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Chapter Overview

- Defining operating systems
- Major functions of an OS
- Types of operating systems
- UNIX
- Kernel organization
What is an operating system?

“What stands between the user and the bare machine”
What is an operating system?

- The *basic* software required to operate a computer.
- Similar role to that of the conductor of an orchestra.
Do not belong to OS

- All *user programs*
- Compilers, spreadsheets, word processors, and so forth
- Most utility programs
  - `mkdir` is a user program calling `mkdir()`
- The *command language interpreter*
  - Anyone can write his/her UNIX shell
The UNIX shells

- UNIX has several shells
  - `sh` (the Bourne shell) is the original UNIX shell
  - `csh` was developed at Berkeley by Bill Joy
  - `ksh` (the Korn shell) was developed by David Korn at AT&T Bell Laboratories
  - `bash` (the GNU Bourne-Again shell)

and the list is far from complete
The core of the OS

- Part that remains in main memory
- Controls the execution of all other programs.
- Known as the **kernel**
  - Also called **monitor, supervisor, executive**
- Other programs interact with it through **system calls**
System calls

Program

System call / system request

Kernel
A question

- Who among you has already used system calls?
The answer

- All of you
  - *All I/O operations are performed through system calls*
The four missions
Functions of an OS

- **Four** basic functions
  - To provide a better user interface
  - To manage the system resources
  - To protect users’ programs and data
  - To let programs exchange information
A better user interface

- Accessing directly the hardware would be very cumbersome
- Must enter manually the code required to read into main memory each program
  - \textit{boot strapping}
How it was done (I)

**PDP 8**
- Early 70’s
- 12-bit machine
  - 4K RAM!
How it was done (II)

Toggle switches in front panel were used to enter the bootstrap code
Batch systems

- Allow users to submit a batches of requests to be processed in sequence
- Include a command language specifying what to do with the inputs
  - Compile
  - Link edit
  - Execute and so forth
An IBM 1401
Interactive systems

- Came later
- Allow users to interact with the OS through their terminals:
  - Include an interactive command language
    - UNIX shells, Windows PowerShell
    - Can also be used to write scripts
Time sharing

- Lets several interactive users to access a single computer at the same time
- Standard solution when computers were expensive
Graphical user interfaces

- Called GUIs (pronounced goo-eyes):
  - Macintosh, Windows, X-Windows, Linux
  - Require a dedicated computer for each user
  - Pioneered at Xerox Palo Alto Research Center (Xerox PARC)
  - Popularized by the Macintosh
  - Dominated the market with MS Windows
The Xerox Alto
Xerox PARC (I)

- Founded by XEROX in 1970
- Invented
  - Laser printing
  - Ethernet
  - The GUI paradigm
  - Object-oriented programming (Smalltalk)
Xerox PARC (II)

- All their inventions were brought to market by other concerns
- Popular belief is that Xerox management blew it
- In reality
  - Alto workstations were very expensive
  - Smalltalk was very slow
  - Group was too small to deliver a full system
Smart phones and tablets

- Convergence of four trends
  - Cheaper LCD displays
  - Solid-State Storage (SSD)
  - Faster wireless communications
  - Ubiquitous wireless
History repeats itself

- First successful devices introduced by Apple
  - iPod, iPhone, iPad, …
    - First iPad was underpowered

- Competition soon grows
  - Cheaper Android devices
With a difference!

- Apple did not "steal" the concept from anyone
- iPods, iPhones, iPads were an instant success
  - Reasonably priced
Two models

- **Apple:**
  - Closed ecosystem (walled garden)
  - Strict controls on app market
  - Missing features
    - No file system

- **Android:**
  - Just the opposite
  - Lax controls on app market
  - Can access the Linux/Android shell
Is this paradise?
Summary

- Six major steps
  - Bare bone machine
  - Batch systems
  - Timesharing
  - Personal computer
  - Personal computer with GUI
  - Smart phone/tablet
File systems

