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Multiprocessor System

- Tight coupling among processors.
- Communicate through shared memory and on-board bus.
- Scheduled by a common scheduler/OS.
  - Global scheduling
  - Partitioned scheduling
- States of all processors available to each other.
Distributed System

- Loose coupling among processors
  - Each processor has its own scheduler
  - Costly to acquire states of other processors

- Wide range of systems
  - Processor boards mounted on a VME bus
  - Automobile: 100s processors connected through Control Area Networks (CANs)
  - Air traffic control system on a wide area network
End-to-End Task Model

- An (end-to-end) task is composed of multiple subtasks running on multiple processors
  - Message, event, remote method invocation

- Task = a chain/tree/graph of subtasks
  - \( T_i = \{T_{i,1}, T_{i,2}, \ldots, T_{i,n(i)}\} \)
  - \( n(i) \): the number of subtasks of \( T_i \)
  - Precedence constraint: Job \( J_{i,j} \) cannot be released until \( J_{i,j-1} \) finishes.

![Diagram of task model with precedence constraints]
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An End-to-End Task on Event Service

- Dependency implemented through events
- Event Channel (EC) dispatches events according to their priorities.
- Gateway forwards events between processors.

![Diagram showing the connection between Application Processors and Event Channels with Gateway]
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End-to-End Deadline

- A task is subject to an end-to-end deadline.
- Does not care about the response time of a subtask.

How to guarantee end-to-end deadlines in distributed systems?
End-to-End Scheduling

1. Task allocation
2. Synchronization protocol
3. Subdeadline assignment
4. Schedulability analysis
Task Allocation

- Map tasks to processors

- Strategies
  - Offline  \(\rightarrow\) static allocation
  - Online
    - Allocate a task when it arrives
    - Re-allocate (migrate) a task after it starts

- NP-hard  \(\rightarrow\) heuristics needed
Bin Packing

- Pack subtasks to bins (processors) with limited capacity
  - Size of a subtask $T_{i,j}$: $u_{i,j} = \frac{C_{i,j}}{P_i}$
  - Capacity of each bin: utilization bound

- Goal: minimize #bins subject to capacity constraints
  - Ignore communication cost
  - Assume every subtask is periodic
Bin Packing: First-Fit

- Subtasks assigned in arbitrary order

- To allocate a new subtask $T_{i,j}$
  - if $T_{i,j}$ can be added to an existing processor $S_m$ ($1 \leq m \leq k$) without exceeding its capacity
    - allocate $T_{i,j} \rightarrow S_m$
  - else
    - add a new processor $S_{k+1}$ and allocate $T_{i,j} \rightarrow S_{k+1}$.
First-Fit Performance

- \#Processor needed: \( \frac{m}{m_{\text{min}}} \rightarrow 1.7 \) as \( m_{\text{min}} \rightarrow \infty \)
  - \( m \): \#processor needed under First-Fit
  - \( m_0 \): minimum \#processor needed

- First-Fit can always find a feasible allocation on \( m \) processors if total subtask utilization \( \leq m(2^{1/2}-1) = 0.414m \)
  - Assuming identical processors
Minimize Communication Cost

- Inter-subtask communication introduces overhead & delay

- Minimize communication subject to processor capacity constraints
  - Partition subtasks into groups
  - Allocate groups to processors
End-to-End Scheduling

1. Task allocation
2. **Synchronization protocol**
3. Subdeadline assignment
4. Schedulability analysis
Synchronization Requirements

- Allow schedulability analysis
- Bounded worst-case response time
- Low overhead
- Low jitter
- Low average response time
Greedy Protocol

- Release job $J_{i,j;k}$ as soon as $J_{i,j-1;k}$ is completed

- Subtasks may not be periodic under a greedy protocol
  - Difficult to analyze schedulability
  - High-priority tasks arrive early $\rightarrow$ long worst-case response time for low-priority tasks
  - Jitter can accumulate over multiple hops
Greedy Protocol Example
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Phase of T₃ misses deadline
Critique of Greedy Protocol

- Low overhead
- Low average response time
- High jitter
- Difficult to analyze schedulability
- Long worst-case response time
Phase-Modification Protocol (PMP)

- Enforce periodic release based on the worst-case response times of preceding subtasks.

