Main Points

• Scheduling policy: what to do next, when there are multiple threads ready to run
  – Or multiple packets to send, or web requests to serve, or ...
• Definitions
  – response time, throughput, predictability
• Uniprocessor policies
  – FIFO, round robin, optimal
  – multilevel feedback as approximation of optimal
• Multiprocessor policies
  – Affinity scheduling, gang scheduling
• Queueing theory
  – Can you predict/improve a system’s response time?
Example

• You manage a web site, that suddenly becomes wildly popular. Do you?
  – Buy more hardware?
  – Implement a different scheduling policy?
  – Turn away some users? Which ones?

• How much worse will performance get if the web site becomes even more popular?
Definitions

• Task/Job
  – User request: e.g., mouse click, web request, shell command, ...
• Latency/response time
  – How long does a task take to complete?
• Throughput
  – How many tasks can be done per unit of time?
• Overhead
  – How much extra work is done by the scheduler?
• Fairness
  – How equal is the performance received by different users?
• Predictability
  – How consistent is the performance over time?
More Definitions

• **Workload**
  – Set of tasks for system to perform

• **Preemptive scheduler**
  – If we can take resources away from a running task

• **Work-conserving**
  – Resource is used whenever there is a task to run
  – For non-preemptive schedulers, work-conserving is not always better

• **Scheduling algorithm**
  – takes a workload as input
  – decides which tasks to do first
  – Performance metric (throughput, latency) as output
  – Only preemptive, work-conserving schedulers to be considered
First In First Out (FIFO)

• Schedule tasks in the order they arrive
  – Continue running them until they complete or give up the processor

• On what workloads is FIFO particularly bad?
Shortest Job First (SJF)

• Always do the task that has the shortest remaining amount of work to do
  – Often called Shortest Remaining Time First (SRTF)

• Suppose we have five tasks arrive one right after each other, but the first one is much longer than the others
  – Which completes first in FIFO? Next?
  – Which completes first in SJF? Next?
Question

• Claim: SJF is optimal for average response time

• Does SJF have any downsides?
Can we do SJF in practice?

• May be hard at OS level since tasks are black boxes but concept can be widely applied

• Think about Web requests
  – You can queue web requests
  – Prioritize small ones v. large ones
  – Examples?
Question

• Is FIFO ever optimal?
  – Yes, when all requests are of equal length

• Why is it good?
Starvation and Sample Bias

• Suppose you want to compare two scheduling algorithms
  – Create some infinite sequence of arriving tasks
  – Start measuring
  – Stop at some point
  – Compute average response time as the average for completed tasks between start and stop

• Problem is at time $t$: one algorithm has completed fewer tasks
Round Robin

• Each task gets resource for a fixed period of time (time quantum)
  – If task doesn’t complete, it goes back in line

• Need to pick a time quantum
  – What if time quantum is too long?
    • Infinite?
  – What if time quantum is too short?
    • One instruction?
Round Robin

Round Robin (1 ms time slice)

Round Robin (100 ms time slice)
Round Robin vs. FIFO

• Assuming zero-cost time slice, is Round Robin always better than FIFO?
  – Same size jobs time-slicing may serve little purpose except “initial” response

• Round robin for video streaming
  – Even for equal size streams this maintains stable progress for all
Round Robin vs. FIFO
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Round Robin = Fairness?

• Is Round Robin always fair?
  – Sort of but short jobs finish first!

• What is fair?
  – FIFO?
  – Equal share of the CPU?
  – What if some tasks don’t need their full share?
  – Minimize worst case divergence?
    • Time task would take if no one else was running
    • Time task takes under scheduling algorithm
Mixed Workload
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Max-Min Fairness

• How do we balance a mixture of repeating tasks:
  – Some I/O bound, need only a little CPU
  – Some compute bound, can use as much CPU as they are assigned

• One approach: maximize the minimum allocation given to a task
  – If any task needs less than an equal share, schedule the smallest of these first
  – Split the remaining time using max-min
  – If all remaining tasks need at least equal share, split evenly
Multi-level Feedback Queue (MFQ)

• Goals:
  – Responsiveness
  – Low overhead
  – Starvation freedom
  – Some tasks are high/low priority
  – Fairness (among equal priority tasks)

• Not perfect at any of them!
  – Used in Linux
MFQ

• Set of Round Robin queues
  – Each queue has a separate priority
• High priority queues have short time slices
  – Low priority queues have long time slices
• Scheduler picks first thread in highest priority queue
• Tasks start in highest priority queue
  – If time slice expires, task drops one level
### MFQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Time Slice (ms)</th>
<th>Round Robin Queues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New or I/O Bound Task

Time Slice Expiration
Uniprocessor Summary (1)

- FIFO is simple and minimizes overhead.
- If tasks are variable in size, then FIFO can have very poor average response time.
- If tasks are equal in size, FIFO is optimal in terms of average response time.
- Considering only the processor, SJF is optimal in terms of average response time.
- SJF is poor in terms of variance in response time.
Uniprocessor Summary (2)

