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Abstract—Exact schedulability analysis of limited-preemptive (or non-preemptive) real-time workloads with variable execution costs and release jitter is a notoriously difficult challenge due to the inherent predictability advantages [1]. To counteract latency spikes that may arise from long-running jobs, it is common practice to insert fixed preemption points to break jobs into segments, where each such segment is executed non-preemptively, but the job overall is limited-preemptive (i.e., the job can be preempted, but only at well-known points in its control-flow graph, which aids WCET analysis). Furthermore, when jobs engage in synchronous I/O (e.g., network communication, storage devices), synchronize via semaphores, or offload computation to accelerators such as GPUs, DSPs, or other co-processors, segments may be separated by self-suspensions (i.e., after one segment completes, the next segment may not immediately be available for execution) [2].

A sound schedulability analysis of this practically relevant class of workloads, on either uni- or multiprocessors, is however presently beyond the reach of the state of the art, due to a number of challenges. For one, the analysis of limited-preemptive (or non-preemptive) real-time workloads is already inherently difficult due to the scheduling anomalies that arise from non-preemptive execution. Additionally, the complex effects of self-suspensions cause further timing anomalies that, if not carefully handled, may result in unsound schedulability tests (as explained in detail in Chen et al.’s recent survey [2]). In fact, as we show in this paper, non-preemptive self-suspending tasks (either periodic or sporadic) suffer from anomalies that render it unsafe to treat suspensions as execution segments (i.e., to simply over-approximate processor demand). This is in contrast to the preemtive case, in which such a suspension-oblivious approach is commonly used and has been shown to be safe [2,3].

This paper. We provide the first exact schedulability test for this difficult setting, that is, a test that decides whether a set of segmented, self-suspending tasks scheduled non-preemptively upon either uni- or multiprocessors will meet all deadlines. By extension, our test also applies to limited-preemptive tasks (i.e., non-suspending tasks with preemption points). This is also the first exact test for the special case of global non-preemptive scheduling (without suspensions or preemption points).

Our test models the system as a synchronized network of timed automata (TA) [4] and maps the schedulability problem to a reachability query. In extensive experiments that evaluate the scalability of the solution with regard to the number of cores, tasks, segments, magnitude of release jitter, and system utilization, it is shown to scale up to 60 periodic tasks scheduled on 2 cores, 30 tasks on 4 cores, and 15 tasks on 8 cores.

Besides scaling to small- and even moderately-sized workloads, the proposed test also provides the first exact baseline against which future, more efficient, but inexact schedulability tests can be compared and thus lays an important foundation for future research into self-susensions and limited-preemptive models. Additionally, the paper highlights some subtle pitfalls and limitations in existing TA-based schedulability tests for non-preemptive workloads.

I. INTRODUCTION

The current state of the art in worst-case execution time analysis (WCET) favors non-preemptive execution due to its inherent predictability advantages [1]. To counteract latency spikes that may arise from long-running jobs, it is common practice to insert fixed preemption points to break jobs into a sequence of segments, where each such segment is executed non-preemptively, but the job overall is limited-preemptive (i.e., the job can be preempted, but only at well-known points in its control-flow graph, which aids WCET analysis). Furthermore, when jobs engage in synchronous I/O (e.g., network communication, storage devices), synchronize via semaphores, or offload computation to accelerators such as GPUs, DSPs, or other co-processors, segments may be separated by self-suspensions (i.e., after one segment completes, the next segment may not immediately be available for execution) [2].

A sound schedulability analysis of this practically relevant class of workloads, on either uni- or multiprocessors, is however presently beyond the reach of the state of the art, due to a number of challenges. For one, the analysis of limited-preemptive (or non-preemptive) real-time workloads is already inherently difficult due to the scheduling anomalies that arise from non-preemptive execution. Additionally, the complex effects of self-suspensions cause further timing anomalies that, if not carefully handled, may result in unsound schedulability tests (as explained in detail in Chen et al.’s recent survey [2]). In fact, as we show in this paper, non-preemptive self-suspending tasks (either periodic or sporadic) suffer from anomalies that render it unsafe to treat suspensions as execution segments (i.e., to simply over-approximate processor demand). This is in contrast to the preemtive case, in which such a suspension-oblivious approach is commonly used and has been shown to be safe [2,3].

