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Overview
• The microkernel idea
  – Mach (and others)
• The great microkernel debate
  – Bershad and Chen vs. Liedtke
• The design of L3 and L4
  – Performance and size are everything
• Lightweight RPC (LRPC)
  – Making interprocess calls fast
• L4 RPC
  – Making interprocess calls even faster

Approaches to tackling OS complexity
• Classical software engineering approach: modularity
  – Relatively small, self-contained components
  – Well-defined interfaces
  – Enforcement of interfaces
  – Containment of faults
• Doesn’t work with monolithic kernels
  – All kernel code executes in privileged mode
  – Faults aren’t contained
  – Interfaces cannot be enforced
  – Performance takes priority over structure

Microkernel
Based on ideas of the “Nucleus” [Brinch Hansen, 1970].

Monolithic vs. microkernel OS structure
• Monolithic OS
  – lots of privileged code
  – services invoked by syscall
• Microkernel OS:
  – little privileged code
  – services invoked by IPC
  – “horizontal” structure

Microkernel OS
Kernel:
• Contains code which must run in privileged mode
• Isolates hardware dependence from higher levels
• Small and fast extensible system
• Provides mechanisms
User-level servers:
• Are hardware independent/portable
• Provide the “OS environment/personality”
• May be invoked:
  – From application (via message-passing IPC)
  – From kernel (via upcalls)
• Implement policies
Early example: Hydra

- Separation of mechanism from policy
  - [Levin et al., 1975]
- No hierarchical layering of kernel
- Protection, even within OS
  - Uses capabilities
- Objects, encapsulation, units of protection
- Can be considered the first object-oriented OS

Popular example: Mach

- Developed at CMU by Rashid and others from 1984 [Rashid et al., 1988]

Goals:
- Tailorability: support different OS interfaces
- Portability: almost all code H/W independent
- Real-time capability
- Multiprocessor and distribution support
- Security
- Coined term microkernel

Basic features of Mach kernel

- Task and thread management
- Inter-process communication
  - asynchronous message-passing
- Memory object management
- System call redirection
- Device support
- Multiprocessor support

Mach = \(\mu\)kernel?

- Most OS services implemented at user level
  - Using memory objects and external pagers
  - Provides mechanisms, not policies
- Mostly hardware independent
- Big!
  - 140 system calls (300 in later versions), >100 kLOC
  - Unix 6th edition had 48 system calls, 10kLOC without drivers
- Poor performance
  - Tendency to move features into kernel
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Critique of microkernel architectures

“Personally, I’m not interested in making device drivers look like user-level. They aren’t, they shouldn’t be, and microkernels are just stupid.”

-- Linus Torvalds
Microkernel performance

- First generation microkernel systems ('80s, early '90s)
  - Exhibited poor performance when compared to monolithic UNIX implementations
  - Particularly Mach, the best-known example
- Typical results:
  - Move OS services back into the kernel for performance
  - Move complete OS personalities into kernel
    - Chorus Unix
    - Mac OS X (Darwin): complete BSD kernel linked to Mach
  - OSF/1
- Some spectacular failures
  - IBM Workplace OS
  - GNU Hurd

Microkernel performance

Reasons investigated [Chen and Bershad, 1993]:

- Instrumented user & system code to collect execution traces
- Run on DECstation 5000/200 (25MHz MIPS R3000)
- Run under Ultrix and Mach with Unix server
- Traces fed to memory system simulator
- Analysed memory cycles per instruction: MCPI = stall cycles due to memory system instructions retired
- Baseline MCPI (i.e. excluding idle loops)

Ultrix vs. Mach+Unix MCPI

Observations:

- Mach memory penalty higher
  - i.e. cache misses or write stalls
- Mach VM system executes more instructions than Ultrix
  - but is portable and has more functionality

Claim:

- Degraded performance is result of OS structure
- IPC cost is not a major factor:
  "...the overhead of Mach's IPC, in terms of instructions executed, is responsible for a small portion of overall system overhead. This suggests that microkernel optimizations focusing exclusively on IPC, without considering other sources of system overhead such as MCPI, will have a limited impact on overall system performance."

Conclusions

- System instruction and data locality is measurably worse than user code
  - Higher cache and TLB miss rates
  - Mach worse than Ultrix
- System execution is more dependent than user on instruction cache behaviour
  - MCPI dominated by system icache misses
- Competition between user and system code not a problem
  - Few conflicts between user and system cache

"The impact of Mach's microkernel structure on competition is not significant."

