CSC 256/456: Operating Systems

#### Microkernels

John Criswell University of Rochester



#### Onwards to user-space!

#### Microkernels

#### Monolithic Kernel (aka Everything and the Kitchen Sink)



#### Monolithic Kernel Limitations

- \* Poor security
  - \* Buffer overflow gains access to *everything!*
- \* Poor reliability
  - \* Bug in kernel can affect unrelated subsystems
  - Difficult to restart faulty subsystem

### Processes Don't Have This Problem

- \* Isolated memory
- Communication via
  - \* Pipes
  - Explicitly shared memory
- Self-contained programs
  - No access to irrelevant data structures



# Could kernel components be processes?

#### Microkernel

- \* Move kernel functionality into user-space processes
  - \* File systems
  - Networking subsystem
  - \* Drivers
- \* Kernel provides
  - Protection
  - Communication mechanisms

#### Microkernel



# Advantages of Microkernels

- \* Faults are localized
  - \* Bug in network code doesn't corrupt disk data
- \* Easier to improve reliability
  - \* Can monitor and restart processes (e.g., filesystem)
- \* Easier to apply security techniques
  - \* Randomization and re-randomization (Guiffruida)
  - Apply memory safety or type-safe language to critical processes

# Disadvantages of Microkernels

- Communication overhead
  - \* Semantics of message passing affects performance
  - \* What is placed in user-space affects performance
- User/Kernel boundary crossing overhead
- Context switching overhead
  - \* Monolithic libraries are always available
  - \* User-space service may not have CPU when needed
  - \* TLB Flush when switching page table pages

#### Microkernel Advantages are Not Magic

- Reliability must be designed and built
  - \* File system process crash still catastrophic
  - Restart of critical processes must be designed and built
- \* Security is still an issue
  - \* Exploited file system process can access any file
  - \* Exploited network process can read all packets

#### Mach

- \* Developed at Carnegie Mellon University in the 80's
- Memory management design influenced modern OS design
- \* Goal: separate policy from mechanism

# Example: Mach

- User-level memory management
  - \* trusted / protected by the kernel
  - kernel provides the basic protection mechanism
  - \* user-level memory manager handles page loading; decides replacement policy



#### Microkernel Failures

- Windows NT family
  - Original Windows NT had microkernel design
  - \* By Windows 2000, functionality moved into kernel
- \* Mac OS X
  - \* Based on NextStep which is based on Mach + 4.4BSD
  - \* BSD sub-systems moved into kernel; live alongside Mach
  - \* Essentially two kernels living in the same space

#### Microkernel Successes

- \* QNX (real-time operating system kernel)
- Symbian (mobile operating system)
- \* L4
  - Major work to reduce microkernel overheads
  - \* Can run Linux with L4Linux
  - seL4: Fully verified variant

# Hypervisors and Virtual Machines

#### Virtual Machines

- \* Run multiple OS instances
- \* Migrate OS instances from one machine to another
- \* Software compatibility when hardware changes

Windows	Mac OS X	Linux		
???				
Hardware				

# **Compiler Translation**

- \* Translate binary code (Original VMWare)
- \* Translate virtual code (JVM, OS/360)

Windows	Mac OS X	Linux		
Original VMWare				
Hardware				

#### Para-Virtualizaiton

- \* Modify OS to interface with lower-level hypervisor
- \* Efficient but requires OS changes

Windows	Mac OS X	Linux	
Original Xen			
	Hardware		

#### Hardware Virtualization

- \* Hardware provide new privilege layer under OS
- \* Efficient
- \* Compatible
- Requires new hardware

Windows	Mac OS X	Linux
	Xen, Hyper-V	
	Hardware	

#### Credits

- \* Some slides based on slides from previous year
- Slides only to be used for instruction at the University of Rochester