This paper. We provide the first exact schedulability test for this difficult setting, that is, a test that decides whether a set of segmented, self-suspending tasks scheduled non-preemptively upon either uni- or multiprocessors will meet all deadlines. By extension, our test also applies to limited-preemptive tasks (i.e., non-suspending tasks with preemption points). This is also the first exact test for the special case of global non-preemptive scheduling (without suspensions or preemption points).

Our test models the system as a synchronized network of timed automata (TA) [4] and maps the schedulability problem to a reachability query. In extensive experiments that evaluate the scalability of the solution with regard to the number of cores, tasks, segments, magnitude of release jitter, and system utilization, it is shown to scale up to 60 periodic tasks scheduled on 2 cores, 30 tasks on 4 cores, and 15 tasks on 8 cores.

Besides scaling to small- and even moderately-sized workloads, the proposed test also provides the first exact baseline against which future, more efficient, but inexact schedulability tests can be compared and thus lays an important foundation for future research into self-susensions and limited-preemptive models. Additionally, the paper highlights some subtle pitfalls and limitations in existing TA-based schedulability tests for non-preemptive workloads.

Prior work. To the best of our knowledge, no exact schedulability test for non-preemptive (or limited-preemptive) self-suspending tasks has been proposed to date (for either uniprocessor or multiprocessor platforms).

Several exact schedulability tests have been introduced for preemptively scheduled uni- and multiprocessor platforms (i.e., for global fixed-priority scheduling) [5]–[8] and for non-preemptive scheduling upon uniprocessor platforms for both sporadic [9,10] and periodic tasks [11]. None of these tests supports self-suspending tasks. Further, even for the special case of non-preemptive global scheduling without self-susensions or preemption points, no exact test has been proposed to date.
The TA formalism has been previously leveraged in a number of schedulability tests for preemptive tasks scheduled by a global scheduling policy upon a multiprocessor platform [12–18]. These tests, however, are not designed for self-suspending tasks, cannot handle blocking times caused by non-preemptive execution, and some use stopwatches (e.g., [14,17,18]) that render the TA reachability problem undecidable [19]. As we discuss in Sec. III, the use of stopwatches significantly limits the practical applicability of the tests. There are further a few TA-based schedulability tests for non-preemptive tasks [14,20,21]. These tests, however, are limited to unprocessors and do not support self-suspensions or preemption points.

Finally, prior work has yielded several sufficient schedulability tests for global non-preemptive scheduling that target either sporadic [22–25] or periodic tasks [26], but these tests do not support self-suspending or limited-preemptive tasks.

II. System Model and Background

We consider a multiprocessor system with $m$ identical processors and a set of $n$ independent, self-suspending tasks $\tau = \{\tau_1, \tau_2, \ldots, \tau_n\}$. Each task $\tau_i$ is represented by a tuple $(T_i, D_i, O_i, P_i, k_i, S_i)$, where $T_i$ is the period (or equivalently, the minimum inter-arrival time), $D_i \leq T_i$ is the relative deadline, $O_i$ is the initial offset, $P_i$ is the priority, $k_i$ is the number of segments, and $S_i$ is the vector of segments of the task. Smaller values of $P_i$ indicate higher priorities. We assume global fixed-priority scheduling and that $P_1 < \ldots < P_n$.

The $j$th segment of a task $\tau_i$ is denoted by a tuple $S_{i,j} = ([s_{i,j}^{\min}, s_{i,j}^{\max}], [C_{i,j}^{\min}, C_{i,j}^{\max}])$, where $s_{i,j}^{\min}$ and $s_{i,j}^{\max}$ are the best-case suspension time (BCST) and worst-case suspension time (WCST), and $C_{i,j}^{\min}$ and $C_{i,j}^{\max}$ are the best-case execution time (BCET) and the worst-case execution time (WCET) of the segment, respectively. Our model implicitly supports release jitter, i.e., the first suspension prior to the first execution segment represents the release jitter of the task. Both the BCST and WCST can be zero for any or all of the segments, which turns such a segment boundary into a fixed preemption point (i.e., for a limited-preemptive task, $s_{i,j}^{\min} = s_{i,j}^{\max} = 0$ for $1 < j < k_i$). Once a segment starts execution it is not preempted until it finishes. If $k_i = 1$ for every $\tau_i \in \tau$, then the problem reduces to non-preemptive global scheduling.

