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Motivation

- Preemptive scheduling on multi (-core) processors introduces new challenges
  - Complex hardware, e.g., different levels of caches
    - Difficult to perform timing analysis
  - Potentially large number of task migrations
    - Difficult to demonstrate predictability
    - Difficult to reason about safety

- Non-preemptive scheduling can be infeasible at arbitrarily small utilization
  - Long task problem: at least one task has execution time greater than the shortest deadline

One solution: limit preemptions
System Model

Identical multiprocessor platform with $m$ processors
Limited Preemptive Scheduling

Combines **best of** preemptive and non-preemptive scheduling

- Controls preemption related overheads
  - Context switch costs, cache related preemption delays, pipeline delays and bus contention costs
- Improves processor utilization
  - **Reduce** preemption related **costs** while **eliminating** infeasibility due to **blocking**

Anecdotal evidence: “**limiting preemptions improves safety and makes it easier to certify** software for **safety-critical** applications”
Limited preemptive scheduling landscape

| Uniprocessor | Limited preemptive FPS  
(Burns’94, Bril et al., RTSJ’09, Yao et al., RTSJ’11) | Limited preemptive EDF  
(Baruah, ECRTS’05) |
| Multiprocessor | Global limited preemptive FPS  
(Block et al., RTCSA’07, Marinho et al., RTSS’13, Davis et al., TECS’15) | Global limited preemptive EDF  
(Block et al., RTCSA’07, Thekkilakattil et al., ECRTS’14, Chattopadhyay and Baruah, RTNS’14) |

… of course the references are by no way exhaustive!
Managing Preemptions in Global Limited Preemptive Scheduling
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Global Limited Preemptive FPS with Fixed Preemption Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lazy Preemption Approach</th>
<th>Block et al., RTCSA’07: Link Based Scheduling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eager Preemption Approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lazy Preemption Approach: Link Based Scheduling

- Developed in the context of resource sharing by Block et al., RTCSA’07
  - Applicable to limited preemptive scheduling

- Implements lazy preemption approach

- Higher priority tasks blocked on a processor is linked to that processor

- Analyzable using a simple and generic inflation based test (Brandenburg and Anderson, MPI-Tech Report’14)
  1) Inflate WCET with largest blocking factor
  2) Determine schedulability using any standard test e.g., response time analysis for global preemptive FPS
Global Limited Preemptive FPS with Fixed Preemption Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lazy Preemption Approach</th>
<th>Block et al., RTCSA’07: Link Based Scheduling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eager Preemption Approach</strong></td>
<td>No significant work!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How can we perform schedulability analysis of tasks scheduled using G-LP-FPS with eager preemptions?
Schedulability Analysis under G-LP-FPS with Eager Preemptions

Interference (higher and lower priority)

Task $i$
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- Case 1: no “push through” blocking
- Case 2: presence of “push through” blocking
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Interference (higher and lower priority)

- Case 1: no "push through" blocking
- Case 2: presence of "push through" blocking
Lower Priority Interference before Task Start Time

Case 1: no push through blocking

blocking = sum of $m$ largest $\{\text{lower priority NPRs}\}$
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Interference
(higher and lower priority)

Task $i$

• Case 1: no “push through” blocking
• Case 2: presence of “push through” blocking
Lower Priority Interference before Task Start Time

Case 2: presence of push through blocking

blocking = sum of $m$ largest \{lower priority NPRs, final NPR of $i$\}
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Interference (higher and lower priority)

Task $i$
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Interference (higher and lower priority)

Task $i$
Lower Priority Interference after Task Start Time

blocking = sum of \((m-1)\) largest \(\{\text{lower priority NPRs}\}\)
Schedulability Analysis under G-LP-FPS with Eager Preemptions

\[ R_i = \text{Interference (higher and lower priority)} + \text{Interference (higher and lower priority)} + \text{Interference (higher and lower priority)} + \text{Interference (higher and lower priority)} + C_i \]

Of course, preemption may not occur at all preemption points

- No. of preemptions as a function of response time to reduce pessimism
- Details in the paper
Experiments

Which among eager and lazy preemption approaches is better for Global Limited Preemptive FPS (G-LP-FPS)?

