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Read: A&D Ch 8
Goals for Today

• Finish up discussion of highly concurrent systems

• Start exploring OS memory management
Recall: Little’s Law

• The number of “things” in a system is equal to the bandwidth times the latency (on average)

\[ n = L B \]

• Applies to any stable system (arrival rate = departure rate)

• Can be applied to an entire system:
  • Including the queues, the processing stages, parallelism, whatever

• Or to just one processing stage:
  • i.e., disk I/O subsystem, queue leading into a CPU or I/O stage, ...
Recall: Simple Systems Performance Model

Request Rate: $\lambda$

Queuing delay: $d$

Operation Time: $t$

Service Rate: $\mu$

Latency ($L$)

The maximum service rate $\mu_{\text{max}}$ is a property of the system – the “bottleneck”

Utilization: $\rho = \frac{\lambda}{\mu_{\text{max}}}$
Recall: Ideal System Performance

• How does \( \mu \) (service rate) vary with \( \lambda \) (request rate)?

![Graph showing the relationship between request rate and service rate with \( \mu_{\text{max}} \) as the asymptotic peak rate.]

Request Rate (\( \lambda \)) - “offered load”

Service Rate (\( \mu \)) - “delivered load”

\( \mu_{\text{max}} \)
Recall: A Bursty World

- $T_A$: time between arrivals
  - Now, a random variable
- $T_S$: service time
  - $\mu = \frac{k}{T_S}$
- $T_Q$: queuing time
  - $L = T_Q + T_S$

- Requests arrive in a burst, must queue up until served
- Same average arrival time, but almost all of the requests experience large queue delays (even though average utilization is low)
Recall: Little’s Law Applied to a Queue

• Before, we had $n = LB$ (for a stable system):
  • $B$: bandwidth
  • $L$: latency
  • $n$: number of operations in the system

• When applied to a queue, we get:

  \[ L_Q = \lambda T_Q \]

  - Average length of the queue
  - Average Arrival Rate
  - Average time “waiting”
Recall: Some Results from Queuing Theory

- Assumptions: system in equilibrium, no limit to the queue, time between successive arrivals is random and memoryless

\[ \lambda: \text{arrival rate} \]
\[ T_S: \text{mean time to service a customer} \]
\[ C: \text{squared coefficient of variance} \left( \frac{\sigma^2}{T_S^2} \right) \]

\[ \mu: \text{service rate} \left( \frac{1}{T_S} \right) \]
\[ \rho: \text{utilization} \left( \frac{\lambda}{\mu} \right) \]
Recall: Some Results from Queuing Theory

• Memoryless service distribution ($C = 1$)—an “M/M/1 queue”:
  \[ L_Q = \frac{\rho}{1-\rho} \]

• General service distribution (no restrictions)—an “M/G/1 queue”:
  \[ L_Q = \frac{1+C}{2} \cdot \frac{\rho}{1-\rho} \]

• $\lambda$: arrival rate
• $T_S$: mean time to service a customer
• $C$: squared coefficient of variance ($\sigma^2/T_S^2$)

• $\mu$: service rate ($1/T_S$)
• $\rho$: utilization ($\lambda/\mu$)
Ideal System Performance

- **Request Rate (\(\lambda\))** - "offered load"
- **Service Rate (\(\mu\))** - "delivered load"

**Latency (\(\lambda\))**

**Operation Time**

"Half-Power Point" : load at which system delivers half of peak performance
- Design and provision systems to operate roughly in this regime
- Latency low and predictable, utilization good: ~50%

- \(T_Q \sim \frac{\rho}{1-\rho}\)
- \(\rho = \frac{\lambda}{\mu_{max}}\)
- Why does latency blow up as we approach 100% utilization?
  - Queue builds up on each burst
  - But very rarely (or never) gets a chance to drain
Do real systems really hit a wall as utilization approaches 100%?

