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Consider a simple example

“The Observer pattern defines a one-to-many dependency between a subject object and any number of observer objects so that when the subject object changes state, all its observer objects are notified and updated automatically.”

Eric Gamma, Richard Helm, Ralph Johnson, John Vlissides: *Design Patterns*, Addison-Wesley, 1995
Example: Observer pattern in Java

```java
public void addListener(listener) {...}

public void setValue(newvalue) {
    myvalue=newvalue;
    for (int i=0; i<myListeners.length; i++) {
        myListeners[i].valueChanged(newvalue)
    }
}
```

Will this work in a multithreaded context?
Observer pattern with mutexes

```java
public synchronized void addListener(listener) {...}

public synchronized void setValue(newvalue) {
    myvalue=newvalue;
    for (int i=0; i<myListeners.length; i++) {
        myListeners[i].valueChanged(newvalue)
    }
}
```

Resolves race condition between addListener and setValue

Javasoft recommends against this. What’s wrong with it?
Mutexes are minefields

```java
public synchronized void addListener(listener) {...}

public synchronized void setValue(newvalue) {
    myvalue=newvalue;
    for (int i=0; i<myListeners.length; i++) {
        myListeners[i].valueChanged(newvalue)
    }
}
```

`valueChanged()` may attempt to acquire a lock on some other (independent) object and stall. If the holder of that lock calls `addListener()`: deadlock!
Simple observer pattern gets complicated

public synchronized void addListener(listener) {...}

public void setValue(newValue) {
  synchronized (this) {
    myValue=newValue;
    listeners=myListeners.clone();
  }
  for (int i=0; i<listeners.length; i++) {
    listeners[i].valueChanged(newValue)
  }
}

This still isn’t right.
What’s wrong with it?
Simple observer pattern: How to make it right?

```java
public synchronized void addListener(listener) {...}

public void setValue(newValue) {
    synchronized (this) {
        myValue=newValue;
        listeners=myListeners.clone();
    }
    for (int i=0; i<listeners.length; i++) {
        listeners[i].valueChanged(newValue)
    }
}
```

Suppose two threads call setValue(). One of them will set the value last, leaving that value in the object, but listeners may be notified in the opposite order. Listeners have different value than object. In other scenarios, listeners may have different values.
Problems with thread-based concurrency

- Nontrivial software written with threads, semaphores, and mutexes is incomprehensible to humans.

Search for non-thread-based models: which are the requirements for appropriate specification techniques?
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**Represent hierarchy**
Humans not capable to understand systems containing more than a few objects.

Most actual systems require more objects

- **Behavioral hierarchy**
  Examples: states, processes, procedures.

- **Structural hierarchy**
  Examples: processors, racks, printed circuit boards
Requirements for Specification Techniques (2)

- **Represent timing behavior/requirements**
- **Represent state-oriented behavior**
  Required for reactive systems.
- **Represent dataflow-oriented behavior**
  Components send streams of data to each other.
- **No obstacles for efficient implementation**
What does it mean, “to compute”? Models of computation define:

- **Components** and an execution model for computations for each component
- **Communication** model for exchange of information between components.
  - Shared memory
  - Message passing
  - …
Communication: Shared memory

- Potential race conditions (inconsistent results possible)
  - Critical sections = sections at which exclusive access to resource \( r \) (e.g. shared memory) must be guaranteed.

```plaintext
process a {
  ..
  P(S)  //obtain lock
  ..   // critical section
  V(S)  //release lock
}

process b {
  ..
  P(S)  //obtain lock
  ..   // critical section
  V(S)  //release lock
}
```

Race-free access to shared memory protected by \( S \) possible

This model may be supported by:
- mutual exclusion for critical sections
- cache coherency protocols
Non-blocking/asynchronous message passing

- Sender does not have to wait until message has arrived; potential problem: buffer overflow

... send ()
...

