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What is processor scheduling?

Why?

At first to share an expensive resource – multiprogramming

Now to perform concurrent tasks because processor is so powerful

Future looks like past + now

Computing utility – large data/processing centers use multiprogramming to maximize resource utilization

Systems still powerful enough for each user to run multiple concurrent tasks
Assumptions

Pool of jobs contending for the CPU

Jobs are independent and compete for resources (this assumption is not true for all systems/scenarios)

Scheduler mediates between jobs to optimize some performance criterion

In this lecture, we will talk about processes and threads interchangeably. We will assume a single-threaded CPU.
Multiprogramming Example

Process A

1 sec

start idle; input idle; input stop

Process B

start idle; input idle; input stop

Time = 10 seconds
Multiprogramming Example (cont)

Process A

- start
- idle; input
- idle; input
- stop A

Process B

- start B
- idle; input
- idle; input
- stop B

Total Time = 20 seconds

Throughput = 2 jobs in 20 seconds = 0.1 jobs/second

Avg. Waiting Time = (0+10)/2 = 5 seconds
Multiprogramming Example (cont)

Throughput = 2 jobs in 11 seconds = 0.18 jobs/second

Avg. Waiting Time = (0+1)/2 = 0.5 seconds
What Do We Optimize?

System-oriented metrics:

Processor utilization: percentage of time the processor is busy
Throughput: number of processes completed per unit of time

User-oriented metrics:

Turnaround time: interval of time between submission and termination (including any waiting time). Appropriate for batch jobs
Response time: for interactive jobs, time from the submission of a request until the response begins to be received
Deadlines: when process completion deadlines are specified, the percentage of deadlines met must be promoted
Design Space

Two dimensions

Selection function

Which of the ready jobs should be run next?

Preemption

Preemptive: currently running job may be interrupted and moved to Ready state

Non-preemptive: once a process is in Running state, it continues to execute until it terminates or blocks
Job Behavior

- load store
- add store
- read from file
- wait for I/O
- store increment index
- write to file
- wait for I/O
- load store
- add store
- store
- read from file
- wait for I/O
- CPU burst
- I/O burst
- CPU burst
- I/O burst
- CPU burst
- I/O burst
Job Behavior

I/O-bound jobs

Jobs that perform lots of I/O
Tend to have short CPU bursts

CPU-bound jobs

Jobs that perform very little I/O
Tend to have very long CPU bursts
Histogram of CPU-burst Times
Network Queuing Diagrams

- enter
- ready queue
- CPU
- exit
- Disk 1
- Disk 2
- Network
- I/O
- disk queue
- network queue
- other I/O queue
Network Queuing Models

Circles are servers (resources), rectangles are queues
Jobs arrive and leave the system
Queuing theory lets us predict: avg length of queues, # jobs vs. service time

Little’s law:
Mean # jobs in system = arrival rate x mean response time
Mean # jobs in queue = arrival rate x mean waiting time
# jobs in system = # jobs in queue + # jobs being serviced
Response time = waiting + service
Waiting time = time between arrival and service

Stability condition:
Mean arrival rate < # servers x mean service rate per server
Example of Queuing Problem

A monitor on a disk server showed that the average time to satisfy an I/O request was 100 milliseconds. The I/O rate is 200 requests per second. What was the mean number of requests at the disk server?
Example of Queuing Problem

A monitor on a disk server showed that the average time to satisfy an I/O request was 100 milliseconds. The I/O rate is 200 requests per second. What was the mean number of requests at the disk server?

Mean # requests in server = arrival rate x response time =

= 200 requests/sec x 0.1 sec

= 20

Assuming a single disk, how fast must it be for stability?
Example of Queuing Problem

A monitor on a disk server showed that the average time to satisfy an I/O request was 100 milliseconds. The I/O rate is 200 requests per second. What was the mean number of requests at the disk server?

Mean # requests in server = arrival rate x response time =

= 200 requests/sec x 0.1 sec

= 20

Assuming a single disk, how fast must it be for stability? Service time must be lower than 0.005 secs.
(Short-Term) CPU Scheduler

Selects from among the processes in memory that are ready to execute, and allocates the CPU to one of them.