Conclusions

- Self-interference, especially on instructions, is a problem for system code
  - Ultrix would benefit more from higher cache associativity (direct-mapped cache was used)
- Block memory operations are responsible for a large component of overall MCPI
  - I/O and copying
- Write buffers less effective for system
- Page mapping strategy has significant effect on cache

"The locality of system code and data is inherently poor"
Other experience with μkernel performance

- System call costs are high
- Context switching costs are high
  - Getting worse with increasing CPU/memory speed ratios and lengthening pipelines
  ⇒ IPC (system call + context switch) expensive
- Microkernels depend heavily on IPC
  - Is the microkernel idea inherently flawed?

A Critique of the critique

• System call costs are high
• Context switching costs are high
• Getting worse with increasing CPU/memory speed ratios and lengthening pipelines
  ⇒ IPC (system call + context switch) expensive
• Microkernels depend heavily on IPC
  - Is the microkernel idea inherently flawed?

Conclusion

• Mach system is too big
  - Kernel + Unix server + emulation library
  - Unix server is essentially the same as Unix
  - Emulation library irrelevant [Chen and Bershad, 1993]
  - Conclusion:
    Mach kernel working set is too big
  • Can we build microkernels which avoid these problems?

Improving IPC by kernel design

• IPC is the most important operation in a microkernel
• The way to make IPC fast is to design the whole system around it
• Design principle: aim at a concrete performance goal
  - Hardware-dictated costs are 172 cycles (3.5μs) for a 486
  - Aimed at 350 cycles for the implementation
• Applied to the L3 kernel
L3/L4 implementation techniques

- Minimise number of system calls
  - Combined operations: Call, ReplyWait
  - Complex messages
    - Combines multiple messages into one operation
    - As many arguments as possible in registers
- Copy messages only once
  - via direct mapping, not user → kernel → user
- Fast access to thread control blocks (TCBs)
  - TCBs accessed via VMaddress determined from thread ID
  - Invalid threads caught via a page fault
  - Separate kernel stack for each thread in TCB
  - Avoids extra TLB misses on fast path

Results (L3)

- A short cross address space IPC (user to user) takes 5.2μs
  - compared to 115μs for Mach
- Code and data together use 592 bytes (7%) of on-chip cache
  - kernel must be small to be fast

What should a microkernel not provide?

- Memory management
- Page-fault handler
- File system
- Device drivers
- ...

Rationale:
few features ⇒ small size ⇒ low cache use ⇒ fast

On µ-Kernel Construction

[Liedtke, 1995]

What primitives should a microkernel implement?

"...a concept is tolerated inside the µ-kernel only if moving it outside the kernel, i.e., permitting competing implementations, would prevent the implementation of the system’s required functionality."

- Recursively-constructed address spaces
  - Required for protection
- Threads
  - As execution abstraction
- IPC
  - For communication between threads
- Unique identifiers
  - For addressing threads in IPC

Non-portability

- Liedtke argues that microkernels must be constructed per-processor and are inherently unportable
- Eg. major changes made between 486 and Pentium:
  - Use of segment registers for small address spaces
  - Different TCB layout due to different cache associativity
    - Changes user-visible bit structure of thread identifiers!
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Lots of Unix IPC mechanisms

• Pipes
• Signals
• Unix-domain sockets
• POSIX semaphores
• FIFOs (named pipes)
• Shared memory segments
• System V semaphore sets
• POSIX message queues
• System V message queues
• etc.

IPC is usually heavyweight

IPC mechanisms in conventional systems tend to combine:
• Notification: (telling the destination process that something has happened)
• Scheduling: (changing the current runnable status of the destination, or source)
• Data transfer: (actually conveying a message payload)

Unix doesn’t have a lightweight IPC mechanism

IPC in Unix is usually polled

• Blocking read()/recv() or select()/poll()
• Signals are the nearest thing to upcalls, but...
  – Dedicated (small) stack
  – Limited number of syscalls available (e.g. semaphores)
  – Calling out with longjmp() problematic, to say the least
• Unix lacks a good upcall / event delivery mechanism

The Problem

• How to perform has cross-domain invocations?
• Does the calling domain/process block?
• Is the scheduler involved?
• Is more than one thread involved?
• What happens across physical processors?