We assume $C_i + X_i \leq D_i$, where $C_i = \sum_{j=1}^{k_i} C_{i,j}^{\max}$ is the total execution time and $X_i = \sum_{j=1}^{k_i} s_{i,j}^{\max}$ is the total suspension time of task $\tau_i$. The system utilization by $U = \sum_{i=1}^{n} u_i$, where $u_i = C_i / T_i$ is the utilization of task $\tau_i$. The execution time ratio of $\tau_i$ is given by $\beta_i = C_i / (C_i + X_i)$.

Timed automata. A timed automaton is a finite-state machine extended with a finite set of real-valued clocks that progress monotonically at the same rate and measure the time spent after their latest resets [4]. UPPAAL \(^3\) extends the formal definition of timed automata with integer variables, structured data

---

\(^1\) For example, if a task $\tau_i$ has a minimum and maximum release jitter equal to $[r_{i}^{\min}, r_{i}^{\max}]$, then $s_{i}^{\min} = r_{i}^{\min}$ and $s_{i}^{\max} = r_{i}^{\max}$.

\(^2\) This paper assumes the reader to be familiar with the timed automata formalism; an overview and tutorial may be found in [19,27].

\(^3\) www. uppal.com
which is however deemed *not schedulable* by David et al.’s analysis [21] due to the inclusion of impossible event orderings.

**Counterexample 1.** When applying David et al.’s test [21] to the periodic task set $\tau_1 = (3, 3, 0, 1, 1, \{(0, 0), [1, 1]\})$ and $\tau_2 = (6, 6, 0, 2, 1, \{(0, 0), [3, 3]\})$, UPPAAL reports the following scenario to result in a deadline miss: at time 0, $\tau_2$ enters its ready location before $\tau_1$. Next, UPPAAL activates the scheduler, which dispatches the only job in the ready queue, i.e., $\tau_2$ (at time 0). This is allowed as the scheduler and task automata are independent of each other [21], i.e., UPPAAL is allowed to non-deterministically pick any enabled transition, including the scheduler transition. Finally, $\tau_1$ also moves to its ready location (still at time 0). However, the processor has already been allocated, so $\tau_2$ blocks $\tau_1$ for three time units. Consequently, $\tau_1$ is reported to miss its deadline at time 3. This, however, is actually impossible, since a fixed-priority scheduler will always select the higher-priority task $\tau_1$ if both $\tau_1$ and $\tau_2$ release a job at exactly the same time (note the absence of release jitter). The problem can be avoided if, at time 0, both tasks are forced to synchronously move to their ready locations before the scheduler can be called.

UPPAAL’s scheduling framework [14], which uses stopwatches, reports “may not be schedulable” for this example.

**Suspension-oblivious analysis is unsound.** The following example shows that, given a self-suspending task set (either periodic or sporadic), if suspension segments are analyzed as if they were execution segments (i.e., using a suspension-oblivious approach [2]), then the resulting task set may be deemed schedulable while the original task set is in fact *not schedulable*. Hence, naïvely accounting for suspensions as execution time is not safe for limited-preemptive self-suspending tasks.

**Counterexample 2.** Consider three tasks $\tau_1 = (20, 6, 1, 1, 2, \{(0, 0), [1, 1]\}, \{(1, 1), [1, 1]\})$, $\tau_2 = (20, 20, 2, 2, 1, \{(0, 0), [3, 3]\})$, and $\tau_3 = (20, 20, 0, 3, 1, \{(0, 0), [3, 3]\})$. Fig. 1(a) shows that the task set is schedulable if suspension time is treated as execution time since $\tau_1$ can only suffer from one low-priority blocking, while in reality it can suffer from two such blockings and hence is not schedulable as shown in Fig. 1(b). This counterexample holds also for sporadic tasks.