CPU scheduling decisions may take place when a process:

1. Switches from running to waiting state.
2. Switches from running to ready state.
3. Switches from waiting to ready.
4. Terminates.
Dispatcher

Dispatcher module gives control of the CPU to the process selected by the short-term scheduler; this involves:

- switching context
- switching to user mode
- jumping to the proper location in the user program to restart that program

*Dispatch latency* – time it takes for the dispatcher to stop one process and start another running.
First-Come, First-Served (FCFS) Scheduling

Example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Burst Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$P_1$</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_2$</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_3$</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suppose that the processes arrive in the order: $P_1, P_2, P_3$

The Gantt Chart for the schedule is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$P_1$</th>
<th>$P_2$</th>
<th>$P_3$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Waiting time for $P_1 = 0$; $P_2 = 24$; $P_3 = 27$

Average waiting time: $(0 + 24 + 27)/3 = 17$
Suppose that the processes arrive in the order

\[ P_2, P_3, P_1. \]

The Gantt chart for the schedule is:

```
        P2  |  P3  |  P1
0-----------------3-----------------6-----------------30
```

Waiting time for \( P_1 = 6; P_2 = 0; P_3 = 3 \)

Average waiting time: \( (6 + 0 + 3)/3 = 3 \)

Much better than previous case.

*Convoy effect* short process behind long process
Shortest-Job-First (SJF) Scheduling

Associate with each process the length of its next CPU burst. Use these lengths to schedule the process with the shortest time.

Two schemes:

Non-preemptive – once CPU given to the process it cannot be preempted until completes its CPU burst.

Preemptive – if a new process arrives with CPU burst length less than remaining time of current executing process, preempt. This scheme is known as the Shortest-Remaining-Time-First (SRTF).

SJF is optimal – gives minimum average waiting time for a given set of processes.
Example of Non-Preemptive SJF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Arrival Time</th>
<th>Burst Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$P_1$</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_2$</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_3$</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_4$</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SJF (non-preemptive)

\[
\text{Average waiting time} = \frac{(0 + 6 + 3 + 7)}{4} = 4
\]
Example of Preemptive SJF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Arrival Time</th>
<th>Burst Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$P_1$</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_2$</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_3$</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_4$</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SJF (preemptive)

Average waiting time = \((9 + 1 + 0 + 2)/4 = 3\)
Determining Length of Next CPU Burst

Can only estimate the length.

Can be done by using the length of previous CPU bursts, using exponential averaging.

1. \( t_n = \) actual length of \( n^{th} \) CPU burst
2. \( \tau_{n+1} = \) predicted value for the next CPU burst
3. \( \alpha, 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1 \)
4. Define :

\[
\tau_{n+1} = \alpha t_n + (1 - \alpha) \tau_n.
\]
Examples of Exponential Averaging

\[ \alpha = 0 \]

\[ \tau_{n+1} = \tau_n \]

Recent history does not count.

\[ \alpha = 1 \]

\[ \tau_{n+1} = t_n \]

Only the actual last CPU burst counts.
Round Robin (RR)

Each process gets a small unit of CPU time (*time quantum*), usually 10-100 milliseconds. After this time has elapsed, the process is preempted and added to the end of the ready queue.

If there are \( n \) processes in the ready queue and the time quantum is \( q \), then each process gets \( 1/n \) of the CPU time in chunks of at most \( q \) time units at once. No process waits more than \( (n-1)q \) time units.

Performance

\[ q \text{ large } \Rightarrow \text{FIFO} \]

\[ q \text{ small } \Rightarrow q \text{ must be large with respect to context switch, otherwise overhead is too high.} \]
Example: RR with Time Quantum = 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Burst Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( P_1 )</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( P_2 )</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( P_3 )</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( P_4 )</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Gantt chart is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( P_1 )</th>
<th>( P_2 )</th>
<th>( P_3 )</th>
<th>( P_4 )</th>
<th>( P_1 )</th>
<th>( P_3 )</th>
<th>( P_4 )</th>
<th>( P_1 )</th>
<th>( P_3 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Typically, higher average turnaround than SJF, but better *response time*.
How a Smaller Time Quantum Increases Context Switches

![Diagram showing how a smaller time quantum increases context switches]

- Process time = 10
- Quantum:
  - 12
  - 6
  - 1
- Context switches:
  - 0
  - 1
  - 9
Turnaround Time Varies With Time Quantum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>process</th>
<th>time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$P_1$</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_2$</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_3$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_4$</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Diagram showing average turnaround time vs. time quantum, with data points for processes $P_1$, $P_2$, $P_3$, and $P_4$.]
Priority Scheduling

A priority number (integer) is associated with each process.

