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Introduction

- **Dynamic Voltage Scaling (DVS)**
  - Slow down underutilized resources and decrease their operating voltages
  - Effective for reducing power consumption of the CPU

- **Dynamic Power Management (DPM)**
  - Selective shut-off of idle system components
  - Effective for reducing power consumption of the CPU, peripheral components, and I/O devices

- **Integrated DVS and DPM**
  - Idle intervals are created by the scheduler which decides when and how fast to perform the tasks
  - May be beneficial to speed up task processing in order to create an idle period in which the system can sleep
Related Work

- **Low Power Scheduling for DVS**
  - List-scheduling algorithm
    - Task priority: reciprocal of the slack time [Luo, 2002]
    - High priority: high energy saving and low slack time [Gruian, 2001]
  - Early-deadline-first scheduling to assign a task to the best-fit processor [Zhang, 2002]

- **DPM-based Task Scheduling**
  - Online algorithm to reduce the number of on/off transitions of devices [Lu, 2000]
  - Offline branch-and-bound algorithm [Swaminathan, 2002]

- **Approaches for integrated DVS and DPM**
  - Stochastic Approach: CTMDP [Qinru, 1999], Renewal Theory with DVS [Simunic, 2001]
  - Competitive analysis based algorithm: 3-competitive for a processor with one sleep state [Irani, 2003]
Problem Description

- **Targeted System**
  - A real-time system having a single CPU and \( K \) other devices, e.g., I/O and memory
    - CPU (device 0) can operate at a number of \( m \) different voltage levels and supports power-down modes
    - Devices have only one active mode and support at least one low power mode
  - A set of \( n \) non-preemptive dependent tasks, periodically run on the system with a hard deadline; Task dependency captured by a DAG, \( G(V,E) \)
  - Every task has to be performed on the CPU, but may require support from only some of the devices

- **Objective**
  - Determine the optimal task scheduling and task-level voltage assignment that minimize the total system energy consumption while meeting the hard real-time constraint
Problem Formulation

- Energy consumption for execution of task $u$

$$\text{ene}_u = c_u \sum_{i=1}^{m} x(u, i) \cdot N_{u,i} \cdot V_i^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{K} Z_k(u) \cdot P_k \cdot \text{dur}_u$$

$$\text{dur}_u = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{x(u, i) N_{u,i}}{f_i}$$

$C_u$: Switched capacitance per clock cycle

$f_i$: Clock frequency of the CPU at voltage $V_i$

$P_k$: Power dissipation of device $k$ in active mode

- Precedence constraints

$$s(u) + \text{dur}_u \leq s(v) \quad \forall (u,v) \in E$$

$x(u, i)$: Percentage of the workload of task $u$ that is performed at CPU voltage $V_i$

$N_{u,i}$: Actual number of CPU cycles required to complete task $u$ at operating voltage $V_i$

$Z_k(u)$: 0-1 integer variable; 1 iff task $u$ requires service from device $k$

$s(u)$: Start time of task $u$

$Y_k(u, v)$: 0-1 integer variable; it is set to 1 iff task $u$ is executed immediately before task $v$ on device $k$
■ Energy consumption when device $k$ is idle

$$\text{idlene}_k(\text{it}) = \begin{cases} 
    \varepsilon_{\text{tr}} + p_s \cdot \text{it}, & \text{if } \text{it} \geq \max(\tau_{\text{BE}}, \tau_{\text{tr}}) \\
    p_a \cdot \text{it}, & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}$$

$$\tau_{\text{BE}} = \frac{\varepsilon_{\text{tr}}}{p_a - p_s}$$

■ Idle time of device $k$ just before task $v$ is executed

$$\text{it}_{k,v} = s(v) - \sum_{u=0}^{n} (s(u) + \text{dur}_u) \cdot Y_k(u, v)$$
Problem Formulation (Cont’d)

- Total system energy consumption (ignoring the boundary intervals for each data instantiation period)

  \[ E_{sys} = \sum_{u=1}^{n} \text{ene}_u + \sum_{k=0}^{K} \sum_{v=1}^{n} \text{idlene}_k (Z_k (v) \cdot \text{it}_{k,v}) \]

- Precedence constraint between a task and its immediate successor

  \[ \sum_{u=0}^{n} (s(u) + \text{dur}_u) \cdot Y_k (u, v) \leq s(v) \quad \forall v \in V, k \in \text{devs}_v \]
Solution Approach

- This problem formulation is a nonlinear non-convex integer program over variables $Y_k(u,v)$, $x(u,i)$, and $s(u)$
- Three-step heuristic approach
  - Task Ordering: Derive a linear ordering of tasks (i.e., calculate $Y_k(u,v)$ values) by performing an interactive minimum-cost matching on some appropriately constructed graph
  - Voltage Assignment: Given the task ordering implied by the schedule obtained in step 1, assign voltages and task durations (i.e., calculate $x(u,i)$ values) and exact start times (i.e., calculate $s(u)$ values) to each task so as to meet a target cycle time, $T_d$, for data initiation
  - Solution Refinement: Improve the task scheduling and voltage assignment of steps 1 and 2 to increase the energy efficiency of the resulting solutions
Task Ordering

Goal is to schedule the task graph with known task execution times on the CPU so as to minimize the total energy dissipation by maximizing the I/O device sleep times while accounting for the energy transition cost of devices going from ON to OFF states and vice versa.