- Let users create and delete files without having to worry about disk allocation
  - Users lose the ability to specify how their files are stored on the disk
  - Database designers prefer to bypass the file system
- Some file systems tolerate disk failures (RAID)
Managing system resources

- *Focus of the remainder of the course*
- *Not an easy task*
  - Enormous gap between CPU speeds and disk access times
## The memory hierarchy (I)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Device</th>
<th>Access Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fastest registers (2 GHz)</td>
<td>0.5 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Main memory</td>
<td>10-70 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Secondary storage (flash)</td>
<td>35-100 μs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Secondary storage (disk)</td>
<td>3-12 ms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mass storage (off line)</td>
<td>a few s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The memory hierarchy (II)

- To make sense of these numbers, let us consider an analogy
Writing a paper (I)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Access Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Open book on desk</td>
<td>1 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Book on desk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Book in UH library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Book in another library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Book very far away</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Writing a paper (II)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Access Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Open book on desk</td>
<td>1s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Book on desk</td>
<td>20-140 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Book in UH library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Book in another library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Book very far away</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Writing a paper (II)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Access Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Open book on desk</td>
<td>1s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Book on desk</td>
<td>20-140s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Book in UH library</td>
<td>20-55h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Book in another library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Book very far away</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Writing a paper (III)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Access Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Open book on desk</td>
<td>1 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Book on desk</td>
<td>20-140 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Book in UH library</td>
<td>20-55 h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Book in another library</td>
<td>70-277 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Book very far away</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Writing a paper (V)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Access Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Open book on desk</td>
<td>1 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Book on desk</td>
<td>20s-140 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Book in UH library</td>
<td>20-55 h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Book in another library</td>
<td>70-277 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Book very far away</td>
<td>&gt; 63 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Will the problem go away?

- New storage technologies
  - Cheaper than main memory
  - Faster than disk drives
- Flash drives
- Optane memory
Flash drives

- Offspring of EEPROM memories
- Fast reads
  - Block-level
- Slower writes
  - Whole page of data must be erased then rewritten
- Can only go through a finite number of program / erase cycles
Optane memory (I)

- Byte-addressable non-volatile memory (BNVM)
- Simpler design
  - Bits are stored as resistivity levels of a secret alloy
  - No transistors (≠ SRAM and DRAM)
- Faster than flash
  - 100-300 ns
Optane memory (II)

- Now
  - Non-volatile RAM
  - Disk cache

- In a few years
  - Could replace flash (phones, laptops, …)
  - Flash could replace disks (disk farms)
  - Disks could replace slower devices
  - Will require a redesign of file system
Optimizing disk accesses

- Two main techniques
  - Making disk accesses more efficient
  - Doing something else while waiting for an I/O operation

- *Not very different from what we are doing in our every day's lives*
Optimizing read accesses (I)

- When we shop in a market that’s far away from our home, we plan ahead and buy food for several days.
- The OS will read as many bytes as it can during each disk access:
  - In practice, entire blocks (4KB or more)
  - Blocks are stored in the I/O buffer
Optimizing read accesses (II)

- Most small read operations can be completed \textit{without} any disk access
Optimizing read accesses (III)

- Buffered reads work quite well
  - Most systems use it

- Major limitation
  - Cannot read *too much ahead* of the program
    - Could end bringing into main memory data that would *never be used*
Optimizing read accesses (IV)

- Can **also keep** in a buffer recently accessed blocks hoping they will be accessed again
  - **Caching**

- Works very well because we keep accessing again and again the data we are working with

**Caching is a fundamental technique of OS and database design**
Optimizing write accesses (I)

- If we live far away from a library, we wait until we have several books to return before making the trip

- The OS will *delay writes* for a few seconds then write an entire block
  - Since most writes are sequential, most small writes will not require any disk access
Optimizing write accesses (II)

- **Delayed writes** work quite well
  - Most systems use it

- **Major drawback**
  - We will *lose data* if the system or the program crashes
    - After the program issued a write but
    - Before the data were saved to disk
  - Unless we use NVRAM
Doing something else