The CPU is allocated to the process with the highest priority (smallest integer \(\equiv\) highest priority).

- Preemptive
- Non-preemptive

SJF is a priority scheduling policy where priority is the predicted next CPU burst time.

Problem \(\equiv\) Starvation – low priority processes may never execute.

Solution \(\equiv\) Aging – as time progresses increase the priority of the process.
Multilevel Queue

Ready queue is partitioned into separate queues:
- foreground (interactive)
- background (batch)

Each queue has its own scheduling algorithm,
- foreground – RR
- background – FCFS

Scheduling must be done between the queues.
- Fixed priority scheduling; i.e., serve all from foreground then from background.
- Possibility of starvation.

- Time slice – each queue gets a certain amount of CPU time which it can schedule amongst its processes; e.g.,
  - 80% to foreground in RR
  - 20% to background in FCFS
Multilevel Queue Scheduling

highest priority

system processes

interactive processes

interactive editing processes

batch processes

student processes

lowest priority
Multilevel Feedback Queue

A process can move between the various queues; aging can be implemented this way.

Multilevel-feedback-queue scheduler defined by the following parameters:

number of queues

scheduling algorithms for each queue

method used to determine when to upgrade a process

method used to determine when to demote a process

method used to determine which queue a process will enter when that process needs service
Multilevel Feedback Queues

- Quantum = 8
- Quantum = 16
- FCFS
Example of Multilevel Feedback Queue

Three queues:

$Q_0$ – time quantum 8 milliseconds
$Q_1$ – time quantum 16 milliseconds
$Q_2$ – FCFS

Scheduling

A new job enters queue $Q_0$. When it gains CPU, job receives 8 milliseconds. If it does not finish in 8 milliseconds, job is moved to queue $Q_1$.

At $Q_1$ job receives 16 additional milliseconds. If it still does not complete, it is preempted and moved to queue $Q_2$.

After that, job is scheduled according to FCFS.
Traditional UNIX Scheduling

Multilevel feedback queues

128 priorities possible (0-127; 0 most important)

1 Round Robin queue per priority

At every scheduling event, the scheduler picks the highest priority non-empty queue and runs jobs in round-robin (note: high priority means low Q #)

Scheduling events:

Clock interrupt
Process gives up CPU, e.g. to do I/O
I/O completion
Process termination
Traditional UNIX Scheduling

All processes assigned a baseline priority based on the type and current execution status:

- swapper 0
- waiting for disk 20
- waiting for lock 35
- user-mode execution 50

At scheduling events, all process priorities are adjusted based on the amount of CPU used, the current load, and how long the process has been waiting.

Most processes are not running/ready, so lots of computing shortcuts are used when computing new priorities.
UNIX Priority Calculation

Every 4 clock ticks a process priority is updated:

\[ P = BASELINE + \left( \frac{\text{utilization}}{4} \right) + 2 \text{NiceFactor} \]

The NiceFactor allows some control of job priority. It can be set from –20 to 20.

Jobs using a lot of CPU increase the priority value. Interactive jobs not using much CPU will return to the baseline.
Very long running CPU-bound jobs will get “stuck” at the lowest priority, i.e. they will run infrequently.

Decay function used to weight utilization to recent CPU usage.

A process’s utilization at time $t$ is decayed every second:

$$u_t = \left[ \frac{2 \text{load}}{2 \text{load} + 1} \right] \times u(t-1) + \text{NiceFactor}$$

The system-wide load is the average number of runnable jobs during last 1 second
UNIX Priority Decay

Assume 1 job on CPU. Load will thus be 1. Assume NiceFactor is 0.

