Hard Real-time Scheduling for Parallel Run-time Systems

Peter Dinda Xiaoyang Wang Jinghang Wang Chris Beauchene Conor Hetland

> Prescience Lab Department of EECS Northwestern University

> > pdinda.org presciencelab.org



Paper in a Nutshell

- HPC node OS as an RTOS
 - Isolation in time-shared environment
 - Resource control with commensurate performance
 - Coordination via time instead of via synchronization
 - Barrier removal example
- Hard real-time threads in Nautilus kernel
 - Despite x64
 - ~10 us resolution (Xeon Phi KNL)
- Thread group scheduling and coordination
 - ~3 us synchronization for 255 threads (Phi)
- Publicly available codebase

Outline

- Motivation
 - Prior work on soft RT scheduling of distributed machines
 - Modern machines and interesting runtimes
- What is hard real-time?
 - Liu model
- Implementation in Nautilus
 - Threads
 - Groups
- Performance evaluation
 - Limits (mostly on KNL)
 - Fine-grain BSP benchmark
- Conclusions and future work

Experiences with Soft Real-time

- VSched soft RT scheduler extension for Linux
- Consolidation of interactive and batch VMs
- Time-sharing of distributed memory parallel applications on a cluster with performance isolation and control
 - Coordinated scheduling (i.e., gang scheduling based on time) so BSP applications achieve resource-commensurate performance

B. Lin, P. Dinda, VSched: Mixing Batch and Interactive Virtual Machines Using Periodic Real-time Scheduling, SC 2005 B. Lin, A. Sundararaj, P. Dinda, Time-sharing Parallel Applications Through Performance-targeted Feedback-controlled Real-time Scheduling, Cluster Computing, 11:3, 2008; ICAC 2007, patent application

Can This Apply Within a Node?

- Increasingly interesting target

 Growing CPU count: Phi now at 256; NUMA, ...
- OS noise concerns continue
- Much finer granularity scheduling and coordination needed
 - OpenMP loops and tasking
 - NESL VCODE model (abstract vector machine)
- New opportunity: substitute timing for synchronization
 - Example: potential barrier removal

What is Hard Real-time?

- Formal admission control process
 - Based on work and deadlines
 - Scheduler can say no
- Scheduler engine guarantees all deadlines
- Limitations
 - Scheduler overheads
 - Context switch overheads
- Our system: threads on a NUMA node

What is Hard Real-time?

- Aperiodic threads
 - Have priority
 - Always admitted
- Periodic threads



- Phase, period, slice (deadline=period)
- Selective admission (RMA tests)
- Sporadic threads
 - Phase, size, deadline, aperiodic priority
 - Selective admission (EDF tests)

Nautilus as the Basis for an RTOS

- Nautilus: kernel framework for constructing hybrid run-times (HRTs) on x64
 - No userspace, simple address translation, single address space, streamlined primitives, NUMA, ...
 - 15-40% speedup over Linux for Legion run-time
- Particularly salient for an RTOS:
 - No page faults, only capacity TLB misses
 - Deterministic path length in drivers and all core functionality
 - Steerable interrupts

K. Hale, P. Dinda, A Case for Transforming Parallel Runtime Systems Into Operating System Kernels, HPDC 2015
K. Hale, P. Dinda, Enabling Hybrid Parallel Runtimes Through Kernel and Virtualization Support, VEE 2016.
K. Hale, C. Hetland, P. Dinda, Multiverse: Easy Conversion Of Runtime Systems Into OS Kernels Via Automatic Hybridization, ICAC 2017



- ns-resolution time based on cycle counter (ARAT, ConstantTSC)
 - Scheduling interrupts: APIC timer (TSC deadline mode if available) 9

The Curse of Missing Time

- Unaccounted time within kernel itself
 - Scheduler overhead, context switch overhead, etc.
- Deliberate, nondeterministic, unaccounted time due to System Management Interrupts (SMIs)
 - Firmware-level interrupts
 - Higher privilege than kernel or even VMM
 - Cannot be turned off
 - Like an alien abduction from the scheduler's perspective
 - "My clock just jumped forward 10 us!"
- Our approach to both:
 (a) Reservations, (b) Eager Earliest Deadline First

