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A basic scheduling model

• Model (of a system in general):
  – Abstraction (of that system)
    • leaving out details irrelevant to a given set of criteria
    • preserving the properties of interest

• Scheduling model (for Real-Time SW)
  – explicitly addresses relevant issues in real-time systems
  – ...but must be mapped eventually onto an execution environment
    • OS, hardware, run-time system, ...
A basic scheduling model

- **Event:**
  - indicates a state change requiring a *timely* response, i.e. neither too early nor too late;
  - *external* (e.g. at RT(C)S boundary),
  - *internal* (e.g. a task triggering another), or *timed*.

- **Task:** actions in response of event.

- **Processor:** executes a single task at the time.

- **Schedule:**
  - assignment of tasks to processor;
  - set \( \Gamma \) on \( n \) tasks \( \tau_1 \ldots \tau_n \);
  - \( \sigma: \mathbb{R} \to \{0, 1, \ldots, n\} \), where \( \sigma(t) = 0 \) means idle.
Schedule: example

Schedule $\sigma(t)$ of three independent periodic tasks $\tau_1$, $\tau_2$, $\tau_3$, where $\tau_1$ has highest priority and $\tau_3$ lowest priority.
Initial basic assumptions

- Events: implicit
- Tasks:
  - released strictly periodically, elastically, or sporadically;
  - independent;
  - no self-suspension.
- Processor: only one
- Scheduling algorithm:
  - fixed-priority pre-emptive scheduling (FPPS),
    - i.e. processor is used to execute the highest priority task that has work pending;
    - non-idling;
  - tasks have unique priorities;
  - Overhead of scheduling and context switching is ignored.
Basic model for a task

- Task $\tau_i$: sequence of jobs $\tau_{ik}$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}$.
- Basic timing notions (taken from R) for $\tau_{ik}$
  - activation time $a_{ik}$;
  - start time $s_{ik}$;
  - finalization time $f_{ik}$;
- Derived timing notions
  - response (or active) interval $[a_{ik}, f_{ik})$;
  - response time $R_{ik} = f_{ik} - a_{ik}$;
  - phasing $\varphi_i = a_{i,0}$;
Basic model for a task – continued

• (Best-case and worst-case) characteristics:
  – deadline: $R_{ik} \in [BD_i, WD_i]$, where $BD_i \in \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{0\}$, $WD_i \in \mathbb{R}^+$;
  – computation time $C_{ik} \in [BC_i, WC_i]$, where $BC_i, WC_i \in \mathbb{R}^+$;
  – inter-arrival time (or period):
    • strictly periodic task (i.e. without activation jitter):
      – period $T_i \in \mathbb{R}^+$;
    • elastic task:
      – best-case period $BT_i$ and worst-case period $WT_i$,
        where $WT_i < BT_i$;
    • sporadic task:
      – worst-case period $WT_i$ (best-case period $BT_i \rightarrow \infty$)
  – deadlines and inter-arrival times:
    • $0 \leq BD_i \leq WD_i \leq WT_i$

• Notation:
  – we will also use $WT_i$ and $BT_i$ for periodic tasks.
Deadlines

- **Relative deadlines:**
  - best-case $BD_i$ (typically assumed to be zero);
  - worst-case $WD_i$;

- **Absolute deadlines:**
  - best-case $bd_{ik} = a_{ik} + BD_i$;
  - worst-case $wd_{ik} = a_{ik} + WD_i$;

![Diagram of task execution and deadlines]

**Legend:**
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Overview of basic assumptions

- Single processor;
- Set $\Gamma$ on $n$ tasks $\tau_1 \ldots \tau_n$:
  - (released strictly periodically: $a_{ik} = \phi_i + kT_i$);
  - (independent: no resource sharing and no precedence relations);
  - arbitrary phasing;
  - `ready' to run upon activation;
  - no self-suspension;
  - a job does not start before previous job completed ($f_{i,k-1} \leq s_{ik}$);
  - hard deadlines (i.e. $BD_i \leq R_{ik} \leq WD_i$ and $WD_i \leq WT_i$).
- Scheduling:
  - (FPPS and unique priorities);
  - (instantaneous pre-emption and non-idling);
  - overhead of context switching and task scheduling is ignored;
- Notational convenience:
  - tasks are given in order of decreasing priority,
    - i.e. $\tau_1$ has highest priority and $\tau_n$ has lowest priority.
Motivation for FPPS