• If tasks are variable in size, Round Robin approximates SJF.
• If tasks are equal in size, Round Robin will have very poor average response time.
• Tasks that intermix processor and I/O benefit from SJF and can do poorly under Round Robin.
Uniprocessor Summary (3)

- Max-Min fairness can improve response time for I/O-bound tasks.
- Round Robin and Max-Min fairness both avoid starvation.
- By manipulating the assignment of tasks to priority queues, an MFQ scheduler can achieve a balance between responsiveness, low overhead, and fairness.
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Part II
Multiprocessor Scheduling

• What would happen if we used MFQ on a multiprocessor?
  – Contention for scheduler spinlock
  – Cache slowdown due to ready list data structure pinging from one CPU to another
  – Limited cache reuse: thread’s data from last time it ran is often still in its old cache
Per-Processor Affinity Scheduling

• Each processor has its own ready list
  – Protected by a per-processor spinlock
• Put threads back on the ready list where it had most recently run
  – Ex: when I/O completes, or on Condition->signal
• Idle processors can steal work from other processors
Per-Processor Multi-level Feedback with Affinity Scheduling
Scheduling Parallel Programs

• What happens if one thread gets time-sliced while other threads from the same program are still running?
  – Assuming program uses locks and condition variables, it will still be correct
  – What about performance?
Bulk Synchronous Parallelism

• Loop at each processor:
  – Compute on local data (in parallel)
  – Barrier
  – Send (selected) data to other processors (in parallel)
  – Barrier

• Examples:
  – MapReduce
  – Fluid flow over a wing
  – Most parallel algorithms can be recast in BSP
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Scheduling Parallel Programs

Oblivious: each processor time-slices its ready list independently of the other processors

\[ px.y = \text{Thread } y \text{ in process } x \]
Gang Scheduling

px.y = Thread y in process x
Critical Path Delay
Parallel Program Speedup

- Perfectly Parallel
- Diminishing Returns
- Limited Parallelism

Performance (Inverse Response Time) vs. Number of Processors
Space Sharing

![Diagram of Space Sharing]

- **Process 1**
  - Processor 1
  - Processor 2
  - Processor 3

- **Process 2**
  - Processor 4
  - Processor 5
  - Processor 6
Queueing Theory

• Can we predict what will happen to user performance:
  – If a service becomes more popular?
  – If we buy more hardware?
  – If we change the implementation to provide more features?
Assumption: average performance in a stable system, where the arrival rate ($\lambda$) matches the departure rate ($\mu$)
Definitions

- Queueing delay (W): wait time
  - Number of tasks queued (Q)
- Service time (S): time to service the request
- Response time (R) = queueing delay + service time
- Utilization (U): fraction of time the server is busy
  - Service time * arrival rate (\( \lambda \))
- Throughput (X): rate of task completions
  - If no overload, throughput = arrival rate
Little’s Law

\[ N = X \times R \]

\( N \): number of tasks in the system

Applies to any stable system – where arrivals match departures.
Question

Suppose a system has throughput \( X = 100 \) tasks/s, average response time \( R = 50 \) ms/task

- How many tasks are in the system on average?
- If the server takes 5 ms/task, what is its utilization?
- What is the average wait time?
- What is the average number of queued tasks?
Queueing

• What is the best case scenario for minimizing queueing delay?
Queueing: Best Case

- **Response Time**
  - $\lambda < \mu$: no queuing, $R = S$
  - $\lambda > \mu$: growing queues, $R$ undefined

- **Throughput ($\mu$)**
  - Max Throughput

- **Arrival Rate ($\lambda$)**
Response Time: Best vs. Worst Case

![Diagram showing response time vs. arrival rate](image-url)

- For $\lambda < \mu$, queuing depends on burstiness.
- For $\lambda > \mu$, growing queues and $R$ undefined.
- Evenly spaced arrivals.
- Bursty arrivals.
Queueing: Average Case?

• What is average?
  – Gaussian: Arrivals are spread out, around a mean value
  – Exponential: arrivals are memoryless
  – Heavy-tailed: arrivals are bursty

• Can have randomness in both arrivals and service times
Exponential Distribution

Exponential Distribution
$f(x) = \lambda e^{-\lambda x}$
Exponential Distribution

Permits closed form solution to state probabilities, as function of arrival rate and service rate
Response Time vs. Utilization

\[ R = \frac{S}{1-U} \]
Question

- Exponential arrivals: \( R = \frac{S}{1-U} \)
- If system is 20% utilized, and load increases by 5%, how much does response time increase?

- If system is 90% utilized, and load increases by 5%, how much does response time increase?
What if Multiple Resources?