- *When we order something on the web, we do not remain idle until the goods are delivered*

- The OS can implement *multiprogramming* and let the CPU run another program while a program waits for an I/O
Advantages (I)

- Multiprogramming is very important in business applications
  - Many of these applications use the peripherals much more than the CPU
  - For a long time the CPU was the most expensive component of a computer
  - *Multiprogramming* was invented to keep the CPU busy
Advantages (II)

- Multiprogramming made *time-sharing* possible
- Multiprogramming lets your PC run several applications at the same time
  - MS Word and MS Outlook
Multiprogramming (I)

- Multiprogramming lets the CPU divide its time among different tasks:
  - One tenth of a second on a program, then another tenth of a second on another one and so forth
- Each core of your CPU will still be working on *one single task* at any given time
Multiprogramming (II)

- The CPU does not waste any time waiting for the completion of I/O operations.

- From time to time, the OS will need to regain control of the CPU:
  - Because a task has exhausted its fair share of the CPU time.
  - Because something else needs to be done.

- This is done through *interrupts*. 
Interrupts (I)

- Request to interrupt the flow of execution the CPU
- Detected by the CPU hardware
  - After it has executed the current instruction
  - Before it starts the next instruction.
A very schematic view (I)

- A very basic CPU would execute the following loop:

```c
forever {
    fetch_instruction();
    decode_instruction();
    execute_instruction();
}
```

- Pipelining makes things more complicated
  - And CPU much faster!
A very schematic view (II)

- We add an extra step:

  ```
  forever {
    check_for_interrupts();
    fetch_instruction();
    decode_instruction();
    execute_instruction();
  }
  ```
Interrupts (II)

- When an interrupt occurs:
  a. The *current state of the CPU* (program counter, program status word, contents of registers, and so forth) is saved, normally on the top of a stack
  b. A *new CPU state* is fetched
Interrupts (III)

- New state includes a new *hardware-defined* value for the program counter
  - Cannot “hijack” interrupts
- Process is totally transparent to the task being interrupted
  - A process *never* knows whether it has been interrupted or not
Types of interrupts (I)

- **I/O completion interrupts**
  - Notify the OS that an I/O operation has completed,

- **Timer interrupts**
  - Notify the OS that a task has exceeded its quantum of core time
Types of interrupts (II)

- **Traps**
  - Notify the OS of a *program error* (division by zero, illegal opcode, illegal operand address, ...) or a *hardware failure*

- **System calls**
  - Notify OS that the running task wants to submit a request to the OS
A surprising discovery

- *Programs do interrupt themselves!*
Context switches

- Each interrupt will result into two context switches:
  - One when the running task is interrupted
  - Another when it regains the CPU
- Context switches are not cheap
- The overhead of any simple system call is two context switches

Remember that!
Prioritizing interrupts (I)

- Interrupt requests may occur while the system is processing another interrupt
- All interrupts are not equally urgent (as it is also in real life)
  - Some are more urgent than other
  - *Also true in real life*
Prioritizing interrupts (II)

- The best solution is to prioritize interrupts and assign to each source of interrupts a priority level.
  - New interrupt requests will be allowed to interrupt lower-priority interrupts but will have to wait for the completion of all other interrupts.

- Solution is known as vectorized interrupts.
Example from real life

- Let us try to prioritize
  - Phone is ringing
  - Washer signals end of cycle
  - Dark smoke is coming out of the kitchen
  - …

- With vectorized interrupts, a phone call will never interrupt another phone call
The solution

- Smoke in the kitchen
- Phone is ringing
- End of washer cycle
- More low-priority stuff
Disabling Interrupts

- We can **disable** interrupts
- OS does it before performing short critical tasks that cannot be interrupted
  - Works only for single-threaded kernels
- User tasks **must** be prevented from doing it
  - Too dangerous
DMA

- Disk I/O poses a special problem
  - CPU will have to transfer large quantities of data between the disk controller's buffer and the main memory