- De-facto standard
- Supported by commercial RTOS
- Rate monotonic analysis (RMA):
  - Adopted by leading companies and institutions [Obenza 94]:
    - Boeing, Honeywell, IBM, McDonnell Douglas, NASA, …;
    - IBM research, CMU/SEI.
  - Usage:
    - From simple control applications …
    - to large defense and aero-space applications.
  - Documentation [Klein et al 93]:
    - Practitioner’s Handbook by CMU/SEI (KAP).
Overview

- Context
- Schedulability conditions
  - Exact, necessary, and sufficient conditions;
  - Recapitulation of [Liu and Layland 73].
- Basic response time analysis
- Jitter analysis for periodic tasks
- Resource sharing
- Practical factors
- Concluding remarks
- References
Schedulability conditions

- **Requirement** *Req*:
  - all jobs of all tasks of \( \Gamma \) must meet their deadline constraints,
    - i.e. \( BD_i \leq R_{ik} \leq WD_i \) for all \( i \) and all \( k \).

- **Derived notions for task** \( \tau_i \)
  - *worst-case* response time \( WR_i \)
    \[
    WR_i = \sup_{\varphi,k} R_{ik}(\varphi)
    \]
    where \( \varphi \) is the phasing of the set \( \Gamma \);
  - *critical* instant: a (hypothetical) instant that leads to \( WR_i \);
  - *best-case* response time \( BR_i \)
    \[
    BR_i = \inf_{\varphi,k} R_{ik}(\varphi)
    \]
    - *optimal* instant: a (hypothetical) instant that leads to \( BR_i \).
Schedulability conditions

• Re-phrased requirement *Req*:
  – \( BD_i \leq BR_i \land WR_i \leq WD_i \) for all \( i \) and all \( k \);
  – note:
    • a best-case part: \( BReq = BD_i \leq BR_i \), and
    • a worst-case part: \( WReq = WR_i \leq WD_i \).

• Types of conditions:
  – *Exact condition* \( EC \): \( EC \iff Req \)
  – *Sufficient condition* \( SC \): \( SC \Rightarrow Req \)
  – *Necessary condition* \( NC \): \( NC \Leftarrow Req \)

• Specializations for best-case and worst-case, e.g.
  – *best-case sufficient condition* \( BSC \): \( BSC \Rightarrow BReq \)

• Examples:
  – \( BC_i \geq BD_i \): best-case sufficient condition;
  – \( WC_i \leq WD_i \): worst-case necessary condition.
Recapitulation of [Liu and Layland 73]

- **Assumptions (additional):**
  - fixed computation time and inter-arrival time:
    i.e. $C_i = BC_i = WC_i$ and $T_i = BT_i = WT_i$;
  - best-case deadlines ignored: i.e. assume $BD_i = 0$;
  - worst-case deadlines equal to periods: i.e. $WD_i = T_i$.

- **Utilization**
  - $U_{i} = C_i / T_i$ : utilization factor of task $\tau_i$;
  - $U^\Gamma = \sum U_{i} :$ (processor) utilization factor.

- **Necessary condition:** $U^\Gamma \leq 1$.

- **Th. 1:** A critical instant occurs upon a simultaneous release of a task with all its higher priority tasks.
Task $\tau_2$ is preempted by a single activation of the higher priority task $\tau_1$.

The interference increases when the activation of task $\tau_1$ is advanced.
Recapitulation of [Liu and Layland 73]

• Th. 2: rate monotonic priority assignment (RMA) is an optimal fixed priority assignment,
  – i.e. if a set $\Gamma$ of tasks can be scheduled based on a fixed priority assignment, then $\Gamma$ can be scheduled based on RMA.
• Note: Th. 2 only holds for arbitrary phasing; see [Goossens et al 97].
• Sufficient condition: $U^\Gamma \leq n(2^{1/n} - 1)$
  – also referred to as `Liu and Layland bound’ $LL(n)$;
  – adding tasks increases $U^\Gamma$ and decreases `RHS’;
  – converges to $\ln(2) (\approx 0.69)$ for $n \to \infty$;
  – for the proof, see [Devillers et al 00].
Alternative utilization bound