![Fig. 1. (a) suspension-oblivious and (b) suspension-aware schedules.](image)

The main contribution of this paper is a new TA-based exact schedulability test that avoids all of the aforementioned pitfalls.

**IV. PROPOSED SCHEDULABILITY TEST**

Our solution includes three TA templates for tasks (Task), the scheduler (SCHED), and an event synchronizer (SYNC), as shown in Figs. 2(a)–(c). Fig. 2(d) provides details of the functions used in the timed automata. A system with $n$ tasks requires $n$ Task instances, and one SCHED and one SYNC instance each. The SYNC automaton uses a broadcast channel synch, defined in Fig. 2(d), whose receivers are the Task automata. The SCHED automaton uses $n$ high-priority urgent channels called run to send signals to the Task automata. The system is schedulable if, in any reachable state, no Task automaton resides in its Missed location.

**TASK.** This automaton models a periodic, segmented, self-suspending task with initial offset and release jitter. Each TASK automaton uses two clocks: $t$ keeps track of the arrival time (and deadline) of the task, while $x$ keeps track of the execution and suspension time of each segment. The initial offset of the task is enqueued in the Start location, in which the automaton is forced to stay for offset time units. Next, the automaton enters the Suspended location, which realizes both release jitter and suspensions. A task stays Suspended nondeterministically for $x$ units of time, where $s_{\text{min}} \leq x \leq s_{\text{max}}$. The functions $s_{\text{min}}$ and $s_{\text{max}}$ return the minimum and maximum suspension duration of the current segment of the task (indicated by seg_idx), respectively.

When the suspension time (or initial jitter delay) has passed, the task enters the Ready location, where it waits until it receives a run signal from the scheduler to start its execution and enter the Running location. During this transition, it decreases the number of available processors by one as it starts executing on one of the processors. The task remains in the Running location until some time within the minimum and maximum execution time of the current segment, denoted by $c_{\text{min}}$ and $c_{\text{max}}$, respectively. When the task completes the execution of its current segment, it either enters the Completed location (if seg_idx indicates the last segment of the task), or goes back to the Suspended location to model the next suspension. Whenever the task leaves the Running location, it increments the current segment index as well as the number of available processors. If a task is not completed before its deadline, i.e., it is still in the Suspended, Ready, or Running location when $t$ exceeds deadline, then it enters the Missed location. A task enters the Completed location when it completes the execution of its last segment, and stays there until the next arrival time (i.e., the end of its period, as is indicated by $t \geq \text{period}()$).

The TASK automaton can be easily modified to realize a sporadic task by (i) adding a self-loop to the Completed location with guard “synch?” and removing the location invariant “$t <= \text{period}()$”, and (ii) replacing “$t \geq \text{period}$” with “$t >= \text{period}$” on the transition from Completed to Suspended.

The resulting automaton is discussed in the Appendix.

**SCHED.** This automaton is similar to the scheduler model used by David et al. [14,21] and realizes a global work-conserving

---

\*Please refer to the original paper for an illustration.

\*\Fig. 2 differs in a minor way from the conference version. Specifically, the SYNC automaton first sends a first_synchron signal followed by two synch signals (in the conference version, it simply sends three synch signals in a row). This modification is required to address a corner case in the analysis of limited-preemptive (non-suspending) tasks.
A fixed-priority scheduler using a priority queue that stores a sorted list of tasks whose current segment is ready for execution. The first task in the list has the highest priority among all ready tasks. This automaton schedules a task as soon as there is a ready task in the queue and at least one processor available, in which case it sends a run signal to the highest-priority task.

**SYNC.** The purpose of SYNC is to synchronize the TASK automata such that all tasks that release a segment at a given time \( t' \) enter their Ready location at the same time before the scheduler is triggered. This construct serves to avoid the impossible event ordering problem mentioned in Sec. III.

