

# Schedulability Analysis of Real-Time Systems with Uncertain Worst-Case Execution Times

Jaekwon Lee  
SnT, University of Luxembourg  
Luxembourg  
jaekwon.lee@uni.lu

Seung Yeob Shin  
SnT, University of Luxembourg  
Luxembourg  
seungyeob.shin@uni.lu

Shiva Nejati  
University of Ottawa  
Canada  
SnT, University of Luxembourg  
Luxembourg  
snejati@uottawa.ca

Lionel C. Briand  
University of Ottawa  
Canada  
SnT, University of Luxembourg  
Luxembourg  
lbriand@uottawa.ca

Yago Isasi Parache  
LuxSpace  
Luxembourg  
Isasi@luxspace.lu

## ABSTRACT

Schedulability analysis is about determining whether a given set of real-time software tasks are *schedulable*, i.e., whether task executions always complete before their specified deadlines. It is an important activity at both early design and late development stages of real-time systems. Schedulability analysis requires as input the estimated worst-case execution times (WCET) for software tasks. However, in practice, engineers often cannot provide precise point WCET estimates and prefer to provide plausible WCET ranges. Given a set of real-time tasks with such ranges, we provide an automated technique to determine for what WCET values the system is likely to meet its deadlines, and hence operate safely. Our approach combines a search algorithm for generating worst-case scheduling scenarios with polynomial logistic regression for inferring safe WCET ranges. We evaluated our approach by applying it to a satellite on-board system. Our approach efficiently and accurately estimates safe WCET ranges within which deadlines are likely to be satisfied with high confidence.

## KEYWORDS

Schedulability Analysis, Worst-Case Execution Time, Meta-Heuristic Search, Machine Learning, Search-Based Software Engineering

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Safety-critical systems, e.g., those used in the aerospace, automotive and healthcare domains, often consist of many software tasks that run in parallel. The correctness of safety-critical systems does not only depend on the system outputs but also on the time the system takes to generate its outputs. For instance, the Anti-lock Braking System (ABS) of a vehicle has to activate within milliseconds after the driver breaks as failures to do so may result in a vehicle skid due to the wheels locking up. The systems that have to perform their operation in a timely manner are known as real-time systems (RTS) [14]. In order to ensure safe and correct operation of RTS, the execution of their concurrent software tasks are expected to satisfy a number of real-time constraints. RTS typically execute within a real-time operating system (RTOS) [48] where a scheduler

is used to coordinate the execution of parallel tasks based on a standard scheduling policy [32]. To ensure RTOS can operate arrival, execution, preemption and completion of RTS tasks in a safe and timely manner, we need to perform *schedulability analysis* at early design stages. The goal of schedulability analysis is to determine if a given set of RTS tasks are *schedulable*, i.e., their executions always complete before their specified deadlines [32].

The inputs to schedulability analysis are a set of task parameters, in particular, task priorities, deadlines, inter-arrival times and worst-case execution times (WCET). Some of these parameters can be specified or estimated with a high degree of precision at early development stages even when tasks are not yet fully implemented. For example, task priorities are typically determined by the selected scheduling policy, e.g., rate monotonic [31], or based on the task criticality levels (i.e., more critical tasks are prioritised over the less critical ones). Task deadlines are typically decided by system requirements. Task inter-arrival times, i.e., the time interval between consecutive task executions, usually depend on system environment events triggering task executions. However, among task parameters, tasks' WCET values are typically difficult to accurately estimate at early development stages. For some tasks, WCET values may depend on various factors such as implementation decisions, task workloads, RTOS properties and hardware components. These factors may not be fully known at early stages of development, making it difficult to precisely estimate WCET values for some tasks [3, 11, 21]. As a result, engineers tend to provide ranges for WCET values instead of point estimates.

Schedulability analysis is, in general, a hard problem because the space of all possible task schedules, i.e., all possible ways where tasks can be executed according to an underlying scheduling policy, is very large. The problem becomes computationally more expensive when WCET values are uncertain and are specified as value ranges instead of single values. Specifically, provided with WCET value ranges, engineers need to have ways to determine for what WCET values within the given ranges the system is likely to miss or satisfy its deadline constraints. Such results greatly support engineers during development as they provide targets driving design and implementation choices. If they know that deadline constraints

are likely met for all or most of the expected WCET range, they can consider a wider choice of design and implementation choices, e.g., using a relational database instead of an in-memory data storage. Otherwise, in situations where only tight WCET sub-ranges seem acceptable, developers may have to consider more expensive hardware, decreased functionality or performance, or more restricted design and implementation choices.

The problem of schedulability analysis of real-time tasks has been extensively studied in the past. Using real-time schedulability theory [31], engineers are able to determine if tasks are schedulable when exact WCET values are provided [32, 45]. In addition to requiring exact WCET values, real-time schedulability theory often relies on implicit assumptions which may not hold in practice, e.g., treating aperiodic tasks with irregular arrival times as periodic tasks with regular arrival times [46]. As a result, approaches based on schedulability theory may be inaccurate when their underlying assumptions do not hold. In contrast to real-time schedulability theory, some model-based approaches [1, 4, 30] try to solve the schedulability problem exhaustively by applying a model checker to a real-time model of the system under analysis. Such approaches tend to suffer from the state-space explosion problem [15] as the number of software tasks and their different states increases. More recently, stress testing and simulation-based approaches [2, 13] have been proposed to stress RTS and generate test scenarios where their deadline constraints are violated. Such approaches cast the schedulability test problem as an optimisation problem to find worst-case task execution scenarios exhibiting deadline misses. However, none of the existing simulation-based approaches account for uncertainties in WCET values and therefore do not handle WCET value ranges.

In this paper, we propose a **Safe WCET Analysis method For real-time task schedulability (SAFE)** (1) to test schedulability of a set of tasks while accounting for uncertain WCET values, i.e., ranges, and (2) to estimate WCET ranges under which tasks are likely to be schedulable. Our approach is based on a stress testing approach [13] using meta-heuristic search [33] in combination with polynomial logistic regression models. Specifically, we use a genetic algorithm [33] to search for sequences of task arrivals which likely lead to deadline misses. Afterwards, logistic regression [28], a classification algorithm, is applied to infer a *safe WCET border* in the multidimensional WCET space that helps us partition the given WCET ranges into *safe* and *unsafe* sub-ranges for a selected deadline miss probability. We evaluated our approach by applying it to a complex, industrial satellite system developed by our industry partner, LuxSpace. Results show that our approach can efficiently and accurately compute safe WCET ranges.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: Section 2 motivates our work. Section 3 defines our specific schedulability analysis problem in practical terms. Section 4 describes SAFE. Section 5 evaluates SAFE. Section 6 compares SAFE with related work. Section 7 concludes this paper.

## 2 MOTIVATING CASE STUDY

We motivate our work with a mission-critical real-time satellite system, named Attitude Determination and Control System (ADCS), which LuxSpace, a leading system integrator for microsatellites and aerospace systems, has been developing over the years. ADCS

determines the satellite’s attitude and controls its movements [18]. ADCS controls a satellite in either autonomous or passive mode. In the autonomous mode, ADCS must orient a satellite in proper position on time to ensure that the satellite provides normal service correctly. In the passive mode, operators are able to not only control satellite positions but also maintain the satellite, e.g., upgrading software. Such a maintenance operation does not necessarily need to be completed within a fixed hard deadline; instead, it should be completed within a reasonable amount of time, i.e., soft deadlines. Hence, ADCS is composed of a set of tasks having real-time constraints with hard and soft deadlines.

Engineers at LuxSpace conduct real-time schedulability analysis across different development stages for ADCS. At an early development stage, practitioners use a theoretical schedulability analysis technique [31] which determines that a set of tasks is schedulable if CPU utilisation of the task set is less than a threshold, e.g., 69%. As mentioned earlier, at an early development stage, practitioners estimate task WCETs as ranges and often assign large values to upper limits of WCET ranges base. To be on the safe side, practitioners tend to estimate large WCET values to avoid overly optimistic results, thus aiming at conservatively schedulable tasks.

Engineers, however, are still faced with the following issues: (1) An analytical schedulability analysis technique, e.g., utilisation-based schedulability analysis [31], typically indicates whether or not tasks are schedulable. However, practitioners need additional information to understand how tasks miss their deadlines. For instance, a set of tasks may not be schedulable for only for a few specific sequences of task arrivals. (2) Practitioners estimate WCETs without any systematic support; instead, they often rely on their experience of developing tasks providing similar functions-to-develop. This practice typically results in imprecise estimates of WCET ranges, which may cause serious problems, e.g., significantly changing tasks at later development stages. To this end, LuxSpace is interested in SAFE as a way to address these issues in analysing schedulability.

## 3 PROBLEM DESCRIPTION

This section first formalises task, scheduler and schedulability concepts. We then describe the problem of identifying safe WCET ranges under which tasks likely meet their deadline constraints, at a certain level of confidence.

