Something Cool

- RFID is an exciting and growing technology
- This reader from Parallax is $40 and has a serial interface



Lab

- Lab 1 due next Tues
- Seemed to go pretty well on Tues?
- Questions?

Quiz Results

- Problem 1: About 50% of class got it totally right
- Problem 2:
  - Most everyone got the first 4 parts correct
  - Remaining 3 parts were about 60%
- Problem 3: 40%
- Problem 4: 50%
- Problem 5: 90% was close, about 20% was totally correct

Last Time

- Low-level parts of the toolchain for embedded systems
  - Linkers
  - Programmers
  - Booting an embedded CPU
  - Debuggers
    - JTAG
- Any weak link in the toolchain will hinder development

Today: Intro to Embedded C

- We are not learning C
- We are leaning "advanced embedded C"
  - Issues that frequently come up when developing embedded software
  - Seldom care about these when writing general-purpose apps

Embedded Compilers

- Today:
  - General capabilities
  - Specific issues part 1
- First: Almost all compilers for embedded systems are cross-compilers
  - Compiler runs on an architecture other than its target
  - Does this matter at all?

Compiler Requirements

- Be correct
  - Embedded compilers are notoriously buggy
    - Relatively few copies sold
    - Diverse hardware impedes thorough testing
- Produce small, fast code
  - Speed and size are conflicting goals
    - Oops!
  - Take advantage of platform-specific features
- Produce code that's easy to debug
  - Conflicts with optimization
  - Whole-program optimization particularly problematic

Want To Tell the Compiler…

- There are only 32 KB of RAM
  - Program must fit, but there's no point reducing RAM consumption further
- There are only 256 KB of ROM
  - Again: Program must fit but there's no point reducing ROM consumption further
- Interrupt handler 7 is time critical
  - So make it very fast, even if this bloats code
- Threads 8-13 are background threads
  - Performance is unimportant so focus on reducing code size

What We Get To Tell It

- A few compiler flags:
  - -O2, -Os, Etc.
  - May or may not do what you want
  - Typically no flags for controlling RAM usage
- Therefore…
  - Meeting resource constraints is 100% your problem
  - Shouldn't assume compiler did the right thing
  - Shouldn't assume code you reuse does the right thing
    - Including the C library
  - Figure out which resources matter and focus on dealing with them
  - Changing or upgrading compiler mid-project is usually very bad

Nice Example

- I have a 1982 book on 6502 assembly programming:
  - strcmp(): compare two strings
    - Registers used: all
    - Execution time: 93 + 19 * length of shorter string
    - Code size: 52 bytes
    - Data size:
      - 4 bytes on page 0
      - 4 bytes to hold the string pointers
- Try to find this information for current C libraries!

Why use C?

- "Mid-level" language
  - Some high-level features
  - Good low-level control
  - Static types
  - Type system is easily subverted
- C is popular and well-understood
  - Plenty of good developers exist
  - Plenty of good compilers exist
  - Plenty of good books and web pages exist
- In many cases there's no obviously superior language

Why not use C?

- Hard to write portable code
  - For example "int" does not have a fixed size
- Hard to write correct code
  - Very hard to tell when your code does something bad
  - E.g. out-of-bounds array reference
  - This is Microsoft's major problem…
- Language standard is weak in some areas
  - Means there is plenty of diversity in implementations
- Linking model is unsafe
- Preprocessor is poorly designed

CPP – the C Preprocessor

- CPP runs as a separate pass before the compiler
- Basic usage:
  - `#define FOO 32`
  - `int y = FOO;`
- Compiler sees:
  - `int y = 32;`
- CPP operates by lexical substitution
- Important: The compiler never sees `FOO`
  - So of course the debugger, linker, etc. do not know about it either

Some Interesting Macros

```
#define PLUS_ONE(x) x+1
int a = PLUS_ONE(y)*3

#define TIMES_TWO(x) (x*2)
int a = TIMES_TWO(1+1)

#define MAX(x,y) ((x)>(y)?(x):(y))
void f () { int m = MAX(a++,b); }

#define INT_POINTER int *
INT_POINTER x, y;
```

Macro Problems

- Root of the problem:
  - C preprocessor is highly error-prone
  - Avoid it except to do very simple things
  - Fully parenthesize macro definitions
  - Make macro usage conventions clear
- Entertaining macros:

```
#define DISABLE_INTS asm volatile ("cli"); {
#define ENABLE_INTS asm volatile ("sei"); }
```

  - Is this good or bad macro usage?

- Old conventional wisdom:
  - Careful use of CPP is good
- New conventional wisdom:
  - Most uses of CPP can be avoided
  - Trust the optimizer

Macro Avoidance

- Constants
  - Instead of
    - `#define X 10`
  - Use
    - `const int X = 10;`
- Functions
  - Instead of
    - `#define INC_X x++`
  - Use
    - `inline void INC_X(void) { x++ }`

More Macro Avoidance

- Conditional compilation
  - Instead of
    - `#if FOO … #endif`
  - Use
    - `if (FOO) { … }`
  - Instead of
    - `#ifdef X86 … #endif`
  - Put x86 code into a separate file
- However: Design of C makes it impossible to avoid macros entirely
  - C++ much better in this respect

Bit Manipulation without Macros

- Something like this is good:

```
void set_bit (int *a, int bit) {
  *a |= (1<<bit);
}
void clear_bit (int *a, int bit) {
  *a &= ~(1<<bit);
}
```

CPP in Action

- Sometimes you need to look at the CPP output
  - That is, see what the C compiler really sees
  - There's always a way to do this
  - In CodeWarrior, do this using the IDE
  - For gcc: "gcc –E foo.c"

Intrinsics

- "Intrinsic" functions are built in to the compiler
  - As opposed to living in a library somewhere
- Why do compilers support intrinsics?
  - Efficiency – can perform interesting optimizations
  - Ease of use
    - Compiler can add function calls where they do not exist in your code
    - Compiler can eliminate "library calls" in your code
- Need to be careful when compiler inserts function calls for you!