- **Sufficient condition**
  - `Hyperbolic bound´ $HB(n)$ [Liu 00]*
    
    $$HB(n) : \prod_{i=1}^{n} (U_i^\tau + 1) \leq 2$$
  - improves $LL(n)$, i.e. $LL(n) \Rightarrow HB(n)$;
  - the bound is `tight´;
  - **Note:**
    - adding tasks increases `LHS´.
    - * independently conceived by [Bini et al 01].
Exercises

• Consider the exercises C.1, C.2, and C.3 of the module “Implementing the real-time task model”.
  – Determine the utilization of the task-sets.
  – Determine whether or not the necessary condition $U^\Gamma \leq 1$ holds for the task-sets.
  – Determine whether or not the sufficient conditions for the task-sets holds:
    • LL-bound;
    • Hyperbolic bound.
An example (leading)

Task set $\Gamma$ consisting of 3 tasks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>$T$</th>
<th>$C$</th>
<th>$U$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_1$</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_2$</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_3$</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- RM priority assignment and $D_i = T_i$ (RMS);
- Necessary condition:
  - $U_1^\tau + U_2^\tau + U_3^\tau = 0.97 \leq 1$, hence $\Gamma$ could be schedulable;
- Sufficient condition:
  - $LL(n)$: $U^\Gamma \leq n \left(2^{1/n} - 1\right)$: $U_1^\tau + U_2^\tau = 0.88 > `LL(2)` \approx 0.83$, therefore $U_1^\tau + U_2^\tau + U_3^\tau > `LL(3)`$, hence another test required;
  - $HB(n)$: $(U_1^\tau + 1)(U_2^\tau + 1) \approx 2.05 > 2$, therefore `HB(3)` > 2, hence another test required.
Overview

• Context
• Schedulability conditions
• Basic response time analysis
  – Worst-case response time analysis
  – Best-case response time analysis
• Jitter analysis for periodic tasks
• Resource sharing
• Practical factors
• Concluding remarks
• References
Basic response time analysis

• Assumptions (‘reset’)
  – deadlines at most equal to periods: $WD_i \leq WT_i$;
  – worst-case and best-case characteristics;
  – arbitrary (but fixed and unique) priority assignments.

• Worst-case response time analysis
  – (Critical instant);
  – Techniques: timeline + calculation

• Best-case response time analysis
  – Introduction
  – Optimal instant;
  – Techniques: timeline + calculation.
Worst-case response time analysis

**Critical instant for task** $\tau_i$: $\tau_i$ “assumes” its $WR_i$.

A critical instant for task $\tau_i$:
- Task $\tau_i$ is released simultaneously with all tasks with a higher priority.
- The *highest* amount of pre-emption of a task is found *after* a simultaneous release of higher priority tasks.
- General for a set of tasks.

• Note: “A” rather than “the”, because there may be more instants for which $\tau_i$ “assumes” its $WR_i$. 
WCRT – Techniques

Time line:

Task $\tau_1$

Task $\tau_2$

Task $\tau_3$

$WR_1 = 3$

$WR_2 = 17$

$WR_3 = 56$
WCRT – Techniques

Calculation:

– Recursive equation for task $\tau_i$:

$$x = WC_i + \sum_{j<i} \left\lceil \frac{x}{WT_j} \right\rceil WC_j$$

$WR_i$ is the smallest positive solution

– Assume a task $\tau_j$ with a higher priority than $\tau_i$;

  • $\lceil x/WT_j \rceil$ denotes the maximum number of preemptions of task $\tau_i$ in an interval $[0, x)$ by task $\tau_j$;

  • $\lceil x/WT_j \rceil WC_j$ denotes the maximal preemption time of task $\tau_i$ in an interval $[0, x)$ by task $\tau_j$.

