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Problem

ASML builds wafer scanners

- Very complex lithographic machines used in the semiconductor manufacturing process
  - Machine is regarded as Task-Resource system (flexibility)
  - Scheduling in real-time (many things can go wrong)
  - Throughput is one of the main performance characteristics
  - Deadlock should be avoided at all costs

What is this case-study about?

- Material flow in Extreme Ultra Violet (EUV) machine
  - Compute a (least restrictive) deadlock avoidance policy
  - Compute schedules (optimal wrt throughput)
Approach

**AMETIST mission:**
- Improve TA model checking tools
- **Investigate the applicability of TA tools**
- Link to dedicated tools when appropriate

**The AMETIST approach:**
- Model as dynamical system with *state space* and well-defined *dynamics*: model generates behavior (the semantics)
- Design activities (verification, synthesis) explore and modify system structure so that behavior is correct, optimal, etc
- Do not let modeling suffer from tools

**Timed automaton** model as mathematical carrier
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Straightforward modeling

- Every place is modeled by a state variable which can be empty (e), red (r), or green (g)
- Every pair of arrows is modeled by an asynchronous process
module main ()
{
   -- the places in the machine:
   l : array 0..3 of {e,r,g};
   c : array 0..1 of {e,r,g};
   rb: array 0..1 of
       array 0..1 of {e,r,g};

   -- initialization:
   for (i=0; i<4; i=i+1)
      init(l[i]):=e;
   for (i=0; i<2; i=i+1)
      for (j=0; j<2; j=j+1)
         init(rb[i][j]):=e;
   for (i=0; i<2; i=i+1)
      init(c[i]):=e;

   -- system dynamics:
   for (i=0; i<4; i=i+1)
      t21[i]: process entry_exit(l[i]);
   for (i=0; i<4; i=i+1)
      for (j=0; j<2; j=j+1)
         l2r[i][j]: process move(l[i],rb[(i<2?0:1)][j]);
   for (i=0; i<2; i=i+1)
      for (j=0; j<2; j=j+1)
         for (k=0; k<2; k=k+1)
            r2c[i][j][k]: process move(rb[i][j],c[k]);
   for (i=0; i<2; i=i+1)
      exp[i]: process expose(c[i]);
}

module entry_exit (p)
{
   if (p=e)
      next(p):=r;
   else if (p=g)
      next(p):=e;
}

module move (lft,rgt)
{
   if (lft=r & rgt=e)
   {
      next(lft):=e;
      next(rgt):=r;
   }
   else if (lft=e & rgt=g)
   {
      next(lft):=g;
      next(rgt):=e;
   }
}

module expose (p)
{
   if (p=r)
      next(p):=g;
}
Handling deadlock

3 ways of handling deadlock:

- Deadlock prevention: restrict system such that deadlock is a priori impossible
- Deadlock detection: detect and resolve deadlocks at runtime
- Deadlock avoidance: dynamically choose control actions to avoid deadlock

Deadlock avoidance: keep the system in a set of safe states (Dijkstra, 1965)

- What is deadlock and what are safe states?
- How to express deadlock and safety in CTL?
- How to characterize the set of safe states?
Informal definitions

Deadlock:
- A state is a *deadlock* iff there is a circular wait (*Operating systems – internals and design principles*, Stallings)
- In our model, a state is a deadlock iff there exists a wafer that cannot move anymore

Safety:
- A state is *safe* iff all processes (wafers in our case) can be run to completion (*Banker’s algorithm*, Dijkstra, 1965).
- In our model, a wafer is run to completion when it exits the machine
**CTL interlude**

*SMV* builds a transition system over which it interprets CTL

$$\text{EF}(p)$$

$$\text{EG}(p)$$

$$\text{AF}(p)$$

$$\text{AG}(p)$$
CTL definitions

\[
deadlock \equiv \bigvee_{p \in P} AG(p \text{ is not empty})
\]

\[
safe \equiv EF \left( \bigwedge_{p \in P} (p \text{ is empty}) \right)
\]

where \( P \) is the set of places of the EUV machine

**Note:** \( deadlock \rightarrow \neg safe \) but in general not: \( \neg safe \rightarrow deadlock \)
Avoiding Deadlock

What is the connection between safe and deadlock states?