**Task.** We denote by  $j$  a real-time task that should complete its execution within a specified deadline after it is activated (or arrived). Every real-time task  $j$  has the following properties: priority denoted by  $pr(j)$ , deadline denoted by  $dl(j)$ , and worst-case execution time (WCET) denoted by  $wcet(j)$ . Task priority  $pr$  determines if an execution of a task is preempted by another task. Typically, a task  $j$  preempts the execution of a task  $j'$  if the priority of  $j$  is higher than the priority of  $j'$ , i.e.,  $pr(j) > pr(j')$ .

The  $dl(j)$  function determines the deadline of a task  $j$  relative to its arrival time. A task deadline can be either *hard* or *soft*. A hard deadline of a task  $j$  constrains that  $j$  *must* complete its execution within a deadline  $dl(j)$  after  $j$  is activated. While violations of hard deadlines are not acceptable, depending on the operating context of a system, violating soft deadlines may be tolerated to some extent. Note that, for notational simplicity, we do not introduce

new notations to distinguish between hard and soft deadlines. In this paper, we refer to a hard deadline as a deadline. Section 4 further discusses how our approach manages hard and soft deadlines.


The  $wcet(j)$  function denotes a range of WCET values of a task  $j$ . We denote by  $wmin(j)$  and  $wmax(j)$ , respectively, the minimum and the maximum WCET values of  $j$ . As discussed in the introduction, at an early development stage, it is difficult to provide exact WCET values of real-time tasks. Hence, we assume that engineers specify WCETs using a range of values, instead of single values, by indicating estimated minimum and maximum values that they think each task's WCET can realistically take.

Real-time tasks are either *periodic* or *aperiodic*. Periodic tasks, which are typically triggered by timed events, are invoked at regular intervals specified by their *period*. We denote by  $pd(j)$  the period of a periodic task  $j$ , i.e., a fixed time interval between subsequent activations (or arrivals) of  $j$ . Any task that is not periodic is called aperiodic. Aperiodic tasks have irregular arrival times and are activated by external stimuli which occur irregularly, and hence, in general, there is no limit on the arrival times of an aperiodic task. However, in real-time analysis, we typically specify a minimum inter-arrival time denoted by  $pmin(j)$  and a maximum inter-arrival time denoted by  $pmax(j)$  indicating the minimum and maximum time intervals between two consecutive arrivals of an aperiodic task  $j$ . In real-time analysis, sporadic tasks are often separately defined as having irregular arrival intervals and hard deadlines [32]. In our conceptual definitions, however, we do not introduce new notations for sporadic tasks because the deadline and period concepts defined above sufficiently characterise sporadic tasks. Note that for periodic tasks  $j$ , we have  $pmin(j) = pmax(j) = pd(j)$ . Otherwise, for aperiodic tasks  $j$ , we have  $pmax(j) > pmin(j)$ .

**Scheduler.** Let  $J$  be a set of tasks to be scheduled by a real-time scheduler. A scheduler then dynamically schedules executions of tasks in  $J$  according to the tasks' arrivals and the scheduler's scheduling policy over the scheduling period  $\mathbb{T} = [0, T]$ . We denote by  $at_k(j)$  the  $k$ th arrival time of a task  $j \in J$ . The first arrival of a periodic task  $j$  does not always occur immediately at the system start time 0. Such offset time from the system start time 0 to the first arrival time  $at_1(j)$  of  $j$  is denoted by  $offset(j)$ . For a periodic task  $j$ , the  $k$ th arrival of  $j$  within  $\mathbb{T}$  is  $at_k(j) \leq T$  and is computed by  $at_k(j) = offset(j) + (k - 1) \cdot pd(j)$ . For an aperiodic task  $j'$ ,  $at_k(j')$  is determined based on the  $k-1$ th arrival time of  $j'$  and its minimum and maximum arrival times. Specifically, for  $k > 1$ ,  $at_k(j') \in [at_{k-1}(j') + pmin(j'), at_{k-1}(j') + pmax(j')]$  and, for  $k = 1$ ,  $at_1(j') \in [pmin(j'), pmax(j')]$  where  $at_k(j') < T$ .

A scheduler reacts to a task arrival at  $at_k(j)$  to schedule the execution of  $j$ . Depending on a scheduling policy (e.g., rate monotonic [31]), an arrived task  $j$  may not start its execution at the same time as it arrives when a higher priority task is executing. Also, task executions may be interrupted due to preemption. We denote by  $et_k(j)$  the end execution time for the  $k$ th arrival of a task  $j$ . Depending on actual worst-case execution time of a task  $j$ , denoted by  $w(j)$ , within its WCET range  $[wmin(j), wmax(j)]$ , the  $et_k(j)$  end execution time of  $j$  satisfies the following:  $et_k(j) \geq at_k(j) + w(j)$ .

During the system operation, a scheduler generates a *schedule scenario* which describes a sequence of task arrivals and their end time values. We define a schedule scenario as a set  $S$  of tuples  $(j, at_k(j), et_k(j))$  indicating that a task  $j$  has arrived at  $at_k(j)$  and



**Figure 1: Example schedule scenarios of three tasks:  $j_1$ ,  $j_2$ , and  $j_3$ . (a)  $j_3$  is not schedulable, i.e.,  $et_2(j_3) > at_2(j_3) + dl(j_3)$ . (b) All the three tasks are schedulable. When  $j_2$  executes over 3 (WCET) time units, it causes a deadline miss of  $j_3$ . When the WCET is reduced to 2, the three tasks are schedulable even for the same sequence of task arrivals.**


completed its execution at  $et_k(j)$ . Due to the randomness of task execution times and aperiodic task arrivals, a scheduler may generate a different schedule scenario in different runs of a system.

Figure 1 shows two schedule scenarios produced by a scheduler over the  $[0, 23]$  time period of a system run. Both Figure 1a and Figure 1b describe executions of three tasks,  $j_1$ ,  $j_2$ , and  $j_3$  arrived at the same time stamps (see  $at_i$  in the figures). In both scenarios, the aperiodic task  $j_1$  is characterised by:  $pmin(j_1) = 5$ ,  $pmax(j_1) = 10$ ,  $dl(j_1) = 4$ , and  $wmin(j_1) = wmax(j_1) = 2$ . The periodic task  $j_2$  is characterised by:  $pd(j_2) = 8$  and  $dl(j_2) = 6$ . The aperiodic task  $j_3$  is characterised by:  $pmin(j_3) = 3$ ,  $pmax(j_3) = 20$ ,  $dl(j_3) = 3$ , and  $wmin(j_3) = wmax(j_3) = 1$ . The priorities of the three tasks satisfy the following:  $pr(j_1) > pr(j_2) > pr(j_3)$ . In both scenarios, task executions can be preempted depending on their priorities. We note that a WCET range of the  $j_2$  task is set to  $wmin(j_2) = 1$  and  $wmax(j_2) = 3$  in Figure 1a, and  $wmin(j_2) = 1$  and  $wmax(j_2) = 2$  in Figure 1b. Then, Figure 1a can be described by the  $S_a = \{(j_1, 5, 7), \dots, (j_2, 0, 3), \dots, (j_3, 9, 14), (j_3, 14, 15)\}$  schedule scenario; and Figure 1b by  $S_b = \{(j_1, 5, 7), \dots, (j_2, 0, 2), \dots, (j_3, 9, 11), (j_3, 14, 15)\}$ .

**Schedulability.** Given a schedule scenario  $S$ , a task  $j$  is *schedulable* if  $j$  completes its execution before its deadline, i.e., for all  $et_k(j)$  observed in  $S$ ,  $et_k(j) \leq at_k(j) + dl(j)$ . Let  $J$  be a set of tasks to be scheduled by a scheduler. A set  $J$  of tasks is then schedulable if for every schedule  $S$  of  $J$ , we have no task  $j \in J$  that misses its deadline.

As shown in Figure 1a, a deadline miss occurs after the second arrival of  $j_3$ , i.e.,  $et_2(j_3) > at_2(j_3) + dl(j_3)$ . During  $[at_2(j_3), at_2(j_3) + dl(j_3)]$  period, the  $j_3$  task cannot execute because the other  $j_1$  and  $j_2$  tasks with higher priorities are executing. Thus,  $j_3$  is not schedulable in the schedule scenario  $S_a$  of Figure 1a. This scheduling problem can be solved by restricting tasks' WCET ranges as discussed below.

**Problem.** Uncertainty in task WCET values at an early development stage is a critical issue preventing the effective design and assessment of mission-critical real-time systems. Upper bounds of WCETs correspond to worst-case WCET values and have a direct impact on deadline misses as larger WCET values increase their probability. Lower bounds of WCETs are estimates of tasks' best-case WCET values, below which task implementations are likely not feasible. Our approach aims to determine the maximum upper bounds



**Figure 2: An overview of our Safe WCET Analysis method For real-time task schedulability (SAFE).**

for WCET under which tasks are likely to be schedulable, at a given level of risk, and thus provides an objective to engineers implementing the tasks. Specifically, for every task  $j \in J$  to be analysed, our approach computes a new upper bound value for the WCET range of  $j$  (denoted by  $newwmax(j)$ ) such that  $newwmax(j) \leq wmax(j)$  and by restricting the WCET range of  $j$  to  $newwmax(j)$  we should, at a certain level of confidence, no longer have deadline misses. That is, tasks  $J$  become schedulable, with a certain probability, after restricting the maximum WCET value of  $j$  to  $newwmax(j)$ . For instance, as shown in Figure 1b, restricting the maximum WCET of  $j_2$  from  $wmax(j_2) = 3$  to  $newwmax(j_2) = 2$  enables all the three tasks to be schedulable.