- Every job \( J_{i,j;k} \) is released at time

\[
\phi_i + (k-1)P_i + \sum_{l=1}^{j-1} R_{i,l}
\]

- \( R_{i,l} \): worst case response time of \( T_{il} \)

- Require upper bounds on the response times of all subtasks.

- Modified PMP (MPMP): Same as PMP and a subtask cannot be released unless its predecessor has been completed.
On P1
T₁
2 4 6 8 10 12

On P2
T₂,₁
2 4 6 8 10 12

T₂,₂
2 4 6 8 10 12

Phase of T₃

Synch signal delayed
Properties of MPMP

- Enable schedulability analysis
- Bounded worst-case response time
- Low jitter
- Does not require global clock synchronization
  - Indicate “ahead time” in sync message
- Require worst-case response times of all subtasks
- Long average response time
Release Guard

if CPU never idles since releasing $J_{i,j;k}$, release $J_{i,j;k+1}$ when

- it receives a sync message from $J_{i,j;k}$, or
- at time $r_{i,j;k-1} + P_i$

whichever is later // periodic release based on local knowledge

else, release $J_{i,j;k+1}$ when

- receiving a sync message from $J_{i,j;k}$, or
- when processor becomes idle // improve response time

whichever is later

Improve average response time without affecting schedulability
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Non-Assumptions

✓ Do **not** require worst-case response times of all subtasks
✓ Do **not** require global clock synchronization
✓ Work best for loosely coupled system!
Properties of Release Guard

- Enable schedulability analysis
- Bounded worst-case response time
- Does not require global clock synchronization
- Low jitter (if idle rule is not used)
- Low average response time (if idle rule is used)
RG: Middleware Implementation

If current time is earlier than the release guard $T_g$

- EC I/O thread buffers the event in the release guard queue;
- At $T_g$, RG thread removes the buffered event from queue and inserts it into a dispatching lane

### Score Board: Sync Protocols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Schedulability</th>
<th>WCRT</th>
<th>ART</th>
<th>Global State</th>
<th>Jitter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greedy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hard</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MPMP</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RG</strong></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M/H</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M/L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- if information about all tasks are available *a priori*
  - use RG or MPMP
- else
  - use RG
End-to-End Scheduling

1. Task allocation
2. Synchronization protocol
3. **Subdeadline assignment**
4. Schedulability analysis
Subdeadline Assignment

- Subdeadline $\rightarrow$ priority $\rightarrow$ response time

- Optimal subdeadline assignment is NP-hard
  - Offline: heuristic search
  - Online: simpler heuristics
Subdeadline Assignment

Notations

- Relative deadline $D_i$ of task $T_i$
- Relative subdeadline $D_{ij}$ of subtask $T_{ij}$ ($1 \leq j \leq n(i)$)

Ultimate Deadline (UD): $D_{ij} = D_i$
- But some subtasks must finish earlier than the end-to-end deadline!
More Heuristics

- Proportional Deadline (PD):
  \[
  D_{ij} = D_i \frac{C_{ij}}{\sum_{k=1}^{n(i)} C_{ik}}
  \]
  - Assign slack proportionally to execution time

- Normalized Proportional Deadline
  \[
  D_{ij} = D_i \frac{C_{ij} U(V_{i,j})}{\sum_{k=1}^{n(i)} (C_{ik} U(V_{i,k}))}
  \]
  - Assign more slack to subtasks on busier processors
End-to-End Scheduling

1. Task allocation
2. Synchronization protocol
3. Subdeadline assignment
4. Schedulability analysis