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## Logistics

- Project proposals due today 10pm
- Wednesday - we'll start working on a problem in class in groups. Your assignment 5 is to complete the problem
- Next Monday (4/3): working session (instead of $4 / 12$ )


## Today

- Scheduling principles and algorithms


## Preemptible vs. Non-preemptible

- A preemptible resource can be taken away and used for something else
- E.g., a GPU
- A preemptible resource is shared through explicit scheduling
- A non-preemptible resource cannot be taken away without acknowledgement
- E.g., GPU memory
- A non-preemptible resource is shared through allocations and deallocations


## Scheduler

- A scheduler is a high-level policy to decide which jobs to run when
- It is not responsible for the details of context-switching


## When Does a Scheduler Run?

- A scheduler runs when a job changes state
- Let's first consider a job that cannot be preempted - once it starts, it runs until completion
- In this case, the scheduler will only make a decision once the job finishes


## Jobs

- For now, we will think of ML jobs at discrete, e.g., run ResNet50 on these 1000 images with a batch size of 16
- Reality: if processing video, you might also have to think about how to make discrete jobs when frames arrive continually
- There are often several (tens of) models trying to run jobs on a single GPU


## Metrics

- What makes a scheduling policy "good"?


## Metrics

- Minimize waiting time and response time
- Don't have jobs waiting too long to start
- Maximize GPU utilization
- Don't have idle GPU
- Maximize throughput
- Complete as many jobs as possible
- Fairness
- Try to give each process a similar percentage of the GPU


## First Come First Serve (FCFS)

- The simplest form of scheduling
- GPU runs ML jobs in the order they arrived



## A Gantt Chart Illustrates the Schedule

| Process | Arrival Time | Burst Time |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| P1 | 0 | 7 |
| P2 | 0 | 4 |
| P3 | 0 | 1 |
| P4 | 0 | 4 |

Assume they arrive in the order P1 -> P2 -> P3 -> P4. What is the average waiting time?
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## Different Arrival Order?

| Process | Arrival Time | Burst Time |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| P1 | 0 | 7 |
| P2 | 0 | 4 |
| P3 | 0 | 1 |
| P4 | 0 | 4 |

Assume they arrive in the order P3 -> P2 -> P4 -> P1. What is the average waiting time?
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## Shortest Job First

- Slight tweak to FCFS
- Always schedule the job with the shortest burst time first


## Shortest Job First

| Process | Arrival Time | Burst Time |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| P1 | 0 | 7 |
| P2 | 2 | 4 |
| P3 | 4 | 1 |
| P4 | 5 | 4 |



## Shortest Job First

| Process | Arrival Time | Burst Time |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| P1 | 0 | 7 |
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## Shortest Job First (SJF)

| Process | Arrival Time | Burst Time |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| P1 | 0 | 7 |
| P2 | 2 | 4 |
| P3 | 4 | 1 |
| P4 | 5 | 4 |



Is this always a good idea?

## Is this always a good idea?

- You sometimes won't know exactly how long a process takes
- If you've run the model before, you'll probably have some idea
- You might starve longer jobs (they may never execute) -> not good for fairness


## Adding preemptions

| Process | Arrival Time | Burst Time |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| P1 | 0 | 7 |
| P2 | 2 | 4 |
| P3 | 4 | 1 |
| P4 | 5 | 4 |

## Shortest Remaining Time First (SRTF)

| Process | Arrival Time | Burst Time |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| P1 | 0 | 7 |
| P2 | 2 | 4 |
| P3 | 4 | 1 |
| P4 | 5 | 4 |

Further reduces average waiting time


## Round-Robin

- So far we haven't handled fairness (it's a tradeoff with the others)
- Scheduler divides time into slots (also called quanta, individual: quantum)
- Maintain a FCFS queue
- Preempt if still running and re-add to queue


## Round-Robin: Quantum = 3

| Process | Arrival Time | Burst Time |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| P1 | 0 | 7 |
| P2 | 2 | 4 |
| P3 | 4 | 1 |
| P4 | 5 | 4 |
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## Round-Robin: Quantum = 3



Number of context switches?
Average wait time?
Average response time?

Note on ties: if a new job is added exactly when one is preempted, favor the new one

## Round-Robin: Quantum = 3

| Process | Arrival Time | Burst Time |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| P1 | 0 | 7 |
| P2 | 2 | 4 |
| P3 | 4 | 1 |
| P4 | 5 | 4 |



Number of context switches: 7
Average wait time: 7
Average response time: 2.75

## Round-Robin: Quantum = 1

| Process | Arrival Time | Burst Time |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| P1 | 0 | 7 |
| P2 | 2 | 4 |
| P3 | 4 | 1 |
| P4 | 5 | 4 |



Number of context switches?
Average wait time?
Average response time?

## Round-Robin: Quantum = 10

| Process | Arrival Time | Burst Time |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| P1 | 0 | 7 |
| P2 | 2 | 4 |
| P3 | 4 | 1 |
| P4 | 5 | 4 |



Number of context switches?
Average wait time?
Average response time?

## Round-Robin Performance

- Depends on job length and quantum length
- Quantum length too low -> too many context switches
- Quantum length too high -> FCFS (high response time)
- Poor average waiting time when jobs are similar in length
- It is fair!


## Next Time

- We'll start writing code to implement these scheduling policies, which will be part of your assignment
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