We note that, in our context, both arrival time ranges for aperiodic tasks and WCET ranges for all tasks are represented as continuous intervals. Since our approach works based on sampling values from these continuous ranges, our approach cannot be exhaustive and cannot provide a guarantee that the tasks can always be schedulable after restricting their WCET ranges. Our approach instead relies on sampling values within the WCET and arrival time ranges, simulating the scheduler behaviour using the sampled values and observing whether, or not, a deadline miss occurs. In lieu of exhaustiveness, we rely on statistical and machine learning techniques to provide probabilistic estimates indicating how confident we are that a given set of tasks are schedulable.

## 4 APPROACH

Figure 2 shows an overview of our Safe WCET Analysis method For real-time task schedulability (SAFE). Phase 1 of SAFE aims at searching worst-case task-arrival sequences. A task-arrival sequence is worst-case if deadline misses are maximised or, when this is not possible, tasks complete their executions as close to their deadlines as possible. Building on existing work, we identify worst-case task-arrival sequences using a search-based approach relying on genetic algorithms. Phase 2 of SAFE, which is the main contribution of this paper, aims at computing safe WCET ranges under which tasks are likely to be schedulable. To do so, relying on logistic regression and an effective sampling strategy, we augment the worst-case task-arrival sequences generated in Phase 1 to compute safe WCET ranges with a certain deadline miss probability, indicating a degree of risk. We describe in detail these two phases next.

### 4.1 Phase 1: Worst-case task arrivals

The first phase of SAFE finds worst-case sequences in the space of possible sequences of task arrivals, defined by their inter-arrival time characteristics. As SAFE aims to provide conservative, safe WCET ranges, we optimise task arrivals to maximise task completion times and deadline misses, and indirectly minimise safe WCET ranges (see the safe area visually presented in Figure 2). We

address this optimisation problem using a single-objective search algorithm. Following standard practice [19], we describe our search-based approach for identifying worst-case task arrivals by defining the solution representation, the scheduler, the fitness function, and the computational search algorithm. We then describe the dataset of sequences generated by search and then used for training our logistic regression model to compute safe WCET ranges in the second phase of SAFE.

Our approach in Phase 1 is based on past work [13], where a specific genetic algorithm configuration was proposed to find worst-case task arrival sequences. One important modification though is that we account for uncertainty in WCET values through simulations for evaluating the magnitude of deadline misses.

**Representation.** Given a set  $J$  of tasks to be scheduled, a feasible solution is a set  $A$  of tuples  $(j, at_k(j))$  where  $j \in J$  and  $at_k(j)$  is the  $k$ th arrival time of a task  $j$ . Thus, a solution  $A$  represents a valid sequence of task arrivals of  $J$  (see valid  $at_k(j)$  computation in Section 3). Let  $\mathbb{T} = [0, T]$  be the time period during which a scheduler receives task arrivals. The size of  $A$  is equal to the number of task arrivals over the  $\mathbb{T}$  time period. Due to the varying inter-arrival times of aperiodic tasks (Section 3), the size of  $A$  will vary across different solutions.

**Scheduler.** SAFE uses a simulation technique for analysing the schedulability of tasks to account for the uncertainty in WCET values and scalability issues. For instance, an inter-arrival time of a software update task in a satellite system is approximately at most three months. In such cases, conducting an analysis based on an actual scheduler is prohibitively expensive. Instead, SAFE uses a real-time task scheduling simulator, named SafeScheduler, which samples WCET values from their ranges for simulating task executions and applies a scheduling policy, e.g., rate monotonic [31], based on discrete logical time events.

SafeScheduler takes a feasible solution  $A$  for scheduling a set  $J$  of tasks as an input. It then outputs a schedule scenario as a set  $S$  of tuples  $(j, at_k(j), et_k(j))$  where  $at_k(j)$  and  $et_k(j)$  are the  $k$ th arrival and end time values of a task  $j$ , respectively (see Section 3). For each task  $j$ , SafeScheduler computes  $et_k(j)$  based on its scheduling policy and a selected WCET value for  $j$ . Recall from Section 3,  $wcet(j)$  is a range. Hence, each run of SafeScheduler for the same input solution  $A$  can and will likely produce a different schedule scenario.

SafeScheduler implements an extended rate monotonic policy which allows assigning explicit priority  $pr(j)$  and deadline  $dl(j)$  to a task  $j$ . The extended policy follows the same assumptions of the standard rate monotonic policy, except for explicit priorities and deadlines of tasks, such as the no resource sharing and free context switching assumptions [31]. Note that the assumptions are practically valid and useful at an early development step in the context of real-time analysis. For instance, our collaborating partner accounts for the waiting time of tasks due to resource sharing and context switching between tasks through adding some extra time to WCET ranges at the task design stage. We chose the extended rate monotonic policy for SafeScheduler because our case study system relies on this policy. Note that SAFE can be applied with any scheduling policy, including those that account for resource sharing and context switching time, as implemented by SafeScheduler.

**Fitness.** Given a feasible solution  $A$  for a set  $J$  of tasks, we formulate a fitness function,  $f(A, J, n)$ , to quantify the degree of

deadline misses regarding a set  $J_t \subseteq J$  of target tasks, where  $n$  is a number of SafeScheduler runs to account for the uncertainty in WCET. SAFE provides the capability of selecting target tasks  $J_t$  as practitioners often need to focus on the most critical tasks. We denote by  $dist_k(j)$  the distance between the end time and the deadline of the  $k$ th arrival of task  $j$  and define  $dist_k(j) = et_k(j) - at_k(j) + dl(j)$  (see Section 3 for the notation end time  $et_k(a)$ , arrival time  $at_k(j)$ , and deadline  $dl(j)$ ).

To compute the  $f(A, J_t, n)$  fitness value, SAFE runs SafeScheduler  $n$  times for  $A$  and obtains  $n$  schedule scenarios  $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_n$ . For each schedule scenario  $S_i$ , we denote by  $dist_k^i(j)$  the distance between the end and deadline time values corresponding to the  $k$ th arrival of the  $j$  task observed in  $S_i$ . We denote by  $lk(j)$  the last arrival index of a task  $j$  in  $A$ . SAFE aims to maximise the  $f(A, J_t, n)$  fitness function defined as follows:

$$f(A, J_t, n) = \sum_{i=1}^n \max_{j \in J_t, k \in [1, lk(j)]} dist_k^i(j)/n$$

We note that soft deadline tasks also require to execute within reasonable execution time ranges. Hence, engineers may estimate more relaxed WCET ranges for soft deadline tasks than those of hard deadline tasks. SAFE uses the above fitness function for both soft and hard deadline tasks.

**Computational search.** SAFE employs a steady-state genetic algorithm [33]. The algorithm breeds a new population for the next generation after computing the fitness of a population. The breeding for generating the next population is done by using the following genetic operators: (1) *Selection*. SAFE selects candidate solutions using a tournament selection technique, with the tournament size equal to two which is the most common setting [20]. (2) *Crossover*. Selected candidate solutions serve as parents to create offspring using a crossover operation. (3) *Mutation*. The offspring are then mutated. Below, we describe our crossover and mutation operators.

*Crossover.* A crossover operator is used to produce offspring by mixing traits of parent solutions. SAFE modifies the standard one-point crossover operator [33] as two parent solutions  $A_p$  and  $A_q$  may have different sizes, i.e.,  $|A_p| \neq |A_q|$ . Let  $J = \{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_m\}$  be a set of tasks to be scheduled. Our crossover operator, named SafeCrossover, first randomly selects an aperiodic task  $j_r \in J$ .

For all  $i \in [1, r]$  and  $j_i \in J$ , SafeCrossover then swaps all  $j_i$  arrivals between two solutions  $A_p$  and  $A_q$ . As the size of  $J$  is fixed for all solutions, SafeCrossover can cross over two solutions that may have different sizes.

*Mutation operator* SAFE uses a heuristic mutation algorithm, named SafeMutation. For a solution  $A$ , SafeMutation mutates the  $k$ th task arrival time  $at_k(j)$  of an aperiodic task  $j$  with a mutation probability. SafeMutation chooses a new arrival time value of  $at_k(j)$  based on the  $[pmin(j), pmax(j)]$  inter-arrival time range of  $j$ . If such a mutation of the  $k$ th arrival time of  $j$  does not affect the validity of the  $k+1$ th arrival time of  $j$ , the mutation operation ends. Specifically, let  $d$  be a mutated value of  $at_k(j)$ . In case  $at_{k+1}(j) \in [d + pmin(j), d + pmax(j)]$ , SafeMutation returns the mutated  $A$  solution.

