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Scheduling Policies in Queueing Models

Scheduling is a compromise . . .

- not only between individual tasks, but also . . .
- between systems with different workload patterns,
- between different performance requirements, including
  - mean response time, mean slowdown, responsiveness, . . .
  - fairness measures: seniority, RAQFM, . . .

Our work

- Design a flexible scheduling policy to balance these requirements.

Assumptions in this talk

- Single-server queueing model
- Work-conserving, preemption allowed
Blind Scheduling Policies

Non-blind policies
Know required and remaining service time when tasks arrive.

Non-blind policy examples
SJF, SRPT, SMART . . .

Blind policies
No information about remaining service until tasks complete.

Blind policy examples
FCFS, PS, LAS, LCFS, . . .
How Do We Measure Fairness of a Policy?

Fairness criteria [cf. Raz, Levy & Avi-Itzhak 2004]

- Task seniority (emphasis on \( t_i \)) \( \Rightarrow \) FCFS
- Task service requirements (emphasis on \( x_i \))
  - Equal attained service \( \Rightarrow \) LAS/FBPS
- Combination of the two: Equal share of processor
  - Current: \( \frac{dx_i(t)}{dt_i(t)} \equiv x'_i(t) \) \( \Rightarrow \) PS
  - Aggregated: \( \frac{x_i(t)}{t_i(t)} \) \( \Rightarrow \) GAS
How to Measure Fairness of a Policy? (cont’d)

Fairness measures in literature

- Comparison vs FCFS [Wang & Morris 1985]
- RAQFM: Comparison vs PS [Raz, Levy & Avi-Itzhak 2004]
  - A quantitative measure.
  - Difficult to analyze: with results for FCFS, LCFS, PLCFS, and Random in $M/M/1$.
- $G/D/m$ [Raz, Levy & Avi-Itzhak 2005]
- Expected slowdown for given required service $E[S|X = x]$ compared with PS [Wierman & Harchol-Balter 2004]
  - A classification: always fair/unfair, sometimes fair.
  - Assume $M/G/1$.
  - Extended in [Wierman & Harchol-Balter 2005].
- SQF [Avi-Itzhak, Brosh & Levy 2007]
PBS Policy
Balance Between Two Fairness Criteria

Sojourn Time:
\[ t_i(t) = t - \tau_i^A \]

Seniority — Prefer larger sojourn time \( t_i(t) \)

Service requirements — Prefer smaller attained service \( x_i(t) \)

Our idea: A configurable balance

Schedule a task with maximal \( t_i(t) - \alpha x_i(t) \).

More general: \( g(t_i(t)) - \alpha g(x_i(t)) \), e.g., \( \log t_i(t) - \alpha \log x_i(t) \).
The PBS policy with a single server

- For every task $i$, compute its **priority value**

\[ p_i(t) = \log t_i(t) - \alpha \log x_i(t) , \quad \text{ Equivalent to } \quad P_i(t) = \frac{t_i(x)}{[x_i(t)]^\alpha} \]

- $\alpha$ is a configurable parameter in $[0, \infty)$.
- At time $t$, serve the task with the highest priority $p_i$ (or $P_i$).
  - Randomly choose among equal-priority tasks.
  - Preempt low-priority tasks, if currently been served.
- Can be used in continuous time (theory) or in discrete time (practice).
Why PBS?

- Tunable: Parameter $\alpha$ can be changed from 0 to $\infty$.
  - Emulate well-known policies:
    - $\alpha = 0$: First-come first-serve (FCFS)
    - $\alpha \to \infty$: Least attained service (LAS),
      a.k.a. Foreground-Background Processor-Sharing (FBPS)
    - $\alpha = 1$: Greatest Attained Slowdown (GAS),
      closely emulate Processor-Sharing (PS).
    - $\alpha =$ other values: Hybrid policies.
  - Blind: Using only past information ($t_i, x_i$)
  - Simple: Easy to implement.
  - Dimensionless: Not dependent on scale of time unit (minute, second).

$$P_i = \frac{t_i}{x_i^\alpha}$$

$$P_i = t_i$$

$$P_i \sim \frac{1}{x_i}$$

$$P_i = \frac{t_i}{x_i}$$
Behavior of PBS

An example
- Four tasks in 4 colors
- Arrival time: 0s, 1s, 3s, 5s
- Service: 4.5s, 2.5s, 3s, 2s

How to read the graphs
- X-axis: Time
- Y-axis: CPU utilization per task.
- Area: Service received.
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Properties
Some properties of PBS proved in the paper

- A new task immediately receives service after arrival.
  - Small CPU fraction for $\alpha < 1$
  - Large CPU fraction for $\alpha > 1$.

- **Seniority**: Earlier tasks get more attained service.

- **Time-shared**: CPU may be shared by two or more tasks.
  - **Hospitality**: A new task always gets a CPU share.

- **Convergence**: Converge to PS in a long run for long jobs.
  - Converge to DPS with an offset to $\log$ formula,

- **No Starvation**: Priority values of temporarily blocked tasks increase towards infinity, and will become highest-priority task.
  - For $\alpha$ close to 0 (FCFS) or $\infty$ (LAS), tasks may be blocked for a long time.
PBS Tunability: A Graphical Conclusion

PBS is monotonic in many aspects

- Guidelines for tuning $\alpha$ manually.