Specifically, the SYNC automaton uses a broadcast channel to synchronize the TASK automata. In UPPAAL, any receiver of a broadcast channel is forced to activate the transition that has become enabled upon receiving the broadcast signal. As a result, any two tasks that are in their respective Suspended locations and release their next segments at time \( t' \), upon receiving the synch signal, must move to the Ready location at the same time. This ensures that, whenever SCHED is activated, all ready tasks have indeed entered their Ready location.

Adding a broadcast signal to transition guards forces them to react upon receiving a signal on the broadcast channel. Hence, in order to allow TASK automata to stay in their Suspended or Running locations for some time, we have added self-loop transitions to these locations. Upon receiving a synch signal (or, respectively, a first_synch signal), two of the outgoing transitions of these locations will be enabled, and since UPPAAL non-deterministically chooses one of them, the tasks can stay in the Suspended or Running locations for the duration of their current segment.

Another important detail of the SYNC automaton is that it always sends a sequence of three synchronization signals (one first_synch followed by two synch signals) due to the two committed locations that follow the Init location in the SYNC automaton. This design covers corner cases in which a task finishes its execution exactly at the end of its current period and hence must be able to reach the Ready location from the Running location in the same instant (i.e., at the period boundary). This requires a forced multi-step transition from Running to Ready via Completed and Suspended without any passage of time, which in turn requires first a first_synch signal, as indicated in the transitions out of the Running location, and two subsequent synch signals to move from Completed to Suspended and then to Ready.

The reason for distinguishing between the first_synch and synch signals, and for using the first_synch signal to leave the Running location, is to align the SYNC automaton’s sequence of three committed transitions with the TASK automaton’s multi-step transition. Specifically, this construction ensures that whenever a task leaves the Running location, it will receive a sufficient number of follow-up synch signals (i.e., two) to let the task automaton reach the Ready location if needed, which is required to ensure an exact analysis of limited-preemptive tasks that do not suspend in between segments.
This section answers the following questions: (i) How is the proposed test’s runtime affected by various system parameters, such as the number of cores, tasks, etc., and (ii) to what extent does it improve schedulability gain w.r.t. the state of the art?

We compared the proposed test against existing schedulability tests for global non-preemptive (G-NP) and global limited-preemptive (G-LP) scheduling in terms of average runtime and schedulability ratio (i.e., the fraction of task sets deemed schedulable for a particular set of parameters). We considered the following baselines: Guan et al.’s test [24] for any work-conserving G-NP policy (Guan-G-NP-WC), three tests for fixed-priority G-NP scheduling by Guan et al. [24], Lee et al. [25], and Nasri et al. [26] (denoted Guan-G-NP-FP, Lee-G-NP, and Nasri-G-NP, respectively), and Serrano et al.’s test for limited-preemptive scheduling [28] (Serrano-G-LP).

It should be noted that, with the exception of Nasri-G-NP [26], all baseline tests were designed specifically for sporadic tasks. We hence expect them to exhibit some degree of inherent pessimism when applied to periodic workloads (i.e., some feasible periodic workloads become infeasible if tasks exhibit sporadic arrivals). We focus on periodic tasks in the following and report on experiments involving sporadic tasks in the Appendix.

We generated periodic task sets following the guidelines of the Autosar benchmark introduced by Kramer et al. [29]. Specifically, for a given number of tasks \( n \), we sampled the (non-uniform) distribution of common periods \( \{1, 2, 5, 10, 20, 50, 100, 200, 1000\} \)ms reported by Kramer et al. [29] to randomly draw a realistic period for each task. Due to UPPAAL’s restricted support for integer variables and parameters, we multiplied each period by ten to obtain integer values, respectively. Finally, for each segment, we assigned rate-monotonic priorities. Moreover, based on \( C_i \) and \( X_i \), we used the RandFixSum algorithm [30] to distribute \( C_i \) among the \( C_{i,j}^{max} \) values and \( X_i \) among the \( s_{i,j}^{max} \) values, respectively. Finally, for each segment, we assigned \( C_{i,j}^{min} = 0.1 \cdot C_{i,j}^{max} \) and \( s_{i,j}^{min} = 0.1 \cdot s_{i,j}^{max} \), respectively. Tasks were assumed to have implicit deadlines and to not have release jitter, and were assigned rate-monotonic priorities. Moreover, we discarded task sets that did not pass even a trivial simulation-based necessary test that considers only one execution scenario in which each task executes for \( C_i \) time units and suspends for \( X_i \) time units (i.e., where all job parameters are maximal).