After mutating the  $k$ th arrival time  $at_k(j)$  of a task  $j$  in a solution  $A$ , if the  $k+1$ th arrival becomes invalid, SafeMutation corrects the remaining arrivals of  $j$ . Let  $o$  and  $d$  be, respectively, the original and

mutated  $k$ th arrival time of  $j$ . For all the arrivals of  $j$  after  $d$ , SafeMutation first updates their original arrival time values by adding the difference  $d - o$ . Let  $\mathbb{T} = [0, T]$  be the scheduling period. SafeMutation then removes some arrivals of  $j$  if they are mutated to arrive after  $T$  or adds new arrivals if SafeScheduler can handle them.

We note that when a system is only composed of periodic tasks, SAFE will skip searching for worst-case arrival sequences as arrivals of periodic tasks are deterministic (see Section 3), but will nevertheless generate the labelled dataset described below. When needed, SAFE can be easily extended to manipulate offset (and period) values for periodic tasks, in a way identical to how we currently handle inter-arrival times.

**Labelled dataset.** SAFE infers safe WCET ranges using a supervised learning technique [44] which requires a labelled dataset, namely logistic regression. Recall from the fitness computation described above, SAFE runs SafeScheduler  $n$  times to obtain schedule scenarios  $S = \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_n\}$ , and then computes a fitness value of a solution  $A$  based on  $S$ . We denote by  $W_i$  a set of tuples  $(j, w)$  representing that a task  $j$  has the  $w$  WCET value in the  $S_i$  schedule scenario. Let  $\vec{D}$  be a labelled dataset to be created by the first phase of SAFE. We denote by  $b_i$  a label indicating whether or not a schedule scenario  $S_i$  has any deadline miss for any of the target tasks in  $J_t$ , i.e.,  $b_i$  is either *safe* or *unsafe* which denotes, respectively, no deadline miss or deadline miss. For each fitness computation, SAFE adds  $n$  number of tuples  $(W_i, b_i)$  to  $\vec{D}$ . Specifically, for a schedule scenario  $S_i$ , SAFE adds  $(W_i, unsafe)$  to  $\vec{D}$  if there are  $j \in J_t$  and  $k \in [1, lk(j)]$  such that  $dist_k^i(j) > 0$ ; otherwise SAFE adds  $(W_i, safe)$  to  $\vec{D}$ .

## 4.2 Phase 2: Safe ranges of WCET

In Phase 2, SAFE computes safe ranges of WCET values under which target tasks are likely to be schedulable. To do so, SAFE applies a supervised machine learning technique to the labelled dataset generated by Phase 1 (Section 4.1). Specifically, Phase 2 executes SafeRefinement (Algorithm 1) which has following steps: complexity reduction, imbalance handling and model refinement.

**Complexity reduction.** The “reduce complexity” step in Algorithm 1 reduces the dimensionality of a labelled dataset  $\vec{D}$  obtained from the first phase of SAFE (line 2). It predicts initial safe WCET ranges based on the WCET variables for the tasks in  $J$  (line 3) that have the most significant effect on deadline misses for target tasks. A labelled dataset  $\vec{D}$  obtained from the first phase of SAFE contains tuples  $(W, b)$  where  $W$  is a set of WCET values for tasks in  $J$  and  $b$  is a label of  $W$  indicating either no deadline miss (safe) or deadline miss (unsafe) (Section 4.1). Note that some WCET values in  $W$  may not be relevant to determine  $b$ . Hence,  $\vec{D}$  may contain irrelevant variables to predict  $b$ . To decrease computational complexity for the remaining steps, SafeRefinement creates a reduced dataset  $\vec{D}^r$  which contains the same number of data instances (tuples) as  $\vec{D}$  while including only WCET values with a significant effect on  $b$ . To that end, SafeRefinement employs a standard feature reduction technique: random forest feature reduction [12].


After reducing the dimensionality of the input dataset  $\vec{D}$  in Algorithm 1, resulting in the reduced dataset  $\vec{D}^r$ , SafeRefinement learns an initial model to predict safe WCET ranges. SafeRefinement uses logistic regression [29] because it enables a probabilistic

**Algorithm 1:** SafeRefinement. An algorithm for computing safe WCET ranges under which target tasks are schedulable. The algorithm consists of three steps as follows: “reduce complexity”, “handle imbalanced dataset”, and “refine model” steps.

**Input:** -  $\vec{D}$ : Labeled dataset obtained from the SAFE search  
-  $P$ : Worst solutions obtained from the SAFE search  
-  $ns$ : Number of WCET samples per solution  
-  $nl$ : Number of logistic regression models  
-  $pt$ : Precision threshold

**Output:** -  $m$ : Safe WCET model  
-  $p$ : Probability of deadline misses


- 1: //step 1. reduce complexity
- 2:  $\vec{D}^r \leftarrow \text{ReduceDimension}(\vec{D})$  //feature reduction
- 3:  $m \leftarrow \text{StepwiseRegression}(\vec{D}^r)$  //term selection
- 4:  $p \leftarrow \text{Probability}(m, \vec{D}^r)$
- 5: //step 2. handle imbalanced dataset
- 6:  $\vec{D}^b \leftarrow \text{HandleImbalance}(\vec{D}^r, m)$
- 7: //step 3. refine model
- 8: **for**  $nl$  times **do**
- 9: //step 3.1. add new data instances
- 10: **for** each solution  $A \in P$  **do**
- 11:  $\{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_{ns}\} \leftarrow \text{RunSafeScheduler}(A, m, p, ns)$
- 12: **for** each scenario  $S_i \in \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_{ns}\}$  **do**
- 13: **if**  $S_i$  has any deadline miss **then**
- 14:  $\vec{D}^b \leftarrow \text{Add}(\vec{D}^b, (\text{WCET}(S_i), \text{unsafe}))$
- 15: **else**
- 16:  $\vec{D}^b \leftarrow \text{Add}(\vec{D}^b, (\text{WCET}(S_i), \text{safe}))$
- 17: **end if**
- 18: **end for**
- 19: **end for**
- 20: //step 3.2. learn regression model
- 21:  $m \leftarrow \text{Regression}(m, \vec{D}^b)$
- 22:  $p \leftarrow \text{Probability}(m, \vec{D}^b)$
- 23: **if**  $\text{PrecisionByCrossValidation}(m, \vec{D}^b) > pt$  **then**
- 24: **break**
- 25: **end if**
- 26: **end for**
- 27: **return**  $m, p$



**Figure 3:** A safe border line of WCET values for the  $j_1$  and  $j_2$  tasks. The safe border is determined by a deadline miss probability of 0.01.  $w_1$  and  $w_2$  determine safe WCET ranges of  $j_1$  and  $j_2$  under which they likely satisfy their deadlines.

interpretation of safe WCET ranges and the investigation of relationships among different tasks’ WCETs. For example, Figure 3 shows a *safe border* determined by an inferred logistic regression model  $m$  with a probability  $p$  of deadline misses. Note that a safe range, e.g.,  $[wmin(j_1), w_1]$  of task  $j_1$  in Figure 3, is determined by a point on the safe border in a multidimensional WCET space. A safe border distinguishes safe and unsafe areas in the WCET space. After inferring a logistic regression model  $m$  from the dataset, SafeRefinement selects a probability  $p$  maximising the safe area under the safe border determined by  $m$  and  $p$  while ensuring that all the data instances, i.e., sets of WCET values, classified as safe using the safe border are actually observed to be safe in the input dataset, i.e., no false positives (lines 3–4).

SafeRefinement uses a second-order polynomial response surface model (RSM) [41] to build a logistic regression model. RSM is



**Figure 4:** Handling imbalanced dataset by excluding unsafe WCET values based on logistic regression intercepts.

known to be useful when the relationship between several explanatory variables (e.g., WCET variables) and one or more response variables (e.g., safe or unsafe label) needs to be investigated [34, 41]. RSM contains linear terms, quadratic terms, and 2-way interactions between linear terms. Let  $V$  be a set of WCET variables  $v_i$  in  $\vec{D}^r$ . Then, the logistic regression model of SafeRefinement is defined as follows:

$$\log \frac{p}{1-p} = c_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{|V|} c_i v_i + \sum_{i=1}^{|V|} c_{ii} v_i^2 + \sum_{j>i} c_{ij} v_i v_j$$

As shown in the above equation, an RSM equation, i.e., the right-hand side, built on the reduced dataset  $\vec{D}^r$  has a higher number of dimensions, i.e., the number of coefficients to be inferred, than  $|V|$  as RSM additionally accounts for quadratic terms ( $v_i^2$ ) and 2-way interactions ( $v_i v_j$ ) between linear terms. Hence, SafeRefinement employs a stepwise regression technique (line 3), e.g., stepwise AIC (Akaike Information Criterion) [51], in order to select significant explanatory terms from the RSM equation. This allows the remaining “refine model” step of SafeRefinement to execute efficiently as it requires to run SafeScheduler and logistic regression multiple times within a time budget (line 8), both operations being computationally expensive.

