School of Computer Science & Engineering

COMP9242 Advanced Operating Systems

2022 T2 Week 04 Part 2

Real-Time Systems Basics

@GernotHeiser



Copyright Notice

These slides are distributed under the
Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) License

- You are free:
  - to share—to copy, distribute and transmit the work
  - to remix—to adapt the work
- under the following conditions:
  - **Attribution:** You must attribute the work (but not in any way that suggests that the author endorses you or your use of the work) as follows:

    "Courtesy of Gernot Heiser, UNSW Sydney"

The complete license text can be found at
http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode

© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Today's Lecture

- Real-time systems (RTS) basics
  - Types or RTS
  - Basic concepts & facts
- Resource sharing in RTS
- Scheduling overloaded RTS
- Mixed-criticality systems (MCS)

© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Real-Time Basics

© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Real-Time Systems

© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

What's a Real-Time System?

Aka. events

A real-time system is a system that is required to react to stimuli from the environment (including passage of physical time) within time intervals dictated by the environment.

[Randell et al., Predictably Dependable Computing Systems, 1995]

Real-time systems have timing constraints, where the correctness of the system is dependent not only on the results of computations, but on *the time at which those results arrive*. [Stankovic, IEEE Computer, 1988]

Issues:

- Correctness: What are the temporal requirements?
- Criticality: What are the consequences of failure?

© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Strictness of Temporal Requirements

- Hard real-time systems
- Weakly-hard real-time systems
- Firm real-time systems
- Soft real-time systems
- Best-effort systems



© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Real-Time Tasks

Real-time tasks have deadlines

- Usually stated relative to release time
- Frequently *implicit*: next release time




```
void main(void) {
   init(); // initialise system
   while (1) {
      wait();  // timer, device interrupt, signal
      doJob();
   }
}
```


© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Real Time ≠ Real Fast

System	Deadline	Single Miss Conseq	Ultimate Conseq.
Combustion engine ignition	2.5 ms	Catastrophic	Engine damage
Industrial robot	5 ms	Recoverable?	Machinery damage
Air bag	20 ms	Catastrophic	Injury or death
Aircraft control	50 ms	Recoverable	Crash
Industrial process	100 ms	Recoverable	Lost production, plant/ environment damage
Pacemaker	100 ms	Recoverable	Death

Criticality

© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Example: Industrial Control



© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Hard Real-Time Systems

- Safety-critical: Failure ⇒ death, serious injury
- Mission-critical: Failure ⇒ massive financial damage

- Deadline miss is *catastrophic*
- Steep and real *cost* function





© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0
UNSW SYDNEY

Challenge: Execution-Time Variance



- Data-dependent execution paths
- Microarchitecture (caches)

© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Weakly-Hard Real-Time Systems

- Most feedback control systems (incl life-support!)
    - Control compensates for occasional miss
    - Becomes unstable if too many misses
- Typically integrated with fault tolerance for HW issues

Tolerate small fraction of deadline misses



In practice, certifiers treat critical avionics as hard RT

© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Firm Real-Time Systems

- Forecast systems
- Trading systems

Result obsolete if deadline missed (loss of revenue)



© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Soft Real-Time Systems

Deadline miss undesirable but tolerable, affects QoS

- Media players
- Web services







© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Best-Effort Systems

No deadline

In practice, duration is rarely totally irrelevant



© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Real-Time Operating System (RTOS)

- Designed to support real-time operation
  - Fast context switches, fast interrupt handling
  - More importantly, *predictable* response time
- **Main duty is scheduling tasks to meet their deadline**

Requires analysis of worst-case execution time (WCET)

Traditional RTOS is very primitive
- single-mode execution
- no memory protection
- inherently cooperative
- *all code is trusted*

RT vs OS terminology:
- "task" = thread
- "job" = execution of thread resulting from event

© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Real-Time Scheduling

- Ensuring all deadlines are met is harder than bin-packing
- Reason: time is not fungible



© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Real-Time Scheduling

- Ensuring all deadlines are met is harder than bin-packing
- Time is not fungible

Terminology:

- A set of tasks is **feasible** if there is a known algorithm that will schedule them (i.e. all deadlines will be met).
- A scheduling algorithm is **optimal** if it can schedule all **feasible** task sets.

© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Cyclic Executives

- Very simple, completely static, scheduler is just table
- Deadline analysis done off-line
- Fully deterministic

Drawback: Latency of event handling is hyper-period

```
while (true) {
    wait_tick();
    job_1();
    wait_tick();
    job_2();
    wait_tick();
    job_1();
    wait_tick();
    job_3();
    wait_tick();
    job_4();
}
```



Hyper-period (inverse base rate)

© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Are Cyclic Executives Optimal?

- Theoretically yes if can slice (interleave) tasks
- Practically there are limitations:
  - Might require very fine-grained slicing
  - May introduce significant overhead

```
while (true) {
    wait_tick();
    job_1();
    wait_tick();
    job_2();
    wait_tick();
    job_1();
    wait_tick();
    job_3();
    wait_tick();
    job_4();
}
```



© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

On-Line RT Scheduling

- Scheduler is part of the OS, performs scheduling decision on-demand
- Execution order not pre-determined
- Can be preemptive or non-preemptive
- Priorities can be
  - **fixed**: assigned at admission time
    - scheduler doesn't change prios
    - system may support dynamic adjustment of prios
  - **dynamic**: prios potentially different at each scheduler run

© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Fixed-Priority Scheduling (FPS)

- Classic L4 scheduling is a typical example:
  - always picks highest-prio runnable thread
  - round-robin within prio level
  - will preempt if higher-prio thread is unblocked or time slice depleted

FPS is not optimal, i.e. cannot schedule some feasible sets



In general may or may not:
- preempt running threads
- require unique prios

© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Rate Monotonic Priority Assignment (RMPA)

- Higher rate ⇒ higher priority:
  - $T_i < T_j \Rightarrow P_i > P_j$

T: period
1/T: rate
P: priority
U: utilisation

- Schedulability test: Can schedule task set with periods $\{T_1 \ldots T_n\}$ if

Assumes "*implicit*" deadlines: release time of next job

$$U \equiv \sum C_i/T_i \leq n(2^{1/n}-1)$$

RMPA is optimal for FPS

n	1	2	3	4	5	10	∞
U [%]	100	82.8	78.0	75.7	74.3	71.8	log(2) = 69.3

© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0 UNSW SYDNEY

Rate-Monotonic Scheduling Example

RMPA schedulability bound is sufficient but not necessary

WCET

C/T

Task	T	P	C	U [%]
t_3	20	3	10	50
t_2	40	2	10	25
t_1	80	1	20	25
				100



© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Another RMPA Example

Deadline

	P	C	T	D	U [%]	release
t_3	3	5	20	20	25	5
t_2	2	8	30	20	27	12
t_1	1	15	50	50	30	0
					82	



© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Dynamic Prio: Earliest Deadline First (EDF)

- Job with closest deadline executes
  - priority assigned at job level, not task (i.e. thread) level
  - deadline-sorted release queue

- Schedulability test: Can schedule task set with periods $\{T_1 \ldots T_n\}$ if

$$U \equiv \sum C_i/T_i \leq 1$$

Preemptive EDF is optimal

© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

FPS vs EDF



© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

FPS vs EDF



Task	P	C	T	D	U [%]	release
t_3	3	5	20	20	25	5
t_2	2	8	30	20	27	12
t_1	1	15	40	40	37.5	0
					89.5	

© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

FPS vs EDF



© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Resource Sharing

© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Challenge: Sharing



© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Critical Sections: Locking vs Delegation



© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Implementing Delegation




```
serv_local() {
  ...
  Wait(ep);
  while (1) {
    /* critical section */
    ReplyWait(ep);
  }
}
```

```
client() {
  while (1) {
    ...
    Call(ep);
    ...
    Signal(not_ry);
    ...
    Wait(not_rq);
  }
}
```

```
serv_remote() {
  ...
  while (1) {
    Wait(not_rq);
    /* critical section */
    Signal(not_ry);
  }
}
```

