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Virtual Machine (VM)

“A VM is an efficient, isolated duplicate of a real machine”
[Popek&Goldberg 74]

• Duplicate: VM should behave identically to the real machine
  – Programs cannot distinguish between real or virtual hardware
  – Except for:
    • Fewer resources (and potentially different between executions)
    • Some timing differences (when dealing with devices)
• Isolated: Several VMs execute without interfering with each other
• Efficient: VM should execute at speed close to that of real hardware
  – Requires that most instruction are executed directly by real hardware

Hypervisor aka virtual-machine monitor: Software implementing the VM

“Real machine”: Modern usage more general, “virtualise” any API
Types of Virtualization

- **Type-1** "Native" Platform VM or System VM
- **Type-2** "Hosted" OS-level VM
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Plus anything else you want to sound cool!
Why Virtual Machines?

• Historically used for easier sharing of expensive mainframes
  – Run several (even different) OSes on same machine
    • called *guest operating system*
  – Each on a subset of physical resources
  – Can run single-user single-tasked OS in time-sharing mode
    • legacy support

• Gone out of fashion in 80’s
  – Time-sharing OSes common-place
  – Hardware too cheap to worry...
Why Virtual Machines?

- Renaissance in recent years for improved isolation
- Server/desktop virtual machines
  - Improved QoS and security
  - Uniform view of hardware
  - Complete encapsulation
    - replication
    - migration/consolidation
    - checkpointing
    - debugging
  - Different concurrent OSes
    - eg Linux + Windows
  - Total mediation
- Would be mostly unnecessary
  - ... if OSes were doing their job!

Gernot prediction of 2004: 2014 OS textbooks will be identical to 2004 version except for s/process/VM/g
Why Virtual machines

- Core driver today is Cloud computing
  - Increased utilisation by sharing hardware
  - Reduced maintenance cost through scale
  - On-demand provisioning
  - Dynamic load balancing through migration
Why Virtual Machines?

- **Embedded systems:** integration of heterogeneous environments
  - RTOS for critical real-time functionality
  - Standard OS for GUIs, networking etc

- **Alternative to physical separation**
  - low-overhead communication
  - cost reduction
  - consolidate complete components
    - including OS,
    - certified
    - supplied by different vendors
Hypervisor

- Program that runs on real hardware to implement the virtual machine
- Controls resources
  - Partitions hardware
  - Schedules guests
    - "world switch"
  - Mediates access to shared resources
    - e.g. console
- Implications
  - Hypervisor executes in *privileged* mode
  - Guest software executes in *unprivileged* mode
  - Privileged instructions in guest cause a trap into hypervisor
  - Hypervisor interprets/emulates them
  - Can have extra instructions for *hypercalls*
Native vs. Hosted VMM

Native/Classic/Bare-metal/Type-I

Hosted/Type-II

• Hosted VMM beside native apps
  – Sandbox untrusted apps
  – Convenient for running alternative OS on desktop
  – Leverage host drivers

• Less efficient
  – Double node switches
  – Double context switches
  – Host not optimised for exception forwarding
Virtualization Mechanics: Instruction Emulation

- Traditional *trap-and-emulate* (T&E) approach:
  - guest attempts to access physical resource
  - hardware raises exception (trap), invoking HV’s exception handler
  - hypervisor emulates result, based on access to virtual resource

- Most instructions do not trap
  - prerequisite for efficient virtualisation
  - requires VM ISA (almost) same as processor ISA
**Trap-and-Emulate Requirements**

**Definitions:**

- **Privileged instruction:** traps when executed in user mode
  - Note: NO-OP is insufficient!
- **Privileged state:** determines resource allocation
  - Includes privilege mode, addressing context, exception vectors…
- **Sensitive instruction:** control- or behaviour-sensitive
  - **control sensitive:** changes privileged state
  - **behaviour sensitive:** exposes privileged state
    - incl instructions which are NO-OPs in user but not privileged state
- **Innocuous instruction:** not sensitive

