# ANALYSIS OF FEDERATED AND GLOBAL SCHEDULING FOR PARALLEL REAL-TIME TASKS

JING LI<sup>\*</sup>, JIAN-JIA CHEN<sup>!</sup>, **KUNAL AGRAWAL<sup>\*</sup>**, CHENYANG LU<sup>\*</sup>, CHRIS GILL<sup>\*</sup> AND ABUSAYEED SAIFULLAH<sup>\*</sup>

\*Washington University in St. Louis <sup>!</sup>TU Dortmund University

#### PROBLEM: SCHEDULING HARD-REAL TIME DAG TASKS

Schedule task set  $\tau = \{\tau_1, \tau_2, ..., \tau_k\}$  on *m* identical cores.

Each task  $\tau_i$  is a DAG

- Nodes: sequential subtasks
- Edges: dependences.

 $C_i$ : Execution time on 1 core (total work)  $L_i$ : Execution time on  $\infty$  cores (critical-path length)  $D_i$ : Deadline/minimum inter-arrival time

Utilization of  $\tau_i: U_i = C_i / D_i$ Total utilization of task set:  $U_s = a_i U_i$ 



 $C_i = 31$  $L_i = 6$ 

#### PERFORMANCE CRITERION: CAPACITY AUGMENTATION BOUND

A scheduler S provides a *capacity augmentation bound* of  $\alpha$  if it can always schedule a task set  $\tau$  on m processors if:



**Notes:** No scheduler can provide a < 1.

The conditions do not depend on the structure of the DAG.

## CONTRIBUTIONS

Scheduler	Prior Work	This Paper
Federated		Upper bound: $a \pm 2$ Lower bound: $a > 2 - 1/m$
Global EDF	Resource augmentation (speedup) bound $\leq 2$ Schedulability test [BMSW13] Upper bound: $\partial \pm 4$ Lower bound: $\partial 3(3+\sqrt{5})/2 \gg 2.618$ for large <i>m</i> [LALG13]	Upper bound: $\partial floor (3 + \sqrt{5})/2$ for large $m$ Improved lower bound for small $m$
Global RM	Resource augmentation $\leq 3$ Schedulability test [BMSW13] For synchronous tasks (a subset of DAG tasks), $a \pm 2 \pm \sqrt{3}$ for large <i>m</i> (using decomposition and DM)	Upper bound: $a \pm 2 + \sqrt{3} = 3.73$ for large <i>m</i>

## OUTLINE

- Canonical form of a DAG task.
- Federated Scheduling
- Upper Bound on GEDF

# HIGH VS. LOW-UTILIZATION TASKS

- Classify task as
  - Low-utilization if  $U_i 
    otin 1$
  - High-utilization if  $U_i > 1$
- Low utilization tasks can execute sequentially and still meet their deadlines.
- High utilization tasks need parallelism to complete within their deadline.



- Case 1: D<sub>i</sub> = 32; u<sub>i</sub> = 0.96
   Low utilization.
- Case 2:  $D_i = 18; u_i = 1.72$ 
  - High utilization.

#### KEY INTUITION: CANONICAL FORM OF A DAG TASK



LU task: A sequential task with work  $C_i$ 

$$C_i = 15$$



HU task: A chain of  $(L_i / e) - 1$  nodes of size All remaining work is maximally parallel with -sized nodes.



## CANONICAL DAG IS THE "WORST-CASE" DAG

Pretend we give the job ∞ processors.

#### DEFINE

- work<sub>i</sub>(t) :maximum work that task τ<sub>i</sub> has to finish in any interval of time t.
- work<sup>\*</sup><sub>i</sub>(t):maximum work that task  $\tau_i$ 's canonical form has to finish in any interval of time t.

We can prove that for all twork<sup>\*</sup><sub>i</sub>(t) <sup>3</sup> work<sup>\*</sup><sub>i</sub>(t)



## OUTLINE

- Canonical form of a DAG task.
- Federated Scheduling
- Upper Bound on GEDF

# HOW MANY CORES DOES A HIGH-UTILIZATION TASK NEED IF IT IS THE ONLY TASK IN THE SYSTEM?



We can prove that on  $n_i$  dedicated cores and using a workconserving scheduler, an HU task never misses a deadline.

