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Mixed Periodic and Aperiodic Task Systems

- Question: how to execute aperiodic tasks without violating schedulability guarantees given to periodic tasks?

- One Answer: Execute aperiodic tasks at lowest priority
  - Problem: Poor performance for aperiodic tasks
Mixed Periodic and Aperiodic Task Systems

- Idea: aperiodic tasks can be served by periodically invoked servers
- The server can be accounted for in periodic task schedulability analysis
- The server has a period $P_s$ and a budget $B_s$
- Server can serve aperiodic tasks until budget expires
- Servers have different flavors depending on the details of when they are invoked, what priority they have, and how budgets are replenished
Mixed Periodic and Aperiodic Task Systems

- Idea: aperiodic tasks can be served by periodically invoked servers
- The server can be accounted for in periodic task schedulability analysis
- The server has a period $P_s$ and a budget $B_s$
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Polling Server

- Runs as a periodic task (priority set according to RM)
- Aperiodic arrivals are queued until the server task is invoked
- When the server is invoked it serves the queue until it is empty or until the budget expires then suspends itself
  - If the queue is empty when the server is invoked it suspends itself immediately.
- Server is treated as a regular periodic task in schedulability analysis
Example of a Polling Server

- **Polling server:**
  - Period $P_s = 5$
  - Budget $B_s = 2$
- **Periodic task**
  - $P = 4$
  - $C = 1.5$
- All aperiodic arrivals have $C=1$

Aperiodic arrivals
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Example of a Polling Server

- Polling server:
  - Period \( P_s = 5 \)
  - Budget \( B_s = 2 \)
- Periodic task
  - \( P = 4 \)
  - \( C = 1.5 \)
- All aperiodic arrivals have \( C=1 \)

Why not execute immediately?

Example of a Polling Server

- Polling server:
  - Period \( P_s = 5 \)
  - Budget \( B_s = 2 \)
- Periodic task
  - \( P = 4 \)
  - \( C = 1.5 \)
- All aperiodic arrivals have \( C=1 \)
Deferrable Server

- Keeps the balance of the budget until the end of the period
- Example (continued)

Worst-Case Scenario

\[ U_p \leq \ln \left( \frac{2U_s + 1}{U_s + 1} \right) \]

Exercise: Derive the utilization bound for a deferrable server plus one periodic task
Worst-Case Scenario

Exercise: Derive the utilization bound for a deferrable server plus one periodic task

Priority Exchange Server

- Like the deferrable server, it keeps the budget until the end of server period
- Unlike the deferrable server the priority slips over time: When not used, the priority is exchanged for that of the executing periodic task
**Priority Exchange Server**

Example

Aperiodic tasks

Priority Exchange Server

Periodic Tasks

\[ U_p \leq \ln \left( \frac{2}{U + 1} \right) \]
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**Sporadic Server**

- Server is said to be active if it is in the running or ready queue, otherwise it is idle.
- When an aperiodic task comes and the budget is not zero, the server becomes active.
- Every time the server becomes active, say at $t_A$, it sets replenishment time one period into the future, $t_A + P_s$ (but does not decide on replenishment amount).
- When the server becomes idle, say at $t_I$, set replenishment amount to capacity consumed in $[t_A, t_I]$

$$U_p \leq \ln \left( \frac{2}{U_s + 1} \right)$$

**Slack Stealing Server**

- Compute a slack function $A(t_s, t_f)$ that says how much total slack is available.
- Admit aperiodic tasks while slack is not exceeded.
Aperiodic Servers

Dynamic Priority
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PRIORITy INVERSION

Resources and Blocking

Priority Inheritance
Priority Ceiling
Slack Resource Policy
The Problem

- Tasks have synchronization constraints
  - Semaphores protect critical sections
- Blocking can cause a higher-priority task to wait on a lower-priority one to unlock a resource
  - Problem: In all previous derivations we assumed that a task can only wait for higher-priority tasks not lower-priority tasks
- Question
  - What is the maximum amount of time a higher-priority task can wait for a lower-priority task?
  - How to account for that time in schedulability analysis?

Mutual Exclusion Constraints

- Tasks that lock/unlock the same semaphore are said to have a mutual exclusion constraint
Priority Inversion

- Locks and priorities may be at odds. Locking results in priority inversion

High-priority task

Preempt.

Lock S

Low-priority task

Priority Inversion

- Locks and priorities may be at odds. Locking results in priority inversion

High-priority task

Attempt to lock S results in blocking

Preempt.

Priority Inversion

Low-priority task

Lock S
**Priority Inversion**

- How to account for priority inversion?

  - High-priority task
  - Low-priority task
  - Attempt to lock $S$ results in blocking
  - Preempt.
  - Lock $S$
  - Unlock $S$
  - Priority Inversion
  - Unlock $S$

**Unbounded Priority Inversion**

- Consider the case below: a series of intermediate priority tasks is delaying a higher-priority one

  - High-priority task
  - Intermediate-priority tasks
  - Low-priority task
  - Attempt to lock $S$ results in blocking
  - Preempt.
  - Lock $S$
  - Unbounded Priority Inversion
  - Preempt.
Unbounded Priority Inversion

- How to prevent unbounded priority inversion?