– Intuition:

  • LHS: amount of time available (or provided) in $[0, x)$;

  • RHS: max. amount of time requested in $[0, x)$ by $\tau_i$ and $\forall j < i \tau_j$. 
WCRT – Techniques

Calculation:

- Iterative procedure:
  \[
  WR_i^{(0)} = WC_i + \sum_{j<i} WC_j
  \]
  \[
  WR_i^{(k+1)} = WC_i + \sum_{j<i} \left( \frac{WR_i^{(k)}}{WT_j} \right) WC_j
  \]

- Stopped when either:
  - the same value is found for two successive iterations; or
  - the deadline $WD_i$ is exceeded (hence, not schedulable).

- All intermediate values are at most equal to $WR_i$;
- Terminates when $\sum_{j<i} U_j \tau < 1$.
- See [Harter 84], [Joseph et al 86] or [Audsley et al 91].
WCRT – Techniques

• Example for task $\tau_3$:

- $WR_3^{(0)} = C_3 + \Sigma_{j < 3} C_j = 5 + 3 + 11 = 19$
- $WR_3^{(1)} = C_3 + \Sigma_{j < 3} \left\lceil \frac{WR_3^{(0)}/T_j}{C_j} \right\rceil C_j = \\
 5 + \left\lceil \frac{19}{10} \right\rceil \cdot 3 + \left\lceil \frac{19}{19} \right\rceil \cdot 11 = 5 + 2 \cdot 3 + 1 \cdot 11 = 22$
- $WR_3^{(2)} = 5 + \left\lceil \frac{22}{10} \right\rceil \cdot 3 + \left\lceil \frac{22}{19} \right\rceil \cdot 11 = 5 + 3 \cdot 3 + 2 \cdot 11 = 36$
- $WR_3^{(3)} = 5 + \left\lceil \frac{36}{10} \right\rceil \cdot 3 + \left\lceil \frac{36}{19} \right\rceil \cdot 11 = 5 + 4 \cdot 3 + 2 \cdot 11 = 39$
- $WR_3^{(4)} = 5 + \left\lceil \frac{39}{10} \right\rceil \cdot 3 + \left\lceil \frac{39}{19} \right\rceil \cdot 11 = 5 + 4 \cdot 3 + 3 \cdot 11 = 50$
- $WR_3^{(5)} = 5 + \left\lceil \frac{50}{10} \right\rceil \cdot 3 + \left\lceil \frac{50}{19} \right\rceil \cdot 11 = 5 + 5 \cdot 3 + 3 \cdot 11 = 53$
- $WR_3^{(6)} = 5 + \left\lceil \frac{53}{10} \right\rceil \cdot 3 + \left\lceil \frac{53}{19} \right\rceil \cdot 11 = 5 + 6 \cdot 3 + 3 \cdot 11 = 56$
- $WR_3^{(7)} = 5 + \left\lceil \frac{56}{10} \right\rceil \cdot 3 + \left\lceil \frac{56}{19} \right\rceil \cdot 11 = 5 + 6 \cdot 3 + 3 \cdot 11 = 56$
- Because $WR_3^{(6)} = WR_3^{(7)} = 56 \leq D_3 = T_3$, $WR_3 = 56$. 
WCRT – Techniques

Calculation (visualization):

\[ WR_{3}^{(6)} = WR_{3}^{(7)} = 5 + 6 \cdot 3 + 3 \cdot 11 = 56 \]
WCRT – Exercises

• Consider the exercises C.1, C.2, and C.3 of the module “Implementing the real-time task model”.
  – Determine the worst-case response times of the tasks under FPPS.
WCRT – Exercise*

- Task set $\Gamma'$ consisting of 3 tasks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>$WT = WD$</th>
<th>$WC$</th>
<th>$WU$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_1$</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_2$</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_3$</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Determine `worst-case schedulability` of $\Gamma'$.
- Draw a time line with a critical instant for $\Gamma'$.
- Explain, using the time line, why 25 and 27 are also solutions for the recursive equation for $WR_3$. 


Best-case response time analysis

See [Redell et al 02] or [Bril et al 04].

Motivation

- **Best-case and worst-case notions are duals:**
  - Best-case: *earliest*, *shortest*, or *minimal*;
  - Worst-case: *latest*, *longest*, or *maximal*;
- **Best-case deadline:**
  - response no *earlier* than *BD*
- **May simplify design and reduce cost:**
  - No need to “delay” (i.e. buffer) output artificially;
- **Desirable for analysis in distributed systems:**
  - but also applies to single-processor systems;
  - examples: airbag, engine control.
BCRT – Optimal instant

*Optimal* instant for task $\tau_i$: $\tau_i$ “assumes” its $BR_i$.