We performed four experiments by varying (Exp1) the number of cores and total utilization \( U \) (for \( U \in \{0.5m, 0.5m, 0.7m\}, n = 10 \), one segment per task, and no suspensions); (Exp2) the number of tasks \( n \) (for \( m \in \{1, 2, 4, 8\} \), \( U=0.3 \cdot m \), one segment per task, and no suspensions); (Exp3) the maximum execution time ratio \( \beta \) (for \( m \in \{1, 2\} \),

Fig. 3. Experiments with various parameters. (a, b, c, d) The schedulability ratio and runtime in Exp1; (e, f) the runtime in Exp2 for both the TA-based test and Nasri-G-NP; (g) the runtime in Exp3; and (h, i) the schedulability ratio and runtime in Exp4.
While our test confirms that schedulability improves with increasing number of jobs per hyperperiod, when multiple cores are available. This reveals further room for improvement in schedulability analysis and demonstrates the benefit of having an exact baseline to compare sufficient tests against. Moreover, our test reveals considerable pessimism in the state-of-the-art schedulability test for limited-preemptive tasks (Serrano-G-LP) when mapped to the TA reachability problem, discussed some subtle pitfalls and limitations of prior TA-based schedulability tests, and proposed task, scheduler, and event synchronizer automata to realize an exact test. In addition to scaling to nontrivial workload sizes before succumbing to the state-space explosion problem, our work also provides the first exact baseline against which sufficient schedulability tests can be compared and thus enables future research into self-suspensions and limited-preemptive models.

VI. CONCLUSION

We have proposed the first exact schedulability test for limited-preemptive (and non-preemptive) self-suspending real-time tasks scheduled upon a uniprocessor or multiprocessor platform (under a global fixed-priority scheduling policy). We mapped the schedulability problem to the TA reachability problem, discussed some subtle pitfalls and limitations of prior TA-based schedulability tests, and proposed task, scheduler, and event synchronizer automata to realize an exact test. In addition to scaling to nontrivial workload sizes before succumbing to the state-space explosion problem, our work also provides the first exact baseline against which sufficient schedulability tests can be compared and thus enables future research into self-suspensions and limited-preemptive models.
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Fig. 3 has been updated to reflect the aforementioned tweak of the SYNC automation and hence differs in minor ways from the conference version. However, none of the general conclusions have been affected.

\[ U' \in \{0.5m, 0.7m, 0.9m\}, \text{ where } U' = \frac{C_i + X_i}{T_i}, n = 5, \]

and up to 5 segments separated by suspensions; and (Exp4) the maximum number of execution segments (for \( m = 2, n = 10, U = 0.3m \), and no suspensions). For each parameter combination, we generated and analyzed at least 100 task sets. For instance, Exp2 evaluated 27,000 task sets for all parameter values, with 1,300 jobs per hyperperiod on average (with a minimum of 3 and a maximum of 10,728 jobs).

For each task set, we ran an instance of UPPAAL's verifyta tool (a mainly single-threaded computation) on an Intel Xeon E7-8855 v2 processor clocked at 3 GHz. A task set was deemed unschedulable either if it was rejected by the proposed test or if the proposed test could not reach a conclusion within one hour. We applied the same timeout to all other tests as well. Moreover, to avoid wasting compute resources, we stopped an experiment (e.g., in Exp2, stopped increasing \( n \)) when the analysis of more than 50% of the task sets timed out. Fig. 3 reports the results of our experiments. When reporting average runtimes, we consider only schedulable task sets (i.e., we exclude unschedulable task sets) to avoid biasing the results since tests can typically reject unschedulable task sets very quickly without exploring the whole state space.