- Some instructions are inherently sensitive
  - eg TLB load
- Others are context-dependent
  - eg store to page table
**Trap-and-Emulate Architectural Requirements**

- **T&E virtualisable**: all sensitive instructions are privileged
  - Can achieve accurate, efficient guest execution
    - ... by simply running guest binary on hypervisor
  - VMM controls resources
  - Virtualized execution indistinguishable from native, except:
    - resources more limited (smaller machine)
    - timing differences (if there is access to real time clock)

- **Recursively virtualisable**:
  - run hypervisor in VM
  - possible if hypervisor not timing dependent, overheads low
Impure Virtualization

• Virtualise other than by T&E of unmodified binary

• Two reasons:
  – Architecture not T&E virtualisable
  – Reduce virtualisation overheads

• Change guest OS, replacing sensitive instructions
  – by trapping code ("hypercalls")
  – by in-line emulation code

• Two approaches
  – binary translation: change binary
  – para-virtualisation: change ISA

```
ld r0, curr_thrd
ld r1, (r0, ASID)
mv CPU_ASID, r1
ld sp, (r1, kern_stk)
```

```
ld r0, curr_thrd
ld r1, (r0, ASID)
trap
ld sp, (r1, kern_stk)
```

```
ld r0, curr_thrd
ld r1, (r0, ASID)
jmp fixup_15
ld sp, (r1, kern_stk)
```
Binary Translation

- Locate sensitive instructions in guest binary, replace on-the-fly by emulation or trap/hypercall
  - pioneered by VMware
  - detect/replace combination of sensitive instruction for performance
  - modifies binary at load time, no source access required
- Looks like pure virtualisation!
- Very tricky to get right (especially on x86!)
  - Assumptions needed about sane guest behaviour
  - “Heroic effort” [Orran Krieger, then IBM, later VMware] 😊
Para-Virtualization

- New(ish) name, old technique
  - coined by Denali [Whitaker ‘02], popularised by Xen [Barham ‘03]
  - Mach Unix server [Golub ‘90], L4Linux [Härtig ‘97], Disco [Bugnion ‘97]
- Idea: manually port guest OS to modified (more high-level) ISA
  - Augmented by explicit hypervisor calls (hypercalls)
    - higher-level ISA to reduce number of traps
    - remove unvirtualisable instructions
    - remove “messy” ISA features which complicate
  - Generally outperforms pure virtualisation, binary re-writing
- Drawbacks:
  - Significant engineering effort
  - Needs to be repeated for each guest-ISA-hypervisor combination
  - Para-virtualised guests must be kept in sync with native evolution
  - Requires source
Virtualization Overheads

• VMM must maintain virtualised privileged machine state
  – processor status
  – addressing context
  – device state

• VMM needs to emulate privileged instructions
  – translate between virtual and real privileged state
  – eg guest ↔ real page tables

• Virtualisation traps are expensive
  – >1000 cycles on some Intel processors!
  – Better recently, Haswell has <500 cyc round-trip

• Some OS operations involve frequent traps
  – STI/CLI for mutual exclusion
  – frequent page table updates during fork()
  – MIPS KSEG addresses used for physical addressing in kernel
Virtualization and Address Translation

Two levels of address translation!

Virtual Memory → Virtual Page Table → Guest Physical Memory

Virtual Memory → Virtual Page Table → Guest Physical Memory

Virtual Memory → Virtual Page Table → Guest Physical Memory

Must implement with single MMU translation!
Virtualization Mechanics: Shadow Page Table

- User
  - `ld r0, adr`
- Guest OS
  - Virtual guest address
- Hypervisor
  - Physical address
- Shadow (real) guest page table
  - Translations cached in TLB
- Hypervisor's guest memory map
- Guest page table (Software)
- Guest page table (Hardware)
- Memory
  - Data
Virtualization Mechanics: Shadow Page Table

Hypervisor must shadow (virtualize) all PT updates by guest:
- trap guest writes to guest PT
- translate guest PA in guest (virtual) PTE using guest memory map
- insert translated PTE in shadow PT