An optimal (or *favourable*) instant:

- Job $\nu_{ik}$ *ends* simultaneously with the *release* of all tasks with a higher priority, and $\nu_{ik}$’s release time is equal to its start time, i.e. $a_{ik} = s_{ik}$.

- The *lowest* amount of pre-emption of a task is found before a simultaneous release of higher priority tasks.

- Specific for each task!

• Note: “An” rather than “the”, because there may be more instants for which $\tau_i$ “assumes” its $BR_i$. 
BCRT – Techniques

Time line: optimal instant for $\tau_2$

Task $\tau_1$

Task $\tau_2$

$BR_2 = 14$

$T_2$

$f_{2,k}$

time
BCRT – Techniques

Time line: optimal instant for $\tau_3$

Task $\tau_1$

Task $\tau_2$

Task $\tau_3$

$T_3$

$BR_3 = 22$

$f_{3,k}$

time
BCRT – Techniques

Calculation:

– Recursive equation for task $\tau_i$:

$$x = BC_i + \sum_{j<i} \left( \left\lceil \frac{x}{BT_j} \right\rceil - 1 \right) BC_j$$

$BR_i$ is the largest positive solution

– Assume a task $\tau_j$ with a higher priority than $\tau_i$:

  • $\left\lceil \frac{x}{BT_j} \right\rceil - 1$ denotes the **minimal** number of preemptions of task $\tau_i$ in an interval $(0, x)$ by task $\tau_j$;
  • $(\left\lceil \frac{x}{BT_j} \right\rceil - 1)BC_j$ denotes the **minimal** preemption time of task $\tau_i$ in an interval $(0, x)$ by task $\tau_j$.

– Intuition:

  • LHS: amount of time available (or provided) in $(0, x)$;
  • RHS: min. amount of time requested in $(0, x)$ by $\tau_i$ and $\forall j < i \tau_j$. 
BCRT – Techniques

Calculation:

– Iterative procedure:

\[ BR_i^{(0)} = WR_i \]

\[ BR_i^{(k+1)} = BC_i + \sum_{j<i} \left( \left\lfloor \frac{BR_i^{(k)}}{BT_j} \right\rfloor - 1 \right) BC_j \]

– Stopped when:
  
  • the same value is found for two successive iterations; or
  
  • the deadline \( BD_i \) is exceeded (hence, not schedulable).

– All intermediate values are at least equal to \( BR_i \).
BCRT – Techniques

• Example for task $\tau_3$:
  - Assume $BD_i = 0$.
  - $BR_3^{(0)} = WR_3 = 56$
  - $BR_3^{(1)} = C_3 + \sum_{j < 3} \left(\left\lceil BR_3^{(0)}/T_j \right\rceil - 1\right)C_j = 5 + \left(\left\lceil 56/10 \right\rceil - 1\right) \cdot 3 + \left(\left\lceil 56/19 \right\rceil - 1\right) \cdot 11 = 5 + 5 \cdot 3 + 2 \cdot 11 = 42$
  - $BR_3^{(2)} = 5 + \left(\left\lceil 42/10 \right\rceil - 1\right) \cdot 3 + \left(\left\lceil 42/19 \right\rceil - 1\right) \cdot 11 = 5 + 4 \cdot 3 + 2 \cdot 11 = 39$
  - $BR_3^{(3)} = 5 + \left(\left\lceil 39/10 \right\rceil - 1\right) \cdot 3 + \left(\left\lceil 39/19 \right\rceil - 1\right) \cdot 11 = 5 + 3 \cdot 3 + 2 \cdot 11 = 36$
  - $BR_3^{(4)} = 5 + \left(\left\lceil 36/10 \right\rceil - 1\right) \cdot 3 + \left(\left\lceil 36/19 \right\rceil - 1\right) \cdot 11 = 5 + 3 \cdot 3 + 1 \cdot 11 = 25$
  - $BR_3^{(5)} = 5 + \left(\left\lceil 25/10 \right\rceil - 1\right) \cdot 3 + \left(\left\lceil 25/19 \right\rceil - 1\right) \cdot 11 = 5 + 2 \cdot 3 + 1 \cdot 11 = 22$
  - $BR_3^{(6)} = 5 + \left(\left\lceil 22/10 \right\rceil - 1\right) \cdot 3 + \left(\left\lceil 22/19 \right\rceil - 1\right) \cdot 11 = 5 + 2 \cdot 3 + 1 \cdot 11 = 22$
  - Because $BR_3^{(5)} = BR_3^{(6)} = 22 \geq BD_3 = 0$, $BR_3 = 22$. 
BCRT – Techniques