Monotonicity of PBS with respect to $\alpha$ in terms of ...

- Mean response time for DHR
- Mean response time for IHR
- Starvation
- Slowdown Fairness
- Seniority Fairness
- Attained Service Fairness (Variability)
- Service Interruption
- Responsiveness
- Preference to Small Tasks
Implementation in Linux Kernel

CPU utilization measurement

- Discrete time implementation in Linux 2.6.15.
- 50ms moving average of measured CPU utilization per task.
- Measurement results are close to simulation results.
- Difference is the roughness on small time scales.

(Measured in Modified Linux System)
Emulating Existing Linux Scheduler

A small tweak

- Add a bonus priority $\gamma$ to the current task in order to limit context switch.
- With $\alpha = 2$ and $\gamma = 0.07$, PBS looks close to Linux native scheduler.

(Time: seconds)
Experimental model

A closed model

- A fixed number of users.
- Each user submits a task after thinking.
- Exponentially distributed thinking time.
- Response time of every task is measured.
Experimental Results (Set A)

- Computational tasks with almost deterministic CPU usage.
- About 3-second processing for each task.
- 8 users, 25s average thinking time.

For this work load,
- small $\alpha$ works best.
- PBS ($\alpha < 0.7$) outperforms Linux and Round-robin.
Experimental Results (Set B) (1/2)

- Apache web server 2.0, dynamic pages with heavy processing.
- Overloaded with 30 users, 10s average thinking time.
- Processing time is heavy-tailed.

For this workload,
- big $\alpha$ works best.
- PBS ($\alpha > 2$) outperforms Linux and Round-robin.

Conclusion
- Different $\alpha$’s are better for different workloads.
Experimental Results (Set B) (2/2)

- Apache web server 2.0, dynamic pages with heavy processing.
- Overloaded with 30 users, 10s average thinking time.
- Processing time is heavy-tailed.

![Graph showing Mean response time of small tasks vs Policy Parameter (α)]
Data center
Data center fabric: A giant switch

DC Fabric: Just a Giant Switch
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Objective?

Minimize avg FCT

DC transport = Flow scheduling on giant switch

TX

RX

ingress & egress capacity constraints

Goal: Complete Flows Quickly
- Requires scheduling flows such that:
  - High throughput for large flows
  - Fabric latency (no queuing delays) for small flows

Prior work: use rate control to schedule flows
- vastly improve performance, but complex
### pFabric in one slide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pFabric Packets</th>
<th>Packets carry a single priority number, e.g., ( \text{prio} = \text{remaining flow size} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| pFabric Switches| Very small buffers (20-30KB for 10Gbps fabric)  
Send highest priority / drop lowest priority pkts |
| pFabric Hosts   | Send/retransmit aggressively  
Minimal rate control: just prevent congestion collapse |
**Priority Scheduling**

send highest priority packet first

**Priority Dropping**

drop lowest priority packets first

\[ \text{prio} = \text{remaining flow size} \]

small “bag” of packets per-port
Figure 14: Overall average FCT for different priority assignment schemes. Note the different y-axis range in these plots.
Summary of results

- SJF and SRPT achieve nearly equal performance (for large flows $\text{SRPT} \approx 15\%$ better than SJF).
- LAS (BytesSent) for DataMining nearly as good as optimal/SRPT, for WebSearch performance breaks down at high load.
- Many jobs of similar sizes keep getting pre-empted at high loads, until the new job “catches up”, and then it starts again.

Tradeoffs

- SJF/SRPT work across workload distributions, but require Job Size information
  - Job size often not available ahead of time
- LAS requires no job size information, but doesn’t work well with non-heavytailed job size distributions.
- PBS can achieve balance with right $\alpha$
Homa: Practical Low Latency Datacenter Transport (Sigcomm 2018)

**Congestion At The Edge**

- No persistent congestion in the core
Approach and Performance
Schedule messages in shortest-remaining-first order (SRPT)
Near-optimal average latency & good tail latency for short messages

Key Ideas
- Receiver-driven congestion control and packet scheduling
- Reduce buffer occupancy & improve latency
- Use of network priorities dynamically assigned by receivers
- Bypass queues for short messages
- Controlled overcommitment on receivers downlink
- Avoid bandwidth waste, leads to high bandwidth utilization
Homa mechanism

**SRPT to schedule packets**

- Homa receivers schedule incoming packets: one grant per packet
- Problem: 1 RTT additional latency for scheduling (size unknown)
- Solution: Transmit 1 RTT of packets per message blindly

**PBS for Homa**

- No need to know size of flows
- First packet has natural high priority (unless \( \alpha = 0 \))
Conclusion
Conclusion and Future Work

Contributions

- We introduce a novel configurable policy, PBS.
- By varying the single parameter, we can tune for various performance and fairness requirements.
- Demonstrate properties and advantages of PBS by analysis, simulations, implementation, and experiments.

Current/Future work

- Closed form of mean response time in $M/G/1$ for any $\alpha$.
- Design an automatic mechanism to dynamically adapt $\alpha$ to workload.
- Implement PBS with Data Center scheduling/transport systems.
- Extend PBS to multi-core systems.
The End