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Real-Time Systems

- The correctness of a real-time system depends not just on the validity of results but on the times at which results are computed
  - Computations have deadlines
  - Usually, but not always, ok to finish computation early
- Hard real-time system: missed deadlines may be catastrophic
- Soft real-time system: missed deadlines reduce the value of the system
- Real-time deadlines are usually in the range of microseconds through seconds

Real-Time System Examples

- Hard real-time
  - Most feedback control systems
    - E.g. engine control, avionics, ...
    - Missing deadlines affects stability of control
    - Air traffic control
    - Missing deadlines affects ability of airplanes to fly
- Soft real-time
  - Windows Media Player
  - Software DVD player
  - Network router
  - Games
  - Web server
  - Missing deadlines reduces quality of user experience

Real-Time Abstractions

- System contains n periodic tasks $T_1, \ldots, T_n$
- $T_i$ is specified by $(P_i, C_i, D_i)$
  - $P$ is period
  - $C$ is worst-case execution cost
  - $D$ is relative deadline
- Task $T_i$ is “released” at start of period, executes for $C_i$ time units, must finish before $D_i$ time units have passed
  - Often $P_i=D_i$, and in this case we omit $D_i$
- Intuition behind this model:
  - Real-time systems perform repeated computations that have characteristic rates and response-time requirements
- What about non-periodic tasks?

Real-Time Scheduling

- Given a collection of runnable tasks, the scheduler decides which to run
  - If the scheduler picks the wrong task, deadlines may be missed
- Interesting schedulers:
  - Fixed priorities
  - Round robin
  - Earliest deadline first (EDF)
  - Many, many more exist
- A scheduler is optimal when, for a class of real-time systems, it can schedule any task set that can be scheduled by any algorithm

Real-Time Analysis

- Given:
  - A set of real-time tasks
  - A scheduling algorithm
- Is the task set schedulable?
  - Yes --> all deadlines met, always
  - No --> at some point a deadline might be missed
- Important: Answer this question at design time
- Other questions to ask:
  - Where does worst-case execution cost come from?
  - How close to schedulable is a non-schedulable task set?
  - How close to non-schedulable is a schedulable task set?
  - What happens if we change scheduling algorithms?
  - What happens if we change some task's period or execution cost?
Cyclic Schedule

- This is an important way to sequence tasks in a real-time system
  - We'll look at other ways later
- Cyclic scheduling is static – computed offline and stored in a table
  - For now we assume table is given
  - Later look at constructing scheduling tables
- Task scheduling is non-preemptive
  - No RTOS is required
- Non-periodic work can be run during time slots not used by periodic tasks
  - Implicit low priority for non-periodic work
  - Usually non-periodic work must be scheduled preemptively

Cyclic Schedule Table

\[
T(t) = \begin{cases} 
T_i & \text{if } T_i \text{ is to be scheduled at time } t \\
I & \text{if no periodic task is scheduled at time } t 
\end{cases}
\]

- Table executes completely in one hyperperiod \( H \)
  - Then repeats
  - \( H \) is least common multiple of all task periods
  - \( N \) quanta per hyperperiod
- Multiple tables can support multiple system modes
  - E.g., an aircraft might support takeoff, cruising, landing, and taxiing modes
  - Mode switches permitted only at hyperperiod boundaries
  - Otherwise, hard to meet deadlines

Example

- Consider a system with four tasks
  - \( T_1 = (4, 1) \)
  - \( T_2 = (5, 1.8) \)
  - \( T_3 = (20, 1) \)
  - \( T_4 = (20, 2) \)
- Possible schedule:

```
(0, T_1), (1, T_3), (2, T_2), (3.8, I), (4, T_1), ...
```

Refinement: Frames

- We divide hyperperiods into frames
  - Timing is enforced only at frame boundaries
  - Each task is executed as a function call and must fit within a single frame
  - Multiple tasks may be executed in a frame
  - Frame size is \( f \)
  - Number of frames per hyperperiod is \( F = H/f \)

Frame Size Constraints

1. Tasks must fit into frames
   - \( f \geq C_i \) for all tasks
   - Justification: Non-preemptive tasks should finish executing within a single frame
2. \( f \) must evenly divide \( H \)
   - Equivalently, \( f \) must evenly divide \( P_i \) for some task \( i \)
   - Justification: Keep table size small

More Frame Size Constraints

3. There should be a complete frame between the release and deadline of every task
   - Justification: Want to detect missed deadlines by the time the deadline arrives
   - \( 2f - \text{gcd}(P_i, f) \leq D_i \) for each task \( i \)

   \[
   t \quad t+1 \quad t+2f \quad t+3f \quad t+P_i \quad t+D_i
   \]
Example Revisited

