Hardware/Software Partitioning and Scheduling of Embedded Systems

Andrew Morton PhD Thesis Defence Electrical and Computer Engineering University of Waterloo January 13, 2005

Outline

- 1. Thesis Statement
- 2. Study 1: EDF with coprocessors
- 3. Study 2: SoPC case study
- 4. Study 3: Automated Partitioning
- 5. Summary

Thesis Statement

• Thesis: partitioning and scheduling of concurrent systems are closely connected and best approached in an integrated manner

Motivation

- 1.To explore relationship between partitioning and scheduling of embedded real-time systems
- 2.To apply Earliest Deadline First (EDF) scheduling policy in the context of hardware/software codesign
- 3.To integrate kernel partitioning with application partitioning

Dissertation Organization

- Study I
 - Extension of off-line EDF feasibility analysis for task sets that block on coprocessors
- Study II
 - Case study of application and kernel partitioning of a system on programmable chip (SoPC)
- Study III
 - Automated hardware/software partitioning of application and kernel for EDF feasibility

Study I: Extended EDF Analysis Overview

- Problem
 - task set scheduled by EDF
 - task with earliest deadline is scheduled first; if another task arrives with earlier deadline, it preempts current task
 - a task blocks on coprocessor during execution



- "coprocessor-blocked task"
- highly constrained form of heterogeneous multiprocessor EDF

- Analysis
 - Based on algorithm by Stankovic, Spuri, Ramamritham and Buttazzo (1998)
 - use processor demand analysis to ensure no missed deadlines
 - uni-processor, periodic and sporadic tasks
 - negligible kernel overhead
- Extended for task sets which include one coprocessor-blocked task
 - no contention for coprocessor

• Analyze impact of coprocessor-induced idle



• Assign phases to sub-tasks of coprocessorblocked task



- In τ replace τ_x with $\tau_{x,1}$, $\tau_{x,3}$... $\tau_{x,N}$
- Pass 1

$$-\Phi_{x,I}, \Phi_{x,3} \dots \Phi_{x,N} = 0$$

- perform processor demand analysis
- For each coprocessor block $\tau_{x,2}$, $\tau_{x,4} \dots \tau_{x,N-1}$
 - assign $\Phi_{x,1}$, $\Phi_{x,3}$... $\Phi_{x,N}$ to simulate coprocessor idle
 - perform processor demand analysis

• Benefit

$$\Delta U = \frac{\Delta C_x}{T_x}$$
$$= \frac{\sum_{k=2,4,\dots,N-1}^{k=2,4,\dots,N-1} C_{x,k}}{T_x}$$

• Limitation

$$\forall |\vec{C}_i| = 1,$$

 $\forall k \in \{N-1, N-3, \dots, 2\}: D_i \ge C_i + C_{x, k+1}$

Extended EDF Analysis Contributions

- 1. Identified and characterized the problem of EDF feasibility analysis for coprocessor-blocked tasks
- 2. Proposed a first solution
- 3.Applied EDF in the context of hardware/software codesign
 - increases applicability of EDF to codesign

Extended EDF Analysis Future Research

- 1. Develop analysis that doesn't impose limitation caused by subtask $\tau_{x,a}$ with zero slack
 - reconsider subtask deadline assignment
- 2.Extend analysis to multiple coprocessor-blocked tasks
- 3.Extend analysis to multiprocessor systems
- 4.Explore heuristics for dynamic planning of task sets with coprocessor-blocked tasks

Study II: SoPC Case Study Overview

- System on Programmable Chip
 - FPGA with soft-core processor, system bus and coprocessors
- Real-time kernel
 - scheduling by EDF, inter-task message queues, integration of coprocessors
- Application
 - idle engine simulation, load simulation, crankshaft speed controllers

SoPC Case Study Overview

- Application coprocessor
 - cosine calculation
 - used by environment task

	Cosine	Task
C++ cos()	1.435 ms	1.680 ms
cordic	0.081 ms	0.343 ms
difference	1.354 ms	1.337 ms*

* doesn't include kernel overhead

SoPC Case Study Overview

- Kernel coprocessor
 - EDF scheduling
 - replaces run list, timer list and timer

	C_{k}
cs1	128 µs
cs2	66 µs
cs2 coproc	4.56 µs

SoPC Case Study Overview

• Coprocessor Comparison

Coprocessor	Δt	ΔU	LE	$\Delta U/LE \ge 10^6$
cordic	1.081 ms	0.2162	3840	56.30
cs2	62 µs	0.1036	1836	56.42

SoPC Case Study Contributions

- 1.One more hardware/software partitioning of kernel
- 2. Proposed coprocessor evaluation metric
 - *\[] U/LE*
- 3.Real-time kernel with integrated coprocessor support
- 4. Data source for automated hardware/software partitioners

SoPC Case Study Future Research

- 1.Perform additional case-studies of real-time SoC systems
- 2.Implement kernel Slif nodes on FPGA to check hardware estimates and schedule feasibility
- 3.Compare multi-processor implementations against processor/coprocessor implementations

Study III: Hardware/Software Partitioning Overview

- Problem
 - Given one processor with fixed throughput, limited programmable logic, and possibly limited program/data memory, partition the application and kernel such that all deadlines are met when scheduled by the preemptive EDF policy.

