Microkernels and Client-Server Architectures

I’m not interested in making devices look like user-level. They aren’t, they shouldn’t, and microkernels are just stupid.

*Linus Torvalds*
Motivation

- Early operating systems had very little structure.
- A strictly layered approach was promoted by [Dijkstra, 1968].
- Later OS (more or less) followed that approach (e.g., Unix).

PROBLEMS WITH LAYERED APPROACH

- Widening range of services and applications
  ⇒ OS bigger, more complex, slower, more error prone.
- Need to support same OS on different hardware.
- Like to support various OS environments.
- Distribution
  ⇒ impossible to provide all services from same (local) kernel.
Idea: Break Up the OS

- Applications
- User-level servers
- Microkernel
- Hardware
Monolithic versus Client-Server OS Structure
KERNEL:
• Contains code which must run in supervisor mode;
• Isolates hardware dependence from higher levels;
• Is small and fast ⇒ extensible system;
 Kernel provides mechanisms.

USER-LEVEL SERVERS:
• Are hardware independent/portable,
• Provide “OS environment”/”OS personality” (maybe several),
• May be invoked:
  – from application (via message-passing IPC)
  – from kernel (upcalls);
 Servers implement policies [Brinch Hansen, 1970].
Down Call vs. Upcall

- unprivileged code enters kernel mode
- implemented via trap

- privileged code enters user mode
- implemented via IPC or callback
Early example: Hydra

- Separation of mechanism from policy
  - e.g. protection vs. security
- No hierarchical layering of kernel.
  - Viewed layering as an unnecessary restriction
  - Protection, even within OS.
- Uses (segregated) *capabilities*.
- Objects, encapsulation, units of protection.
  - Objects have a *type* associated with them.
    - Includes a *procedure* type, which can be associated with object
  - Created indirectly via the representative of that type
    - Can create new types by creating a new representative
- Unique object *name*, no ownership.
- Object persistence based on reference counting [Wulf et al., 1974].
Hydra…

• can be considered the first *object-oriented* OS;
• has been called the first *microkernel* OS;
• has had enormous influence on later operating systems research;
• was never widely used even at CMU because of
  – poor performance,
  – lack of a complete environment.
Popular Example: Mach

- Developed at CMU by Rashid and others [Rashid et al., 1988] from 1984
- successor of Accent [Fitzgerald and Rashid, 1986] and RIG [Rashid, 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 Microkernel

• Task and thread management;
• interprocess communication (asynchronous message-passing);
• memory object management;
• system call redirection;
• device support;
• multiprocessor support.
MACH Basic Abstractions
MACH Tasks And Threads

- Task consists of one or more threads.
- Task provides *address space* and other environment.
- Thread is active entity (basic unit of CPU utilisation).
- Threads have own stacks, are kernel scheduled.
- Threads may run in parallel on multiprocessor.
- “Privileged user-state program” may be used to control scheduling.
- Task created from “blueprint” with empty or inherited address space.
- Activated by creating a thread in it.
MACH IPC: Ports

- Addressing based on ports:
  - port is a mailbox, allocated/destroyed via a system call;
  - has a fixed-size message queue associated with it;
  - is protected by (segregated) capabilities;
  - has exactly one receiver, but possibly many senders;
  - can have “send-once” capability to a port.
- Can pass the receive capability for a port to another process
  - give up read access to the port.
- Kernel detects ports without senders or receiver.
- Processes may have many ports (UNIX server has 2000!)
- Ports can be grouped into port sets.
  - Allows listening to many ports (like select())
- Send blocks if queue is full
  - except with send-once cap (used for server replies)
MACH IPC: Messages

- Segregated capabilities:
  - threads refer to them via local indices.
  - kernel marshalls capabilities in messages.
  - message format must identify caps

- Message contents:
  - Send capability to destination port (mandatory)
    - used by kernel to validate operation;
  - optional send capability to reply port
    - for use by receiver to send reply
  - possibly other capabilities;
  - “in-line” (by-value) data;
  - “out-of-line” (by reference) data, using copy-on-write,
    - may contain whole address spaces;
MACH Ports and Messages

- port

- message queue

- message

- destination port
- reply port
- size/operation
- pure typed data
- port rights
- out-of-line-data
- ... message control