**Imbalance handling.** Recall from Section 4.1 that SAFE searches for worst-case sequences of task arrivals and is guided by maximising the magnitude of deadline misses, when they are possible. Therefore, the major portion of  $\vec{D}$ , the dataset produced by the first phase of SAFE, is a set of task arrival sequences leading to deadline misses. Supervised machine learning techniques (including logistic regression) typically produce unsatisfactory results when faced with highly imbalanced datasets [8]. SafeRefinement addresses this problem with the “handle imbalanced dataset” step in Algorithm 1 (lines 5–6) before refining safe WCET ranges. SafeRefinement aims to identify WCET ranges under which tasks are likely to be schedulable. This entails that WCET ranges under which tasks are highly unlikely to be schedulable can be safely excluded from the remaining analysis. Specifically, SafeRefinement prunes out WCET ranges with a high probability of deadline misses above a high threshold  $p_u$  and thus creates a more balanced dataset  $\vec{D}^b$  compared to the original imbalanced dataset  $\vec{D}^r$  (line 6). SafeRefinement automatically finds a minimum probability  $p_u$  which leads to a safe border classifying no false unsafe (negative) instances in  $\vec{D}^r$ . SafeRefinement then updates the maximum WCET  $wmax(j)$  of a task  $j$  based on the intercept of the logistic regression model  $m$  (with a probability of  $p_u$ ) on the WCET axis for  $j$ . Figure 4 shows an example dataset  $\vec{D}^r$  with a safe border characterised by a high deadline miss probability, i.e.,  $p_u = 0.99$ , to create a more balanced dataset  $\vec{D}^b$  within the restricted ranges  $[wmin(j_1), intercept(j_1)]$  and  $[wmin(j_2), intercept(j_2)]$ .

**Model refinement.** The “refine model” step in Algorithm 1 refines an inferred logistic regression model by sampling additional schedule scenarios selected according to a strategy that is expected to improve the model. As described in Section 4.1, the SAFE search produces a set  $P$  (population) of worst-case arrival sequences of tasks  $J$  which likely violate deadline constraints of target tasks  $J_t \subseteq J$ . For each arrival sequence  $A$  in  $P$ , SafeRefinement executes SafeScheduler  $ns$  times to add  $ns$  new data instances to the dataset  $\vec{D}^b$  based on the generated schedule scenarios and their schedulability results (lines 9–19). After adding  $ns \cdot |P|$  new data instances to  $\vec{D}^b$ , SafeRefinement runs logistic regression again to infer a refined logistic regression model  $m$  and computes a probability  $p$  that ensures no false safe instances (positives) in  $\vec{D}^b$  and maximises the safe area under the safe border defined by  $m$  and  $p$  (lines 20–25).

In the second phase of SAFE, SafeScheduler selects WCET values for tasks in  $J$  to compute a schedule scenario based on a distance-based random number generator, which extends the standard uniform random number generator. The distance-based WCET value sampling aims at minimising the Euclidean distance between the sampled WCET points and the safe border defined by the inferred model  $m$  and the selected probability  $p$ . SafeScheduler iteratively computes new WCET values using the following distance-based sampling procedure: (1) generating  $r$  random samples in the WCET space, (2) computing their distance values from the safe border, and (3) selecting the closest point to the safe border.

SafeRefinement stops model refinements either by reaching an allotted analysis budget (line 8 of Algorithm 1) or when a precision reaches an acceptable level  $pt$ , e.g., 0.99 (lines 23–25). SafeRefinement uses the standard precision metric [49] as described in Section 5.4. In our context, practitioners need to identify safe WCET ranges at a high level of precision to ensure that identified safe WCET ranges can be trusted. To compute a precision value, SafeRefinement uses a standard k-fold cross-validation [49]. In k-fold cross-validation,  $\vec{D}^b$  is partitioned into k equal-size splits. One split is retained as a test dataset, and the remaining k-1 splits are used as training datasets. The cross-validation process is then repeated k times to compute a precision of inferred safe borders which are determined by  $m$  and  $p$  at each validation.

**Selecting WCET ranges.** A safe border defined by an inferred logistic regression model and a deadline miss probability of  $p$  represents a (possibly infinite) set of points, corresponding to safe WCET ranges of tasks, e.g.,  $[wmin(j_1), w_1]$  and  $[wmin(j_2), w_2]$  in Figure 3. In practice, however, engineers need to choose a specific WCET range for each task to conduct further analysis and development. How to choose optimal WCET ranges depends on the system context. At early stages, however, such contextual information may not be available. Hence, SAFE proposes a *best-size point*, i.e., WCET ranges, on a safe border which maximises the volume of the hyperbox the point defines. In general, the larger hyperbox, the greater flexibility the engineers have in selecting appropriate WCET values. Choosing the point with the largest volume is helpful when no domain-specific information is available to define other selection criteria. In general the inferred safe border enables engineers to investigate trade-off among different tasks’ WCET values.

## 5 EVALUATION

We evaluate SAFE using an industrial case study from the satellite domain. Our full evaluation package is available online [6].

### 5.1 Research Questions

**RQ1 (effectiveness of distance-based sampling):** *How does SAFE, based on distance-based sampling, perform compared with random sampling? We compare our distance-based sampling procedure described in Section 4.2 and used in the second phase of SAFE with a naive random sampling. Our conjecture is that distance-based sampling, although expensive, is needed to improve the quality of the training data used for logistic regression. RQ1 assesses this conjecture by comparing distance-based and random sampling.*

**RQ2 (usefulness):** *Can SAFE identify WCET ranges within which tasks are highly likely to satisfy their deadline constraints? In RQ2, we investigate whether SAFE identifies acceptably safe WCET ranges in practical time. We further discuss our insights regarding the usefulness of SAFE from the feedback obtained from engineers in LuxSpace.*

### 5.2 Industrial Study Subject

We evaluate SAFE by applying it to the satellite attitude determination and control system (ADCS) described in Section 2. Our evaluation relies on real task characteristics defined by our partner, LuxSpace, at an early development stage of the system. LuxSpace is a leading system integrator of micro satellites and aerospace systems. Our case study includes a set of 15 periodic and 19 aperiodic tasks. Eight tasks out of the 19 aperiodic tasks are constrained by their hard deadlines, i.e., sporadic tasks. Out of the 34 tasks, engineers provide single WCET values for eight tasks. For the remaining 26 tasks, engineers estimate WCET ranges due to uncertain decisions, e.g., implementation choices and hardware specifications, made at later development stages (see Section 2). The differences between the estimated WCET maximum and minimum values across the 26 tasks varies from 0.1ms to 20000ms. The full task descriptions are available online [6].

### 5.3 Experimental Setup

To answer the RQs described in Section 5.1, we used the case study data provided by LuxSpace and considered all 34 tasks for analysis. We conducted two experiments, EXP1 and EXP2, as described below. **EXP1.** To answer RQ1, EXP1 compares our distance-based WCET sampling technique (described in Section 4.2) with the naive random WCET sampling technique, for the second phase of SAFE. To this end, EXP1 first creates an initial training dataset by running the first phase of SAFE. EXP1 then relies on this initial training data for model refinement (Section 4.2) by using both distance-based and naive random sampling. For comparison, EXP1 creates a test dataset by randomly sampling WCET values, which is independently created from the second phase of SAFE, and then compares the accuracy of the two sampling approaches in identifying safe WCET ranges for the test dataset.

**EXP2.** To answer RQ2, EXP2 monitors precision values of SAFE, obtained from 10-fold cross-validation (see Section 4.2), over each model refinement. In our study context, i.e., developing safety-critical systems, engineers require very high precision, i.e., ideally

no false positives, (see Section 4). Hence, EXP2 measures precision over model refinements to align with such practice. EXP2 then measures whether SAFE can compute safe WCET ranges within practical execution time and at an acceptable level of precision.

## 5.4 Metrics

We use the standard precision and recall metrics [49] to measure the accuracy in our experiments. To compute precision and recall in our context, for EXP1, we created a synthetic test dataset containing tuples of WCET values and a flag indicating the presence or absence of deadline miss obtained from running SafeScheduler. Note that creating a test dataset by running an actual satellite system with varying WCETs of 34 tasks is prohibitively expensive. We therefore used a set of task arrival sequences obtained from the first phase of SAFE as we aim at testing sequences of task arrivals which are more likely to violate their deadlines. We then ran SafeScheduler to simulate task executions for the set of task arrival sequences with randomly sampled WCET values. We note that WCET values were sampled within the restricted WCET ranges after the "handling imbalance" step in Algorithm 1. Parts of the WCET ranges under which tasks are unlikely to be schedulable are therefore not considered when sampling. For EXP2, we used 10-fold cross-validation based on the training dataset at each model refinement step (phase 2).

