch` function that detects basic block terminators (i.e., branch instructions).
5) The ASM printers, used to print debug traces.

An instruction is stored in a `struct` type containing an identifier, a pointer to the semantics function, and an `union` field containing the instruction parameters. The list of the instruction parameters is computed automatically by analysing the pseudo-code. There are 80 distinct parameter lists; for each of them, we generate a `struct` type, which is referenced in the `union` field.

The generation of the decoder is somewhat tricky, due to some features of the ARM instruction set. In particular, looking at the encoding tables is not enough, because some binary words match many instruction tables. For example, any `UXTH` instruction matches the encoding tables of `LDRB`, `LDRBT`, and `UXTAH`; trying to decode the addressing mode eliminates the `LDRB` and `LDRBT` candidates, and checking the validity constraint of `UXTAH` (`Rn`≠`R15`) eliminates this third candidate. To solve this issue, our decoders work in two phases: the first phase selects the candidates using a `switch` statement, the second phase evaluates the validity constraints.

The dynamic translation technique we use requires to recognize the *basic blocks* (i.e., a sequence of instructions always executed in a row). An instruction is a basic-block terminator if it *may branch* for some states of the processor. Some particular instructions are managed manually, but the *may-branch* condition is computed automatically for most instructions, using a small static analyser.

We illustrate the principle of this static analyser on the `LDR` instruction combined with the *register pre-indexed* addressing mode. First, we go trough the AST, searching for assignments to the PC, which, on ARM, is the register `R15`. We encounter three register assignments: 1) `Rn=address` (code of the addressing mode), 2) `PC=data AND...`, 3) `Rd=data`. Then, we associate a condition to each assignment. From the first assignment, we conclude that the instruction may branch if `n==15`. The second (respectively third) assignment appears on the `then` side (resp. `else` side) of an `if` statement whose condition is `Rd is R15`. So the assignment 2) yields the condition `d==15`, and the latter yields the condition `false` (obtained by reduction of `d==15&&d!=15`). At this point we have the global *may-branch* condition `n==15||d==15`. However, one of the validity constraint associated with this

(a) binary encoding of the ADC instruction

31 ... 28	27 26	25	24 ... 21	20	19 ... 16	15 ... 12	11 0
cond	0 0	I	0 1 0 1	S	Rn	Rd	shifter_operand

(b) binary encoding of the "logical shift left by immediate" operand

31 ... 28	27 26	25	24 ... 21	20	19 ... 16	15 ... 12	11 7	6 ... 4	3 ... 0
cond	0 0	0	opcode	S	Rn	Rd	shift_imm	0 0 0	Rm

(a+b) resulting binary encoding of the flattened instruction

31 ... 28	27 26	25	24 ... 21	20	19 ... 16	15 ... 12	11 7	6 ... 4	3 ... 0
cond	0 0	0	0 1 0 1	S	Rn	Rd	shift_imm	0 0 0	Rm

Fig. 2. Flattening the ADC instruction with the shift left by immediate operand

instruction is `n!=15`, so the final *may-branch* condition is simplified to `d==15`. This condition will be evaluated at decode-time once the value of `d` in known, deciding whether it is the end of the current basic-block.

The whole OCaml extractor-generator is 5400 lines long, and it generates 74,000 lines of C/C++. Note that the ISS is mainly written in C because we have started some formal verification work using tools not compatible with C++.

To allow full system simulation, we integrated our ISS in a SystemC/TLM module (4000 LoC in addition of the generated code), and added this module to the open-source SimSoC project [4]. The generated code is already released as part of the version 0.7 of SimSoC[1], and we plan to release the generator itself in a near future.

Additionally, we generate a formal specification of the ARMv6 in Coq, which is used by another work investigating the certification of simulators. The Coq code generation uses the same techniques than the C++ generator, excepted that optimizations are disabled, and imperative code is translated to functional code using monadic specifications [13]. Our Coq specification is similar to the HOL specification of [14].

D. Automatic test generation

In order to validate the SimSoC decoder, we prepare massive binary tests. We built an automatic test generator that generates all possible instructions which are neither undefined nor unpredictable. We generate two files. The first contains the instruction binary, in the ELF format. The second contains the expected assembly code. Both files are generated according to the instruction encoding and syntax as extracted from the reference manual.

The parameter values are chosen with respect to the validity constraints to ensure that the instruction is defined and predictable. The validity constraints are dealt with during the parameter generation. For example, `Rn` in instruction `LDRBT` cannot be `R15`, so we chose directly a value between 0 and 14. Continuing the example of `LDRBT`, another constraint states that `Rd` and `Rn` must be different: the generator produces two different values from the previous table and assigns them to `Rd` and `Rn`.

The generated binary instructions are given as input to the SimSoC decoder. The latter prints the corresponding assembly code which is then compared with the generated assembly code using the Unix command `diff`. Minor issues have been detected and fixed in this way. We did also compare the result with the one of the GNU disassembler (`arm-elf-objdump -d`), but as the GNU syntax is slightly different, comparison must be done by hand.