Open System

Closed System
Closed System

• Clients generating the load depend on completion of previous requests
  • Request-response protocols
  • Humans in-the-loop waiting for results

• Model of client: \{request, wait\}+ repeat
  • Request rate determined by length of wait

• In closed system, wait time depends on response time (latency = operation time + queuing delay)

• As system saturates (utilization → 100%) delay increases, request rate is limited by service rate
  • Queueing smooths bursts, but does not grow unbounded due to rate mismatch
What Causes Systems to Close?

• Protocols are designed to have self-limited behavior
  • Request-response, bounded number of outstanding requests per client

• Underlying system induces “back pressure” even if higher level services and applications don’t
  • Bounded size queues (not just because of memory size)
  • What happens when it fills up?
Queuing Theory Resources

• Queuing theory resources are available on the “Resources” section of the course website
Recall: Well-Conditioned Systems

- A system that behaves this way is well-conditioned
  - Delivered load increases with offered load until pipeline saturates
  - As offered load increases further, throughput remains high

Request Rate ($\lambda$) - “offered load”

Service Rate ($\mu$) - “delivered load”

$\mu_{max}$

Asymptotic peak rate
Recall: Non-Well-Conditioned Systems

• A server that spawns a new pthread per request is *not* well-conditioned!

• Figure from SEDA Section 2 reading (Welsh 2001)

Figure 2: Threaded server throughput degradation: This benchmark measures a simple threaded server which creates a single thread for each task in the
Building Well-Conditioned Systems

• Spawning a new thread or process for each request is not well-conditioned

• Too many threads is bad
  • Scheduling overhead becomes large
  • Context switch overhead becomes large
    • E.g., Poor cache performance
  • Synchronization overhead becomes large
    • E.g., Lock contention

• Was our original (v1) server well-conditioned?
  • The one that handles requests one at a time, with no concurrency?
Concurrent, Well-Conditioned Systems

1. Thread Pools
2. User-Mode Threads
3. Event-Driven Execution
Thread Pools

• Key idea: limit the number of threads
  • Before throughput starts to degrade
• Instead, allocate a bounded “pool” of worker threads, representing the maximum level of multiprogramming
Thread Pools

master() {
    allocThreads(worker, queue);
    while(TRUE) {
        con=AcceptCon();
        Enqueue(queue, con);
    }
}

worker(queue) {
    while(TRUE) {
        // Blocks if empty
        Dequeue(queue);
        ServiceWebPage(con);
    }
}
Highly Concurrent Well-Conditioned Systems

• Thread pools work well, but they somewhat limit concurrency

• Is there a good alternative?
We’ve Looked At: Kernel-Supported Threads

- Threads run and block (e.g., on I/O) independently
- One process may have multiple threads waiting on different things
- Two mode switches for every context switch (expensive)
- Create threads with syscalls

- Alternative: multiplex several streams of execution (at user level) on top of a single OS thread
  - E.g., Java, Go, ... (and many many user-level threads libraries before it)
User-Mode Threads

• User program contains its own scheduler
• Several user threads per kernel thread
• User threads may be scheduled non-preemptively
  • Only switch on yield
• Context switches cheaper
  • Copy registers and jump (switch in userspace)
Thread Yield

Kernel-Supported Threads

- ComputePI
- yield (syscall)
- kernel_yield
- run_new_kernel_thread
- switch

Trap to OS (Expensive)

Stack growth

User-Mode Threads

- ComputePI
- yield
- run_new_user_thread
- switch

Library Function Call (Cheap)

Stack growth
Thread I/O

Kernel-Supported Threads

- CopyFile
  - read
  - kernel_read
  - run_new_thread
  - switch

User-Mode Threads

- CopyFile
  - read
  - kernel_read
  - run_new_thread
  - switch

- Trap to OS
- Stack growth

• Selects a new kernel thread to run
• Bypassing user-level scheduler
User-Mode Threads: Problems

• One user-level thread blocks on I/O: they all do
  • Kernel cannot adjust scheduling among threads it doesn’t know about

• Multiple Cores?