We define the precision and recall metrics as follows: (1) precision  $P = TP / (TP + FP)$  and (2) recall  $R = TP / (TP + FN)$ , where  $TP$ ,  $FP$ , and  $FN$  denote the number of true positives, false positives, and false negatives, respectively. A true positive is a test instance (a set of WCET values) labelled as safe and correctly classified as such. A false positive is a test instance labelled as unsafe but incorrectly classified as safe. A false negative is a test instance labelled as safe but incorrectly classified as unsafe. We prioritise precision over recall as practitioners require (ideally) no false positives – an unsafe instance with deadline misses is incorrectly classified as safe – in the context of mission-critical, real-time satellite systems. For EXP1, precision and recall values are measured based on a synthetic test dataset. For EXP2, precision values are computed using collective sets of true positives and false positives obtained from 10-fold cross-validation at each model refinement.

Due to the randomness of SAFE, we repeat our experiments 50 times. To statistically compare our results, we use the non-parametric Mann-Whitney U-test [35]. We set the level of significance,  $\alpha$ , to 0.05.

## 5.5 Implementation and Parameter Tuning

To implement the feature reduction step of Algorithm 1, we used the random forest feature reduction [12] as it has been successfully applied to high-dimensional data [27, 43]. For the stepwise regression step of Algorithm 1, we used the stepwise AIC regression technique [51] which has been used in many applications [38, 53]. Recall from Section 4.2 that our distance-based sampling and best-size region recommendation require a numerical optimisation technique to find the nearest WCET sample and a maximum safe region size based on an inferred safe border. For such optimisations, we applied a standard numerical optimisation method, i.e., the Nelder-Mead method [42].

To compute the GA fitness, we set the number of SafeScheduler runs (Section 4.1) for each solution ( $A$  in Section 4.1) to 20. This number was chosen based on our initial experiments. We observed that 20 runs of SafeScheduler per solution  $A$  keeps execution time under a reasonable threshold, i.e.,  $<1m$ , and is sufficient to compute the fitness of SAFE. SafeScheduler schedules 34 tasks in our case study data for 1820s during which SafeScheduler advances its simulation clock by 0.1ms, for adequate precision. We chose the time period to ensure that all the 34 tasks can be executed at least once.

For the GA search parameters, we set the population size to 10, the crossover rate to 0.7, and the mutation rate to 0.2, which are consistent with existing guidelines [26]. We ran GA for 1000 iterations after which we observed that fitness reached a plateau in our initial experiments.

Regarding the feature reduction step of Algorithm 1, we set the random forest parameters as follows: (1) the tree depth parameter is set to  $\sqrt{|F|}$ , where  $|F|$  denotes the number of features, i.e., 26 WCET ranges in our case study data, based on guidelines [25]. (2) The number of trees is set to 100 based on our initial experiments. We observed that learning more than 100 trees does not provide additional gains in terms of reducing the number of features.


Note that all the parameters mentioned above can probably be further tuned to improve the performance of SAFE. However, since with our current setting, we were able to convincingly and clearly support our conclusions, we do not report further experiments on tuning those parameters.

We ran our experiments over the high-performance computing cluster at the University of Luxembourg. To account for randomness, we repeated each run of SAFE 50 times for all the experiments. Each run of SAFE was executed on a different node of the cluster. It took around 35h for us to create a synthetic test dataset with 50,000 instances. When we set 1000 GA iterations for the first phase of SAFE and 10,000 new WCET samples (100 refinements  $\times$  100 new WCET samples per refinement) for the second step of SAFE, each run of SAFE took about 19.1h – phase 1: 10.6h and phase 2: 8.5h. The running time is acceptable as SAFE can be executed offline in practice.


## 5.6 Experiment Results

**Sanity check.** Recall from Section 4 that the first phase of SAFE uses GA. Based on existing guidelines [5, 24], a search-based solution should be compared with at least a naive random search (RS). Such a sanity check aims to ensure that a proposed search-based solution is not ineffective due to the search problem being simple. To do so, we compared two versions of SAFE, which use either GA or RS. We compared fitness values, which SAFE aims to maximise (see Section 4.1), obtained by GA and RS over 1000 iterations. Our results show that, on average, fitness values obtained by GA are always higher than those obtained by RS over 1000 iterations. Based on our statistical comparisons, the differences in fitness values between GA and RS become statistically significant ( $p$ -value  $< 0.05$ ) after 939 iterations. Hence, we conclude that SAFE with GA finds worst-case sequences of task arrivals (which maximise deadline misses) more effectively than SAFE with RS. Since this aspect of the our experiments is not the main focus here, full results are available online [6].





**Figure 5: Distributions of precision (a) and recall (b) over 100 model refinements when SAFE employs either our distance-based sampling (D) or random sampling (R). The boxplots (25%-50%-75%) show precision (a) and recall (b) values obtained from 50 runs of SAFE with each algorithm. The lines represent average trends.**




**Figure 6: Precision values computed from 10-fold cross validation at each model refinement. The boxplots (25%-50%-75%) show precision values obtained from 50 runs of SAFE. The line represents an average trend.**

**RQ1.** Figure 5 depicts distributions of precision (Figure 5a) and recall (Figure 5b) obtained from EXP1. The boxplots in Figure 5a (resp. Figure 5b) show distributions (25%-50%-75%) of precision (resp. recall) values obtained from 50 executions of SAFE with either distance-based sampling (D) or simple random sampling (R). The solid lines represent the average trends of precision and recall value changes over 100 regression model refinements.

As shown in Figure 5a, across over 100 model refinements, SAFE with D achieves higher precision values than those obtained by R. Also, Figure 5a shows that the variance of precision with D tends to be smaller than that of R. On average, D’s precision converges toward 1 with model refinements; however, precision with R shows a markedly different trend without convergence to 1, an important property in our context. Based on our statistical comparisons, the difference in precision values between D and R becomes statistically significant after only 2 model refinements.

Regarding recall comparisons between D and R, as shown in Figure 5b, D produces higher recall values over 100 model refinements than those of R. The difference in recall values between D and R becomes statistically significant after only 3 model refinements. For 100 model refinements, SAFE took, on average, 8.5h and 5.7h with D and R, respectively.

*The answer to RQ1 is that SAFE with distance-based sampling significantly outperforms SAFE with random sampling in achieving higher precision and recall. Only distance-based sampling can achieve a precision close to 1 within practical time, an important requirement in our context.*



**Figure 7: An inferred safe border and best-size WCET regions for tasks T30 and T33. The safe border determines WCET ranges within which tasks are likely to be schedulable with a deadline miss probability of 1.97%.**

**RQ2.** Figure 6 shows precision values obtained from 10-fold cross-validation at each model refinement. Recall from Section 4.2 that SAFE stops model refinements once a precision value reaches a desired value. As shown in Figure 6, precision values tend to increase with additional WCET samples. Hence, practitioners are able to stop the model refinement procedure once precision reaches an acceptable level, e.g.,  $>0.999$ . At 100 model refinement, SAFE reaches, on average, a precision of 0.99986. For EXP2, SAFE took, on average, 10.6h for phase 1 and 8.5h for phase 2.

As described in Section 4.2, SAFE reduces the dimensionality of the WCET space through a feature reduction technique based on random forest. The computed importance scores of each task’s WCET in our dataset are as follows: 0.773 for T30, 0.093 for T33, 0.0385 for T23, and  $\leq 0.005$  for the remaining 31 tasks. Based on a standard feature selection guideline [25], only the WCET values of two tasks, i.e., T30 and T33, are deemed to be important enough to retain as their score is higher than the average importance, i.e., 0.0385. Hence, SAFE computes safe WCET ranges of these two tasks in the next steps described in Algorithm 1.

Figure 7 shows the inferred safe border which identifies safe WCET ranges within which all 34 tasks are schedulable with an estimated deadline miss probability of 1.97%. Given the safe border, we found a best-size point which restricts the WCET ranges of T30 and T33 as follows: T30 [0.1ms, 458.0ms] and T33 [0.1ms, 2138.1ms]. We note that the initial estimated WCET ranges of the two tasks are as follows: T30 [0.1ms, 900.0ms] and T33 [0.1ms, 20000.0ms]. SAFE therefore resulted in safe WCET ranges representing a significant decrease of 49.11% and 89.31% of initial maximum WCET estimates, respectively. This information is therefore highly important and can be used to guide design and development.

*The answer to RQ2 is that SAFE helps compute safe WCET ranges that have a much lower maximum than practitioners’ initial WCET estimates. Our case study showed that SAFE determined safe maximum WCET values that were only 51% or less the original estimate. Further, these safe WCET ranges have a deadline miss probability of 1.97% based on the inferred logistic regression model. More restricted ranges can be selected to reduce this probability. SAFE took, on average, 19.1h to compute such safe WCET regions, which is acceptable for offline analysis in practice.*

**Benefits from a practitioner’s perspective.** Investigating practitioners’ perceptions of the benefits of SAFE is necessary to adopt SAFE in practice. To do so, we draw on the qualitative reflections of three software engineers at LuxSpace, with whom we have been collaborating on this research. The reflections are based on the

observations that the engineers made throughout their interactions with the researchers.