IV. Reliability and Performances

A. Validation

An ISS for the ARMv5 architecture was already available in SimSoC. Thanks to backward compatibility, all the tests running on ARMv5 can be used to test our new ARMv6 ISS.

The new ISS passes all the tests written to validate the previous ARMv5 ISS of SimSoC. In particular, the new ARMv6 ISS can simulate Linux running on two boards based on the ARMv5 architecture (the SPEArPlus600 from STMicroelectronics and the TI AM1707 from Texas Instrument).

Using a generator avoids many typo-like errors. However, other kinds of errors remain possible. Here are the last bugs we found and fixed while trying to boot Linux on the SPEArPlus600 SoC simulator:

- After the execution of an `LDRBT instruction`, the content of the base register (`Rn`) was wrong. It was due to a bug in the reference manual itself; the last line of the pseudo-code has to be deleted[2].
- After a data abort exception, the base register write-back was not canceled, because we did not notice this rule during our first reading of the manual. We fix this issue as explained in section III-B.3.

Once Linux was booting on the SPEArPlus600, Linux booted at the first try on the TI AM1707 SoC simulator (the other components were already validated using the previous hand-written ARMv5 ISS).

B. Simulation Speed

The ISS has two levels of dynamic translation. First, the instructions are decoded and stored in an array of instruction objects. Filling this array is quick (between 5 and 10 Mips), and then simulating one basic block is done by calling the instructions functions one by one.

We compared the speed of the generated ARMv6 ISS with the hand-written ARMv5 ISS. We wanted to know whether our approach based on extraction, transformation

[1]SimSoC URL:`http://gforge.inria.fr/projects/simsoc/`

[2]This error is fixed in the ARMv7 reference manual, which is now the recommended manual for the ARMv6 architecture.

inria-00546228, version 1 - 20 Sep 2011

TABLE I

COMPARISON OF THE SIMULATION SPEEDS

		ARMv6 generated ISS speed and relative gain		ARMv5 hand-written speed
arm32-crypto-O0	Linux 64	104.78 Mi/s	+2.6%	102.16 Mi/s
	MacOSX	89.08 Mi/s	+7.4%	82.98 Mi/s
	Linux 32	76.74 Mi/s	-10.8%	86.03 Mi/s
arm32-crypto-O3	Linux 64	89.97 Mi/s	+2.4%	87.89 Mi/s
	MacOSX	74.65 Mi/s	+4.6%	71.39 Mi/s
	Linux 32	70.91 Mi/s	-5.1%	74.70 Mi/s
arm32-loop	Linux 64	124.85 Mi/s	-1.2%	126.38 Mi/s
	MacOSX	108.50 Mi/s	+1.9%	106.52 Mi/s
	Linux 32	88.89 Mi/s	-5.8%	94.39 Mi/s
arm32-sorting-O0	Linux 64	82.18 Mi/s	-0.5%	82.61 Mi/s
	MacOSX	74.40 Mi/s	+8.6%	68.49 Mi/s
	Linux 32	62.42 Mi/s	-11.3%	70.37 Mi/s
arm32-sorting-O3	Linux 64	106.41 Mi/s	-1.0%	107.54 Mi/s
	MacOSX	97.51 Mi/s	+5.6%	92.35 Mi/s
	Linux 32	83.39 Mi/s	-1.0%	84.27 Mi/s
thumb-crypto-O0	Linux 64	117.80 Mi/s	+2.3%	115.15 Mi/s
	MacOSX	100.22 Mi/s	-0.5%	100.71 Mi/s
	Linux 32	84.56 Mi/s	-8.1%	91.98 Mi/s
thumb-crypto-O3	Linux 64	111.67 Mi/s	+7.1%	104.30 Mi/s
	MacOSX	98.48 Mi/s	+6.5%	92.46 Mi/s
	Linux 32	84.33 Mi/s	-2.9%	86.87 Mi/s
thumb-loop	Linux 64	133.95 Mi/s	+4.3%	128.44 Mi/s
	MacOSX	108.24 Mi/s	+3.2%	104.86 Mi/s
	Linux 32	75.96 Mi/s	-24.2%	100.16 Mi/s
thumb-sorting-O0	Linux 64	79.61 Mi/s	0.0%	79.61 Mi/s
	MacOSX	74.17 Mi/s	+1.4%	73.13 Mi/s
	Linux 32	62.24 Mi/s	-9.5%	68.78 Mi/s
thumb-sorting-O3	Linux 64	121.39 Mi/s	+26.5%	95.98 Mi/s
	MacOSX	97.19 Mi/s	+8.2%	89.83 Mi/s
	Linux 32	89.55 Mi/s	+15.1%	77.81 Mi/s
average	Linux 64	107.26 Mi/s	+4.1%	103.00 Mi/s
	MacOSX	92.24 Mi/s	+4.5%	88.27 Mi/s
	Linux 32	77.90 Mi/s	-6.8%	83.54 Mi/s
global average		92.47 Mi/s	+0.9%	91.60 Mi/s

and generation allows to reach the same speed ISS written and optimized by hand. We used three benchmarks "loop", "sorting", and "crypto". We compiled them targeting either the ARM or the Thumb variant of the ARMv5 instruction set, a first time with optimization (`-O3`) and a second without (`-O0`). Three different computers were used: a 32-bit Linux, a 64-bit Linux, and a MacBook pro (64-bit).