... receive ()
...
Blocking/synchronous message passing

- Sender will wait until receiver has received message
Synchronous message passing: CSP

- CSP (communicating sequential processes) [Hoare, 1985], rendez-vous-based communication.

Example:

```plaintext
process A
  ..
  var a ...
  a:=3;
  c!a; -- output
end

process B
  ..
  var b ...
  ...
  c?b; -- input
end
```
Components (1)

- Von Neumann model
  
  Sequential execution, program memory etc.

- Discrete event model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>queue</th>
<th>time action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a:=5</td>
<td>b:=7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

```plaintext
a := 5   b := 7  c := 8   a := 6  a := 9
```
Example Discrete Event: VHDL

- VHDL (hardware description language) is commonly used as a design-entry language for digital circuits.

```
Start of simulation
  ↓
  Future values for signal drivers
  ↓
  Assign new values to signals  Evaluate processes
  ↓
  Activate all processes sensitive to signal changes
```
Sensitivity lists in VHDL

Sensitivity lists are a shorthand for a single `wait on`-statement at the end of the process body:

```vhdl
process (x, y)
begin
  prod <= x and y;
end process;
```

is equivalent to

```vhdl
process
begin
  wait on x,y;
  prod <= x and y;
end process;
```
Components (2)

- Finite state machines

- Differential equations

\[ \frac{\partial^2 x}{\partial t^2} = b \]
No language that meets all language requirements using compromises
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Classical Automata

Classical automata:

- **Moore-automata:**
  \[ Y = \lambda(Z); \quad Z^+ = \delta(X, Z) \]

- **Mealy-automata**
  \[ Y = \lambda(X, Z); \quad Z^+ = \delta(X, Z) \]

Next state \( Z^+ \) computed by function \( \delta \)
Output computed by function \( \lambda \)

Moore- + Mealy automata=finite state machines (FSMs)
StateCharts

Classical automata not useful for complex systems (complex graphs cannot be understood by humans).

Introduction of hierarchy StateCharts [Harel, 1987]
Introducing Hierarchy

 FSM will be in exactly one of the substates of S if S is active (either in A or in B or ..)
Definitions

- Current states of FSMs are also called **active** states.
- States which are not composed of other states are called **basic states**.
- States containing other states are called **super-states**.
- For each basic state $s$, the super-states containing $s$ are called **ancestor states**.
- Super-states $S$ are called **OR-super-states**, if exactly one of the sub-states of $S$ is active whenever $S$ is active.

![Diagram](image-url)
Default State Mechanism

Filled circle indicates sub-state entered whenever super-state is entered. Not a state by itself!
For input m, S enters the state it was in before S was left (can be A, B, C, D, or E). If S is entered for the very first time, the default mechanism applies.

History and default mechanisms can be used hierarchically.
Combining History and Default State

same meaning
Concurrent ways of describing concurrency are required.

**AND-super-states**: FSM is in all (immediate) sub-states of a super-state.
Line-monitoring and key-monitoring are entered and left, when service switch is operated.
Tree representation of state sets

basic state

OR-super-state

AND-super-state
Computation of state sets

- Computation of state sets by *traversing the tree* from leaves to root:
  - basic states: state set = state
  - OR-super-states: state set = union of children
  - AND-super-states: state set = Cartesian product of children

\[
\begin{align*}
Q_H &= Q_L, \quad Q_G = Q_I \cup Q_K \\
Q_F &= Q_G \times Q_H, \quad Q_B = Q_C \cup Q_D \\
Q_E &= Q_F \cup Q_M, \quad Q_A = Q_B \times Q_E \\
Q_A &= (Q_C \cup Q_D) \times (Q_M \cup ((Q_I \cup Q_K) \times Q_L))
\end{align*}
\]
Types of States

In StateCharts, states are either

*Basic states*, or

*AND-super-states*, or

*OR-super-states.*
Timers

Since time needs to be modeled in embedded systems, timers need to be modeled. In StateCharts, special edges can be used for timeouts.