Lightweight RPC (LRPC): Basic concepts

• Simple control transfer: client’s thread executes in server’s domain
• Simple data transfer: shared argument stack, plus registers
• Simple stubs: i.e. highly optimized marshalling
• Design for concurrency: Avoids shared data structures
High overhead of previous efforts

- Stubs copy lots of data (not an issue for the network)
- Message buffers usually copied through the kernel (4 copies!)
- Access validation
- Message transfer (queueing/dequeuing of messages)
- Scheduling: programmer sees thread crossing domains, system actually rendezvous's two threads in different domains
- Context switch (x 2)
- Dispatch: find a receiver thread to interpret message, and either dispatch another thread, or leave another one waiting for more messages

Most messages are short

- Most messages are short

LRPC Binding: connection setup phase

- Procedure Descriptors (PDs) registered with kernel for each procedure in the called interface
- For each PD, argument stacks (A-stacks) are preallocated and mapped read/write in both domains
- Kernel preallocates linkage records for return from A-stacks
- Returns A-stack list to client as (unforgeable) Binding Object

Calling sequence (all on client thread)

1. Verify Binding Object, find correct PD
2. Verify A-Stack, find corresponding linkage
3. Ensure no other thread using that A-stack/linkage pair
4. Put caller's return addr and stack pointer in linkage
5. Push linkage on to thread control block's stack (for nested calls)
6. Find an execution stack (E-stack) in server's domain
7. Update thread's SP to run off E-stack
8. Perform address space switch to server domain
9. Upcall server's stub at address given in PD

LRPC discussion

- Main kernel housekeeping task is allocating A-stacks and E-stacks
- Shared A-stacks reduce copying of data while still safe
- Stubs incorporated other optimizations (see paper)
- Address space switch is most of the overhead (no TLB tags)
- For multiprocessors:
  - Check for processor idling on server domain
  - If so, swap calling and idling threads
    - (note: thread migration was very cheap on the Firefly!)
    - Same trick applies on return path
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L4 synchronous RPC

- L4 pushed this idea further (for uniprocessor case)
- No kernel-allocated A-stack: server must have waiting thread (no upcalls possible)
- RPC just exchanges register contents with calling thread
- Synchronous RPC: calling thread blocks, waits for reply
- Scheduler bypassed completely
  - The infamous “null RPC” microbenchmark
  - Latency of a single call, nothing else happening
- Design couples notification, transfer, scheduling

IPC overview

- L4 provides a single system call for all IPC
  - Synchronous and unbuffered (apart from async notify)
  - Has a send and a receive component
  - Either send or receive may be omitted
- Receive may specify:
  - A specific thread ID from which to receive (“closed receive”)
  - Willingness to receive from any thread (“open wait”)

Logical IPC operations

- Send sends a message to a specific thread
- Receive “closed” receive from a specific sender
- Wait “open” receive from any sender
- Call send to and wait for reply from specific thread
  - Typical client RPC operation
- ReplyWait send to specific thread, “open” receive
  - Typical server operation

IPC message registers (MRs)

- Virtual registers
  - Not necessarily backed by CPU registers
  - Part of thread state
- On ARM: 6 physical registers, rest in UTCB
- Actual number is a system configuration parameter
  - At least 8, no more than 64
- Contents of MRs form message
  - First MR stores the message tag defining message size etc.
  - Rest are untyped words, not normally interpreted by the kernel
  - Kernel protocols define semantics in some cases
- IPC just copies data from sender’s to receiver’s MRs

Message tag: MR0

- u: number of words in message (excluding tag)
- p: specifies propagation
  - Allows sending on behalf of another thread; details in L4 manual
- n: specifies asynchronous notification operation
- r: blocking receive
  - If unset, fail immediately if no message pending
- s: blocking send
  - If unset, fail immediately if receiver is not waiting
- label: user-defined value (e.g. opcode, syscall number)

IPC result tag: MR0

- u: number of words received (u = 0 for send-only IPC)
- p: received propagated IPC
  - Check ActualSender field in UTCB
- r: received redirected IPC
  - Check IntendedReceiver field in UTCB
- X: received cross-processor IPC
- E: error indicator
  - If non-zero, check ErrorCode field in UTCB for details
Asynchronous Notification

- Very restricted form of asynchronous IPC
  - Delivered without blocking sender
  - Delivered immediately, directly to receiver’s UTCB
  - Message consists of a bit mask ORed to the receiver:
    - receiver.NotifyBits |= sender.MR1
  - No effect if receiver’s bits are already set
  - Receiver can prevent asynchronous notification by setting a flag in its UTCB
LMP: Barrefish local RPC

- On a single core:
  - IPC is asynchronous: one-way messaging only
  - RPC implemented at higher level in stubs
- Message is queued at destination, may cause an upcall
  - L4-style fast path: thread can optionally wait for a message
- Unlike L4, can decouple notification & transfer
  - Scheduler is always involved (but . . . )
- Between cores: later in this course...