- Consider a system with four tasks
  - \( T_1 = (4, 1) \)
  - \( T_2 = (5, 1.8) \)
  - \( T_3 = (20, 1) \)
  - \( T_4 = (20, 2) \)
- By Constraint 1: \( f \geq 2 \)
- By Constraint 2: \( f \) might be 1, 2, 4, 5, 10, or 20
- By Constraint 3: only 2 works

Task Slices

- What if frame size constraints cannot be met?
  - Example: \( T = \{ (4, 1), (5, 2, 7), (20, 5) \} \)
  - By Constraint 1: \( f \geq 5 \)
  - By Constraint 3: \( f \leq 4 \)
- Solution: “slice” a task into smaller sub-tasks
  - So \( (20, 5) \) becomes \( (20, 1), (20, 3), \) and \( (20, 1) \)
  - Now \( f = 4 \)
- What is involved in slicing?

Design Decision Summary

- Three decisions:
  - Choose frame size
  - Partition tasks into slices
  - Place slices into frames
- In general these decisions are not independent

Cyclic Executive Pseudocode

```plaintext
// L is the stored schedule
current time t = 0;
current frame k = 0;
do forever
  accept clock interrupt;
currentBlock = L(k);
t++;
k = t mod F;
if last task not completed, take appropriate action;
execute slices in currentBlock;
sleep until next clock interrupt;
```

Practical Considerations

- Handling frame overrun
  - Main issue: Should offending task be completed or aborted?
  - How can we eliminate the possibility of overrun?
- Mode changes
  - At hyperperiod boundaries
  - How to schedule the code that figures out when it’s time to change modes?
- Multiprocessor systems
  - Similar to uniprocessor but table construction is more difficult
- Splitting tasks
  - Painful and error prone

Computing a Static Schedule

- Problem: Derive a frame size and schedule meeting all constraints
- Solution: Reduce to a network flow problem
  - Use constraints to compute all possible frame sizes
  - For each possible size, try to find a schedule using network flow algorithm
    - If flow has a certain value:
      - A schedule is found and we’re done
    - Otherwise:
      - Schedule is not found, look at the next frame size
  - If no frame size works, system is not schedulable using cyclic executive
**Network Flow Problem**
- Given a graph of links, each with a fixed capacity, determine the maximum flow through the network
- Efficient algorithms exist

![Flow Graph Illustration](image)

**Flow Graph Definitions**
- Denote all jobs in hyperperiod of F frames as \( J_1, J_2, \ldots, J_n \)
- Vertices:
  - \( N \) job vertices \( J_1, J_2, \ldots, J_n \)
  - \( F \) frame vertices \( 1, 2, \ldots, F \)
- Edges:
  - \((\text{source}, J_i)\) with capacity \( C_i \)
    - Encodes jobs’ compute requirements
  - \((J_i, x)\) with capacity \( f \) iff \( J_i \) can be scheduled in frame \( x \)
    - Encodes periods and deadlines
  - \((f, \text{sink})\) with capacity \( f \)
    - Encodes limited computational capacity in each frame

**Finding a Schedule**
- Maximum attainable flow is \( \sum_{i=1}^{N} C_i \)
  - Total amount of computation in the hyperperiod
  - If a max flow is found with this amount then we have a schedule
- If a task is scheduled across multiple frames, we must slice it into subtasks
  - Potentially difficult
  - However, if we don’t allow the algorithm to split tasks, the problem becomes NP-complete
    - Common pattern in this sort of problem
      - E.g. optimal bin packing becomes easy if we can split objects

**Non-Independent Tasks**
- Precedence constraints: “\( T_i \) must execute before \( T_j \)”
  - Enforce these by adjusting tasks’ release times and deadlines
- Critical sections: “\( T_i \) must not be sliced in such a way that \( T_j \) runs in the middle”
  - These make the problem of finding a schedule NP-hard

**Flow Graph Example**
- This flow is telling us to split \( J_i \) into two jobs, one in \( x \) and one in \( y \), while \( J_k \) executes entirely in \( y \)
CE Advantages

- Main advantage: Cyclic executives are very simple – you just need a table
  - Table makes the system very predictable
  - Can validate and test with very high confidence
  - No race conditions, no deadlock
  - No processes, no threads, no locks, ...
  - Task dispatch is very efficient: just a function call
  - Lack of scheduling anomalies

CE Disadvantages

- Cyclic executives are brittle – any change requires a new table to be computed
- Release times of tasks must be fixed
- $F$ could be huge
  - Implies mode changes may have long latency
- All combinations of tasks that could execute together must be analyzed
- Slicing tasks into smaller units is difficult and error-prone

Summary

- Cyclic executive is one of the major software architectures for embedded systems
  - Historically, cyclic executives dominate safety-critical systems
  - Simplicity and predictability win
  - However, there are significant drawbacks
  - Finding a schedule might require significant offline computation