- *Direct memory access (DMA)* allows the disk controller to read data from and write data to main memory without any CPU intervention
  - Controller “steals” memory cycles from CPU
Protecting users’ data (I)

- Unless we have an isolated single-user system, we must prevent users from
  - Accessing
  - Deleting
  - Modifying

without authorization other people's programs and data
Protecting users’ data (II)

- Two aspects
  - Protecting user's files on disk
  - Preventing programs from interfering with each other

- Two solutions
  - Dual-mode CPUs
  - Memory protection
Historical Considerations

- Earlier operating systems for personal computers did not have any protection
  - They were single-user machines
  - They typically ran one program at a time

- Windows 2000, Windows XP, Vista and MacOS X are protected
Protecting users’ files

- Key idea is to prevent users’ programs from directly accessing the disk
- Will require I/O operations to be performed by the kernel
- Make them *privileged instructions*
  - Only the kernel can execute
Privileged instructions

- Require a *dual-mode CPU*
- Two CPU modes
  - *Privileged mode* or *executive mode*
    - Allows CPU to execute all instructions
  - *User mode*
    - Allows CPU to execute only safe unprivileged instructions
- State of CPU is determined by a *special bit*
All disk/SSD accesses must go through the kernel.
Switching between states

- User mode will be the default mode for all programs
  - Only the kernel can run in supervisor mode
- Switching from user mode to supervisor mode is done through an interrupt
  - Safe because the jump address is at a well-defined location in main memory
Performing an I/O

User Process \rightarrow I/O request (interrupt) \rightarrow Kernel

Physical I/O (executed by the kernel)
An analogy (I)

- Most UH libraries are *open stacks*
  - Anyone can consult books in the stacks and bring them to checkout

- National libraries and the Library of Congress have *closed stack collections*
  - Users fill a request for a specific document
  - A librarian will bring the document to the circulation desk
An analogy (II)

- **Open stack collections**
  - Let users browse the collections
  - Users can misplace or vandalize books

- **Closed stack collections**
  - Much slower access
  - Much safer
More trouble

- Having a dual-mode CPU is *not enough* to protect user’s files
- Must also prevent rogue users from tampering with the kernel
  - Same as a rogue customer bribing a librarian in order to steal books
- Done through *memory protection*
Memory protection (I)

- Prevents programs from accessing any memory location outside their own *address space*
- Requires special *memory protection hardware*
  - *Memory Management Unit (MMU)*
- Memory protection hardware
  - Checks *every* reference issued by program
  - Generates an interrupt when it detects a protection violation
Memory protection (II)

- Has additional advantages:
  - Prevents programs from corrupting address spaces of other programs
  - Prevents programs from crashing the kernel
    - Not true for device drivers which are inside the kernel
- Required part of any multiprogramming system
Memory protection (III)

- CPU
  - MAR
    - memory address
  - MMU
    - Main memory
Even more trouble

- Having both a dual-mode CPU and memory protection is not enough to protect user’s files

- Must also prevent rogue users from booting the system with a doctored kernel

  - Example:
    - Can run Linux from a “live” CD Linux
    - Linux will read all NTFS files ignoring all restrictions set up by Windows
Inter-process communication

- Has become very important over the last thirty years
- Two techniques
  - Message passing
    - General but not very easy to use
  - Shared memory
    - Less general, easier to use but requires inter-process synchronization
ANOTHER VIEW

- Arpaci-Dusseau & Arpaci-Dusseau
  - Focus on services provided by OSes

- Three themes
  - Virtualization
  - Concurrency
  - Persistence
Virtualization

- The process abstraction
- Virtualizing the CPU:
  - Process scheduling
- Virtualizing the memory:
  - Memory management
Concurrency

- Threads
- Locks
- Semaphores

We will cover threads in the chapter on processes because they are essential to the client server model.
Persistence

- The file system
Types of operating systems
Types of operating systems

- Already discussed:
  - Batch systems
  - Time-Sharing systems

- Will now introduce
  - Real-Time systems
  - Operating systems for multiprocessors
  - Distributed systems
Real-time systems