Shadow PT has TLB semantics (i.e. weak consistency) ⇒
Update at synchronisation points:
- page faults
- TLB flushes

Shadow PT as virtual TLB
- similar semantics
- can be incomplete: LRU translation cache
Virtualisation Semantics: Lazy Shadow Update

User → Guest OS
- access new page
- add mapping to GPT
- add mappings...
- return to user

Guest OS → Hypervisor
- write-protect GPT
- unprotect GPT & mark dirty
- update dirty shadow
- write-protect GPT

Hypervisor → Guest OS
- write-protect GPT
Virtualisation Semantics: Lazy Shadow Update

User

Guest OS

Hypervisor

continue

invalidate mapping in GPT

invalidate mapping ...

flush TLB

write-protect GPT

unprotect GPT & mark dirty

update dirty shadow

write-protect GPT

flush TLB
Virtualization Mechanics: Real Guest PT

- On guest PT access must translate (virtualize) PTEs
  - store: translate guest “PTE” to real PTE
  - load: translate real PTE to guest “PTE”
- Each guest PT access traps!
  - including reads
  - high overhead
Virtualization Mechanics: Optimised Guest PT

- Guest translates PTEs itself when reading from PT
  - supported by Linux PT-access wrappers
- Guest batches PT updates using hypercalls
  - reduced overhead

Para-virtualized guest “knows” it is virtualized

User

Guest virtual address

Guest OS

Hypervisor

Guest PT

HV PT

Physical address

Memory

data

Used by original Xen
Virtualization Techniques

- Impure virtualisation methods enable new optimisations
  - avoid traps through ability to control the ISA
  - changed contract between guest and hypervisor

- Example: virtualised guest page table
  - lazy update of virtual state (TLB semantics)

- Example: virtual interrupt-enable bit (in virtual PSR)
  - requires changing guest’s idea of where this bit lives
  - hypervisor knows about VM-local virtual state
    - eg queue virtual interrupt until guest enables in virtual PSR
Virtualization Mechanics: 3 Device Models

- Emulated
  - VM
  - OS
  - Device Driver
  - Emulation
  - Hypervisor
  - Device

- Split
  - VM
  - OS
  - Virtual Driver
  - Device Driver
  - Hypervisor
  - Device

- Pass-through
  - VM
  - OS
  - Device Driver
  - Hypervisor
  - Device
Virtualization Mechanics: Emulated Device

- Each device access must be trapped and emulated
  - unmodified native driver
  - high overhead!
Virtualization Mechanics: Split Driver (Xen speak)

- Simplified, high-level device interface
  - small number of hypercalls
  - new (but very simple) driver
  - low overhead
  - must port drivers to hypervisor
Virtualization Mechanics: Driver OS (Xen Dom0)

- Leverage Driver-OS native drivers
  - no driver porting
  - must trust complete Driver OS guest!
  - huge TCB!
Virtualization Mechanics: Pass-Through Driver

- Unmodified native driver
- Must trust driver (and guest)
  - unless have hardware support (I/O MMU)

Available on modern x86, latest ARM

Direct device access by guest
Modern Architectures Not T&E Virtualisable

- **Examples:**
  - x86: many non-virtualizable features
    - e.g. sensitive PUSH of PSW is not privileged
    - segment and interrupt descriptor tables in virtual memory
    - segment description expose privileged level
  - MIPS: mostly ok, but
    - kernel registers k0, k1 (for save/restore state) user-accessible
    - performance issue with virtualising KSEG addresses
  - ARM: mostly ok, but
    - some instructions undefined in user mode (banked registers, CPSR)
    - PC is a GPR, exception return in MOV$ to PC, doesn’t trap

- **Addressed by virtualization extensions to ISA**
  - x86, Itanium since ~2006 (VT-x, VT-i), ARM since ’12
  - additional processor modes and other features
  - all sensitive ops trap into hypervisor or made innocuous (shadow state)
    - eg guest copy of PSW
x86 Virtualization Extensions (VT-x)

- New processor mode: \textit{VT-x root mode}
  - orthogonal to protection rings
  - entered on virtualisation trap
ARM Virtualization Extensions (1)

Hyp mode

- New privilege level
  - Strictly higher than kernel
  - Virtualizes or traps all sensitive instructions
  - Only available in ARM TrustZone “non-secure” mode
ARM Virtualization Extensions (2)

Configurable Traps

- x86 similar
- Can configure traps to go directly to guest OS
- Big performance boost!