Calculation (visualization):

\[ BR_3^{(5)} = BR_3^{(6)} = 5 + 2 \cdot 3 + 1 \cdot 11 = 22 \]
BCRT – Exercises

- Consider the exercises C.1, C.2, and C.3 of the module “Implementing the real-time task model”.
  - Determine the best-case response times of the tasks under FPPS.
  - Can all tasks assume their best-case response times for a “single” phasing?
BCRT – Exercise*

- Task set $\Gamma'$ consisting of 3 tasks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>$BT$</th>
<th>$BC = BD$</th>
<th>$BU$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_1$</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_2$</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_3$</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Determine the best-case response times $BR_i$ for all three tasks of $\Gamma'$.
- Draw a time line with an optimal instant for $\tau_3$.
- Explain, using the time line, why 3 is also a solution for the recursive equation for $BR_3$. 
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Distributed systems analysis

Finalization of a task $\tau_f$ on one processor activates a task $\tau_a$ on another processor:

- **Periodic tasks:**
  - *Finalization jitter* $FJ$: variation in finalization times;
  - *Activation jitter* $AJ$: variation in activation times (e.g. output of one task triggers a next task);
  - Example: multimedia in a networked environment.

- **Elastic tasks:**
  - *Minimal inter-finalization time* of $\tau_f$ determines $WT_a$ of task $\tau_a$.
  - *Maximal inter-finalization time* of $\tau_f$ determines $BT_a$ of task $\tau_a$.

- **Sporadic tasks:**
  - *Minimal inter-finalization time* of $\tau_f$ determines $WT_a$ of task $\tau_a$. 
Distributed systems analysis

– Example:

$$\tau_f \quad \tau_a, \tau_k$$

CPU-1 \hspace{1cm} CPU-2

$$\tau_f$$ triggers $$\tau_a$$

$$FJ_f$$ causes $$AJ_a$$, which influences response times of both $$\tau_a$$ and $$\tau_k$$

– Goal jitter analysis:
  • Determine schedulability in the context of jitter,
  • hence, determine response (or finalization) times.

– Note: strictly spoken, the variations in the delay of the messages on the bus should be taken into account as well…
Advanced exercises

• Proof that the “type” of $\tau_a$ is determined by $\tau_f$, e.g. $\tau_a$ is an elastic task if $\tau_f$ is an elastic task.

• For both an elastic and a sporadic task $\tau_f$, express $WT_a$ in terms of $WT_f$, $WR_f$, and $BR_f$.

• For an elastic task, express $BT_a$ in terms of $BT_f$, $WR_f$, and $BR_f$.

• How about $BT_a$ for a sporadic task?
Jitter analysis for periodic tasks

Types of (absolute) jitter (recap):

- **Response jitter** $RJ_i$:
  - variations in *response* times;

- **Activation (or release) jitter** $AJ_i$:
  - variation in *release* times (e.g. output of one task triggers a next task);

- **Finalization (or end) jitter** $FJ_i$:
  - variation in *end* times;
Response jitter

Response jitter $RJ_i$ of a task $\tau_i$:
\[
RJ_i = \sup_{\varphi, k, l}(R_{ik}(\varphi) - R_{il}(\varphi))
\]

- A bound on response jitter

\[
RJ_i \leq WR_i - BR_i
\]

- “≤” because $WR_i$ and $BR_i$ are not necessarily assumed for the same phasing
Response jitter

Example (leading):

