Scheduler Activations

Adopted some slides from www.cs.pdx.edu/~walpole/class/cs533/winter2007/slides/92.ppt
Managing Concurrency Using Threads

- **User-level library**
  - Management in application’s address space
  - High performance and very flexible
  - Lack functionality

- **Operating system kernel**
  - Poor performance (when compared to user-level threads)
  - Poor flexibility
  - High functionality

- **New system: kernel interface combined with user-level thread package**
  - Same functionality as kernel threads
  - Performance and flexibility of user-level threads
User-level Threads

- Thread management routines linked into application
- No kernel intervention == high performance
- Supports customized scheduling algorithms == flexible
- (Virtual) processor blocked during system services == lack of functionality
- I/O, page faults, and multiprogramming cause entire process to block
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- User space
  - Process ("virtual processor")
  - Thread
- Kernel space
  - Runtime system
  - Thread table
  - Process table
Kernel Threads

- No system integration problems (system calls can be blocking calls) == high functionality
- Extra kernel trap and copy and check of all parameters on all thread operations == poor performance
- Kernel schedules thread from same or other address space (process)
- Single, general purpose scheduling algorithm == lack of flexibility
Kernel Threads Supporting User-level Threads

Question: Can we accomplish system integration by implementing user-level threads on top of kernel threads?

Typically one kernel thread per processor (virtual processor)
- User-level thread blocks, so does kernel thread: processor idle
- More kernel threads implicitly results in kernel scheduling of user-level threads
- Increasing communication between kernel and user-level will negate performance and flexibility advantages of using user-level threads

Answer: No

Also:
- No dynamic reallocation of processors among address spaces
- Cannot ensure logical correctness of user-level thread system built on top of kernel threads
Goals (from paper)

- **Functionality**
  - No processor idles when there are ready threads
  - No priority inversion (high priority thread waiting for low priority one) when its ready
  - When a thread blocks, the processor can be used by another thread

- **Performance**
  - Closer to user threads than kernel threads

- **Flexibility**
  - Allow application level customization or even a completely different concurrency model
Problems

- User thread does a blocking call?
  - Application loses a processor!
- Scheduling decisions at user and kernel not coordinated
  - Kernel may de-schedule a thread at a bad time (e.g., while holding a lock)
  - Application may need more or less computing
- Solution?
  - Allow coordination between user and kernel schedulers
Scheduler activations

- Allow user level threads to act like kernel level threads/virtual processors

- Notify user level scheduler of relevant kernel events
  - Like what?

- Provide space in kernel to save context of user thread when kernel stops it
  - E.g., for I/O or to run another application
Kernel upcalls

- New processor available
  - Reaction? Run time picks user thread to use it
- Activation blocked (e.g., for page fault)
  - Reaction? Runtime runs a different thread on the activation
- Activation unblocked
  - Activation now has two contexts
  - Running activation is preempted – why?
- Activation lost processor
  - Context remapped to another activation
- What do these accomplish?
Runtime->Kernel

- Informs kernel when it needs more resources, or when it is giving up some
- Could involve the kernel to preempt low priority threads
  - Only kernel can preempt
- Almost everything else is user level!
  - Performance of user-level, with the advantages of kernel threads!
Virtual Multiprocessor

- Application knows how many and which processors allocated to it by kernel.
- Application has complete control over which threads are running on processors.
- Kernel notifies thread scheduler of events affecting address space.
- Thread scheduler notifies kernel regarding processor allocation.
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Scheduler Activations

- Vessels for running user-level threads
- One scheduler activation per processor assigned to address space.
- Also created by kernel to perform upcall into application’s address space
  - “Scheduler activation has blocked”
  - “Scheduler activation has unblocked”
  - “Add this processor”
  - “Processor has been preempted”

- **Result:** Scheduling decisions made at user-level and application is free to build any concurrency model on top of scheduler activations.
Scheduler activations (2)

Fig. 1. Example: I/O request/completion.
Preemptions in critical sections

- Runtime checks during upcall whether preempted user thread was running in a critical section
  - Continues the user thread using a user level context switch in this case
    - Once lock is released, it switches back to original thread
    - Keep track of critical sections using a hash table of section begin/end addresses
Implementation

• Scheduler activations added to Topaz kernel thread management.
  – Performs upcalls instead of own scheduling.
  – Explicit processor allocation to address spaces.
• Modifications to FastThreads user-level thread package
  – Processing of upcalls.
  – Resume interrupted critical sections.
  – Pass processor allocation information to Topaz.
Performance

• Thread performance without kernel involvement similar to FastThreads before changes.

• Upcall performance significantly worse than Topaz threads.
  – Untuned implementation.
  – Topaz in assembler, this system in Modula-2+.

• Application performance
  – Negligible I/O: As quick as original FastThreads.
  – With I/O: Performs better than either FastThreads or Topaz threads.
Application Performance (negligible I/O)

Fig. 2. Speedup of N-Body application versus number of processors, 100% of memory available.
Application Performance (with I/O)

Fig. 3. Execution time of N-Body application versus amount of available memory, 6 processors.
Discussion

Summary:

- Get user level thread performance but with scheduling abilities of kernel level threads
- Main idea: coordinating user level and kernel level scheduling through scheduler activations

Limitations

- Upcall performance (5x slowdown)
- Performance analysis limited

Connections to exo-kernel/spin/microkernels?