Priority Inheritance Protocol

- Let a task inherit the priority of any higher-priority task it is blocking
Priority Inversion and the MARS Pathfinder

- Landed on the Martian surface on July 4th, 1997
- Unconventional landing – bouncing into the Martian surface
- A few days later, not long after Pathfinder started gathering meteorological data, the spacecraft began experiencing total system reset, each resulting in losses of data
- What happened:
  - Pathfinder has an “information bus”
  - The meteorological data gathering task ran as an infrequent, low priority thread, and used the information bus to publish its data (while holding the mutex on bus).
  - A communication task that ran with medium priority.
  - It is possible for an interrupt to occur that caused (medium priority) communications task to be scheduled during the short interval of the (high priority) information bus thread was blocked waiting for the (low priority) meteorological data thread.
  - After some time passed, a watch dog timer goes off, noticing that the data bus has not been executed for some time, it concluded that something had gone really bad, and initiated a total system reset.

The Priority Inversion Problem

Priority order: T1 > T2 > T3

T2 is causing a higher priority task T1 wait!
**Priority Inversion**

1. T1 has highest priority, T2 next, and T3 lowest
2. T3 comes first, starts executing, and acquires some resource (say, a lock).
3. T1 comes next, interrupts T3 as T1 has higher priority
4. But T1 needs the resource locked by T3, so T1 gets blocked
5. T3 resumes execution (this scenario is still acceptable so far)
6. T2 arrives, and interrupts T3 as T2 has higher priority than T3, and T2 executes till completion
7. In effect, even though T1 has priority than T2, and arrived earlier than T2, T2 delayed execution of T1
8. This is “priority inversion” !! Not acceptable.
9. Solution T3 should inherit T1’s priority at step 5

---

**Priority Inheritance Protocol**

- T1
- T2
- T3

lock R fails
lock(R) unlock(R)
lock(R) unlock(R)
T3 blocks T2
T3 directly blocks T1
T3 has priority of T1
T3 has priority of T1

T2 arrives

---
Priority Inheritance Protocol

- Question: What is the longest time a task can wait for lower-priority tasks?
- Answer: ?

Computing the Maximum Priority Inversion Time

- Consider the instant when a high-priority task that arrives.
  - What is the most it can wait for lower priority ones?

If I am a task, priority inversion occurs when
(a) Lower priority task holds a resource I need (direct blocking)
(b) Lower priority task inherits a higher priority than me because it holds a resource the higher-priority task needs (push-through blocking)
Schedulability Test

\[ \forall i, 1 \leq i \leq n, \]
\[ \frac{B_i}{P_i} + \sum_{k=1}^{i} \frac{C_k}{P_k} \leq i(2^{1/i} - 1) \]

Why do we have to test each task separately? Why not just one utilization-based test like it used to?
Problem: Deadlock

Deadlock occurs if two tasks locked two semaphores in opposite order

Priority Ceiling Protocol

- Definition: The priority ceiling of a semaphore is the highest priority of any task that can lock it
- A task that requests a lock $R_k$ is denied if its priority is not higher than the highest priority ceiling of all currently locked semaphores (say it belongs to semaphore $R_h$)
  - The task is said to be blocked by the task holding lock $R_h$
- A task inherits the priority of the top higher-priority task it is blocking
**Problem: Deadlock?**

Deadlock used to occur if two tasks locked two semaphores in opposite order. Can it still occur in priority ceiling?

Lock R2

Preemption

Lock R1

Try R1, Block

Try R2, Deadlock

Lock R2: **Denied because its priority is not higher than ceiling of R1**

Preemption

Lock R1

Unlock R1

Unlock R2

Inherit higher priority

Inherit higher priority
Slack Resource Policy

- **Priority:**
  - Any static or dynamic policy (e.g., EDF, RM, …)

- **Preemption Level**
  - Any fixed value that satisfies: If A arrives after B and Priority (A) > Priority (B) then PreemptionLevel (A) > PreemptionLevel (B)

- **Resource Ceiling**
  - Highest preemption level of all tasks that might access the resource

- **System Ceiling**
  - Highest resource ceiling of all currently locked resources

- **A task can preempt another if:**
  - It has the highest priority
  - Its preemption level is higher than the system ceiling

MULTI-PROCESSOR SCHEDULING
Multiprocessor Scheduling

- **Why consider multiprocessors**
  - Better tradeoff between computational power and costs (energy, fabrication)
  - Ability to exploit inherent concurrency in software

- **Problem statement**
  - Constrained deadline sporadic task system
    - \( W = \{\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n\} \), where \( \tau_i = (T_i, C_i, D_i) \) and \( C_i \leq D_i \leq T_i \)
    - \( C_i \) units must be supplied non-concurrently
  - Identical, unit-capacity multiprocessor platform
    - \( m \) processors
  - How can \( W \) be scheduled on these \( m \) processors?