Compute utilization at time N:

+1 second: \[ U_1 = \frac{2}{3} U_0 \]

Utilization in the previous second

+2 seconds: \[ U_2 = \frac{2}{3} \left[ U_1 + \frac{2}{3} U_0 \right] = \frac{2}{3} U_1 + \left( \frac{2}{3} \right)^2 U_0 \]

+N seconds: \[ U_n = \frac{2}{3} U_{n-1} + \left( \frac{2}{3} \right)^2 U_{n-2} \ldots \]
UNIX Priority Reset

When a process transitions from “blocked” to “ready” state, its priority is set as follows:

\[
ut = \left[ \frac{2load}{(2load + 1)} \right]^{t\text{blocked}} * u(t-1)
\]

where \(t\text{blocked}\) is the amount of time blocked.
Thread Scheduling

- Distinction between user-level and kernel-level threads
- Many-to-one and many-to-many models, thread library schedules user-level threads to run on LWP
  - Known as **process-contention scope (PCS)** since scheduling competition is within the process

- Kernel thread scheduled onto available CPU is **system-contention scope (SCS)** – competition among all threads in system
Pthread Scheduling

- API allows specifying either PCS or SCS during thread creation
  - PTHREAD SCOPE PROCESS schedules threads using PCS scheduling
  - PTHREAD SCOPE SYSTEM schedules threads using SCS scheduling.
Pthread Scheduling API

```c
#include <pthread.h>
#include <stdio.h>
#define NUM THREADS 5
int main(int argc, char *argv[]) {
int i;
    pthread t tid[NUM THREADS];
    pthread attr t attr;
    /* get the default attributes */
    pthread attr init(&attr);
    /* set the scheduling algorithm to PROCESS or SYSTEM */
    pthread attr setscope(&attr, PTHREAD SCOPE SYSTEM);
    /* set the scheduling policy - FIFO, RT, or OTHER */
    pthread attr setschedpolicy(&attr, SCHED OTHER);
    /* create the threads */
    for (i = 0; i < NUM THREADS; i++)
        pthread create(&tid[i],&attr,runner,NULL);
}
```
Pthread Scheduling API

/* now join on each thread */
for (i = 0; i < NUM THREADS; i++)
    pthread join(tid[i], NULL);
}
/* Each thread will begin control in this function */
void *runner(void *param)
{
    printf("I am a thread\n");
    pthread exit(0);
}

Multiple-Processor Scheduling

- CPU scheduling more complex when multiple CPUs are available
- **Homogeneous processors** within a multiprocessor
- **Asymmetric multiprocessing** – only one processor accesses the system data structures, alleviating the need for data sharing
- **Symmetric multiprocessing (SMP)** – each processor is self-scheduling, all processes in common ready queue, or each has its own private queue of ready processes
- **Processor affinity** – process has affinity for processor on which it is currently running
  - soft affinity
  - hard affinity
NUMA and CPU Scheduling
Recent trend to place multiple processor cores on same physical chip
Faster and consume less power
Multiple threads per core also growing
Takes advantage of memory stall to make progress on another thread while memory retrieve happens
Multiprocessor Scheduling

Several different policies:

Load sharing – an idle processor takes the first process out of the ready queue and runs it. Is this a good idea? How can it be made better?

Gang scheduling – all processes/threads of each application are scheduled together. Why is this good? Any difficulties?

Hardware partitions – applications get different parts of the machine. Any problems here?
Pros and Cons: Multiprocessor Scheduling

Load sharing: poor locality; poor synchronization behavior; simple; good processor utilization. Affinity or per processor queues can improve locality.

Gang scheduling: central control; fragmentation --unnecessary processor idle times (e.g., two applications with P/2+1 threads); good synchronization behavior; if careful, good locality

Hardware partitions: poor utilization for I/O-intensive applications; fragmentation – unnecessary processor idle times when partitions left are small; excellent locality and synchronization behavior
Summary: Scheduling Algorithms

FIFO/FCFS is simple but leads to poor average response (and turnaround) times. Short processes are delayed by long processes that arrive before them.

RR eliminates this problem, but favors CPU-bound jobs, which have longer CPU bursts than I/O-bound jobs.

SJN and SRT alleviate the problem with FIFO, but require information on the length (service time) of each process. This information is not always available (though it can sometimes be approximated based on past history or user input).

Feedback is a way of alleviating the problem with FIFO without information on process length.