- Notice that the summation of energy dissipations in all devices when these devices are in active states is fixed and independent of the task ordering. The ordering only changes the duration of the idle times and the number of ON to OFF transitions for the I/O devices.
System Energy for Known Task Execution Schedule, \( \Lambda \)

- **Lower-bound on the total system energy**

\[
\text{totene}_{LB} = \sum_{u=1}^{n} \sum_{k \in \text{dev}_u} \text{funcpow}_k \cdot \text{dur}_u + \sum_{k=0}^{K} \text{sleeppow}_k \cdot (T_d - \sum_{u \in \text{tasks}_k} \text{dur}_u)
\]

- **Total energy computation based on segment set representation of device activity, \( S_k \)**

Let \( \text{tasks}_k \) denote the set of tasks running on device \( k \) and \( \text{dev}_u \) denote the set of devices that are required by task \( u \)

\[
t_{\text{nonactive}}(s_{k,i}) = \text{start}(s_{k,i+1}) - \text{end}(s_{k,i})
\]

\[
F_{k,i} = F_k(s_{k,i}, s_{k,i+1}) = 1 \quad \text{iff} \quad t_{\text{nonactive}}(s_{k,i}, s_{k,i+1}) \geq t_{BE,k}
\]

\[
\text{totene}(\Lambda) = \text{totene}_{LB} + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \sum_{i=1}^{\left| S_k \right| - 1} (F_{k,i} \cdot \text{transene}_k + (1 - F_{k,i}) \cdot \text{funcpow}_k \cdot t_{\text{nonactive}}(s_{k,i}))
\]
Augmented Task Graph (ATG)

- We construct an augmented task graph $A(V,C)$ from the given task graph $G(V,E)$ by copying $G(V,E)$ and adding/deleting some edges to/from $E$
  - The new edge set $C$ has the following properties:
    - It does NOT contain any directed edge $uv$ if there exists another directed path from $u$ to $v$
    - It contains undirected edges $qr$ if tasks associated with $q$ and $r$ can be scheduled next to each other in some order
    - Each directed edge $qr$ has an associated energy cost that captures the energy consumption due to devices staying in their ON state or device state transitions that occur when the two end nodes of the edge are executed in a sequence
  - Each node $q$ in $V$ has three attributes: task execution time $\text{dur}_q$, task energy consumption $\text{ene}_q$; device list required by the task $\text{dev}_q$
Scheduling Algorithm

- **Node Merge Operation**
  - Merge two nodes into a single node and remove the edge between these two nodes
  - Generate properties for the new node
  - Remove all edges that become invalid after this merge
Example: Consider a task graph depicted on the left. Assume that there are four devices \( \{0, 1, 2, 3\} \) with the following device utilization sets. Each device consumes 1 unit of energy for each transition to and from the sleep state

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{dev}(u1) &= \{0\} \\
\text{dev}(u2) &= \text{dev}(u4) = \{0, 1\} \\
\text{dev}(u3) &= \text{dev}(u5) = \text{dev}(u6) = \{0, 2, 3\}
\end{align*}
\]

Undirected edge added between u2 and u3, because they can be scheduled next to each other in any order. Sleep; the extra energy cost is 1.
An Example (Cont’d)

- Select a pair of nodes to merge
  - There are five edges having the minimum extraene value: 0
  - We focus on three of the edge merges here: $u_2u_4$, $u_3u_5$, and $u_5u_6$
  - Pick the edge that results in minimum total extra energy for the ATG

From left to right, the total extra energy costs are 5.5, 6 and 5
Select the $u_2u_4$ edge
Voltage Assignment as an ILP

- Having generated the task schedule, we fix the ordering of tasks, but ignore task execution times and start times
  - Even with a fixed task ordering, the optimization problem cannot be solved efficiently due to the non-convex nature of device idle energy over time