SAFE produces a set of worst-case sequences of task arrivals (see Section 4.1). Engineers deemed them to be useful for further examinations by experts. The current practice is to use an analytical schedulability test [31] which proves whether or not a set of tasks are schedulable. Such an analytical technique typically does not provide additional information regarding possible deadline misses. In contrast, worst-case task arrivals and safe WCET ranges produced by SAFE offer insights to engineers regarding deadline miss scenarios and the conditions under which they happen.

Engineers noted that some tasks' WCET are inherently uncertain and that such uncertainty is hard to estimate based on expertise. Hence, their initial WCET estimates were very rough and conservative. Further, estimating what WCET sub-ranges are safe is even more difficult. Since SAFE estimates safe WCET ranges systematically with a probabilistic guarantee, the engineers deem SAFE to improve over existing practice. Also, SAFE allows engineers to choose system-specific safe WCET ranges from the (infinite) WCET ranges modeled by the safe border, rather than simply selecting the best-size WCET range automatically suggested by SAFE (Figure 7). This flexibility allows engineers to perform domain specific trade-off analysis among possible WCET ranges and is useful in practice to support decision making with respect to their task design.

Given the fact that we have not yet undertaken rigorous user studies, the benefits highlighted above are only suggestive but not conclusive. We believe the positive feedback obtained from LuxSpace and our industrial case study shows that SAFE is promising and worthy of further empirical research with human subjects.

## 5.7 Threats to Validity

We evaluated SAFE using early-stage WCET ranges estimated by practitioners at LuxSpace. However, SAFE can be applied at later development stages as well (1) to test the schedulability of the underlying set of tasks of a system and (2) to develop tasks under more precise constraints regarding safe WCETs. Future case studies covering the entire development process remain necessary for a more conclusive evaluation of SAFE. In addition, while motivated by ADCS (see Section 5.2) in the satellite domain, SAFE is designed to be generally applicable to other contexts. Case studies in other domains are required to assess the general usefulness of SAFE.

## 6 RELATED WORK

This section discusses and compares SAFE with related work in the areas of schedulability analysis, as well as testing and verification of real-time systems.

**Schedulability analysis** has been widely studied for real-time systems [3, 7, 9–11, 21–23, 36, 37, 40, 47, 50]. Among them, the most related research strands study uncertain execution times [7, 10, 40, 50], probability of deadline misses [36, 37, 47], and WCET estimations [3, 9, 11, 21–23] in the context of real-time task analysis.

Bini et al. [10] propose a theoretical sensitivity analysis method for real-time systems accounting for a set of periodic tasks and their uncertain execution times. Brüggem et al. [47] present an analytical method to analyse a deadline miss probability of real-time tasks using probability density functions of approximated

task execution times. In contrast to SAFE, most of these analytical approaches do not directly account for aperiodic tasks having variable arrival intervals; instead, they treat aperiodic tasks as periodic tasks using their minimum inter-arrival times as periods [16]. However, SAFE takes various task parameters, including irregular arrival times, into account without any unwarranted assumption. Also, our simulation-based approach enables engineers to explore different scheduling policies provided by real RTOS; however, these analytical methods are typically only valid for a specific conceptual scheduling policy model.

Hansen et al. [22] present a measurement-based approach to estimate WCET and a probability of estimation failure. The measurement-based WCET estimation technique collects actual execution time samples and estimates WCETs using linear regression and a proposed analytical model. To our knowledge, most of the research strands regarding WCET estimation are developed for later development stages at which task implementations are available. Note that relatively few prior works aim at estimating WCET at an early design stage; however, these work strands still require access to source code, hardware, compilers, and program behaviour specifications [3, 11, 21]. In contrast, SAFE uses as input estimated WCET ranges and then precisely restricts the WCET ranges within which tasks are schedulable with a selected deadline miss probability, by relying on a tailored genetic algorithm, simulation, feature reduction, a dedicated sampling strategy, and logistic regression.

**Testing and verification** are important to successfully develop safety-critical real-time systems [1, 13, 17, 30, 39, 52]. Some prior studies employ model-based testing to generate and execute tests for real-time systems [17, 39, 52]. SAFE complements these prior studies by providing safe WCETs as objectives to engineers implementing and testing real-time tasks. Constraint programming and model checking have been applied to ensure that a system satisfies its time constraints [1, 30]. These techniques may be useful to conclusively verify whether or not a WCET value is safe. However, such exhaustive techniques are not amenable to address the analysis problem addressed in this paper, which requires the inference of safe WCET ranges. To our knowledge, SAFE is the first attempt to accurately estimate safe WCET ranges to prevent deadline misses with a given level of confidence and offer ways to achieve different trade-offs among tasks' WCET values.

## 7 CONCLUSION

We developed SAFE, a two-phase approach applicable in early design stages, to precisely estimate safe WCET ranges within which real-time tasks are likely meet their deadlines with a high-level of confidence. SAFE uses a meta-heuristic search algorithm to generate worst-case sequences of task arrivals that maximise the magnitude of deadline misses, when they are possible. Based on the search results, SAFE uses a logistic regression model to infer safe WCET ranges within which tasks are highly likely to meet their deadlines, given a selected probability. SAFE is developed to be scalable by using a combination of techniques such as a genetic algorithm and simulation for the SAFE search (phase 1) and feature reduction, an effective sampling strategy, and polynomial logistic regression for the SAFE model refinement (phase 2). We evaluated SAFE on a

mission-critical, real-time satellite system. The results indicate that SAFE is able to precisely compute safe WCET ranges for which deadline misses are highly unlikely, these ranges being much smaller than the WCET ranges initially estimated by engineers.

