Dynamic Processor Allocation for Adaptively Parallel Jobs

What is the problem?





[sidsen@ygg ~]\$./nfib —nproc 32

[bradley@ygg ~]\$./nfib --nproc 16



Allocate the processors fairly and efficiently



Why so Dynamic Scheduling?

- Considers all the jobs in the system.
- Programmer doesn't have to specify the number of processors.

[kunal@ygg ~]\$./strassen --nproc 4

Parallelism can change during execution.



Allocation vs. Scheduling



Terminology

The parallelism of a job is dynamic

- adaptively parallel jobs—jobs for which the number of processors that can be used without waste varies during execution.
- At any given time, each job *j* has a
 - □ desire—the maximum number of efficiently usable processors, or the parallelism of the job (d_i) .
 - □ *allocation*—the number of processors allotted to the job (a_j) .

Terminology

- We want to allocate processors to jobs in a way that is
 - fair—whenever a job receives fewer processors than it desires, all other jobs receive at most one more processor than this job received.

• $a_j < d_j \Rightarrow (a_j + 1)$ is a max

efficient—no job receives more processors than it desires, and we use as many processors as possible.

- $\forall j a_j \leq d_j$
- $\exists j a_j < d_j \Rightarrow$ there are no free processors

Overall Goal

Design and implement a *fair* and *efficient* dynamic processor *allocation* system for *adaptively parallel jobs*.

Example: Fair and Efficient Allocation



Assumptions

- All jobs are Cilk jobs.
- Jobs can enter and leave the system at will.
- All jobs are mutually trusting, in that they will
 - □ stay within the bounds of their allocations.
 - □ communicate their desires honestly.
- Each job has at least one processor.
- Jobs have some amount of time to reach their allocations.



High-Level Sequence of Events



Main Algorithms

- (1, 2) Dynamically estimate the current desire of a job.
 - Steal rate (Bin Song)
 - ✓ Number of threads in ready deque
- (3) Dynamically determine the allotment for each job such that the resulting allocation is fair and efficient.
 - SRLBA algorithm (Bin Song)
 - Global allocation algorithm
- (4, 5) Converge to the granted allocation by increasing/decreasing number of processors in use.
 - ✓ While work-stealing?
 - Periodically by a background thread?



Desire Estimation

 (1) Estimate processor desire d_j: add up the number of threads in the ready deques of each processor and divide by a constant.



k > 3

(2) Report the desire to the processor allocation system.



Adjusting the Allocation

- (4) Get the allocation a_{new} .
- **(**5) Adjust the allocation.
 - □ If $a_{new} < a_{old}$, remove $(a_{old} a_{new})$ processors
 - □ If $a_{new} > a_{old}$, add $(a_{new} a_{old})$ processors



Implementation Details

- Adding up the number of threads in the ready deques
 - While work-stealing

- Too late!
- Periodically by a background thread
- Removing processors
 - While work-stealing
 - Periodically by a background thread
- Adding processors
 - While work-stealing
 - Periodically by a background thread
- Bad idea

Complicated





Job 2 *decreases* desire.



Job 1 *decreases* desire.



Job 2 *Increases* desire.



Job 1 *Increases* desire.



Implementation Details

min_depr_a max_allo			
Job Id:1	Job Id:2	Job Id:3	
Desire:6	Desire:2	Desire:7	
Alloc:4	Alloc:2	Alloc:5	

- When desire of job j decreases: if (new_desire<alloc)</p>
 - □ take processors from *j* and give to jobs having *min_depr_alloc*.

mda=4

ma=**§**

Job 1 decreases desire.



Implementation

min_depr_a max_allo			
Job Id:1	Job Id:2	Job Id:3	
Desire:6	Desire:2	Desire:7	
Alloc:4	Alloc:2	Alloc:5	

When desire of job j decreases: if (new_desire<alloc)</p>

- take processors from *j* and give to jobs having *min_depr_alloc*.
- When desire of job j increases: if (alloc<mda)</p>
 - take processors from jobs having max_alloc and give them to j until j reaches min_depr_alloc or new_desire.

mda=4



Experiments

Correctness: Does it work?

Effectiveness: Are there cases where it is better than the static allocation?

Responsiveness: How long does it take the jobs to reach their allocation?

Conclusions

- The desire estimation and processor allocation algorithms are simple and easy to implement.
- We'll see how well they do in practice once we've performed the experiments.
- There are many ways of improving the algorithms and in many cases it is not clear what we should do.

Job Tasks (Extensions)

- Incorporate heuristics on stealrate (Bin Song's idea).
- Remove processors in the background thread, not while work stealing.
 - Need a mechanism for putting processors with pending work to sleep
 - When adding processors, wake up processors with pending work first



Processor Allocation System (Extensions)

Use a sorted data structure for job entries.

- Sort by desires
- □ Sort by allocations
- □ Group jobs:
 - Desires satisfied $(a_i = d_i)$
 - Minimum deprived allocation (a_j = min_depr_alloc)
 - Maximum allocation (a_j = max_alloc)
- Need fast inserts/deletes and fast sequential walk.



Processor Allocation System (Extensions)

- Rethink definitions of fairness and efficiency.
 Incorporate histories of processor usage for each job
 Implement a mechanism for assigning different priorities to users or jobs
- Move the processor allocation system into the kernel.
 - Jobs still report desires since they know best
 - □ How to group the jobs?
 - Make classes of jobs (Cilk, Emacs, etc.)
 - Group by user (sidsen, kunal, etc.)