# FEDERATED SCHEDULER

- Assign  $n_i = \left[\frac{C_i L_i}{D_i L_i}\right]$  dedicated cores to each high-utilization task  $\tau_{i.}$
- All remaining processors are assigned to low-utilization tasks collectively.
   HU Tasks

LU Tasks  $\begin{bmatrix} C_1 = 31 \\ L_1 = 6 \\ D_1 = 18 \\ u_1 = 1.72 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} C_2 = 22 \\ L_2 = 3 \\ D_2 = 7 \\ u_2 = 3.14 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} C_3 = 15 \\ L_3 = 4 \\ D_3 = 17 \\ u_3 = 0.88 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} C_4 = 30 \\ L_4 = 30 \\ D_4 = 40 \\ u_4 = 0.75 \end{bmatrix}$ Treat as sequential tasks  $n_i = 3$   $n_i = 5$  $n_{low} = m - n_{high}$ and use No interference; multiprocessor scheduler such as Use any workconserving P-EDF. m = 12scheduler.

## CAPACITY AUGMENTATION BOUND OF $\alpha \leq 2$

1. For HU tasks, show that, if  $L_i \leq D_i/2$  (using algebra):  $n_i = \left| \frac{C_i - L_i}{D_i - L_i} \right| < 2 u_i$ 

2. Therefore, 
$$n_{low} = m - \mathop{aa}_{t_i:high} n_i^3 m - 2 \mathop{aa}_{t_i:high} u_i = m - 2u_{high}$$

3. If 
$$m^3 a U_s = 2U_s = 2u_{high} + 2u_{low}$$
, we have  $n_{low}^3 2u_{low}$ 

- 4. There are many schedulers, such as partitioned EDF [LDG04] and various fixed priority schedulers [ASJ01, AJ03] that guarantee schedulability to sequential tasks if utilization is at most 50%. Any of these can be used to schedule the low-utilization tasks with a total utilization of  $n_{low}/2$  on  $n_{low}$  cores.
- 5. Checking schedulability for federated scheduler is fast and easy. It often admits task sets with utilization > m/2.

## OUTLINE

- Canonical form of a DAG task.
- Federated Scheduling
- Upper Bound on GEDF

#### BOUND THE TOTAL LOAD OF CANONICAL TASKS



Over all tasks,  $\underset{t}{a}$  work  $_{i}^{*}(t) \in \frac{aU_{S}}{a-1}t$ 

## GEDF Has Capacity Augmentation Bound $\alpha \leq 2.618$

1. Bonifaci et. al [BMSW13] proved that  $\tau$  is schedulable by GEDF on m processors if

- 
$$aL_i \in D_i$$
, and  
-  $a_t work_i(t) \in \frac{am - m + 1}{a}t$ 

- 1. We know that  $\underset{t}{a}$  work<sub>i</sub>(t)  $\underset{t}{b}$   $\underset{t}{a}$  work<sub>i</sub><sup>\*</sup>(t)  $\underset{t}{b}$   $\frac{\partial U_{S}}{\partial -1}t$
- 1. Therefore, the task set is schedulable if  $\frac{aU_s}{a-1} \stackrel{f}{=} \frac{am-m+1}{a}$
- 1. We substitute  $U_{\rm S} \pm m/a$  and solve for  $\alpha$  to get

$$a \pm \frac{3 - 1/m + \sqrt{5 - 2/m + 1/m^2}}{2} \gg \frac{3 + \sqrt{5}}{2}$$

#### **EXTENSION TO GEDF ANALYSIS**

• With simple extensions, we can show that if  $D_{max} = max_i \{L_i / D_i\}$  is "small", then EDF also provides utilization close to m/2.



#### CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

- The canonical DAG allows us to ignore the DAG structure --- we need only know the upper bounds on execution time C<sub>i</sub> and critical path length L<sub>i</sub>.
- Federated scheduler has close-to-optimal capacity augmentation bound for large *m*. What about small *m*?
- For global RM for parallel tasks, the best lower bound is 2.668 (inherited from sequential tasks) [L02], while the upper bound is 3.73. Can we improve either?
- We have speedup bounds for constrained and arbitrary deadline parallel tasks. Can we prove utilization/capacity augmentation bounds for these tasks?