The results are detailed in Table I. Globally, we obtained a small improvement of less than 1%. That is smaller than the measurement accuracy, and so we can only conclude that both ISSes run roughly at the same speed. However, we can note that the new ISS behaves better on 64-bits machine; indeed, figures about 32-bits machines are not a real issue because such machines become less and less common among people doing simulation.

V. CONCLUSION

We have combined two techniques to generate an ISS: 1) automatic extraction of pseudo-formal descriptions, 2) automatic analysis and transformation of an intermediate representation of the target program. We have obtained an ISS for ARMv6 that is as good as the previous hand-written one for ARMv5, and the development time has been significantly reduced. Moreover, trying a new optimization or targetting another ISS architecture is clearly much easier with this approach.

The effort to write our tool chain would have been even smaller if we had used the ARMv7 reference manual. Indeed, the small bugs we noticed in the ARMv6 manual are fixed in the ARMv7 manual, and the description of the instruction set is much more formal in the new reference manual. Thus, much of the remedial transformation steps could be avoided.

Among the transformations steps, some are specific to the ARM architecture, but others could be reused for other architectures such as MIPS or PowerPC. Reusing code would require to agree on an abstract architecture-independent language, and to group the interesting functions in a library.

We have currently three back-ends: the fast ISS back-end, the tests for the decoder, and the Coq formal specification. Moreover, we have almost finished another backend allowing LLVM-based dynamic translation. The intermediate representation contains data that could be useful to generate an assembler. We could also generate descriptions in other ADL languages, and use the associated tools.

REFERENCES

[1] F. Ghenassia, Ed., *Transaction-Level Modeling with SystemC. TLM Concepts and Applications for Embedded Systems*. Springer, June 2005, iSBN 0-387-26232-6.

[2] J. Zhu and D. D. Gajski, "A retargetable, ultra-fast instruction set simulator," in *DATE'99*. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 1999, p. 62.

[3] ARM, *ARM Architecture Reference Manual DDI 0100I*. ARM, 2005.

[4] C. Helmstetter, V. Joloboff, and H. Xiao, "SimSoC: A full system simulation software for embedded systems," in *OSSC'09*, IEEE, Ed., 2009.

[5] R. Leupers, J. Elste, B. Landwehr, and B. L, "Generation of interpretive and compiled instruction set simulators," in *in: Asia and South Pacific Design Automation Conference (ASP-DAC)*, 1999, pp. 339–342.

[6] F. Engel, J. Nührenberg, and G. P. Fettweis, "A generic tool set for application specific processor architectures," in *Proceedings of the eighth international workshop on Hardware/software codesign*, ser. CODES '00. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2000, pp. 126–130. [Online]. Available: http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/334012.334036

[7] E. C. Schnarr, M. D. Hill, and J. R. Larus, "Facile: a language and compiler for high-performance processor simulators," in *PLDI '01: Proceedings of the ACM SIGPLAN 2001 conference on Programming language design and implementation*. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2001, pp. 321–331.

[8] W. Qin, S. Rajagopalan, and S. Malik, "A formal concurrency model based architecture description language for synthesis of software development tools," *SIGPLAN Not.*, vol. 39, pp. 47–56, June 2004. [Online]. Available: http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/998300.997171

[9] A. Nohl, G. Braun, O. Schliebusch, R. Leupers, H. Meyr, and A. Hoffmann, "A universal technique for fast and flexible instruction-set architecture simulation," in *DAC '02: Proceedings of the 39th conference on Design automation*. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2002, pp. 22–27.

[10] F. Bellard, "Qemu, a fast and portable dynamic translator," in *ATEC '05: Proceedings of the annual conference on USENIX Annual Technical Conference*. Berkeley, CA, USA: USENIX Association, 2005, pp. 41–41.

[11] M. Reshadi, N. Dutt, and P. Mishra, "A retargetable framework for instruction-set architecture simulation," *ACM Trans. Embed. Comput. Syst.*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 431–452, 2006.

[12] J. Zhu and D. D. Gajski, "An ultra-fast instruction set simulator," *IEEE Trans. Very Large Scale Integr. Syst.*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 363–373, 2002.

[13] T. Schrijvers, P. Stuckey, and P. Wadler, "Monadic constraint programming," *J. Funct. Program.*, vol. 19, no. 6, pp. 663–697, 2009.

[14] A. C. J. Fox and M. O. Myreen, "A Trustworthy Monadic Formalization of the ARMv7 Instruction Set Architecture," in *ITP*, 2010, pp. 243–258.

inria-00546228, version 1 - 20 Sep 2011