Misleading trade-offs in a combi-product: the Hard Disk / DVD+RW case.

Philips Software Conference, Februari 2004 Ton Kostelijk, PDSL-E

Overview

- Why a HD / DVD+RW combi? Requirements.
- Ideal system architecture versus available
- Proposal of DXC architecture
- Exposure of unsound trade-off thinking
- Outcome & results
- Conclusion

Why a HD / DVD+RW combi?

DVD-recorder

- playback, record, HQ, permanent storage
- removable disk

HD-recorder

- playback, record, HQ, semi-permanent storage
- time-shift by simultaneous playback & record
- non-removable large disk

Combi has it all,

- giving more freedom when to watch what and
- ease of use: less fiddling with disks.

DXC project

Project Leader: Roel de Bruijne

Chief SW architect: Pavlo Barvinko

Major project issues: (dd Q1 2003)1. Time-to-market (Q1 2004)2. Product reliability





Ideal: HD/DVD

Integral application

HD and DVD+RW

Board



Available: DVD



Board



Dual Xalis Combi proposal



++ Reuse DVD SW as is++ No interference++ No performance issues

- Distributed Control, booting, testing, etc.
- Merging of A/V output
- Synchronization of streaming
- BOM

Main opinion against the ideal: Don't put two stacks on one processor

- DVD SW is used to 'own' the processor.
- DVD SW is too fragile and monolithic.
- True independence is better, no interference.

- Prevent performance problems.
- Time-to-market is key.
- Reliability is key.
- BOM can be optimized later.

Integration costs reliability and effort



Oversimplification Qualitative

Artificial balance paradigm versus multi-dimensions in design space



Two stacks on two processors











CPU







Two stacks on one processor



A closer look at the arguments

- DVD SW is used to 'own' the processor.
- DVD SW is too fragile and monolithic.
- True independence is better, no interference.

- SW runs CPU at max 50 % load for playback or record.
- SW is 50 % ^(c), other half:
 Only PBS is used
 - Already ported ST to X
- Parts of a combi cannot be totally independent.
- Synchronization and merging REQUIRES interference, mainly at streaming (Gen. 2)

Elaborate concrete pros and cons and quantify for Dual or Single Chrysalis

Pros of single X:

- Synchronization / merging / control.
- No new board required.
- Much more reuse of DVD SW: boot, factory test, tooling.
- Huge reduction in BOM.

Concerns

- Feasibility of combi SX execution architecture.
- Effort estimates
- Risks

Decision Window

Dual stack single Xalis Combi



Features Continuous HD recording Simult. HD Play / record Timeshift Play DVD[+RW] Archive to DVD CAM support

Outcome

• Performance / execution arch. feasible,

- requires mostly non-intrusive changes, e.g., compiler and priority settings, memory arbiter settings, ...
- Changes would also be required for Dual case!

• Total project effort was slightly less, due to

- synchr./ merging / control greatly simplified.
- booting, debugging, factory test same as DVD SW
 no new board design required.
- BOM reduction received a warm welcome, resulting in an increasing amount of orders.

Current status

- Performance improvement:
 - From >100 % to 60 % continuous cpu load for worst case scenario.
 - Total change effort: 1.5 man-year = 2 % of all !
- Changes were integrated in two days.
- Some unexpected problems were encountered, but none were lethal.
- All project deliveries are on time.

Conclusion

- Reusing DVD SW is possible and beneficial.
- In-depth design exploration really pays off, guided by time-boxing to serve planning.
- Execution architecture effort gives large benefits at low cost, and need not be intrusive.
- Trade-off thinking
 - Takes a one-dimensional look at a multi-dimensional solution space.
 - Based on oversimplification and qualitative reasoning, one overlooks much better solutions.

Thanks

- Roel de Bruijne & Pavlo Barvinko
- Vlatko Milosevski
- Bart Franco

CAEN Chrysalis Driver System team
DVD+RW 2.1 team