- \( WR_2 = 17, BR_2 = 14; \)
- \( WR_2 \) and \( BR_2 \) both assumed for a single phasing,
- hence, \( FJ_2 = WR_2 - BR_2 = 3, \)
- and the bound for \( RJ_2 \) is therefore tight.
Activation jitter of periodic tasks

• Assumptions:
  – revised assumption: \( WD_i \leq WT_i - AJ_i \).
  – lifted restrictive assumption:
    \[
    \sup_{k,l} (a_{ik} - a_{il} - (k - l)T_i) \leq AJ_i
    \]

• Worst-case response times:
  – See [Audsley et al 93] or [Tindell et al 94];
  – Critical instant revisited:
    • Task \( \tau_i \) is released simultaneously with all tasks with a higher priority and
    • all tasks with a higher priority experience
      – a maximal release delay at that simultaneous release, and
      a minimal release delay at subsequent releases.
    – Hence, a maximal pre-emption of \( \tau_i \) occurs.
Activation jitter of periodic tasks

New example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>$T$</th>
<th>$C$</th>
<th>$AJ$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_1$</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_2$</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

- $WR_2$ is independent of $AJ_2$;
- $WR_2$ increases 3 due to $AJ_1$. 
Activation jitter of periodic tasks

Worst-case response times:

- Recursive equation for task $\tau_i$:

$$x = WC_i + \sum_{j<i} \left( \frac{x + AJ_j}{WT_j} \right) WC_j$$

- Where $AJ_j$ is the activation jitter of $\tau_j$.
- $WR_i$ is the *smallest* positive solution of the equation.

- Iterative procedure:
  - Similar to the case without jitter.

- Note: *equation* also holds for elastic and sporadic tasks!
  - Because $AJ_j = 0$ for those tasks.
Activation jitter of periodic tasks

Best-case response times:

– Optimal instant revisited:
  
  • Job $\tau_{ik}$ ends simultaneously with the release of all tasks with a higher priority, and $\tau_{ik}$’s release time is equal to its start time, and
  
  • all tasks with a higher priority experience
    
    – a maximal release delay at that simultaneous release, and
    
    – a minimal release delay at previous releases.

  – Hence, a minimal pre-emption of $\tau_i$ occurs.
Activation jitter of periodic tasks

Same (new) example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>$T$</th>
<th>$C$</th>
<th>$AJ$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_1$</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_2$</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

- $BR_2$ is independent of $AJ_2$;
- $BR_2$ does not change here.
Activation jitter of periodic tasks

Best-case response times:

– Recursive equation for task $\tau_i$:

$$x = BC_i + \sum_{j<i} \left( \left\lfloor \frac{x - AJ_j}{BT_j} \right\rfloor - 1 \right)^+ BC_j$$

• Where $AJ_j$ is the activation jitter of $\tau_j$, and $w^+ = \max\{w,0\}$.
• $BR_i$ is the largest positive solution of the equation.

– Iterative procedure:

• Similar to the case without jitter.

– Note: equation also holds for elastic and sporadic tasks!

• Because $AJ_j = 0$ for those tasks.
Finalization and activation jitter

Finalization jitter $FJ_i$ of a periodic task $\tau_i$:

$$
FJ_i = \sup_{\varphi, k, l} (f_{ik}(\varphi) - f_{il}(\varphi) - (k - l)T_i)
$$

- A bound on finalization jitter:

$$
FJ_i \leq AJ_i + WR_i - BR_i
$$

- “$\leq$” because $WR_i$ and $BR_i$ are not necessarily assumed for the same phasing.

- Exercise: derive this latter bound
Response, finalization and activation jitter

Example:

\[ RJ_2 = WR_2 - BR_2 = 20 - 14 = 6 \]

\[ FJ_2 = AJ_2 + WR_2 - BR_2 = 7 + 20 - 14 = 13 \]

\[ RJ_1 = WR_1 - BR_1 = 0 \]

\[ FJ_1 = AJ_1 = 4 \]
Advanced exercise

• Define worst-case processor utilization $WU$ in the context of periodic tasks with activation jitter.
  – Can you describe a (worst-case) necessary condition using $WU$?
  – What about the analysis?

