Lecture 1

Welcome to CSC469 / CSC2208: Advanced Operating Systems

Instructor: Angela Demke Brown
TA: Tom Hart
Email: demke@cs.toronto.edu
Website: http://www.cs.toronto.edu/~demke/469F.07/
Bboard: https://csc.cdf.toronto.edu/bb/YaBB.pl?board=CSC469H1F
Plan for today

- Overview of CSC 469 / CSC 2208
  - How it’ll work
  - What I expect from you
- What makes software systems tough and interesting
  - Reality
  - Complexity
- Goals and Topics
- What’s next...
Overview (Fall 2007)

- Check the web page for updates and news frequently
  - http://www.cs.toronto.edu/~demke/469F.07/
- Components
  - Regular lectures (by me) and discussion (by you)
  - Tutorials (concrete examples, assignment help, Q&A)
  - Four assignments
  - Two term tests
- Other stuff
  - Readings from the research literature will be assigned
  - No required text, but some books on reserve in library
  - Prereqs
How to read a research paper

• Consider the source (don’t dismiss, but do consider)
  • Who wrote it -- are they experts or unknowns?
  • Where was it published -- top journal or personal web page?
  • Other aspects: sponsor, review process, structure, tone, etc.

• Dig for the point
  • Read the abstract, intro, conclusion and related work (and bib)
  • Flip (semi-quickly) thru the paper, looking at headings, figures and data
  • Consider how much time you really want to devote to the guts
  • What is the hypothesis, how do they try to prove it, and do they succeed?

• Practice Active Reading
  • Underline key points, make notes in margin
  • Write down questions
Example: Active Reading

In a system that includes communications, one usually draws a modular boundary around the communication subsystem and defines a firm interface between it and the rest of the system. When doing so, it becomes apparent that there is a list of functions each of which might be implemented in any of several ways: by the communication subsystem, by its client, as a joint venture, or perhaps redundantly, each doing its own version. In reasoning about this choice, the requirements of the application provide the basis for the following class of arguments:

The function in question can completely and correctly be implemented only with the knowledge and help of the application standing at the endpoints of the communication system. Therefore, providing that questioned function as a feature of the communication system itself is not possible. (Sometimes an incomplete version of the function provided by the communication system may be useful as a performance enhancement.)

We call this line of reasoning against low-level function implementation the end-to-end argument. The following sections examine the end-to-end argument in detail, first with a case study of a typical example in which it is used—the function in question is reliable data transmission—and then by exhibiting the range of functions to which the same argument can be applied. For the case of the data communication system, this range includes encryption, duplicate message detection, message sequencing, guaranteed message delivery, detecting host crashes, and delivery receipts. In a broader context, the argument seems to apply to many other functions of a computer operating system, including its file system. Examination of this broader context will be easier, however, if we first consider the more specific data communication context.
Assignments

Goal is to explore different operating systems and the impact of design choices...

• Assignment 0 – Benchmarking (due Oct. 5)
• Assignment 1 – Using advanced synchronization (due Oct. 19)
• Assignment 2 – Multiprocessor OS support (due Nov. 9)
• Assignment 3 – Fault Tolerance (due Nov. 30)
Prereqs and Refresher

- Prereq: CSC 369 or equivalent
  - you should have a solid command of this material
  - if you don’t, you will struggle
  - worse, you will not benefit nearly as much as you should
- Handout #1 & #2: helping you refresh
  - a bunch of questions from ACM Self Assessment Procs
  - the point is to swap in your OS knowledge
    - use your OS book from 369
    - discuss the problems and topics with your peers
  - now is the time to refresh your memory!
    - so, we will be discussing these questions in tutorial on Thursday
Making the grade in 469

• Breakdown
  • 4 Assignments (10%, 10%, 15%, 15%)
    • First one solo, rest you can pair up
  • 2 term tests (Oct. 24 - 20%, Dec. 5 - 25%)
    • Conflicts with 4-6 p.m. on these dates?
  • 5% class discussions (live and on bboard)
• You need to be here (and in tutorial) to participate in discussions and get the most out of the class!
What is a “system”?