- Designed for applications with *strict real-time constraints*:
  - *Process control*
  - *Guidance systems*
  - Most *multimedia applications*

- Must guarantee that critical tasks will *always* be performed within a specific time frame.
Hard RT systems

- Must guarantee that all deadlines will always be met
- *Any failure* could have *catastrophic consequences*:
  - The reactor could overheat and explode
  - The rocket could be lost
Soft RT systems

- Guarantee that most deadlines will be met
- A DVD decoder that miss a deadline will spoil our viewing pleasure for a fraction of a second
Observations

- Hard RT applications normally run on special RT OSes
- Soft RT applications can run on a regular OS
  - If the OS supports them
- Interactive and time-sharing systems are not RT systems
  - They attempt to provide a fast response time but do not try to meet specific deadlines
Multiprocessor operating systems

- Designed for multiprocessor architectures
- Several processors share the same memory
Leader/follower multiprocessing

- Single copy of OS runs on a dedicated core/processor
  - **Leader** or *master* (deprecated)
- Other cores/processors can only run applications
  - **Followers** or *slaves* (deprecated)
- Major advantage is *simplicity*
  - Requires few changes
- Major disadvantage is *lack of scalability*
  - Single copy of OS can become a *bottleneck*
Symmetric multiprocessing

- Any core/processor can perform all functions
  - There can be multiple copies of the OS running in parallel

- Must prevent them from interfering with each other
  - Disabling interrupts will not work
  - Must add *locks* to all critical sections
The state of the art

- Most computers now have *multicore CPUs*
  - Sole practical way to increase CPU power
- Many have powerful GPUs
  - Highly parallel
- Using multicore architectures in an effective way is a huge challenge
Distributed systems

- Integrated networks of computers
  - *Workstations* sharing common resources (file servers, printers, …)

- Current trend is to leave systems very loosely coupled
  - Each computer has its own OS
Client /Server Model

- Servers wait for requests from clients and process them
  - File servers
  - Print servers
  - Authentication servers
A typical sequential server

for (;;){
  // wait for request
  get_request(...);
  // process it
  process_request(...);
  // send reply
  send_reply(...);
} // forever
Network file system

- Lets several workstations share files stored on a common file server
Performance Issues

- **Response time** is the main issue
  - Network latency is now added to disk latency

- Will attempt to mask these two latencies
  - Extensive **client caching**
  - *Works very well*
File consistency issues (I)

- What happens if a file F is simultaneously modified on two distinct workstations
File consistency issues (II)

- Client caches will hold different versions $F'$ and $F''$ of file $F$
File Consistency Issues (III)

- Maintaining file consistency is a very important issue in distributed/networked file system design

- Different systems use different approaches
  - NFS from Sun Microsystems
  - AFS/Coda from CMU
  - …
Other distributed systems issues

- **Authenticating** users
  - *A problem in open networks*

- Making distributed systems as *reliable* as stand-alone systems
  - *Replication* of data and services

- Keeping the clocks of the machines more or less synchronized.
Unix and Linux
UNIX (I)

- Started at Bell Labs in the early 70's as an attempt to build a sophisticated time-sharing system on a very small minicomputer.
- First OS to be almost entirely written in C
- Ported to the VAX architecture in the late 70’s at U. C. Berkeley:
  - Added virtual memory and networking
The fathers of UNIX

Ken Thompson and Denis Ritchie
UNIX (II)

- Became the standard operating systems for **workstations**
  - Selected by Sun Microsystems
- Became less popular because
  - Too many variants
    - Berkeley BSD, ATT System V, …
  - PCs displaced workstations
  - Windows has a better user interface
UNIX Today

- Several **free versions** exist (FreeBSD, Linux):
  - Free access to source code
  - Ideal platform for OS research
- **Apple OS X** runs on the top of an updated version of BSD
- **Android** runs on top of a heavily customized Linux kernel
- **Chrome** runs on top of a vanilla Linux OS
A Rapid Tour