• Compared schedulability under eager preemptions and lazy preemptions

  • Test for lazy preemptions: test for link-based scheduling that implements lazy preemptions
    – Inflate task execution time with largest blocking time
    – Perform response time analysis for G-P-FPS
Overview of Experiments

- Task utilizations generated using UUnifastDiscard
- Periods in the range $50$ to $500$
- Taskset utilization in the range $2.4$ to $m$

- We investigated how weighted schedulability varies with:
  1. Varying number of tasks
  2. Varying number of processors
  3. Varying NPR lengths
     a. relatively large NPR w.r.t task WCETs
     b. relatively small NPR w.r.t task WCETs
Weighted Schedulability

- Weighs schedulability with utilization (Bastoni et al., OSPERT’10)

\[ W(p) = \frac{\sum_{\forall \Gamma} U(\Gamma)S(\Gamma, p)}{\sum_{\forall \Gamma} U(\Gamma)} \]
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Schedulability of taskset \( \Gamma \) w.r.t parameter \( p \)
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Utilization of taskset $\Gamma$
Weighted Schedulability

• Weighs schedulability with utilization (Bastoni et al., OSPERT’10)

\[
W(p) = \frac{\sum_{\forall \Gamma} U(\Gamma)S(\Gamma, p)}{\sum_{\forall \Gamma} U(\Gamma)}
\]

• Enables investigation of schedulability \( w.r.t \) a second parameter in addition to utilization

• Higher weighted schedulability implies a better algorithm with respect to scheduling high utilization tasksets (and thus better algorithm \( w.r.t \) efficiency)
Experiments

We investigated how *weighted schedulability* varies with:

1. Varying number of tasks
2. Varying number of processors
3. Varying NPR lengths
   a. relatively large NPR *w.r.t* task WCETs
   b. relatively small NPR *w.r.t* task WCETs
Varying Number of Tasks

$m=4$ and NPR=5%

Eager approach outperforms lazy approach for larger number of tasks
Experiments

We investigated how *weighted schedulability* varied with:

1. Varying number of tasks
2. Varying number of processors
3. Varying NPR lengths
   a. relatively large NPR w.r.t task WCETs
   b. relatively small NPR w.r.t task WCETs
Varying Number of Processors

$n = 30$ and NPR = 5%

Higher utilization and fixed $n \Rightarrow$ large execution times $\Rightarrow$ large NPRs

$\Rightarrow$ more blocking after start time

**Lower utilization and fixed $n$ $\Rightarrow$ small execution times $\Rightarrow$ small NPRs**

**No blocking after start time**
Experiments

We investigated how weighted schedulability varied with:

1. Varying number of tasks
2. Varying number of processors
3. Varying NPR lengths
   a. relatively large NPR w.r.t task WCETs
   b. relatively small NPR w.r.t task WCETs
Varying Lengths of NPRs (large)

\( n=30 \) and \( m=4 \)

- G-P-FPS
- EPA
- LPA
- EPA Only
- G-NP-FPS

Eager preemptions:
- Number of preemptions = 3
- Number of preemptions = 2
- Number of preemptions = 1
- Number of preemptions = 0

Lazy preemptions:
- Number of preemptions ≈ 1
Experiments

We investigated how *weighted schedulability* varied with:

1. Varying number of tasks
2. Varying number of processors
3. Varying NPR lengths
   a. relatively large NPR *w.r.t* task WCETs
   b. relatively small NPR *w.r.t* task WCETs
Varying Lengths of NPRs (small)

n=30 and m=4

Lazy approach outperforms eager approach for smaller NPR lengths

Small NPR lengths $\Rightarrow$ many preemption points $\Rightarrow$ more blocking

Lazy preemptions

Eager preemptions
Conclusions

• Presented a schedulability test for global LP FPS with eager preemptions

• Compared eager and lazy approaches using synthetically generated tasksets
  – Eager approach outperforms lazy approach

• Eager preemption is beneficial if high priority tasks have short deadlines relative to their WCETs
  – Need to schedule them ASAP

• Lazy preemption is beneficial if tasks have many preemptions points
  – Need to reduce blocking occurring after tasks start their execution
Future Work

• Evaluation of runtime preemptive behaviors of eager and lazy approaches under global EDF and FPS
  – LP scheduling with eager approach generates more runtime preemptions compared to preemptive scheduling (under submission to RTAS’16)

• Evaluation on a real hardware
  – Context Switch Overheads
  – Cache related preemptions delays

• Efficient preemption point placement strategies for multiprocessor systems
Thank you!

Questions?