- Our approach is to define a set of idle time ranges and map the actual idle time to one of these ranges
  - Define new 0-1 integer variables $W_{k}(v,h)$ to approximate idle time, $i_{v,k}$; Note that $W_{k}(v,h)$ is 1 iff $t_{k,h} \leq i_{k,v} < t_{k,h+1} \cdot t_{k,h}$ and $t_{k,h+1}$ are chosen from a discrete set $\{t_{k,1}, t_{k,2}, \ldots, t_{k,H}\}$
    \[
    \text{idlene}_{k}(i_{v,k}) = \sum_{h=1}^{H} W_{k}(v,h) \cdot \text{idlene}_{k}(t_{k,h}) \quad \text{with} \quad \sum_{h=1}^{H-1} W_{k}(v,h) = 1
    \]
  - Precedence constraint between a task, $u$, and its immediate successor, $v$, becomes
    \[
    \sum_{h=1}^{H-1} t_{k,h} W_{k}(v,h) \leq s(v) - \sum_{u=0}^{n} (s(u) + \text{dur}_{u}) \cdot Y_{k}(u,v) \leq \sum_{h=1}^{H-1} t_{k,h+1} W_{k}(v,h)
    \]
Solution Refinement

1. Move tasks closer together so as to minimize unnecessary positive slack times

2. Identify a task whose duration has a large impact on the system energy dissipation, e.g., a small change of its execution time can enable device transitions to low power states, and change its voltage assignment accordingly

3. Goto step 2 until no further improvement is possible
The CPU operating voltage/frequency levels: 1V/200MHz, 1.1V/300MHz and 1.3V/400MHz

Power and transition parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Device</th>
<th>Active Power</th>
<th>Sleep Power</th>
<th>Energy Overhead</th>
<th>Timing Overhead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDRAM</td>
<td>0.3W</td>
<td>~0</td>
<td>~0</td>
<td>~0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDD</td>
<td>2.1W</td>
<td>0.85W</td>
<td>0.6J</td>
<td>400ms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLAN</td>
<td>0.7W</td>
<td>0.05W</td>
<td>0.04J</td>
<td>100ms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPU</td>
<td>1.0W (200MHz)</td>
<td>0.05W</td>
<td>0.3J</td>
<td>400ms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Characteristics of Task Graphs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Graph</th>
<th>Task Count</th>
<th>CPU and device utilization factors at max CPU speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.61 ; 0.61 ; 0.29 ; 0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.72 ; 0.72 ; 0.51 ; 0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0.34 ; 0.34 ; 0.12 ; 0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>0.48 ; 0.48 ; 0.30 ; 0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G5</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>0.55 ; 0.55 ; 0.28 ; 0.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Approaches Compared

- **M1**: No DVS, no DPM
  - The CPU always operates at the highest voltage level and devices are kept active during the whole execution time.

- **M2**: DPM without any task scheduling
  - Tasks are executed on the CPU (which has assumed its highest frequency and voltage setting) in an un-optimized order based on their ID numbers after they become available. The state transition sequences of all devices and the CPU are determined optimally.

- **M3**: DPM with task scheduling
  - This method is similar to M2, except that our proposed power-aware task scheduling algorithm is used to determine the task execution sequence.

- **M4**: Conventional cpu-driven DVS plus DPM
  - Similar to M2, except that the task operating voltage is assigned to minimize the CPU power consumption. More specifically, the operating voltage setting for each task is obtained without considering the energy consumption of devices.

- **M5**: Proposed system-aware DVS plus DPM (PSVS)
  - Task scheduling and operating voltage settings are determined through the proposed three-phase framework.
## Experiment Results

- Energy consumption comparisons of different approaches (normalized as a ratio over M1 results)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Graph</th>
<th>M2</th>
<th>M3</th>
<th>M4</th>
<th>M5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G5</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

- We addressed the problem of minimizing energy consumption of a computer system performing periodic hard real-time tasks with precedence constraints.

- In our approach, dynamic power management and voltage scaling techniques were combined to reduce the energy consumption of the CPU and devices.

- The optimization problem was first formulated as an integer non-convex programming problem. Next, a three-phase solution framework, which integrates power management scheduling and task voltage assignment, was presented.

- Future work will focus on developing a more efficient algorithm for the voltage assignment step.
s_{k,q} \square [\text{start}(r) - \text{dur}_q, \text{start}(r)]; \quad s_{k,\text{succ}(r)} \square [\text{start}(r) + \text{dur}_r, T_d]\\
F_{k,q,r} \square F_k(s_{k,q}, s_{k,\text{succ}(r)})\\
extraene_{qr} = \sum_{k \in \text{dev}_q - \text{dev}_r} \sum_{i=1}^{\vert s_k \vert - 1} (F_{k,q,r} \cdot \text{transene}_k + (1 - F_{k,q,r}) \cdot \text{funcpow}_k \cdot t_{\text{nonactive}(s_k,i)})