For future work, we plan to extend SAFE in the following directions: (1) developing a real-time task modelling language to describe dependencies, constraints, behaviours of real-time tasks and to facilitate schedulability analysis and (2) building a decision support system to recommend a schedulable solution if a set of tasks are not schedulable, e.g., priority re-assignments. In the long term, we would like to more conclusively re-validate the usefulness of SAFE by applying it to other case studies in different domains.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 694277), and NSERC of Canada under the Discovery and CRC programs.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Stefano Di Alesio, Arnaud Gotlieb, Shiva Nejati, and Lionel C. Briand. 2012. Testing Deadline Misses for Real-Time Systems Using Constraint Optimization Techniques. In *Proceedings of the 5th IEEE International Conference on Software Testing, Verification and Validation (ICST'12)*. 764–769.
- [2] Stefano Di Alesio, Shiva Nejati, Lionel C. Briand, and Arnaud Gotlieb. 2013. Stress Testing of Task Deadlines: A Constraint Programming Approach. In *Proceedings of the 2013 IEEE 24th International Symposium on Software Reliability Engineering (ISSRE'13)*. 158–167.
- [3] Peter Altenbernd, Jan Gustafsson, Björn Lisper, and Friedhelm Stappert. 2016. Early Execution Time-Estimation Through Automatically Generated Timing Models. *Real-Time Systems* 52, 6 (2016), 731–760.
- [4] Rajeev Alur, Costas Courcoubetis, and David L. Dill. 1990. Model-Checking for Real-Time Systems. In *Proceedings of the fifth Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS'90)*. 414–425.
- [5] Andrea Arcuri and Lionel C. Briand. 2014. A Hitchhiker's Guide to Statistical Tests for Assessing Randomized Algorithms in Software Engineering. *Software Testing, Verification and Reliability* 24, 3 (2014), 219–250.
- [6] Anonymous Authors. 2020. [Case study data] Schedulability Analysis of Real-Time Systems with Uncertain Worst-Case Execution Times. <https://figshare.com/s/d63d32e8ee726912e3f0>.
- [7] Jakob Axelsson. 2005. A Method for Evaluating Uncertainties in the Early Development Phases of Embedded Real-Time Systems. In *Proceedings of the 11th IEEE International Conference on Embedded and Real-Time Computing Systems and Applications (RTCSA'05)*. 72–75.
- [8] Gustavo E. A. P. A. Batista, Ronaldo C. Prati, and Maria Carolina Monard. 2004. A Study of the Behavior of Several Methods for Balancing Machine Learning Training Data. *SIGKDD Explorations* 6, 1 (2004), 20–29.
- [9] Guillem Bernat, Antoine Colin, and Stefan M. Petters. 2002. WCET Analysis of Probabilistic Hard Real-Time System. In *Proceedings of the 23rd IEEE Real-Time Systems Symposium (RTSS'02)*. 279–288.
- [10] Enrico Bini, Marco Di Natale, and Giorgio Buttazzo. 2008. Sensitivity Analysis for Fixed-Priority Real-Time Systems. *Real-Time Systems* 39, 1 (2008), 5–30.
- [11] Armelle Bonenfant, Denis Claraz, Marianne De Michiel, and Pascal Sotin. 2017. Early WCET Prediction Using Machine Learning. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Workshop on Worst-Case Execution Time Analysis (WCET'17)*. 5:1–5:9.
- [12] Leo Breiman. 2001. Random Forests. *Machine Learning* 45, 1 (2001), 5–32.
- [13] Lionel C. Briand, Yvan Labiche, and Marwa Shousha. 2005. Stress Testing Real-time Systems with Genetic Algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 7th Annual Conference on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation (GECCO'05)*. 1021–1028.
- [14] Alan Burns and Andrew J. Wellings. 2009. *Real-Time Systems and Programming Languages - Ada, Real-Time Java and C / Real-Time POSIX* (4th ed.). Addison-Wesley.
- [15] Edmund M. Clarke, William Klieber, Miloš Nováček, and Paolo Zuliani. 2012. *Model Checking and the State Explosion Problem*. Springer. 1–30 pages.
- [16] Robert I. Davis and Alan Burns. 2011. A Survey of Hard Real-Time Scheduling for Multiprocessor Systems. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 43, 4 (2011), 35:1–35:44.
- [17] Stefano Di Alesio and Sagar Sen. 2018. Using UML/MARTE to Support Performance Tuning and Stress Testing in Real-Time Systems. *Software and Systems Modeling* 17, 2 (2018), 479–508.
- [18] Jens Eickhoff. 2011. *Onboard Computers, Onboard Software and Satellite Operations: An Introduction*. Springer.
- [19] Filomena Ferrucci, Mark Harman, Jian Ren, and Federica Sarro. 2013. Not Going to Take This Anymore: Multi-objective Overtime Planning for Software Engineering Projects. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE'13)*. 462–471.
- [20] Michel Gendreau and Jean-Yves Potvin. 2010. *Handbook of Metaheuristics* (2nd ed.). Springer.
- [21] Jan Gustafsson, Peter Altenbernd, Andreas Ermedahl, and Björn Lisper. 2009. Approximate Worst-Case Execution Time Analysis for Early Stage Embedded Systems Development. In *Proceedings of the 7th IFIP WG 10.2 International Workshop on Software Technologies for Embedded and Ubiquitous Systems (SEUS'09)*. 308–319.
- [22] Jeffery P. Hansen, Scott A. Hissam, and Gabriel A. Moreno. 2009. Statistical-Based WCET Estimation and Validation. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Workshop on Worst-Case Execution Time Analysis (WCET'09)*. 1–11.
- [23] Damien Hardy, Isabelle Puaut, and Yiannakis Sazeides. 2016. Probabilistic WCET Estimation in Presence of Hardware for Mitigating The Impact of Permanent Faults. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Design, Automation & Test in Europe Conference & Exhibition (DATE'16)*. 91–96.
- [24] Mark Harman, S. Afshin Mansouri, and Yuanyuan Zhang. 2012. Search-based Software Engineering: Trends, Techniques and Applications. *ACM Computing Survey* 45, 1 (2012), 11:1–11:61.
- [25] Trevor Hastie, Robert Tibshirani, and Jerome H. Friedman. 2009. *The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining, Inference, and Prediction* (2nd ed.). Springer.
- [26] Randy L. Haupt and Sue Ellen Haupt. 1998. *Practical Genetic Algorithms*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- [27] Kawakubo Hideko and Yoshida Hiroaki. 2012. Rapid Feature Selection Based on Random Forests for High-Dimensional Data. In *Proceedings of the 2012 International Conference on Parallel and Distributed Processing Techniques and Applications (PDPTA'12)*. 704–710.
- [28] David W. Hosmer and Stanley Lemeshow. 1986. *Applied Logistic Regression*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- [29] David W. Hosmer Jr., Stanley Lemeshow, and Rodney X. Sturdivant. 2013. *Applied Logistic Regression* (3rd ed.). Wiley.
- [30] Marta Z. Kwiatkowska, Gethin Norman, and David Parker. 2011. PRISM 4.0: Verification of Probabilistic Real-Time Systems. In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Computer Aided Verification (CAV'11)*. 585–591.
- [31] Chang Liu and James W. Layland. 1973. Scheduling Algorithms for Multiprogramming in a Hard-Real-Time Environment. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)* 20, 1 (1973), 46–61.
- [32] Jane W. S. Liu. 2000. *Real-Time Systems* (1st ed.). Prentice Hall.
- [33] Sean Luke. 2013. *Essentials of Metaheuristics* (2nd ed.). Lulu. Available for free at <http://cs.gmu.edu/~sean/book/metaheuristics/>.
- [34] Ahmed Maged, Salah Haridy, Mohammad Shamsuzzaman, Imad Alsayouf, and Roubi Zaied. 2018. Statistical Monitoring and Optimization of Electrochemical Machining using Shewhart Charts and Response Surface Methodology. *International Journal of Engineering Materials and Manufacture* 3 (2018), 68–77.
- [35] Henry B. Mann and Donald R. Whitney. 1947. On a Test of Whether one of Two Random Variables is Stochastically Larger than the Other. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 18, 1 (1947), 50–60.
- [36] Sorin Manolache, Petru Eles, and Zebo Peng. 2004. Schedulability Analysis of Applications with Stochastic Task Execution Times. *ACM Transactions on Embedded Computer System (TECS)* 3, 4 (2004), 706–735.
- [37] Dorin Maxim and Liliana Cucu-Grosjean. 2013. Response Time Analysis for Fixed-Priority Tasks with Multiple Probabilistic Parameters. In *Proceedings of the 2013 IEEE 34th Real-Time Systems Symposium (RTSS'13)*. 224–235.
- [38] Michael R. May and Brian R. Moore. 2016. How Well Can We Detect Lineage-Specific Diversification-Rate Shifts? A Simulation Study of Sequential AIC Methods. *Systematic Biology* 65, 6 (2016), 1076–1084.
- [39] Marius Mikucionis, Kim Guldstrand Larsen, and Brian Nielsen. 2004. T-UPPAAL: Online Model-based Testing of Real-Time Systems. In *Proceedings of the 19th IEEE International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE'04)*. 396–397.
- [40] Pranab K. Muhuri and Kaushal Kumar Shukla. 2009. Real-Time Scheduling of Periodic Tasks with Processing Times and Deadlines as Parametric Fuzzy Numbers. *Applied Soft Computing* 9, 3 (2009), 936–946.
- [41] Jagannath Munda and Bijoy Bhattacharyya. 2008. Investigation into Electrochemical Micromachining (EMM) Through Response Surface Methodology Based Approach. *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology* 35 (2008), 821–832. Issue 7.
- [42] John A. Nelder and Roger Mead. 1965. A Simplex Method for Function Minimization. *Comput. J.* 7, 4 (1965), 308–313.
- [43] Thanh-Tung Nguyen, Joshua Zhexue Huang, and Thuy Thi Nguyen. 2015. Unbiased Feature Selection in Learning Random Forests for High-Dimensional Data. *The Scientific World Journal* 2015 (2015), 1–18.
- [44] Stuart J. Russell and Peter Norvig. 2010. *Artificial Intelligence - A Modern Approach* (3rd ed.). Pearson Education.

- [45] Lui Sha and John B. Goodenough. 1990. Real-Time Scheduling Theory and Ada. *Computer* 23, 4 (1990), 53–62.
- [46] Brinkley Sprunt, Lui Sha, and John Lehoczky. 1989. Aperiodic Task Scheduling for Hard-Real-Time Systems. *Real-Time Systems* 1, 1 (1989), 27–60.
- [47] Georg von der Brüggen, Nico Piatkowski, Kuan-Hsun Chen, Jian-Jia Chen, and Katharina Morik. 2018. Efficiently Approximating the Probability of Deadline Misses in Real-Time Systems. In *Proceedings of the 30th Euromicro Conference on Real-Time Systems (ECRTS'18)*, Vol. 106. 6:1–6:22.
- [48] K. C. Wang. 2017. *Embedded and Real-Time Operating Systems* (1st ed.). Springer.
- [49] Ian H. Witten, Eibe Frank, and Mark A. Hall. 2011. *Data Mining: Practical Machine Learning Tools and Techniques* (3rd ed.). Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc.
- [50] Changjiu Xian, Yung-Hsiang Lu, and Zhiyuan Li. 2007. Energy-Aware Scheduling for Real-Time Multiprocessor Systems with Uncertain Task Execution Time. In *Proceedings of the 2007 44th ACM/IEEE Design Automation Conference (DAC'07)*. 664–669.
- [51] Toshie Yamashita, Keizo Yamashita, and Ryotaro Kamimura. 2007. A Stepwise AIC Method for Variable Selection in Linear Regression. *Communications in Statistics - Theory and Methods* 36, 13 (2007), 2395–2403.
- [52] Justyna Zander. 2008. *Model-based Testing of Real-Time Embedded Systems in the Automotive Domain*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Fraunhofer FOKUS.
- [53] Zhongheng Zhang. 2016. Variable Selection with Stepwise and Best Subset Approaches. *Annals of Translational Medicine* 4, 7 (2016), 1–6.