Global (per-node) Scheduler

- Local scheduler coordination via
 - Time (mostly)
 - Interrupts (sparingly)
 - No global locking
- Interrupt steering and segregation
 - Interrupt-free CPUs see only scheduling-related interrupts
 - Interrupt-laden CPUs have careful interrupt control



Group Scheduling

- Local schedulers' clocks synchronized
 - Variance <1000 cycles (<1 us) over 256 CPUs on Phi
- Thread groups and group admission control
 - Main element is admission control done in parallel
 - All or nothing
- Phase correction to coordinate initial thread arrival on all involved local schedulers
- Same constraints on all local schedulers results in gang scheduling of the group of threads
 - Without explicit communication

Local Scheduler Synchronization on Phi



Code Measures

• Scheduler: ~5000 LoC (C)

Also includes work-stealing, thread pools, garbage collection support, and tasks

- Groups and Group Scheduling: ~1000 LoC (C)
- Other changes: ~2000 LoC (C+Assembly)
 - Low-level CPU-state maintenance / context switch
 - Additional thread states
 - Assorted

Test machines

- Phi
 - Supermicro 5038ki ("Colfax KNL Ninja")
 - Intel Xeon Phi 7210 ("Knight's Landing")
 - 64 cores, 4 hardware threads per core
 - 1.3 GHz
 - 16 GB MCDRAM, 96 GB DRAM
 - All throttling/burst behavior disabled in BIOS
- R415
 - Dell R415
 - AMD 4122
 - 2 sockets, 8 cores/threads total,
 - 2.2 GHz
 - 16 GB DRAM
 - All throttling/bust behavior disabled in BIOS

Validation Through External Monitoring



Phi with parallel port attached to oscilloscope period=100us, slice=50us, phase=0

Limits on Phi: ~10us



Controlled Miss Behavior on Phi



Limits on R415: ~4us



Controlled Miss Behavior on R415



Fine-grain BSP Microbenchmark

each thread in group:

for (i=0;i<N;i++) {</pre>

local_compute(granularity)

optional_barrier();

write_to_neighbor(granularity)

```
optional_barrier();
```

}

Barrier overhead grows with shrinking granularity Barriers could be removed if the threads ran in lock-step

Resource Control With Commensurate Performance



Resource Control With Commensurate Performance



23

Fine-grain BSP Microbenchmark

each thread in group:

for (i=0;i<N;i++) {</pre>

local_compute(granularity)

optional_barrier();

write_to_neighbor(granularity)

```
optional_barrier();
```

}

Barrier overhead grows with shrinking granularity Barriers could be removed if the threads ran in lock-step









Related Work

- OS Noise
- Gang scheduling
- Vsched / Coordinated soft RT
 - As in motivation
- Mondragon
- RTVirt
- Tesselation
- Barrelfish
 - Also coordination via time

Ongoing/Future Work

- Further overhead reduction
 - Reduce granularity
- Real-time tasks
- Interrupt-free scheduling
 - Avoid interrupt overheads / Reduce granularity
 - Compiler-based injection of cooperative scheduling calls
- Real-time executive model
 - Scheduling implemented at compile-time as a superloop, as in safety-critical and/or smallest embedded systems
- Custom hardware for scheduling and synchronization

 Intel HARP / FPGA

Paper in a Nutshell

- HPC node OS as an RTOS
 - Isolation in time-shared environment
 - Coordination via time instead of via synchronization
 - Barrier removal example
- Hard real-time threads in Nautilus kernel
 - Despite x64
 - ~10 us resolution (Xeon Phi KNL)
- Thread group scheduling and coordination
 - ~3 us synchronization for 255 threads (Phi)
- Publicly available codebase

For More Information

- Peter Dinda
 - pdinda@northwestern.edu
 - <u>http://pdinda.org</u>
- Codebase available
 - <u>http://v3vee.org</u>
- Prescience Lab
 - <u>http://presciencelab.org</u>
- Acknowledgements
 - NSF, DOE

lab

