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Problem Statement/Introduction

• Virtual Prototype (VP) - Shift left platform expected to be available quite early in SoC development cycle.

• With the new architectural enhancements, protection mechanism is an essential feature of the next generation AURIX™ safety and security architecture.

• Enables application software to restrict read and write accesses to each slave function to a desired set of masters.

• In addition it supports CPU hypervisor functions with access protection control based on Virtual Machine ID.

Proposed Methodology/Advantages

Automated Implementation of New Protection Mechanism (PROT/APU) for TC4xx VP
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Dynamic Resource Allocation

Support multiple PROT/APU mechanism.

Scalable to all the derivative devices.

Flexible to extend/override in special cases. E.g. Dynamic configuration of resource allocation.

Minimum time and effort.

Easy integration into current VP development flow.

Implementation Details/Diagram

Implementation Details/Flow Chart

Centralized implementation of UBS provides protection mechanism API’s.

Easy integration to the existing development flow.

Functions Implementing Protection Mechanism

Generated protection check files

Centralized implementation of PROT/APU

E.g. Dynamic configuration of resource allocation.

Generated protection check functions at each resource level (Registers, memory).

API’s Provided by UBS Kernel

Automatic generation of protection check functions at each resource level (Registers, memory).

Generated protection check functions, uses the API’s provided by the Centralized implementation.

Flexible as the API’s can be used to extend the implementation. E.g. Dynamic configuration of resource allocation.

Results Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Sub activity</th>
<th>No. of days</th>
<th>Total days</th>
<th>Final effort (days)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Spec study Development Reviews</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 * 41 = 164</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>Spec study Test case development Reviews</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 * 41 = 164</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XML Refresh</td>
<td>XML Migration</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>131(4 * [10 % of 328])</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bugs Found in the concept</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 bugs</td>
<td>10 days (Feed back to concept)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deployment</td>
<td>Initial issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code generator development</td>
<td>Spec study Scripting Verification</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Effort saved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion

Automation resulted in significant development cost saving:

• Significant development cost (approximately 369 man days) was saved because of the automation process.

• In addition it will also help in reducing the time and effort for development of other derivative VP of the same family.

Early feedback to the concept on the new protection mechanisms and also on the correctness of single source XML.
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