Means for dependability

A. Avizienis, J.C. Laprie, B. Randell, C. Landwehr
Basic Concepts and Taxonomy of Dependable and Secure Computing
IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing, Vol. 1, N. 1, 2004

FMSS 2020-2021

Dependability tree





From [Avizienis et al., 2004]

Fault tolerance techniques



Fault Tolerance

- deals with faults at run-time
- (zero faults not possible)
- deliver correct service in presence of activated faults and errors



Organisation of fault tolerance





Error compensation



the system contains enough redundancy to enable errors to be masked

➡ faults are masked

fault masking

A general method to achieve fault masking is to perform multiple computations through multiple channels, either sequencially or concurrently and then apply majority vote on the outputs

Hardware faults - Hardware components fail independently

- replicas of the hw component

Software faults

- Replicas of the same sw do not fail independently
- Versions of the sw that implement the same function via separate designs and implementations(design diversity)

Passive HW fault tolerance technique:TMR



1. Triple Modular Redundancy (TMR) – fault masking



TMR: tolerates 1 faulty module

Triplicate the hw (processors, memories, ..) and perform a majority vote to determine the output

- 2/3 of the modules must deliver the correct results
- effects of faults neutralised without notification of their occurrence
- masking of a failure in any one of the three copies at a time

For permanent faults, since the faulty module is not isolated, the fault tolerance decreases Good for transient faults

In some cases, two faulty modules are tolerated

e.g. memory location 127@ModuleA, memory location 153@ModuleB



Cascading series of TMR modules

Series of TMR configurations.

The effect of partitioning of modules (A, B, C) is that the design can withstand more failures than the solution with only one large triplicated module. One faulty module for each element of the series.

Voter is a single point of failure. Reliability of the Voter is very important.

TMR: the Voter



Majority voting is normally performed on a bit-by-bit basis

AND - OR circuit the output is 1 if at least two inputs are 1 the output is 0 if at least two inputs are 0

OUT = AB + BC + AC

1 bit Voter on 3 input bits



Difficulties

Cascading TMR

Delay in signal propagation (decrease in performance):

- due to the voter
- due to multiple copies synchronisation

Trade-off : achieved fault tolerance vs hw required

N-Modular Redundancy

2. NMR – extension of the TMR concept to N Modules

N is made an odd number

Coverage: m faulty modules, with N = 2m +1

5MR: tolerates 2 faulty modules

7MR: tolerates 3 faulty modules



.......

UNIVERSITÀ DI PISA



Active hw redundancy

1. Duplication with comparison scheme (Error detection)

Two identical pieces of hw (Module1 and Module 2) are operated in parallel

- when a failure occurs, the two outputs are no more identical and a simple comparison detects the fault
- Only disagreement can be determined and an error can be signalled by the comparator



The entire system must be considered faulty

Assumption: the two copies must be unlikely to be corrupted together in the same way

Active hw redundancy: the comparator



Problems

- faults in the comparator may cause
 - an error indication when no error exists (false postive) or
 - possible faults in duplicated modules are never detected (false negative)

Coverage

detects all single faults except those of the comparator

Advantages

 simplicity, low cost, low performance impact of the comparison technique, applicable to all levels and areas

Active hw redundancy



2. Reconfigurable Duplication

(Error detection, disconnet the faulty module and disable the comparison)

Two identical pieces of hw (Module1 and Module 2) are operated in parallel

- when a failure occurs, the two outputs are no more identical and a simple comparison detects the fault
- the comparator (hw component) must select the correct output if a disagreement is detected



Active hw redundancy: the comparator



The comparator applies checks to select the correct output

Types of checks

-Coding -Self-checking components -Reversal Checks -Reasonableness Checks -Specification checks -....

Ability to determine which of the two modules is faulty

Ability to disconnect the faulty module and to disable the comparator

Active HW redundancy

3. Stand-by sparing

(error detection, identification of the faulty module, reconfiguration)

Each module is extended with an error detection module. Part of the modules are operational, part of the modules are spares modules (used as replacement modules). The switch can decide no longer use the value of a module (fault detection and localization). The faulty module is removed and replaced with one of the spares.



As long as the outputs of the operational modules agree, the spares are not used

INIVERSITA DI PISA

Different schemes can be implemented



Pair-and-spare approach

- A module is a Duplex system, pairs connected by a comparator

- Duplex systems are connected to spares by a switch

- As long as the two outputs agree, or the comparator can detect the right value, the spare is not used.

