CS 423
Operating System Design: Scheduling

Professor Adam Bates
Goals for Today

- **Learning Objective:**
  - Introduce goals, definitions, and policies related to uniprocessor and multiprocessor scheduling
  - Reason about advantages and disadvantages of different foundational scheduling algorithms

- **Announcements, etc:**
  - MP1 is out! Due **Feb 20**
  - **Midterm Exam — Wednesday March 6th (in-class)**
    - Open book and notes, **no devices permitted or required**
    - Review / Q&A session the class before.

**Reminder:** Please put away devices at the start of class
What Are Scheduling Goals?

- What are the goals of a scheduler?
- Scheduling Goals:
  - Generate illusion of concurrency
  - Maximize resource utilization (e.g., mix CPU and I/O bound processes appropriately)
  - Meet needs of both I/O-bound and CPU-bound processes
    - Give I/O-bound processes better interactive response
    - Do not starve CPU-bound processes
  - Support Real-Time (RT) applications
Definitions

- **Task/Job**
  - Something that needs CPU time: a thread associated with a process or with the kernel…
  - … a 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?
Definitions

• 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?

• Starvation
  • A task ‘never’ receives the resources it needs to complete
  • Not very fair : - (
Definitions

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

• **Work-conserving**
  • Resource is used whenever there is a task to run
  • For non-preemptive schedulers, work-conserving is not always better
Non-preemptive scheduling:
- The running process keeps the CPU until it voluntarily gives up the CPU
  - process exits
  - switches to blocked state
  - 1 and 4 only (no 3)

Preemptive scheduling:
- The running process can be interrupted and must release the CPU (can be forced to give up CPU)
Definitions

- **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

• Example: memcached
  • Facebook cache of friend lists, …

• On what workloads would FIFO be particularly bad?
• 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?
FIFO vs. SJF
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5. (5)
Round Robin (RR)

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

• Characteristics of scheduler change depending on the time quantum size
  • What if time quantum is too short?
    • One instruction?
  • What if time quantum is too long?
    • Infinite?
Round Robin
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Scheduling

- Basic scheduling algorithms
  - FIFO (FCFS)
  - Shortest job first
  - Round Robin
Basic scheduling algorithms
- FIFO (FCFS)
- Shortest job first
- Round Robin

What is an optimal algorithm in the sense of maximizing the number of jobs finished (i.e., minimizing average response time)?
FIFO vs. SJF
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Wait time for 2, 3, 4, 5 is BIG!
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Wait time for 2, 3, 4, 5 is SMALL!
Scheduling

- Basic scheduling algorithms
  - FIFO (FCFS)
  - Shortest job first
  - Round Robin

- Assuming zero-cost to time slicing, is Round Robin always better than FIFO?
RR v. FIFO (fixed size tasks)

Tasks

Round Robin (1 ms time slice)

(1) □ □ □ □ □ □
(2) □ □ □ □ □ □
(3) □ □ □ □ □ □
(4) □ □ □ □ □ □
(5) □ □ □ □ □ □

Tasks

FIFO and SJF

(1) □ □ □ □ □ □
(2) □ □ □ □ □ □
(3) □ □ □ □ □ □
(4) □ □ □ □ □ □
(5) □ □ □ □ □ □

Time
• 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

• Is this valid or invalid?
Sample Bias Solutions

- Measure for long enough that # of completed tasks >> # of uncompleted tasks
  - For both systems!
- Start and stop system in idle periods
  - Idle period: no work to do
  - If algorithms are work-conserving, both will complete the same tasks
Is Round Robin the fairest possible algorithm?

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 Workloads??

**Tasks**

I/O Bound

- Issues I/O Request
- I/O Completes

CPU Bound

CPU Bound

---

**Time**
• 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
• 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 (and probably Windows, MacOS)
Multi-Level Feedback Queue

- 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
## Multi-Level Feedback Queue

<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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **New or I/O Bound Task**
- **Time Slice Expiration**
Summary

• 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 pessimal in terms of variance in response time.
Summary

• 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.
Summary

- 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.
- Is MFQ optimally fair??