• Can’t completely avoid blocking (syscalls, page fault)

• One Solution: *Scheduler Activations*
  • Have kernel inform user-level scheduler when a thread blocks
  • Evolving the contract between OS and application

• Alternative Solution: Language Support?
  • Make the scheduler aware of the blocking operation
Go Goroutines

• Goroutines are lightweight, user-level threads
  • Scheduling not preemptive (relies on goroutines to yield)
  • Yield statements inserted by compiler

• Advantages relative to regular threads (e.g., pthreads)
  • More lightweight
  • Faster context-switch time

• Disadvantages
  • Less sophisticated scheduling at the user-level
  • OS is not aware of user-level threads
Go User-Level Scheduler

Why this approach?

• 1 OS (kernel-supported) thread per CPU core: allows go program to achieve *parallelism* not just *concurrency*
  • Fewer OS threads? Not utilizing all CPUs
  • More OS threads? No additional benefit
    • We’ll see one exception to this involving syscalls

• Keep goroutine on same OS thread: *affinity*, nice for caching and performance
Go User-Level Thread Scheduler

- Why not just have a single global run queue?
Dealing with Blocking Syscalls

- What if a goroutine wants to make a blocking syscall?
  - Example: File I/O
Dealing with Blocking Syscalls

• What if a goroutine wants to make a blocking syscall?
  • Example: File I/O

• While syscall is blocking, allocate new OS thread (M2)
  • M1 is blocked by kernel, M2 lets us continue using CPU
Dealing with Blocking Syscalls

- Syscall completes: Put invoking goroutine back on queue
- Keep M1 around in a spare pool
- Swap it with M2 upon next syscall, no need to pay thread creation cost
Recall: Motivation for Threads

- Operating systems must handle multiple things at once (MTAO)
  - Processes, interrupts, background system maintenance
- Networked servers must handle MTAO
  - Multiple connections handled simultaneously
- Parallel programs must handle MTAO
  - To achieve better performance
- Programs with user interface often must handle MTAO
  - To achieve user responsiveness while doing computation
- Network and disk bound programs must handle MTAO
  - To hide network/disk latency
  - Sequence steps in access or communication
Recall: Threads Allow Handling MTAO

• Threads are a unit of *concurrency* provided by the OS
• Each thread can represent one thing or one task
Event-Driven Execution

• Allows a system to handle MTAO with a single thread
  • Very lightweight

• Key idea: juggle different tasks within a single thread
  • All tasks’ CPU bursts execute within a single thread
  • I/O bursts for each task happen in the background without a backing thread
Event-Driven Server Concept

while (true) {
    int task_id = <wait for task to become ready>
    <look up state for task_id>
    <execute next CPU burst for the task>
    if (task is done) {
        <forget state for task_id>
        continue;
    }
    <issue task’s next I/O operation>
    <update state for task_id>
}
How to “Issue Task’s Next I/O Operation”?

• So far, we’ve seen read and write, which block the calling thread

• We can put file descriptors into non-blocking mode
  • read: Just return whatever data is available
  • write: Just write whatever the kernel can buffer in its memory for now
  • So read/write calls may not read or write anything

• How to wait for the next task to become ready
How to “Wait for Task to Become Ready”?

• POSIX provides a way to wait for one of several files to have data available
  • Select/poll system calls
  • Provide a list of file descriptors
  • Blocks until at least one has “ready” data, then returns which ones do
  • Mixes well with non-blocking I/O, especially sockets
Alternative Asynchronous I/O APIs

• Unfortunately, non-blocking mode and select/poll don’t work well with regular files

• Instead: there’s the asynchronous I/O interface
  • io_submit issues a disk I/O
  • io_getevents syscall reaps completion of disk I/Os issued with io_submit

• Newer, better APIs still emerging (e.g., io_uring)
while (true) {
    int task_id = <wait for task to become ready>
    <look up state for task_id>
    <execute next CPU burst for the task>
    if (task is done) {
        <forget state for task_id>
        continue;
    }
    <issue task’s next I/O operation>
    <update state for task_id>
}
User-Mode Scheduler Based on Event Loop

• User-mode scheduler can be an event-loop

• User threads use I/O library that issues async I/O operations

• Now user-mode scheduler can properly suspend the thread...