Native syscall

Virtual syscall

User mode
Kernel mode
Hyp mode

Virtual syscall
Trap to guest
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ARM Virtualization Extensions (3)

Emulation

1) Load faulting instruction
   • Compulsory L1-D miss!

2) Decode instruction
   • Complex logic

3) Emulate instruction
   • Usually straightforward

```
mv CPU_ASID, r1
ld r1, (r0, ASID)
mv CPU_ASID, r1
ld sp, (r1, kern_stk)
```

```
...  
```

```
ld r1, (r0, ASID)
mv CPU_ASID, r1
ld sp, (r1, kern_stk)
```
ARM Virtualization Extensions (3)

Emulation Support

- HW decodes instruction
  - No L1 miss
  - No software decode
- SW emulates instruction
  - Usually straightforward

```
mv CPU_ASID, r1
```

```
ld r1, (r0, ASID)
```

```
mv CPU_ASID, r1
```

```
ld sp, (r1, kern_stk)
```

```
...  ...  ...
```

```
ld r1, (r0, ASID)
```

```
mv CPU_ASID, r1
```

```
ld sp, (r1, kern_stk)
```
ARM Virtualization Extensions (4)

2-stage translation

- Hardware PT walker traverses both PTs
- Loads combined (guest-virtual to physical) mapping into TLB
- eliminates “virtual TLB”

1st PT ptr (Hardware)

User

ld r0, adr

Guest virtual address

(Virtual) guest page table

Guest OS

2nd PT ptr (Hardware)

Hypervisor's guest memory map

Hypervisor

Physical address

Memory

data
ARM Virtualization Extensions (4)

2-stage translation cost

- On page fault walk twice number of page tables!
- Can have a page miss on each
  - requiring PT walk
- $O(n^2)$ misses in worst case for n-level PT
- Worst-case cost is massively worse than for single-level translation!

1st PT ptr (Hardware)

Guest virtual address

User

ld r0, adr

Guest OS

2nd PT ptr (Hardware)

Guest physical address

Hypervisor

Memory

data

Trade-off:
- fewer traps
- simpler implementation
- higher TLB miss cost 50% in extreme cases!
ARM Virtualization Extensions (5)

Virtual Interrupts

- ARM has 2-part IRQ controller
  - Global “distributor”
  - Per-CPU “interface”
- New H/W “virt. CPU interface”
  - Mapped to guest
  - Used by HV to forward IRQ
  - Used by guest to acknowledge
- Halves hypervisor invocations for interrupt virtualization

x86: issue only for legacy level-triggered IRQs
ARM Virtualization Extensions (6)

System MMU (I/O MMU)

- Devices use virtual addresses
- Translated by system MMU
  - elsewhere called I/O MMU
  - translation cache, like TLB
  - reloaded from same page table

- Can do pass-through I/O safely
  - guest accesses device registers
  - no hypervisor invocation
World Switch

**x86**

- VM state is \( \leq 4 \text{ KiB} \)
- Save/restore done by hardware on VMexit/VMentry
- Fast and simple

**ARM**

- VM state is 488 B
- Save/restore done by software (hypervisor)
- Selective save/restore
  - Eg traps w/o world switch
Microkernel as Hypervisor (NOVA, seL4)