Schedulability. Figs. 3(a,b,c) and (h) confirm that our exact test identifies many more schedulable task sets than prior G-NP and G-LP tests (when applied to periodic tasks). Our results show that, for the tested workloads, Nasri-G-NP is actually as precise as the exact test, even though it is technically only a sufficient test if \( m > 1 \). In fact, thanks to its efficient, interval-based state-space exploration approach, which in contrast to UPPAAL is tailored to the schedulability problem, Nasri-G-NP was able to identify more schedulable task sets than the exact test within the one-hour time limit, as for instance can be seen in Figs. 3(b,c). In future work, it would be promising to extend Nasri-G-NP to the full task model considered herein (i.e., limited-preemptive, self-suspending workloads).

Moreover, our test reveals considerable pessimism in the state-of-the-art schedulability test for limited-preemptive tasks (Serrano-G-LP) [28], which can be observed in Fig. 3(h). While our test confirms that schedulability improves with an increase in the number of cores, the test of Serrano et al. [28] actually indicates the opposite: the number of task sets deemed schedulable by Serrano-G-LP drops considerably when multiple cores are available. This reveals further room for improvement in the state-of-the-art global limited-preemptive schedulability analyses and demonstrates the benefit of having an exact baseline to compare sufficient tests against.

Runtime. As expected and as shown in Figs. 3(d, e, g, i), the exact test’s runtime increases rapidly when \( U, m \), or the number of execution segments increase since each of these changes increases the number of execution scenarios that must be explored. Finally, comparing Figs. 3(d) and (e), we observe that the proposed test’s runtime is more affected by joint increases in \( m \) and \( n \) than by joint increases in \( m \) and \( U \).

Discussion. While the proposed test suffers from the typical scalability limitations expected from TA-based analyses, we nonetheless found it to be able to scale to periodic workloads of nontrivial size: up to 60 tasks on 2 cores, 30 tasks on 4 cores, and 15 tasks on 8 cores. The test performs worse when the number of possible execution scenarios increases, e.g., when there are more segments or longer suspension times (see Fig. 3(g)). Similarly, its runtime grows very quickly in the presence of sporadic tasks (as reported in the Appendix).

Nonetheless, our exact test provides a useful baseline for evaluating the accuracy of other, only sufficient tests. For instance, in the special case of G-NP scheduling (i.e., no preemption points, no suspensions), Nasri-G-NP is as accurate as the exact test while scaling much better: Figs. 3(e) and (f) show the Nasri-G-NP test to be three orders of magnitude faster.
Fig. 4. The TASK automaton for sporadic tasks.

Appendix

Timed Automaton Model for Sporadic Tasks

Fig. 4 shows the TASK automaton for sporadic tasks. There are only few differences between the periodic and sporadic task automata. First, in the sporadic TASK automaton, the Completed location has a self-loop with guard “synch?” to implement sporadic release behavior (i.e., a task does not necessarily release its next job after exactly $T_i$ time units). Second, the invariant on the Completed location (i.e., “$t \leq \text{period}$”) is removed so that the task can stay in this location even after its minimum inter-arrival time has been exceeded. Finally, we have replaced “$t = \text{period}$” with “$t >= \text{period}$” on the transition from Completed to Suspended so that this transition can be activated any time after the minimum inter-arrival time of the task has passed.
Extended Experiments on Sporadic Task Sets

We conducted additional experiments on sporadic task sets to assess the scalability of the model shown in Fig. 4. Unfortunately, sporadic task behavior induces a much larger state space, which translates into substantially worse runtimes.

We used the same task set parameters that were generated for Exp2 in Sec. V (varying number of tasks for $n = \{2, 3, 4\}$) and assumed that every task is sporadic. Fig. 5 shows the observed runtime of the analysis for $m = 1$ and $m = 2$ cores and a varying number of tasks.

Fig. 5 shows that the runtime of the analysis increases exponentially with the increase in the number of sporadic tasks. This is due to the large number of possible release scenarios in sporadic task sets. Unfortunately, for $m = 1, n > 4$ and $m = 2, n > 3$, the analysis did not finish within the configured one-hour time budget. In conclusion, an exact yet scalable analysis of sporadic workloads remains a challenge for future work.