• Response time =
  Sum over all i
  Service time for resource i /
  (1 – Utilization of resource i)

• Implication
  – If you fix one bottleneck, the next highest utilized resource will limit performance
Overload Management

• What if arrivals occur faster than service can handle them
  – If do nothing, response time will become infinite

• Turn users away?
  – Which ones? Average response time is best if turn away users that have the highest service demand
  – Example: Highway congestion

• Degrade service?
  – Compute result with fewer resources
  – Example: CNN static front page on 9/11
Highway Congestion (measured)
Data Center Case Study

• P. 361 to be added
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Part III: Lottery Scheduling
Overview

• Scheduling Issues
• Lottery Scheduling
• Implementation
• Experiments
• Conclusions
Scheduling Issues

• Context
  – multiple scarce resources: CPU, I/O bw, mem
  – concurrently executing clients
  – service requests of varying importance and characteristics

• Quality of Service

• Modularity
Conventional Scheduling

• Priority Scheduling
  – absolute control (but crude)
  – decay-usage scheduling
    • fair, but hard to analyze, gives avg performance
  – Does p=1 vs. p=2 mean p=1 always gets the CPU or 2/3?

• Problems
  – often ad hoc
  – unable to control service rates
  – no modular abstraction
Solution: Lottery Scheduling

• Easily Understood Behavior
  – proportional share
• Resource Rights Vary Smoothly
  – resource consumption rate proportional to share allocated
• Flexible Control Over Service Rates
  – current schedulers are rigid
• Modular Abstraction
  – multiple resource management policies
Lottery Scheduling Basics

• Randomized Mechanism
• Lottery Tickets
  – encapsulate resource rights
  – issued in different amounts
  – first-class objects
• Lotteries
  – randomly select winning ticket
  – grant resource to client holding winning ticket
Example Lottery

Total = 20
Random [1 .. 20] = 15

Winner
Lottery Scheduling Advantages

• Probabilistic Guarantees
  – n lotteries, client holds t tickets, T total tickets
  – p = t/T (binomial distribution)
  – throughput proportional to ticket allocation
    • E[w] = np
  – response time inversely proportional to ticket allocation
    • E[n] = 1/p
Lottery Scheduling Advantages

• Proportional-Share Fairness
  – direct control over service rates
  – easily understood behavior

• Supports Dynamic Environments
  – immediately adapts to changes
  – fair chance to win each allocation

• No starvation
  – hold a non-zero # of tickets
Managing Diverse Resources

- Processor Time
- Lock Access
- I/O Bandwidth
  - disk bandwidth
  - network bandwidth
- Space-Shared Resources
  - memory
Flexible Resource Management

• Ticket Transfers
  – explicit transfer between clients
  – useful when client blocks while waiting

• Ticket inflation/deflation
  – client creates/removes tickets
  – violates modularity and load insulation
  – convenient among mutually trusting clients: no communication is needed
Ticket Currencies

• Tickets Denominated in Currencies
• Modular Resource Management
  – locally contain effects of inflation
  – isolates loads across logical trust boundaries
• Powerful Abstraction
  – name, share, and protect resource rights
  – flexibly group or isolate users and tasks
Currency Implementation

- **Computing Values**
  - currency: sum value of backing tickets
  - ticket: compute share of currency value

- **Example**
  - task1 funding in base units?
  - \( \frac{100}{300} \times 1000 \)
  - 333 base units
Kernel Implementation

• Objects: Ticket, Currency
• Operations
  – create/destroy ticket, currency
  – fund/unfund currency
  – compute value of ticket, currency
• Algorithms
  – straightforward list-based lottery, $O(\lg \# \text{ clients})$
  – simple currency conversion scheme
Prototype

• Platform
  – Mach 3.0 microkernel
  – 25 MHz DECStations
  – 100 msec quantum

• System Overhead
  – overhead comparable to standard scheduler
  – unoptimized prototype
Experiments

• Proportional-Share Service Rates
• Dynamic Ticket Inflation
• Client-Server Ticket Transfers
• Currency Load Insulation
• Lock Waiting Times
Relative Rates

- Dhrystone benchmark
- two tasks
- three 60-second runs for each ratio
Fairness Over Time

- Dhrystone benchmark
- two tasks
- 2:1 allocation
- 8-second averages
Monte-Carlo Rates

- many trials for accurate results
- three tasks
- ticket inflation
- funding based on relative error
Query Processing Rates

- multithreaded “database” server
- three clients
- 8:3:1 allocation
- ticket transfers
Currencies Insulate Loads

- currencies A, B
  - 2:1 funding

- task A
  - funding 100.A

- task B1
  - funding 100.B

- task B2 joins with
  - funding 50.B
Lottery-Scheduled Locks

• Waiting to Acquire
  – waiters transfer funding to lock owner
  – lock owner inherits aggregate funding to acquire CPU

• Release
  – return funding to waiters
  – hold lottery among waiters
  – new winner inherits funding

• Avoids Priority Inversion
Lock Experiment

• Groups of threads A, B with 2:1 Allocation
• Acquire, Hold 50 ms, Release, Compute 50 ms
• Average Waiting Time
  – A waits 450 ms, B waits 948 ms
  – 1:2.11 response time ratio
• Lock Acquisitions
  – A completes 763, B completes 423
  – 1.80 : 1 throughput
Conclusions

• Novel Randomized Scheduling Mechanisms
• Easily Understood Behavior
• Precise Control Over Service Rates
• Modular Resource Management
• Generalizes to Diverse Resources
Next Week

• Address Translation
• OSPP Chapter 8
• Have a great weekend!