ARM

Virtualisation-specific

x86

VM
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Guest apps

Guest OS
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VMM

Hypercall

Root

Guest apps

Guest OS

seL4

VMM

Hypercall

General-purpose
Hybrid Hypervisor OSes

- Idea: turn standard OS into hypervisor
  - ... by running in VT-x root mode
  - eg: KVM (“kernel-based virtual machine”)
- Can re-use Linux drivers etc
- **Huge trusted computing base!**
- Often falsely called a Type-2 hypervisor

### Variant: VMware MVP
- ARM hypervisor
  - pre-HW support
  - re-writes exception vectors in Android kernel to catch virtualization traps in guest
ARM: seL4 vs KVM [Dall&Nieh ‘13]
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## Virtualisation Cost (KVM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Micro BM</th>
<th>ARM A15 cycles</th>
<th>x86 Sandybridge cycles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VE ex+ent</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Switch</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/O Kernel</td>
<td>2,850</td>
<td>3,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/O User</td>
<td>6,704</td>
<td>12,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOI+ACK</td>
<td>13,726</td>
<td>2,305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KVM needs WS for any hypercall!

Source: [Dall&Nieh, ASPLOS’14]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>ARM LoC</th>
<th>x86 LoC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core CPU</td>
<td>2,493</td>
<td>16,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page Faults</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>3,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrupts</td>
<td>1,057</td>
<td>1,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timers</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1,344</td>
<td>1,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,812</td>
<td>25,367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fun and Games with Hypervisors

- Time-travelling virtual machines [King ‘05]
  - debug backwards by replay VM from checkpoint, log state changes
- SecVisor: kernel integrity by virtualisation [Seshadri ‘07]
  - controls modifications to kernel (guest) memory
- Overshadow: protect apps from OS [Chen ‘08]
  - make user memory opaque to OS by transparently encrypting
- Turtles: Recursive virtualisation [Ben-Yehuda ‘10]
  - virtualize VT-x to run hypervisor in VM
- CloudVisor: mini-hypervisor underneath Xen [Zhang ‘11]
  - isolates co-hosted VMs belonging to different users
  - leverages remote attestation (TPM) and Turtles ideas

... and many more!
Hypervisors vs Microkernels

- Both contain all code executing at highest privilege level
  - Although hypervisor may contain user-mode code as well
    - privileged part usually called “hypervisor”
    - user-mode part often called “VMM”

- Both need to abstract hardware resources
  - Hypervisor: abstraction closely models hardware
  - Microkernel: abstraction designed to support wide range of systems

- What must be abstracted?
  - Memory
  - CPU
  - I/O
  - Communication
### What’s the difference?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Hypervisor</th>
<th>Microkernel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>Virtual MMU (vMMU)</td>
<td>Address space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPU</td>
<td>Virtual CPU (vCPU)</td>
<td>Thread or scheduler activation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/O</td>
<td>• Simplified virtual device</td>
<td>• IPC interface to user-mode driver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Driver in hypervisor</td>
<td>• Interrupt IPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Virtual IRQ (vIRQ)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Virtual NIC, with driver and network stack</td>
<td>High-performance message-passing IPC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Similar abstractions
- Optimised for different use cases
- Modelled on HW, Re-uses SW
- Minimal overhead, Custom API
- Just page tables in disguise
- Just kernel-scheduled activities
- Real Difference?
• Communication is critical for I/O
  – Microkernel IPC is highly optimised
  – Hypervisor inter-VM communication is frequently a bottleneck
## Hypervisors vs Microkernels: Drawbacks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypervisors:</th>
<th>Microkernels:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Communication is Achilles heel  
  – more important than expected  
  • critical for I/O  
  – plenty improvement attempts in Xen | • Not ideal for virtualization  
  – API not very effective  
  • L4 virtualization performance close to hypervisor  
  • effort much higher  
  – Needed for legacy support  
  – No issue with H/W support? |
| • Most hypervisors have big TCBs  
  – infeasible to achieve high assurance of security/safety  
  – in contrast, microkernel implementations can be proved correct | • L4 model uses kernel-scheduled threads for more than exploiting parallelism  
  – Kernel imposes policy  
  – Alternatives exist, eg. K42 uses scheduler activations |