- UNIX kernel is the core of the system and handles the system calls
- UNIX has several shells: **sh, csh, ksh, bash**
- On-line command manual:
  - `man xyz`
    - displays manual page for command **xyz**
  - `man 2 xyz`
    - displays manual page for system call **xyz(…)**
Most Lasting Impact

- First OS that
  - Run efficiently on very different platforms
  - Had its source code made available to its users
- File system inspired most more recent OSes
- Remains the best platform for OS research
Kernel organizations
Kernel Organizations

- Three basic organizations:
  - **Monolithic kernels:**
    - The default
  - **Layered kernels:**
    - A great idea that did not work
  - **Microkernels:**
    - Hurt by the high cost of context switches
Monolithic kernels

- No particular organization
  - All kernel functions share the same address space
  - This includes *devices drivers* and other *kernel extensions*

- Lack of internal organization makes the kernel *hard to manage, extend and debug*
MS-DOS (I)
The BIOS

- Basic Input-Output System
- Stored on a chip
  - First ROM, now EEPROM
- Takes control of CPU when system is turned on
  - Identifies system components
  - Initiates booting of operating system
- Also provides low-level I/O access routines
The “curse”

- Hardware lacked dual mode and hardware memory protection
  - Nothing prevented application programs from accessing directly the BIOS
  - Program accessing disk files through BIOS I/O routines assumed a given disk organization
    - Changing it became impossible
The solution

- For a long time, Microsoft could not make radical changes to its FAT-16 disk organization.

- Windows XP and all modern operating systems prevent user programs from bypassing the kernel.
Monolithic kernel contains everything that is *not device-specific* including file system, networking code, and so forth.
Layered kernel

- Proposed by Edsger Dijkstra
- Implemented as a hierarchy of **layers**: Each layer defines a new data object
  - Hiding from the higher layers some functions of the lower layers
  - Providing some new functionality
THE operating system kernel

- (named after Dutch initials of T. U. Eindhoven)

- User programs
- Buffering for I/O devices
- Operator console device driver
- Memory management
- CPU scheduling
- Hardware
Limitations

- Layered design works extremely well for *networking code*
  - Each layer offers its own functionality
- Much less successful for kernel design
  - No clear ordering of layers
    - Memory management uses file system features and vice versa
Microkernels

- A reaction against “bloated” monolithic kernels
  - Hard to manage, extend, debug and secure

- Key idea is making kernel smaller by delegating non-essential tasks to trusted user-level servers
  - Same idea as subcontracting

- Microkernel keeps doing what cannot be delegated:
  - Security, short-term scheduling, …
How it works (I)
How it works (II)

- Microkernel
  - Receives request from user program
  - Decides to forward it to a user-level server
  - Waits for reply for server
  - Forwards it to user program

- **Trusted servers** run outside the kernel
  - Cannot execute privileged instructions
Advantages

- Kernel is smaller, easier to secure and manage
- Servers run outside of the kernel
  - Cannot crash the kernel
  - Much easier to extend kernel functionality
    - Adding new servers
    - Adding an NTFS server to UNIX microkernel
Major disadvantage

- Too slow
  - Four context switches instead of two

- Speed remains an essential concern
- We don’t like to trade speed for safety (or anything else)
A conventional kernel

Each system call occasions two context switches
A microkernel

User program

Trusted server

Four context switches

Smaller microkernel
Mach

- Designed in mid 80’s to replace UNIX kernel
- New kernel with different system calls
  - UNIX system calls are routed to an *emulation server*
- Emulation server was designed to run in user space
  - Slowed down the system
  - Server ended inside the kernel
MINIX 3

- MINIX 1 was designed for teaching OS internals
  - Predates Linux
- Now aimed at high reliability (embedded) applications
  - More willing to trade space for reliability
- Runs on x86 and ARM processors
- Compatible with NetBSD
MINIX 3 microkernel

- "Tiny" (12,700 lines) microkernel
  - Handles *interrupts* and *message* passing
  - Only code running in kernel mode