▶ We want to show that safe states really are safe, i.e., it is always possible to avoid deadlock
▶ Furthermore, the set of safe states is the largest set from which deadlock can always be avoided

\[ s_{\text{init}} \models AG(\text{safe} \iff EG(\neg\text{deadlock})) \]

Least restrictive deadlock avoidance policy for EUV machine:
▶ Keep it within the set of safe states!
Characterizing the set of safe states

Iterative approach:

set \( C = true \)

while \( s_{\text{init}} \not\models AG(\text{safe} \iff C) \) do:

Update \( C \) to exclude counterexample (involves thinking)

This case: 4 iterations to get 4 unsafe situations (mod symmetry)

Note:

- Creative step is not needed: SMV internally builds a BDD representation of the set of safe states if you ask whether \( s_{\text{init}} \models \text{safe} \)
- However, the iterative process gives a good feeling for problems (a BDD does not)
Problem Description
The SMV model
Deadlock and Safety
Characterization of Safe States
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Predicate $C$ that exactly characterizes the set of safe states:

$\neg (1[0]=r \land 1[1]=r \land rb[0][0]=g \land rb[0][1]=g) \land
(1[2]=r \land 1[3]=r \land rb[1][0]=g \land rb[1][1]=g) \land
(\neg c[0]=e \land \neg c[1]=e \land rb[0][0]=r \land rb[0][1]=r \land rb[1][0]=r \land rb[1][1]=r) \land
(\neg c[0]=e \land \neg c[1]=e \land rb[1][0]=r \land rb[1][1]=r \land
(rb[0][0]=r \land rb[0][1]=g) \lor (rb[0][0]=g \land rb[0][1]=r) \land
l[2]=r \land l[3]=r) \land
(\neg c[0]=e \land \neg c[1]=e \land rb[1][0]=r \land rb[1][1]=r \land
(rb[0][0]=r \land rb[0][1]=g) \lor (rb[0][0]=g \land rb[0][1]=r) \land
l[0]=r \land l[1]=r) \land
(\neg c[0]=e \land \neg c[1]=e \land
(rb[0][0]=r \land rb[0][1]=g) \lor (rb[0][0]=g \land rb[0][1]=r) \land
(rb[1][0]=r \land rb[1][1]=g) \lor (rb[1][0]=g \land rb[1][1]=r) \land
l[0]=r \land l[1]=r \land l[2]=r \land l[3]=r) \land
\)
Refinement of the SMV model
Refinement of the SMV model

Add detail and timing
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Refinement of the SMV model

Add constraints (locks for instance; also mutual exclusion)
Refinement of the SMV model

Add Observer process (for throughput optimization)

Ask Uppaal whether

$$s_{init} \models EG \left( \begin{array}{ll} 
\text{Observer.L0} \Rightarrow \text{Observer}.x \leq H \\
\wedge \\
\text{Observer.L1} \Rightarrow \text{Observer}.x \leq S 
\end{array} \right)$$
Relation with the SMV model:

There is a stuttering bisimulation $R$ between the Uppaal model and the SMV model. Thus, CTL $\setminus X$ formulas are preserved (Browne, Clarke & Grumberg, 1988)
Adding heuristics

The state space is too large

- Locks can depressurize or pressurize (almost) any time
- Internal robots can turn (almost) any time
- Chuck can swap (almost) any time
- Large differences in time scale: 670 (lock depres) vs 10 (turn)

Solutions:

- Avoid unsafe material configurations
- Avoid useless transitions (turns, swaps, etc)
- Make some transitions greedy/urgent
Optimal schedule
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Optimal schedule for no crossing wafer paths
Some schedule for 2 locks and 1 internal robot
- Short and exact characterization of safe states (either by iterative process or by extracting a BDD from SMV)

- Synthesis of a schedule that optimizes throughput; analysis of an alternative configuration and control policy

- We have adjusted abstraction level for different goals and proved soundness

- It took us approx. 2 weeks to build the models and to obtain our results

- Our work confirms once more that formal modeling and analysis may help to improve the design process; our work is referred to in a patent application filed by ASML

- Scalability?