If event a does not happen while the system is in the left state for 20 ms, a timeout will take place.
Using Timers in Answering Machine

- Lproc
- 4 s
- timeout
- play text
- beep
- 8 s
- record
- talk
- lift off
- return (callee)
- dead
- beep
- silent
- timeout

Swiss Federal Institute of Technology
Computer Engineering and Networks Laboratory
Representation of computations

Besides states, arbitrary many other variables can be defined. This way, not all states of the system are modeled explicitly.

These variables can be changed as a result of a state transition ("action"). State transitions can be dependent on these variables ("condition").
**General Form of Edge Labels**

**Events:**
Exist only for the next evaluation of the model
Can be either internally or externally generated

**Conditions:**
Refer to values of variables that keep their value until they are reassigned

**Actions:**
Can either be assignments for variables or creation of events

**Example:**
service-off [a <= 7] / service:=0
Events and actions

“event” can be composed of several events:

- \((e_1 \text{ and } e_2)\): event that corresponds to the simultaneous occurrence of \(e_1\) and \(e_2\).
- \((e_1 \text{ or } e_2)\): event that corresponds to the occurrence of either \(e_1\) or \(e_2\), or both.
- \((\text{not } e)\): event that corresponds to the absence of event \(e\).

“action” can also be composed:

- \((a_1; a_2)\): actions \(a_1\) and \(a_2\) are executed in parallel.

All events, states and actions are globally visible.
Example

e/a1

x → e/a1 → y → [c]/a2 → z

e:

a1:

a2:

c: 

ture
false

e:

a1:

a2:

c: 

ture
false
The StateCharts Simulation Phases

How are edge labels evaluated?

*Three phases:*

1. Effect of external changes on events and conditions is evaluated,

2. The set of transitions to be made in the current step and right hand sides of assignments are computed,

3. Transitions become effective, variables obtain new values.
In phase 2, variables $a$ and $b$ are assigned to temporary variables. In phase 3, these are assigned to $a$ and $b$. As a result, variables $a$ and $b$ are swapped.

In a single phase environment, executing the left state first would assign the old value of $b$ (=0) to $a$ and $b$. Executing the right state first would assign the old value of $a$ (=1) to $a$ and $b$. The execution would be non-deterministic.
Execution of a StateChart model consists of a sequence of (status, step) pairs

Status = values of all variables + set of events + current time
Step   = execution of the three phases
Reflects Model of Clocked Hardware

In an actual clocked (synchronous) hardware system, both registers would be swapped as well.

Same separation into phases found in other languages as well, especially those that are intended to model hardware.
More on semantics of StateCharts

- Unfortunately, there are several time-semantics of StateCharts in use. This is another possibility:
  - A step is executed in arbitrarily small time.
  - Internal (generated) events exist only within the next step.
  - **Difference:** External events can only be detected after a stable state has been reached.
Examples

state diagram:

stable states
Example

State diagram (only stable states are represented, only a and b are external):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{B} & \xrightarrow{a/b \lor \overline{a} \ b} \text{G,H} \\
\text{G} & \xrightarrow{\overline{a} \ b} \text{B} \\
\text{F} & \xrightarrow{d} \text{D} \\
\text{D} & \xrightarrow{a} \text{F} \\
\text{E} & \xrightarrow{c/d} \text{H} \\
\text{H} & \xrightarrow{d} \text{E} \\
\end{align*}
\]
Example

state diagram:

A, B → a → C, D

A, B → a → C, D → a → E, H

A, B → a → C, D → a → F, G
Evaluation of StateCharts (1)

**Pros:**

- *Semantics defined* in a follow-up paper to original paper.
- Large number of commercial simulation tools available (StateMate, StateFlow/Matlab, BetterState, UML, ...)
- Available „back-ends“ translate StateCharts into C or VHDL, thus enabling software or hardware implementations.
Evaluation of StateCharts (2)

- **Cons:**
  - Generated C *programs frequently inefficient*,
  - Not useful for *distributed* applications,
  - No description of *non-functional behavior*,
  - No *object-orientation*,
  - No description of *structural hierarchy*. 
**SDL**

- **Specification and Description Language** (SDL) is a specification language targeted at the unambiguous specification and description of the behaviour of reactive and distributed systems.