Hoare-style monitor
Suitable intra-core

Semaphore synchronisation
Suitable inter-core

© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Problem: Priority Inversion

- High-priority job is blocked by low-prio for a long time
- Long wait chain: $t_4 \rightarrow t_1 \rightarrow t_3 \rightarrow t_2$
- Worst-case blocking time of t_4 bounded by total WCET: $C_1+C_2+C_3$



© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Solution 1: Priority Inheritance ("Helping")



© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Solution 1: Priority Inheritance (“Helping”)

If t_1 blocks on a resource held by t_2, *and* $P_1 > P_2$, then
- t_2 is temporarily given priority P_1
- when t_t releases the resource, its priority reverts to P_2



© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Solution 1: Priority Inheritance ("Helping")

If t_1 blocks on a resource held by t_2, *and* $P_1 > P_2$, then

- t_2 is temporarily given priority P_1
- when t_t releases the resource, its priority reverts to P_2



© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Solution 1: Priority Inheritance (“Helping”)

If t_1 blocks on a resource held by t_2, *and* $P_1>P_2$, then
- t_2 is temporarily given priority P_1
- when t_t releases the resource, its priority

Priority Inheritance:
- Easy to use
- Potential deadlocks
- Complex to implement
- Bad worst-case blocking times



© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Solution 2: Priority Ceiling Protocol (PCP)

- Aim: Block at most once, avoid deadlocks
- Idea: Associate *ceiling priority* with each resource
  - Ceiling = Highest prio of jobs that may access the resource
  - On access, bump prio of job to ceiling

Immediate prio ceiling protocol (IPCP)



© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

IPCP vs PIP



© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

ICPC Implementation With Delegation



$P_S = \max(P_1, P_2) + 1$

EDF: Floor of deadlines

Immediate Priority Ceiling:

- Requires correct prio config
- Deadlock-free
- Easy to implement
- Good worst-case blocking times

Each task must declare all resources at admission time

- System must maintain list of tasks using resource
- Defines ceiling priority

Easy to enforce with caps

© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Comparison of Locking Protocols



© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Scheduling Overloaded RT Systems

© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Naïve Assumption: Everything is Schedulable

Standard assumptions of classical RT systems:

- All WCETs known
- All jobs complete within WCET
- Everything is trusted

More realistic: Overloaded system:

Which job will miss its deadline?

- Total utilisation exceeds schedulability bound
- Cannot trust everything to obey declared WCET

© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Overload: FPS



Task	P	C	T	D	U [%]
t_3	3	5	20	20	25
t_2	2	12	20	20	60
t_1	1	15	50	50	30
					115

New

© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Overload: FPS



© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Overload: FPS vs EDF



© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Overload: EDF



 © Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Mixed-Criticality Systems

© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Mixed Criticality Systems



© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Mixed Criticality

Need temporal isolation!

NW driver must preempt control loop

- … to avoid packet loss
- Driver must run at high prio (i.e. RMPA)
- ***Driver must not monopolise CPU***

Runs every 100 ms for a few millisecods

Runs frequently but for short time (order of μs)



© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Mixed Criticality

NW driver must preempt control loop

- … to avoid packet loss
- Driver must run at high prio (i.e. RMPA)
- ***Driver must not monopolise CPU***

Certification requirement:
More critical components must *not* depend on any less critical ones! [ARINC-653]

Critical system certification:

- expensive
- conservative assumptions
  - eg highly pessimistic WCET

- Must minimise critical software
- Need temporal isolation: Budget enforcement

© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0

Mixed-Criticality Support

For supporting *mixed-criticality systems* (MCS), OS must provide:

- *Temporal isolation*, to force jobs to adhere to declared WCET
- Mechanisms for *safely sharing resources* across criticalities

Will discuss seL4 approach next week!

© Gernot Heiser 2019 – CC BY 4.0