- Other OS functions are handled by *isolated, protected, user-mode* processes
  - Each device driver is a separate user-mode process
  - System automatically restarts *crashed drivers*
Modular kernels

- Linux, Windows
- Modules are object files whose contents can be linked to—and unlinked from—the kernel at any time
  - Run inside the kernel address space
  - *Used to add to the kernel device drivers for new devices*
Advantages

- **Extensibility:**
  - Can add new features the kernel
  - In many cases, the process is completely transparent to the user

- **Lack of performance penalty:**
  - Modules run in the kernel address space
Disadvantages

- **Lower reliability**
  - A bad module can corrupt the whole kernel and crash the system.

- **Serious problem**
  - Many device drivers are poorly written
  - Device drivers account for 85% of reported failures of Windows XP
Current state of the art

- UNIX: safe, fast
- Mach: extensible
- Windows
Why?

- Unix has a monolithic kernel (which makes it fast) and does not allow extensions (which makes it both safe and non-extensible)
- Windows has a monolithic kernel (which makes it fast) and allows extensions (which makes it both extensible and unsafe)
- Mach allows extensions in user space (which makes it extensible, safe and slow)
Virtual machines
Virtual machines

- Let different operating systems run at the same time on a single computer
  - Windows, Linux and Mac OS
  - A real-time OS and a conventional OS
  - A production OS and a new OS being tested
How it is done

- A hypervisor / VM monitor defines two or more virtual machines
  - Each virtual machine has
    - Its own virtual CPU
    - Its own virtual physical memory
    - Its own virtual disk(s)
- Can also install VM on top of a host OS
  - VM Box
The virtualization process
Reminder

- In a conventional OS,
  - Kernel executes in *privileged/supervisor mode*
    - Can do virtually everything
  - User processes execute in *user mode*
    - Cannot modify their page tables
    - Cannot execute privileged instructions
A conventional architecture

User process

System call

Privileged mode

Kernel
Two virtual machines

- Hypervisor
- Privileged mode
- User Mode
  - User process
  - User process
  - User process
  - User process
- VM Kernel
- Hypervisor
Explanations (II)

- Whenever the kernel of a VM issues a privileged instruction, an interrupt occurs
  - The hypervisor takes control and do the physical equivalent of what the VM attempted to do:
    - Must convert virtual RAM addresses into physical RAM addresses
    - Must convert virtual disk block addresses into physical block addresses
Translating a block address

VM kernel

Access block x, y of my virtual disk

Virtual disk

Hypervisor

Access block v, w of actual disk

Actual disk

That's block v, w of the actual disk
Handling I/Os

- Difficult task because
  - Wide variety of devices
  - Some devices may be shared among several VMs
    - Printers
    - Shared disk partition
      - Want to let Linux and Windows access the same files
Virtual Memory Issues

- Each VM kernel manages its own memory
  - Its page tables map program virtual addresses into what it believes to be physical addresses
The dilemma

User process A

Page 735 of process A is stored in page frame 435

That's page frame 993 of the actual RAM

Hypervisor
Nastiest Issue

- The whole VM approach assumes that a kernel executing in user mode will behave exactly like a kernel executing in privileged mode except that privileged instructions will be trapped.

- *Not true for all architectures!*
  - *Intel x86 Pop flags (POPF) instruction*
  - …
The Virtual Box Solution

- Code Scanning and Analysis Manager (CSAM)
  - Scans privileged code recursively before its first execution to identify problematic instructions
  - Calls the Patch Manager (PATM) to perform *in-situ* patching.
The Xen solution

- Modify the guest kernel to eliminate badly behaving instructions such as POPF
  - Paravirtualization
  - Faster but less flexible
    - Requires open-source kernel

User programs are not affected
  - Only the kernel
Containers

- Each VM runs its own copy of the kernel
  - Takes memory space
- Containers provide isolated user-space instances that share the same kernel
  - Less overhead
  - Less flexibility
- Docker, LYXC