- Used here as a (prominent) example of a model of computation based on **asynchronous message passing**.

- Appropriate also for distributed systems
Communication among SDL-FSMs

Communication between FSMs (or “processes“) is based on message-passing, assuming a potentially indefinitely large FIFO-queue.

- Each process fetches next entry from FIFO,
- checks if input enables transition,
- if yes: transition takes place,
- if no: input is discarded (exception: SAVE-mechanism).
Deterministic?

Let tokens be arriving at FIFO at the same time:
- Order in which they are stored, is unknown

All orders are legal: simulators can show different behaviors for the same input, all of which are correct.
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Dataflow Language Model

*Processes* communicating through *FIFO buffers*
Philosophy of Dataflow Languages

- **Drastically different way of looking at computation:**
  - Imperative language style: program counter is king
  - Dataflow language: movement of data is the priority
  - Scheduling responsibility of the system, not the programmer

- **Basic characteristic:**
  - All processes run “simultaneously”
  - Processes can be described with imperative code
  - Processes can *only* communicate through buffers
  - Sequence of read tokens is identical to the sequence of written tokens
Dataflow Languages

- Appropriate for applications that deal with *streams of data*:
  - Fundamentally concurrent: maps easily to parallel hardware
  - Perfect fit for block-diagram specifications (control systems, signal processing)
  - Matches well current and future trend towards multimedia applications

- **Representation:**
  - Host Language (process description), e.g. C, C++, Java, ....
  - Coordination Language (network description), usually ‘home made’, e.g. XML.
Example: MPEG-2 video decoder

An MPEG-2 video decoder application structured as a Kahn Process Network.
Kahn Process Networks

Proposed by Kahn in 1974 as a general-purpose scheme for parallel programming:

- **read**: destructive and blocking (reading an empty channel blocks until data is available)
- **write**: non-blocking
- **FIFO**: infinite size

Unique attribute: **determinate**
A Kahn Process

From Kahn’s original 1974 paper

```c
process f(in int u, in int v, out int w)
{
    int i; bool b = true;
    for (;;) {
        i = b ? wait(u) : wait(v);
        printf("%i\n", i);
        send(i, w);
        b = !b;
    }
}
```

Process alternately reads from u and v, prints the data value, and writes it to w.
A Kahn Process

From Kahn’s original 1974 paper:

```cpp
process g(in int u, out int v, out int w)
{
    int i; bool b = true;
    for(;;) {
        i = wait(u);
        if (b) send(i, v); else send(i, w);
        b = !b;
    }
}
```

Process reads from u and alternately copies it to v and w.
A Kahn Process

From Kahn’s original 1974 paper:

```plaintext
process h(in int u, out int v, int init) {
    int i = init;
    send(i, v);
    for(;;) {
        i = wait(u);
        send(i, v);
    }
}
```

What does this do?

Process sends initial value, then passes through values.
A Kahn Process Network

What does this do?

Prints an alternating sequence of 0’s and 1’s.

Emits a 1 once and then copies input to output

Emits a 0 once and then copies input to output
Determinacy

- **Random:**
  - A system is random if the information *known* about the system and its inputs is not sufficient to determine its outputs.

- **Determinate:**
  - Define the *history* of a channel to be the *sequence* of tokens that have been both written and read. A process network is said to be *determinate* if the histories of all channels depend *only* on the histories of the input channels.