Global Scheduling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Physical processors

Single task cluster
Partitioned Scheduling

- Physical processors
  - \( \tau_{x_1} \)
  - \( \tau_{x_2} \)
  - \( \ldots \)
  - \( \tau_{x_m} \)
- Task clusters
  - \( \tau_{x_1} \cup \tau_{x_2} \ldots \cup \tau_{x_m} = \tau \)
  - \( \tau_{x_i} \cap \tau_{x_j} = \emptyset \) for all \( i \) and \( j \)

Counter-example for Partitioned

- Task set and number of processors
  - \( \tau_1 = \tau_2 = \tau_3 = \tau_4 = (3,2,3) \) and \( \tau_5 = (6,4,6), m=4 \)
- No partitioning technique will work
  - Some processor must be assigned two tasks which is not possible
- Schedulable under global LLF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Processor 1</th>
<th>Processor 2</th>
<th>Processor 3</th>
<th>Processor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Counter-example for Global

- Task set and number of processors
  - $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = (3,1,3)$ and $\tau_3 = (7,6,7)$, $m=2$

- Global EDF cannot schedule this task set

- Partitioned EDF can
  - $\tau_3$ on processor 1, and the other two on processor 2

Partitioned vs. Global

- Two extreme cases of task-processor clustering
  - one-one (partitioned) vs. one-all (global)

- Both have advantages and disadvantages
  - Partitioned: Low preemptions, but low resource utilization
  - Global: High resource utilization with high preemptions

- Optimal scheduling on identical platforms
  - Only developed for implicit deadline task systems ($D_i = T_i$ for all $i$)
  - All known optimal schedulers are global strategies (Pfair [BCPV96])
  - Problem open for constrained deadline periodic task systems
    - Shown to be impossible for sporadic task systems

- Can we support general task-processor clustering through the concept of platform virtualization (hierarchical scheduling)?
Virtual Cluster-based Scheduling

- Each \( \Gamma_i \) is resource required to schedule \( \tau_{x_i} \) in cluster \( VC_i \)
- Each \( m_i (\leq m) \) denotes maximum number of physical processors that can be assigned to \( VC_i \) at any instant

\[
\tau_{x_1} \cup \tau_{x_2} \ldots \cup \tau_{x_k} = \tau
\]
\[
\tau_{x_i} \cap \tau_{x_j} = \emptyset \text{ for all } i \text{ and } j
\]
Counter-example for Partitioned and Global

- **Task set and number of processors**
  - $\tau_1=\tau_2=\tau_3=\tau_4=(3,2,3)$, $\tau_5=(6,4,6)$, and $\tau_6=(6,3,6)$, $m=4$

- **No Partitioning technique can work**
  - Some processor needs to be assigned two tasks which is not possible (maximum utilization that can be assigned to any processor is 1)

Counter-example for Partitioned and Global

- **Task set and number of processors**
  - $\tau_1=\tau_2=\tau_3=\tau_4=(3,2,3)$, $\tau_5=(6,4,6)$, and $\tau_6=(6,3,6)$, $m=4$

- **Schedule under global EDF/EDZL (earliest deadline until zero laxity)/LLF**
  - Task $\tau_2$ misses its deadline
Counter-example for Partitioned and Global

- Task set and number of processors
  - \( \tau_1 = \tau_2 = \tau_3 = (3, 2, 3) \), \( \tau_4 = (6, 4, 6) \), and \( \tau_6 = (6, 3, 6) \), \( m = 4 \)

- Schedule under global fp-EDF/US-EDF (highest priority to high utilization tasks \( \tau_1, \ldots, \tau_5 \))
  - Task \( \tau_6 \) misses its deadline

Virtual Clustering

- Task set and number of processors
  - \( \tau_1 = \tau_2 = \tau_3 = (3, 2, 3) \), \( \tau_4 = (6, 4, 6) \), and \( \tau_6 = (6, 3, 6) \), \( m = 4 \)

- Schedule under clustered scheduling
  - \( \tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3 \) scheduled on processors 1 and 2
  - \( \tau_4, \tau_5, \tau_6 \) scheduled on processors 3 and 4
Virtual Clustering

- Two-level hierarchical scheduler
  - Intra-cluster schedulers for tasks within clusters
  - Inter-cluster schedulers for clusters on the platform
    (clusters can share some physical processors)

- Concurrency bound for each cluster
  - Abstract concurrency constraints of tasks within cluster
  - Helps regulate resource access (e.g., Caches)

- Have virtual clusters been used before?
  - Supertasks\([\text{MoRa99}]\), Megatasks\([\text{ACD06}]\)
  - Results restricted to Pfair schedulers (not generalizable)