- Otherwise, the comparator signals the switch that it is not able to compute the right value and the switch operates a replacemnet using the spare.



Pair results are used in a spare arrangment. Spare components at coarser granularity. Not all four copies must be synchronised (only the two pairs)

Hybrid HW approaches



Combine both the active and passive approaches

Very expensive in terms of the amount of hw required to implement a system

Applied in commercial systems, safety critical system (aviation, railways, ...)

NMR disadvantage: fault masking ability deteriorates as more copies fail - Replace failed copies with unused spares (hybrid redundancy)

Reconfigurable NMR

Modules arranged in a voting configuration

- spares to replace faulty units
- rely on detection of disagreements and determine the module(s) not agreeing with the majority

Reconfigurable NMR



- N redundant modules configuration (active modules)
- Voter (votes on the output of active modules)
- The Fault detection units

1) compares the output of the Voter with the output of the active modules

2) replaces modules whose output disagree with the output of the voter with spares

Reliablity

as long as the spare pool is not empty

Coverage

TMR with one spare can tolerate 2 faulty modules (mask the first faulty module; replace the module; mask the second faulty module)



Hw redundancy techniques: summary

UNIVERSITÀ DI PISA

Key differences

Passive: rely on fault masking **Active**: rely on error detection, fault location and recovery **Hybrid**: emply both masking and recovery

- Passive provides fault masking but requires investment in hw (5MR can tolerate 2 faulty modules)
- Active has the disadvantage of additional hw for error detection and recovery, sometimes it can produce momentary erroneous outputs
- **Hybrid** techniques have the highest reliability but are the most costly (3MR with one spare can tolerate 2 faulty modules)

Self checking circuitry



Necessity of reliance on the correct operation of **comparators** and **voters** that are used as core for fault tolerant architectures

Self-checking circuit

given a set of faults, a circuit that has the ability to automatically detect the existence of the fault and the detection occurs during the normal course of its operations

Typically obtained using *Coding* techniques

D. P. Siewiorek R.S. Swarz, Reliable Computer Systems Prentice Hall, 1998, pp.124-126 https://archive.org/details/reliablecomputer00siew

Coding



Coding: application of redundancy to information

Information is represented with more bits that strictly necessary: says, an n-bit information chunk is represented by

n+c= m bits

Among all the possible 2^m configurations of the m bits, only 2ⁿ represent acceptable values (code words)

if a non-code word appears, it indicates an error in transmitting, or storing, or retrieving ...

Parity code – odd parity

for each unit of data, e.g. 8 bits, add a parity bit so that the total number of 1's in the resulting 9 bits is odd





Two bit flips are not detected

Coding

Codes

encoding: the process of determining the c bit configuration for a n bit data item decoding: the process of recovering the original n bit data from the m total bit

Separable code: a code in which the original information is appended with new information to form the code word. The decoding process consists of simply removing the additional information and keeping the original data

Nonseparable code: requires more complicated decoding procedures

Parity code is a separable code

Additional information can be used for error detection and for error correction

Examples of codes



Parity-code (odd parity)

boxed words are code words in the figures

n=2, m=3



3-bit words 8 possible words 4 code words



4-bit words 16 possible words 8 code words

n=3, m=4

Examples of codes



CD - complemented duplication

join n bit value with its complement: n complement(n) the second half is the complemented duplication of the first half

m/n code - m bit equal to 1

2/4 code



4-bit words 16 possible words 4 code words: {0011, 0110, 1001, 1100}



4-bit words 16 possible words 6 code words: {1001, 1010, 1100, 0110, 0011, 0101}

Hamming distance

Hamming distance

- the number of bit positions on which two code words differ

Minimum Hamming distance found between any two code words is the number of independent single bit errors that the code can detect

A code such that the Hamming distance between two code words is equal to k will detect all errors up to k-1 bits

Memories of computer systems. Parity bit added before writing the memory. Parity bit is checked when reading.

