

Achieving Isolation in Mixed-Criticality Industrial Edge Systems with Real-Time Containers

Appendix

Marco Barletta ✉ 

Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II, Italy

Marcello Cinque ✉ 

Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II, Italy

Luigi De Simone ✉ 

Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II, Italy

Raffaele Della Corte ✉ 

Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II, Italy

A Schedulability Test Proof

This is the appendix to the paper¹. Here, we provide the analytical proof of our simplification of the schedulability test presented in Subsection 3.2. In particular, the response time analysis is described by equations (1) and (2).

$$L_i(w_i) = C_i + \sum_{\forall j \in hp(i)} \left\lceil \frac{w_i + J_j}{T_j} \right\rceil C_j \quad \text{with } w_i^0 = C_i + \left(\left\lceil \frac{C_i}{C_s} \right\rceil - 1 \right) (T_s - C_s) \quad (1)$$

$$w_i^{n+1} = L(w_i^n) + \left(\left\lceil \frac{L(w_i^n)}{C_s} \right\rceil - 1 \right) (T_s - C_s) + \sum_{\substack{\forall X \in hp(S) \\ servers}} \left\lceil \frac{\max \left(0, w_i^n - \left(\left\lceil \frac{L(w_i^n)}{C_s} \right\rceil - 1 \right) T_s \right) + J_X}{T_X} \right\rceil C_X \quad (2)$$

According to analysis in Subsection 3.2, the third term in Equation 2 can be rewritten as:

$$\sum_{\substack{\forall X \in hp(S) \\ servers}} C_X \quad (3)$$

We provide in the following the proof about Equation 2 and Equation 3.

From previous studies²³⁴, the interference for a deferrable server is made up of the load that can be generated by a higher priority server x , that is up to:

$$I(t) = \left\lceil \frac{t + J_x}{T_x} \right\rceil C_x = \left\lceil \frac{t - C_x}{T_x} \right\rceil C_x + C_x \quad (4)$$

¹M. Barletta, M. Cinque, L. De Simone, R. Della Corte. *Achieving Isolation in Mixed-Criticality Industrial Edge Systems with Real-Time Containers*. Proceedings 34rd Euromicro Conference on Real-Time Systems (ECRTS 2022).

²R. Davis and A. Burns. *An investigation into server parameter selection for hierarchical fixed priority pre-emptive systems*. 16th International Conference on Real-Time and Network Systems (RTNS 2008).

³R. Davis and A. Burns. *Hierarchical fixed priority preemptive scheduling*. 26th IEEE International Real-Time Systems Symposium (RTSS'05). IEEE, 2005.

⁴G. Bernat and A. Burns. *New results on fixed priority aperiodic servers*. Proceedings 20th IEEE Real-Time Systems Symposium (Cat. No. 99CB37054). IEEE, 1999.

2 Appendix

However, this is the worst case of a more generic formula that can be expressed in this way:

$$I(t) = \begin{cases} \left\lceil \frac{t-\phi_x}{T_x} \right\rceil C_x + \phi_x & \text{if } \phi_x < C_x \\ \left\lceil \frac{t-\phi_x}{T_x} \right\rceil C_x + C_x & \text{if } \phi_x \geq C_x \end{cases} = \left\lceil \frac{t-\phi_x}{T_x} \right\rceil C_x + \min(\phi_x, C_x) \quad \forall \phi_x \in [0, T_x] \quad (5)$$

To demonstrate Equation 5, we rewrite a generic time instant t as:

$$t = \phi_x + k * T_x + \alpha \quad \phi_x \in [0, T_x] \quad \alpha \in [0, T_x] \quad (6)$$

Where ϕ_x is the initial phasing of the server, $k * T_x$ is a multiple of the server period and α is the exceeding. In ϕ_x , at most $\min(C_x, \phi_x)$ load is provided by the server. In $k * T_x$ at most $k * C_x$ load is provided and finally in α the load is at most $\min(\alpha, C_x)$.

Thus, the load provided by the server in $[0, t]$ is: $L(t) = \min(C_x, \phi_x) + k * C_x + \min(\alpha, C_x)$. Then, for a lower priority server the preemption time is: $I(t) = (k + 1) * C_x + \min(\phi, C_x)$, since if there is any exceeding of the period, the higher priority server must complete the execution. The formula can be rewritten as:

$$I(t) = \left\lceil \frac{t-\phi_x}{T_x} \right\rceil C_x + \min(\phi_x, C_x) \quad (7)$$

Being t the extent in the last period³, and T the common period, if we prove that $t \leq T$, then

$$I(t) \leq \left\lceil 1 - \frac{\phi_x}{T} \right\rceil C_x + \min(\phi_x, C_x) = C_x + \min(\phi_x, C_x) \quad (8)$$

Since the periods are lockstep, $\phi_x = 0$ (i.e., all servers have the same phasing).

We prove that $t \leq T$, even if it is trivial due to the extent in the last period is of course not greater than the period. From ³:

$$t = w_i^n - \left(\left\lceil \frac{L(w_i^n)}{C_s} \right\rceil - 1 \right) T \quad L_i(w_i^n) = C_j + \sum_{\forall i \in hp(j)} \left\lceil \frac{w_i + J_i}{T} \right\rceil C_i \quad (9)$$

If t value were greater than T (i.e., $t > T$) then $w_i^n > \left(\left\lceil \frac{L(w_i^n)}{C_s} \right\rceil \right) T$.

However, this is not possible since:

$$w_i^n = L(w_i^{n-1}) + \left(\left\lceil \frac{L(w_i^{n-1})}{C_s} \right\rceil - 1 \right) (T - C_s) + \sum_{\substack{\forall X \in hp(S) \\ servers}} \left\lceil \frac{\max(0, w_i^{n-1} - \left(\left\lceil \frac{L(w_i^{n-1})}{C_s} \right\rceil - 1 \right) T) + J_X}{T} \right\rceil C_X \quad (10)$$

In order to have schedulable servers, the third term should be less than $T_s - C_s$ (see note³):

$$\begin{aligned} w_i^n &\leq L(w_i^{n-1}) + \left(\left\lceil \frac{L(w_i^{n-1})}{C_s} \right\rceil \right) T - \left(\left\lceil \frac{L(w_i^{n-1})}{C_s} \right\rceil \right) C_s - T + C_s + T - C_s \\ L(w_i^{n-1}) - \left(\left\lceil \frac{L(w_i^{n-1})}{C_s} \right\rceil \right) C_s + \left(\left\lceil \frac{L(w_i^{n-1})}{C_s} \right\rceil \right) T &\geq w_i^n \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

If we suppose $w_i^n > \left(\left\lceil \frac{L(w_i^n)}{C_s} \right\rceil \right) T$ then:

$$L(w_i^{n-1}) - \left(\left\lceil \frac{L(w_i^{n-1})}{C_s} \right\rceil \right) C_s + \left(\left\lceil \frac{L(w_i^{n-1})}{C_s} \right\rceil \right) T \geq w_i^n > \left(\left\lceil \frac{L(w_i^n)}{C_s} \right\rceil \right) T \quad (12)$$

50 The first two terms are not positive because of the definition of ceiling function. Thus:

$$51 \quad \eta + \left(\left\lceil \frac{L(w_i^{n-1})}{C_s} \right\rceil \right) T \geq w_i^n > \left(\left\lceil \frac{L(w_i^n)}{C_s} \right\rceil \right) T \quad \text{with } \eta \leq 0 \quad (13)$$

52 But this is not possible since the last term is a non-decreasing succession.