- port

- memory cache object

- memory cache object
MACH Message Transfer

send operation

receive operation
MACH Virtual Memory Management

- Address space constructed from *memory regions*
  - initially empty
  - populated by:
    - explicit allocation
    - explicitly mapping a *memory object*;
    - inheriting from “blueprint” (as in Linux clone()),
      - inheritance: *not, shared or copied*;
    - allocated automatically by kernel during IPC
      - when passing by-reference parameters;
      \[\Rightarrow\] sparse virtual memory use (unlike UNIX).
  - 3 page states:
    - unallocated,
    - allocated & unreferenced,
    - allocated & initialised
Copy-on-write In MACH

- When data is copied ("blueprint" or passed by-reference):
  - source and destination share single copy,
  - both virtual pages are mapped to the same frame.
- Marked as read-only.
- When one copy is modified, a fault occurs.
- Handling by kernel involves making a physical copy is made,
  - VM mapping is changed to refer to the new copy.
- Advantage:
  - efficient way of sharing/passing large amounts of data.
- Drawbacks:
  - expensive for small amounts of data (page table manipulations)
  - data must be properly aligned
MACH Address Maps

- Address spaces represented as *address maps*:
- Any part of AS can be mapped to (part of) a memory object
- Compact representation of *sparse* address spaces
  - Compare to multi-level page tables?
Memory Objects

• Kernel doesn’t support file system
• Memory objects are an abstraction of secondary storage:
  – can be mapped into virtual memory
  – are cached by the kernel in physical memory
  – pager invoked if uncached page is touched
    • used by file system server to provide data
• Support data sharing
  – by mapping objects into several address spaces
• Memory is only cache for memory objects
User-Level Page Fault Handlers

- All actual I/O performed by *pager*; can be
  - default pager (provided by kernel), or
  - *external* pager, running at user-level.
- Intrinsic page fault cost: 2 IPCs
Handling Page Faults

1. Check protection & locate memory object
   • uses address map
2. Check cache, invoke pager if cache miss
   • uses a hashed page table
3. Check copy-on-write
   • perform physical copy if write fault
4. Enter new mapping into H/W page tables.
Remote Communication

• Client A sends message to server B on remote node.
  1. A sends message to local *proxy port* for B’s receive port
  2. User-level *network message server* receives from proxy port
  3. NMS converts proxy port into (global) *network port*.
  4. NMS sends message to NMS on B’s node
     • may need conversion (byte order...)
  5. Remote NMS converts network port into local port (B’s).
  6. Remote NMS sends message to that port.
Remote Communication
MACH UNIX Emulation

- emulation library in user address space handles IPC
- invoked by system call redirection (*trampoline mechanism*)
  - supports binary compatibility
MACH = Microkernel?

- Most OS services implemented at user level
  - using memory objects and external pagers
- Provides mechanisms, not policies.
- Mostly hardware independent.
- 140 system calls.
- Size: 200k instructions.
- Performance???
  - tendency to move features into kernel
- Served as basis for OSF/1, MacOS X...
- Further information on Mach: [Young et al., 1987; Coulouris, 1994; Sinha, 1997]
Chorus

• Developed at INRIA, France, from 1980 on.
• Commercialised by *Chorus Systèmes* in 1988.
• Basic ideas similar to Mach
• Servers can be:
  – user-level,
  – dynamically loaded into kernel (to save system call costs).
• Support for group communication (multicast, any of a group).
• Like Mach, kernel threads, port groups.
• Uses password capabilities
  – but servers use ACL based protection.
• Uses copy-on-write, but receiver controls placement of data.
Chorus UNIX Emulation

- System call redirection to server(s)
- All UNIX emulation in server (to avoid protection problems)
- Further information in [Dean and Armand, 1992; Rozier et al., 1990; Rozier et al., 1992; Coulouris, 1994; Sinha, 1997].
Other Client-Server Systems

- Lots.
- Most notable systems:
  
  **Amoeba**: Mullender, Tanenbaum (early 1980’s)
  [Tanenbaum and Mullender, 1981; Tanenbaum and Mullender, 1984; Mullender and Tanenbaum 1986].

  **Windows NT**: Microsoft (early 1990’s)
  [Custer, 1993].