• This lecture considered elastic, periodic, and sporadic tasks.
  – What is the effect of modeling
    • a periodic task with jitter as an elastic task?
    • a periodic task with jitter as a sporadic task?
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Response-time analysis

Worst-case response time analysis:

- Blocking time $B_i$:
  - Longest time $\tau_i$ can be blocked by a task with a lower priority.
  - Depends on the resource access protocol.
  - Includes blocking due to non-interrupt-able code of system-calls.

- Recursive equation for task $\tau_i$:

$$ x = B_i + WC_i + \sum_{j<i} \left[ \frac{x + AJ_j}{WT_j} \right] WC_j $$

$WR_i$ is the smallest positive solution

- Best-case response time analysis:
  - Yet unknown.
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From external event to task activation

• Steps:
  – External event occurs;
  – Detection by sensor;
  – Interrupt generated by sensor
    • may take some time before the bus is free
  – Interrupt arrival at CPU
    • may take some time before the interrupt is handled
  – Immediate interrupt service
    • may be pre-empted by higher priority interrupts
  – Activation of the scheduler
    • may be delayed to the next clock-tick
  – Activation of the task

• hence, both a *delay* and potential *jitter* between the arrival of the external event and activation of the task!
Context switches

• **Question:** how many *running* jobs can a job pre-empt?

• **Answer:** at most 1!

• Let $CS$ denote the *context-switch time of the system*, i.e.
  
  – max time the system spends on a context switch;
  
  – optionally including time of the scheduler to service the event interrupt that triggered the context switch
Context switches

- Extending the analysis:
  - Replace $C_j$ by $C_j + 2CS$;
  - Replace $C_i$ by $C_i + 2CS$;

- Questions:
  - Can these extensions be applied for the necessary condition, sufficient condition, and response-time analysis? Motivate your answer.
  - Can you ignore the context switch out-of a task for the response time analysis of that task, i.e. use $C_i + CS$ rather than $C_i + 2CS$? Motivate your answer.
External interrupts

- The *immediate interrupt service*
  - will pre-empt a running task \( \tau \);
  - even when the sporadic task handling the interrupt has a lower priority than \( \tau \).

- Let
  - \( T_k \): the minimum inter-arrival time of the interrupt corresponding with sporadic task \( \tau_k \);
  - \( \Gamma_s \): the set of sporadic tasks;
  - \( IH_k \): the cost of handling that interrupt.

- Extension of the recursive equation
  \[
  \sum_{\tau_k \in \Gamma_s} \left\lfloor \frac{x}{T_k} \right\rfloor IH_k
  \]
Clock interrupt

- Simple (basic) approach:
  - similar to external interrupts, i.e.
  - extension of the recursive equation

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
x \\
T_{\text{clk}}
\end{bmatrix} \times IH_{\text{clk}}
\]

- Refinement:
  - distinguish between
    - a *fixed* cost to serve the clock interrupt;
    - *additional* costs to “move” tasks from the waiting queue to the ready queue

- Question: How to model the *additional* costs?
Exercises

• Measure the overhead of the “tick” interrupt handler.
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Concluding remarks

- Many of the restrictive assumptions have been lifted, e.g.
  - other dependencies between tasks
    - e.g. precedence relations;
  - tasks with varying priorities [Harbour et al 91];
  - arbitrary deadlines [Klein et al 93];
  - tasks with offsets;
  - tasks that suspend themselves;
  - limited-pre-emptive scheduling [Regher 02], [Bril et al 07].

- Unlike worst-case response time analysis, best-case response time analysis has not been addressed yet for any of these lifted assumptions!

- Further elaboration falls outside the scope of this lecture, however.
Concluding remarks

• Be aware:
  – The analysis presented has the explicitly stated assumptions as preconditions!
  – For many situations, only looking at the first job upon a critical instant is not sufficient, even when deadlines are at most equal to periods. Instead, the response times of all jobs in a so-called busy (or level-i active) period have to be examined!

Examples:
• tasks with varying priorities [Harbour et al 91].
• preemption thresholds [Regehr 02];
• Controller Area Network (CAN), see [Davis et al 07];
• fixed-priority scheduling with deferred preemption (FPDS), see [Bril et al 07].
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