• But only works for I/O operations for which the kernel supports an asynchronous interface
User-Mode Scheduling vs. Event Loops

• In user-mode scheduling:
  • You’re still maintaining a separate **stack** for each thread
  • Must save PC, stack, registers when switching
  • Even if you use async I/O operations to properly suspend the user thread

• In pure event-driven scheduling:
  • All events execute in the same stack
  • All state to resume each task (e.g., which stage we’re at) must be stored explicitly
Final Word on Scheduling

• When do the details of the scheduling policy and fairness really matter?

• When should you simply buy a faster computer?
  • One approach: Buy it when it will pay for itself in improved response time
    • Perhaps you’re paying for worse response time in reduced productivity, customer angst, etc...
    • Might think that you should buy a faster X when X is utilized 100%, but usually, response time goes to infinity as utilization→100%

• An interesting implication of this curve:
  • Most scheduling algorithms work fine in the “linear” portion of the load curve, fail otherwise
  • Argues for buying a faster X when hit “knee” of curve
Announcements

• Congrats on finishing Project 1!

• Project 2 is released today
  • Design documents due on Monday

• Homework 3 is due on Friday

• Quiz 2 is on Monday
  • Covers everything up to this slide
Next Objective

• Dive deeper into the concepts and mechanisms of memory sharing and address translation

• Enabler of many key aspects of operating systems
  • Protection
  • Multi-programming
  • Isolation
  • Memory resource management
  • I/O efficiency
  • Sharing
  • Inter-process communication
  • Debugging
  • Demand paging
Recall: Four Fundamental OS Concepts

• **Thread: Execution Context**  
  • Program Counter, Registers, Execution Flags, Stack

• **Address Space (with Translation)**  
  • Program’s view of memory is distinct from physical machine

• **Process: Instance of a Running Program**  
  • Address space + one or more threads + ...

• **Dual-Mode Operation and Protection**  
  • Only the “system” can access certain resources  
  • Combined with translation, isolates programs from each other
Key OS Concept: Address Space

• Program operates in an address space that is distinct from the physical memory space of the machine

![Diagram showing the relationship between Processor, Translator, and Memory with address ranges 0x000... to 0xFFFF...]
Recall: Address Space

• Definition: **Set of accessible addresses and the state associated with them**
  • $2^{32} = \sim 4$ billion on a 32-bit machine

• What happens when you read or write to an address?
  • Perhaps acts like regular memory
  • Perhaps causes I/O operation
    • (Memory-mapped I/O)
  • Causes program to abort (segfault)?
  • Communicate with another program
  • ...

```
0x000...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Static Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stack</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0xFFF...
```
Recall: Typical Address Space Structure
Recall: Single and Multithreaded Processes

- Threads encapsulate concurrency
  - “Active” component
- Address space encapsulate protection:
  - “Passive” component
  - Keeps bugs from crashing the entire system
- Why have multiple threads per address space?
Important Aspects of Memory Multiplexing

• Protection
  • Prevent access to private memory of other process or kernel

• Translation
  • Gives uniform view of memory to programs
  • Allows for efficient “tricks”
    • E.g., in implementation of fork()

• Controlled Overlap
  • Read-only data, execute-only shared libraries
  • Inter-process communication
Alternative View: Interposing on Process Behavior

- OS interposes on process’ I/O operations
  - How? All I/O happens via syscalls.