Integer Division Intrinsics

```
int sdiv (int x, int y)
{
  return x/y;
}
```

- On ARM7

```
sdiv:
   str    lr, [sp, #-4]!
   bl     __divsi3
   ldr    pc, [sp], #4
```

- On AVR

```
sdiv:
   rcall  __divmodhi4
   mov    r25,r23
   mov    r24,r22
   ret
```

Copy Intrinsic

```
struct foo {
  int x, y[3];
  double z;
};

void struct_copy2 (struct foo *a,
                   struct foo *b)
{
  *a = *b;
}
```

ColdFire code:

```
struct_copy2:
  link      a6,#0
  moveq     #6,d1
  move.w    (a1),(a0)
  move.w    2(a1),2(a0)
  addq.l    #4,a1
  addq.l    #4,a0
  subq.l    #1,d1
  bne.s     *-14
  unlk      a6
  rts
```

More Copy

- On ARM7

```
struct_copy2:
   str    lr, [sp, #-4]!
   mov    lr, r1
   mov    ip, r0
   ldmia  lr!, {r0, r1, r2, r3}
   stmia  ip!, {r0, r1, r2, r3}
   ldmia  lr, {r0, r1}
   stmia  ip, {r0, r1}
   ldr    pc, [sp], #4
```

Copy on x86-64

- From Intel CC (but copying a larger struct):

```
struct_copy:
  pushq     %rsi
  movl      $4000, %edx
  call      _intel_fast_memcpy
  popq      %rcx
  ret
```

String Length

```
int len_hello1 (void)
{
   return strlen ("hello");
}
```

- ColdFire code:

```
len_hello1:
0x00000000  link     a6,#0
0x00000004  lea      _@71,a0
0x0000000A  jsr      _strlen
0x00000010  unlk     a6
0x00000012  rts
```

Another String Length

- ARM7

```
len_hello1:
   mov    r0, #5
   bx     lr
```

So What?

- Compiler can add function calls where you didn't have one
- Compiler can take out function calls that you put in
- How will you understand the resource usage of the resulting code?
  - What resources are we even talking about?

30-Second Interrupt Review

- Interrupts are a kind of asynchronous exception
- When some external condition becomes true, CPU jumps to the interrupt vector
- When an interrupt returns, previously executing code resumes as if nothing happened
  - Unless the interrupt handler is buggy
  - Also, the state of memory and/or devices has probably changed
- With appropriate compiler support interrupts look just like regular functions
  - Don't be fooled – there are major differences between interrupts and functions

ARM / GCC Interrupt

```
void __attribute__ ((interrupt("IRQ")))
tc0_cmp (void);
{
    timeval++;
    VICVectAddr = 0;
}
```

- All embedded compilers provide similar extensions
- C language has no support for interrupts

Example CF Interrupt

- You write:

```
__declspec(interrupt)
void rtc_handler(void)
{
   MCF_GPIO_PORTTC ^= 0xf;
}
```

- After CPP:

```
__declspec(interrupt)
void rtc_handler(void)
{
  (*(vuint8 *)(0x4010000F)) ^= 0xf;
}
```

Assembly for CF Interrupt

```
rtc_handler:
  strldsr  #0x2700
  link     a6,#0
  lea      -16(a7),a7
  movem.l  d0-d1/a0,4(a7)
  movea.l  #1074790415,a0
  moveq    #0,d1
  move.b   (a0),d1
  moveq    #15,d0
  eor.l    d0,d1
  move.b   d1,(a0)
  movem.l  4(a7),d0-d1/a0
  unlk     a6
  addq.l   #4,a7
  rte
```

Inline Assembly

- Two reasons to add assembly into a C program:
  1. Need to say something that can't be said in C
  2. Need higher performance than the C compiler provides
- In both cases
  - Write most of a function in C and then throw in a few instructions of assembly where needed
    - Let the compiler do the grunt work of respecting the calling convention
- When writing asm to increase performance:
  - Be absolutely sure you identified the culprit
  - First try to write faster C

CodeWarrior Inline Asm

```
long square (short a) {
  long result=0;
  asm {
    move.w a,d0 // fetch function argument 'a'
    mulu.w d0,d0 // multiply
    move.l d0,result // store in local 'result'
  }
  return result;
}
```

- Compiler generates glue code integrating the assembler and C code
- What if it can't?

Inline Assembly Example

```
square:
  link     a6,#0
  subq.l   #8,a7
  move.w   d0,-8(a6)
  clr.l    -6(a6)
  move.w   -8(a6),d0
  mulu.w   d0,d0
  move.l   d0,-6(a6)
  move.l   -6(a6),d0
  unlk     a6
  rts
```

GCC Inline Assembly

- Format:

```
asm volatile (code : outputs : inputs : clobbers );
```

  - Code – instructions
  - Outputs – maps results of instructions into C variables
  - Inputs – maps C variables to inputs of instructions
  - Clobbers – tells the compiler to forget the contents of registers that were invalidated by the assembly code

- This syntax is much more difficult to use than CodeWarrior's!

Important From Today

- Embedded C
  - Pros and cons
- Macros and how to avoid them
- Intrinsics
- Interrupt syntax
- Inline assembly