Useful distance measures depend on type of data and faults

Bank account numbers should be such that mistyping a digit does not credit the wrong account.

each edge of the cube represents a distance-1 transition

INIVERSITÀ DI PISA



Parity-code Hamming distance 2

Codes for error correction

Minimum Hamming distance:

minimum distance between two code words

A code with the minimum Hamming distance is $\ k$

- detect up to k-1 single bit errors
- correct up to d errors, where k = 2d + 1

Hamming distance 3: detects 1 or 2 bits errors correct 1 bit error





Self checking circuitry



Self-checking circuit

given a set of faults, a circuit that has the ability to automatically detect the existence of the fault and the detection occurs during the normal course of its operations

Basic idea:

- circuit inputs and outputs are encoded (also different codes can be used)
- fault free + code word input -> output: correct code word
- fault + code word input -> output: (correct code word) or (non code word)

Self checking circuitry



- Self-testing circuit: if, for every fault from the set, the circuit produces a non code word output for at least one code word input (each single fault is detectable)
- Fault-secure circuit: if, for every fault from the set, the circuit never produces a incorrect code word output for a code word input
- Totally self-checking (TSC): if the circuit is self-testing and faultsecure

two signal input comparator (A, B) output is 0 if inputs are equal; output is 1 otherwise

Fault assumption:

- single fault
- stuck-at-1/stuck-at-0 of each line in the circuit

Coding: complemented duplication (dual-rail signal: coded signal whose two bits are always complementary)









output 0 if inputs are equal; 1 otherwise

```
Fault free
A =0, B =1 different input
m=1, n =1, q=0
o = 0, p=1, r= 1
c2=0
c1=1
c1c2: code word
Output = c1 = 1 correct
```





output 0 if inputs are equal; 1 otherwise

Faulty: A=0, B=1 different input m: stuck-at-0 c2 = 1 c1 = 1 c1c2: non code word Output = error





output 0 if inputs are equal; 1 otherwise

Faulty:
A=0, B=1 different input
m: stuck-at-1
c2=0
c1=1
c1c2: code word
output = c1 = 1 correct





Inputs		Normal		Outputs C2C1 Resulting from Single Stuck-at-1 Faults																
B2B1	A2A1	Output	а	b	с	d	е	f	g	h	i	j	k	I	m	n	0	р	q	r
01	01	10	11	10	11	10	10	10	10	10	10	11	11	10	10	00	10	10	10	11
01	10	01	11	01	01	11	11	01	01	11	01	01	01	01	01	01	00	01	11	01
10	01	01	01	11	11	01	01	11	11	01	01	01	01	01	01	01	01	00	11	01
10	10	10	10	11	10	11	10	10	10	10	11	10	10	11	00	10	10	10	10	11
	10	10				815	100				100				1000	0.50	10 m		1000	100
Inp	outs	Normal					Outp	uts C	2C1 R	lesult	ing fr	om S	ingle	Stuc	k-at-0	Fault	s	hine		
Ing B2B1	outs A2A1	Normal Output	a	b	c	d	Outp	uts C	2C1 R g	tesult h	ing fr	om S j	ingle k	Stuck	k-at-0 m	Fault	s O	р	q	r
B2B1 01	A2A1	Normal Output 10	a 10	b 00	c 10	d 00	Outp e 10	uts C f 10	2C1 R g 00	tesult h	ing fr i 10	om S j 10	ingle k 10	Stuck	k-at-0 m 10	Fault n 10	s 0 11	р 11	q 00	r 10
Ing B2B1 01 01	A2A1 01 10	Normal Output 10 01	a 10 01	b 00 00	с 10 00	d 00 01	Outp e 10 01	uts C f 10 01	2C1 R g 00 01	tesult h 00 01	ing fr i 10 00	om S j 10 00	ingle k 10 01	Stuck	c-at-0 m 10 11	Fault n 10 11	s 0 11 01	р 11 01	q 00 01	r 10 00
01 01 10	01 01 01 01	Normal Output 10 01 01	a 10 01 00	b 00 00 01	c 10 00 01	d 00 01 00	Outp e 10 01 01	uts C. f 10 01 01	2C1 R g 00 01 01	Result h 00 01 01	ing fr i 10 00 01	om S j 10 00 01	ingle k 10 01 00	Stuck	(-at-0 m 10 11 11	Fault n 10 11 11	s 0 11 01 01	p 11 01 01	q 00 01 01	r 10 00

Taken from: [Siewiorek et al., 1998]

- For each fault, there exists at least one input configuration such that the output is a non code word
- If the output is a code word, the output is correct

 n-input TSC comparator: tree of two input self checking comparators



UNIVERSITÀ DI PISA