- **Importance:**
  - Functional behavior is independent of timing (scheduling, communication time, execution time of processes).
  - Separation of functional properties and timing.
Determinacy

Kahn Process: “monotonic mapping” of input sequence to output sequences:

- Process uses prefix of input sequences to produce prefix of output sequences. In other words, if we consider two different scenarios, where the second one has just additional input tokens. Then the output sequence of the second scenario equals that of the first one, but with possible additional tokens appended.
- Process will not wait forever before producing an output (i.e., it will not wait for completion of an infinite input sequence).
Determinacy

**Formal definition:**
- sequence (stream): $X = [x_1, x_2, x_3, ...]$
- prefix ordering: $[x_1] \subseteq [x_1, x_2] \subseteq [x_1, x_2, x_3, ...]$
- p-tuple of sequences: $X = (X_0, X_1, ..., X_p) \in S^p$
- ordered set of sequences: $X \subseteq X'$ if $(\forall i : X_i \subseteq X_i')$
- process: $F: S^p \rightarrow S^q$
- monotonic process: $X \subseteq X' \Rightarrow F(X) \subseteq F(X')$
Proof of Determinism

**Why** is a Kahn Process Network (consisting of monotonic processes) *determinate*?

- A network of monotonic processes itself defines a monotonic process.
- A monotonic process is clearly determinate.

**Reasoning:**

- If I’m a process, I am only affected by the sequence of tokens on my inputs
- I can’t tell whether they arrive early, late, or in what order
- I will behave the same in any case
- Thus, the sequence of tokens I put on my outputs is the same regardless of the timing of the tokens on my inputs
Adding Non-determinacy

There are several ways to introduce non-monotonic behavior:
- Allow processes to test for emptiness
- Allow more than one process to read from or write to a channel
- Allow processes to share a variable

**Example** (fair merge):

![Diagram showing fair merge with a note: don't let any channel starve]
Adding Non-determinacy

\[ X_1 = [a] \]
\[ X_2 = [c] \]

\[ X = (X_1, X_2) \]

\[ X \subseteq X' \text{ as } ([a], [c]) \subseteq ([a, b], [c]) \]
\[ F(X) \nsubseteq F(X') \text{ as } [a, c] \nsubseteq [a, b, c] \]
Philosophy of Dataflow Languages

- **Drastically different way of looking at computation:**
  - Imperative language style: program counter is king
  - Dataflow language: movement of data is the priority
  - *Scheduling responsibility of the system, not the programmer*  

- **Basic characteristic:**
  - All processes run “simultaneously”
  - Processes can be described with imperative code
  - Processes can only communicate through buffers
  - Sequence of read tokens is identical to the sequence of written tokens
Scheduling Kahn Networks

Challenge is running processes without accumulating tokens and without producing a deadlock.

- Always emit tokens
- Only consumes tokens from A
- Tokens will accumulate here
- Only consumes tokens from A
- Tokens will accumulate here
- Always emit tokens
Demand-driven Scheduling?

- Only run a process whose outputs are being actively solicited.
- However...

```
A                  C
<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
B                  D
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>accumulate tokens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

- Only consumes tokens from A
- Always produce tokens
- Always consume tokens
Tom Parks’ Algorithm

Schedules a Kahn Process Network in *bounded memory* if it is possible:

- **Start** with a network with *bounded buffer sizes* and blocking write (can be transformed into a conventional KPN).
- Use *any scheduling technique* to schedule the execution of processes that does not stall if there is still a process that is not blocked.
- As long as the process networks runs *without deadlock* caused by blocking write -> *continue*.
- If system *deadlocks* because of blocking write, *increase size* of smallest buffer and continue.
A given KPN can be changed such that buffer sizes are finite:

- To every channel between two processes an additional (virtual) channel in the reverse direction is added.
- If the buffer size is restricted to $n$, then this new virtual channel has $n$ initial data.
- Every write (read) of the original channel leads to a (read) write of the virtual channel.
- Invariant: The sum of token in both channels is constant.

The resulting KPN has the same functional behavior but it may deadlock because of the finite buffer sizes.
Deadlock Example

An example of a KPN that produces a deadlock caused by a finite buffer size (size(u) < 2):