- Non-linear programming (NLP) model
- Objective: EDF feasibility
 - 1. minimize U
 - 2. repair schedule feasibility
 - $\cdot\,$ add processor demand constraints

$$U = \sum_{\tau_i \in \tau} \frac{C_i}{T_i}$$

$$C_i = \sum_{n_a \in N_i} \left(c_{i,a} [hw] \cdot n_a [hw] + c_{i,a} [sw] \cdot n_a [sw] \right)$$

$$+ 2C_k \left(n_{root} [sw] + \sum_{e_p \in E_i} f_p \left(e_p [h/s] + e_p [s/h] \right) \right)$$

$$C_k = \sum_{n_a \in N_k} \left(c_{k,a} [hw] \cdot n_a [hw] + c_{k,a} [sw] \cdot n_a [sw] \right)$$

- FM-based heuristic
- Objective: EDF feasibility

1. minimize

a) worst-case execution time – metric g^c
b) scaled, weighted cutset – metric g^χ
c) processor utilization – metric g^U
d) processor utilization divided by size – metric g^U/sz

- 2. repair schedule feasibility by
 - minimize $h(v_k)$ for first missed deadline
 - repeat until no missed deadlines

- Idle Engine Partitioning
 - kernel nodes: 11 (5 bound to software)
 - task nodes: 30
 - U (all software) = 1.097
- NLP results
 - U = 0.465680
 - hardware nodes
 - kernel: 5
 - task: 23

- Case study results (cordic)
 - U = 0.881101
 - hardware nodes
 - kernel: 0
 - task: 1

• Heuristic gain metric evaluation results (part 1)

	# Feasible			
Problem	g ^c	g ^χ	g ^U	g ^{U/sz}
idle eng	0	0	31	100
p100_1	0	40	82	83
p100_2	0	3	100	100
p200_1	92	0	92	98
p200_2	0	3	100	100
p500_1	0	0	4	0
p500_2	0	5	100	99
p1000_1	0	14	68	52
p1000_2	0	1	100	100
Total	92	66	677	732

• Heuristic gain metric evaluation results (part 2)

	${oldsymbol{g}}^{\scriptscriptstyle U}$		g ^{U/sz}	
Problem	<i>U</i> min	U std dev	<i>U</i> min	U std dev
idle eng	0.4657	0.01881	0.4657	0.01350
p100_1	0.8984	0	0.8984	0
p100_2	0.8512	0	0.8512	0
p200_1	0.6772	0.02347	0.6772	0.02316
p200_2	0.7836	0	0.7836	0
p500_1	0.5538	0.006246		
p500_2	0.7064	0	0.7064	0
p1000_1	0.7739	0.04015	0.8275	0.02619
p1000_2	0.2445	0	0.2445	0

• Kernel vs Application hardware assignment

Problem	Kernel	Task
idle eng	45.4%	76.7%
p100_1	36.4%	3.0%
p100_2	36.4%	1.0%
p200_1	9.1%	2.5%
p200_2	45.4%	0.0%
p500_1	45.4%	6.2%
p500_2	63.6%	0.0%
p1000_1	36.4%	3.3%
p1000_2	54.5%	0.2%

Hardware/Software Partitioning Contributions

- 1.Addressed schedule feasibility during partitioning
- 2. Minimizing U helps find feasible schedules
- 3.Partitioned kernel nodes contribute to feasible schedules
- 4. Design time should be a constraint
 - encourage code re-use (including kernel)
- 5.Results indicate that schedule feasibility needs to be addressed during partitioning

Hardware/Software Partitioning Future Research

- 1.Use finer-grained internal representation such as control and data-flow graphs
- 2.Extend to multiprocessor partitioning
- 3. Synthesis of hardware coprocessors from software code would make automated partitioning a more applicable technique

Summary

- Demonstrated importance of addressing schedule feasibility during partitioning
- Explored EDF in context of hardware/software codesign
- Results indicate that the kernel is a viable candidate for partitioning because of invocation frequency and code re-use