- OS interposes on process’ CPU usage
  - How? Interrupt lets OS preempt current thread

- **Question: How can the OS interpose on process’ memory accesses?**
  - Too slow for the OS to interpose *every* memory access
  - Translation: hardware support to accelerate the common case
  - Page fault: uncommon cases trap to the OS to handle
From Program to Process

- Preparation of a program for execution involves components at:
  - Compile time (i.e., “gcc”)
  - Link/Load time (UNIX “ld” does link)
  - Execution time (e.g., dynamic libs)

- Addresses can be bound to final values anywhere in this path
  - Depends on hardware support
  - Also depends on operating system

- Dynamic Libraries
  - Linking postponed until execution
  - Small piece of code (i.e. the *stub*), locates appropriate memory-resident library routine
  - Stub replaces itself with the address of the routine, and executes routine
Uniprogramming: One Process at a Time

- No Translation or Protection
  - Application always runs at same place in physical memory since only one application at a time
  - Application can access any physical address
  - Application given illusion of dedicated machine by giving it reality of a dedicated machine
Primitive Multiprogramming

- Multiprogramming without Translation or Protection
- Use Loader/Linker: Adjust addresses while program loaded into memory (loads, stores, jumps)
  - Everything adjusted to memory location where OS put program
  - Translation done by a linker-loader (relocation)
- No protection!
Multiprogramming with Protection

- Can we protect programs from each other without translation?
  - Yes: Base and Bound!
  - Used by, e.g., Cray-1 supercomputer
Recall: Base and Bound (no Translation)

- Requires relocation
- Can the program touch OS?
- Can it touch other programs?
General Translation

• Two views of memory:
  • View from the CPU (what program sees, virtual memory)
  • View from memory (physical memory)
  • Hardware translator (Memory Management Unit or MMU) converts between the two views

• With translation, every program can be linked/loaded into same region of user address space
Recall: Base and Bound (with Translation)

- Can the program touch OS?
- Can it touch other programs?
- Fragmentation still an issue!
Issues with Simple Base and Bound

- Fragmentation problem over time
- No support for sparse address space
- Hard to do interprocess sharing
  - E.g., to share code
Segmentation

- Program’s view of memory: multiple separate segments
- Each segment is given a region of contiguous memory
  - Has a base and limit
- Memory address consists of segment ID and offset
Hardware Support for Segmentation

- Segment map resides in processor
  - Segment number mapped to base/bound pair (for translation)
- Each entry corresponds to a chunk of physical memory
  - Segment addressed by portion of virtual address
  - However, could be included in instruction instead:
    - x86 Example: mov [es:bx],ax.
- What is “V/N” (valid / not valid)?
  - Can mark segments as invalid; requires check as well
• Segmentation can’t be just “turned off”
• What if we just want to use paging?
  • Set base and bound to all of memory, in all segments
Example: Four Segments

Virtual Address Format:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seg ID #</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 (code)</td>
<td>0x4000</td>
<td>0x0800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (data)</td>
<td>0x4800</td>
<td>0x1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (shared)</td>
<td>0xF000</td>
<td>0x1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (stack)</td>
<td>0x0000</td>
<td>0x3000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Virtual Address Space

Physical Address Space

Seg ID = 0

Seg ID = 1

Might be shared

Space for Other Apps

Shared with Other Apps
Observations about Segmentation

• Translation on *every* instruction fetch, load or store
• Virtual address space has holes
  • Segmentation efficient for sparse address spaces
• When it is OK to address outside valid range?
  • This is how the stack (and heap?) allowed to grow
  • For instance, stack takes fault, system automatically increases size of stack
• Need protection mode in segment table
  • For example, code segment would be read-only
  • Data and stack would be read-write (stores allowed)
• What must be saved/restored on context switch?
  • Segment table stored in CPU, not in memory (small)
  • Might store all of processes memory onto disk when switched (called "swapping")
What if not all segments fit in memory?

- Extreme form of Context Switch: Swapping
  - In order to make room for next process, some or all of the previous process is moved to disk
    - Likely need to send out complete segments
  - This greatly increases the cost of context-switching
- What might be a desirable alternative?
  - Some way to keep only active portions of a process in memory at any one time
  - Need finer granularity control over physical memory
Problems with Segmentation

• Must fit variable-sized chunks into physical memory

• May move processes multiple times to fit everything

• Limited options for swapping to disk

• Fragmentation: wasted space
  • External: free gaps between allocated chunks
  • Internal: don’t need all memory within allocated chunks