```
process f(out int a, out int b) {
  for (;;) {
    send(1, u);
    send(1, u);
    send(1, v);
    send(1, v);
  }
}
```

```
process g(in int a, in int b) {
  for (;;) {
    wait(v);
    wait(u);
    wait(u);
    wait(u);
  }
}
```
Example: Finite Size Buffers in KPN

The previous process network with finite buffer size can be converted into a KPN:

```
process f(...) {
    for (;;) {
        wait(u'); send(1, u);
        wait(u'); send(1, u);
        wait(v'); send(1, v);
    }
}
```

```
process g(...) {
    send(1,u'); send(1, u'); send(1, v');
    for (;;) {
        wait(v); send(1, v');
        wait(u); send(1, u');
        wait(u); send(1, u');
    }
}
```
Parks’ Algorithm in Action

- Start with buffers of size 1.
- Run A, B, C, D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only consumes tokens from A
Parks’ Algorithm in Action

- B blocked waiting for space in B->C buffer.
- System will run indefinitely.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only consumes tokens from A
Evaluation of Kahn Process Networks

**Pro:**
- Their beauty is that the scheduling algorithm does not affect their functional behavior
- Matches stream-based processing
- Makes coarse grained parallelism explicit
- Favors mapping to multi-processor and distributed platforms

**Con:**
- Difficult to schedule because of need to balance relative process rates
- System inherently gives the scheduler few hints about appropriate rates
- Parks’ algorithm expensive and fussy to implement
Synchronous Dataflow (SDF)

- Edward Lee and David Messerschmitt, Berkeley, 1987:
  - Restriction of Kahn Networks to allow compile-time scheduling.
  - Each process reads and writes a fixed number of tokens each time it fires; firing is an atomic process.

- Example: DAT-to-CD rate converter (converts a 44.1 kHz sampling rate to 48 kHz)
SDF Scheduling

- **Schedule** can be determined completely *at compile time* (before the system runs).

- Two steps:
  1. *Establish relative execution rates* by solving a system of linear equations (balancing equations).
  2. *Determine periodic schedule* by simulating system for a single round (returns the number of tokens in each buffer to their initial state).

- **Result**: the schedule can be executed repeatedly without accumulating tokens in buffers
Balancing Equations

Each arc imposes a constraint:

\[ 3a - 2b = 0 \]
\[ 4b - 3d = 0 \]
\[ b - 3c = 0 \]
\[ 2c - a = 0 \]
\[ d - 2a = 0 \]

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
3 & -2 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 4 & 0 & -3 \\
0 & 1 & -3 & 0 \\
-1 & 0 & 2 & 0 \\
-2 & 0 & 0 & 1
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
a \\
b \\
c \\
d
\end{bmatrix} = 0
\]
Solving the Balancing Equation

Main SDF scheduling theorem (Lee ‘87):

- A connected SDF graph with \( n \) actors has a periodic schedule iff its topology matrix \( M \) has rank \( n-1 \)
- If \( M \) has rank \( n-1 \) then there exists a unique smallest positive integer solution \( q \) to \( Mq = 0 \)
- Inconsistent systems only have the all-zeros solution
- Disconnected systems have two- or higher-dimensional solutions

Example:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
  a \\
  b \\
  c \\
  d \\
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
  2 \\
  3 \\
  1 \\
  4 \\
\end{bmatrix} \implies \begin{bmatrix}
  3 & -2 & 0 & 0 \\
  0 & 4 & 0 & -3 \\
  0 & 1 & -3 & 0 \\
 -1 & 0 & 2 & 0 \\
 -2 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
  a \\
  b \\
  c \\
  d \\
\end{bmatrix} = 0
\]
Determine Periodic Schedule

**Possible schedules:**
- (BBBCDDDDAA)*
- (BDBDDBCADDA)*
- (BBDDBDDCAA)*
- ...

Systems often have many possible schedules. How can we use this **flexibility**?
- Reduced code size (loop structure, hierarchy)
- Reduced buffer sizes