- **Generic Definition:**
  - A group of independent but interrelated elements comprising a unified whole

- **Characteristics**
  - Environment, boundary, emergence (the whole is more than the sum of the parts), processes, I/O, structure

- **Stability**
  - Complex systems resist change
  - Social systems, environmental systems ...
What makes software systems tough and interesting

- **Reality**
  - simplifying assumptions often don't hold up
    - people are rarely rational, arrivals are rarely Gaussian, environments are rarely clean, failures are rarely independent, etc...
  - poorly done systems can be incredibly expensive
    - billions of dollars and even life & death
- **Rapid changes in technology and applications**
  - technology advances change the rules
  - new applications change the requirements
- **Most generally: Complexity**
  - coping with complexity is what almost all of it boils down to
Real examples of disasters (from J. Saltzer)

• Tax system modernization
  • U.S. Internal Revenue Service
    • tried to replace 27 aging systems
  • Started 1989, scrapped 1997, spent: $4B
  • Causes: complexity
    • all-or-nothing massive upgrade

• Advanced automation system
  • U.S. Federal Aviation Administration
    • tried to replace 1972 Air Route Traffic Control System
  • Started 1982, scrapped 1994, spent: $6B
  • Causes: complexity
    • changing specifications, grandiose expectations, congressional meddling
More examples of disasters (from J. Saltzer)

- Ambulance dispatching
  - London ambulance service
    - automate dispatching and routing
  - Started 1991, scrapped 1992, cost: 20 lives lost (and $2.5M)
    - shut down after 2 days of operation
  - Causes: complexity and poor management
    - unrealistic schedule (5 months), overambitious objectives,
      unidentifiable project manager, low bidder had no experience, no
      testing/overlap with old system, users not consulted during design

- Automated DMV
  - California department of motor vehicles
  - Started 1987, scrapped 1994, spent: $44M
  - Causes: complexity and blame shedding
    - underestimated cost by 3X, slower than 1965 system, governor
      fired whistleblower, DMV blames Tandem, Tandem blames DMV
Rapid pace of our field

• Technology is a major driver
  • Technology eliminates some problems and creates new ones (and enables new applications) over time
  • Incommensurate scaling makes things interesting
  • This means that one has to be on top of technology characteristics and trends

• New application requirements are another major driver
  • Changes the rules (assumptions), often forcing redesign
  • Example: video conferencing vs. best-effort networking
  • Example: mobile computing vs. file system caching

• Systems are complicated and consist of many parts
  • To do top-quality work, you must know about them all!
  • ... and their interactions too.
Problems in complex systems

- Propagation of effects
  - a “small, localized change” often has far-reaching effects
  - example: 13-inch tire to 15-inch tire to improve tire lifetime
    - consequences: wheel wells must be enlarged, spare tire space must be enlarged, back seat must be moved forward to accommodate spare
  - “there are no small changes in a large system”

- Surprises
  - an unexpected consequence of a change
  - example: 15-inch tires may weigh 21 pounds
    - consequence: exceed limit of current land shipping mechanism

- Incommensurate scaling
  - as a system scales up or down in size or speed, not all parts of it follow the same scaling rules
  - example: a mouse the size of an elephant would collapse
How does this translate to software systems?

• The software systems we’re concerned with suffer from all of these problems
• We’d like to have a constructive theory to apply
  • e.g., like linear control systems, thermodynamic systems,
    ...
• Unfortunately, we don’t
  • note that this would be a worthy career contribution
• Where does that leave us?
  • Case studies
  • Lessons from study of other complex systems
    • major difference is the unprecedented rate of change
Let's try to define complexity, as a start

- Webster: “the state of being complex”
  - complex => “difficult to understand”
- Relative term, not lending itself to quantification
- Symptoms of complexity
  - large number of elements
  - large number of interconnections
  - irregularity (lots of exceptions, neither regular nor repetitive)
  - lack of a methodical description
    - like previous one, but highlights difficulty of understanding
  - minimum team size
    - combines all of above into “how many people to collectively get it”
Some sources of system complexity

• Large number of objectives
  • example: new goals, requirements, or performance targets

• Need for high utilization of limited resources
  • example: single-track railroad line

• Generality
  • example: separately steerable front wheels
  • generally, generality increases complexity
  • frequently, it does so without real purpose
Techniques for coping with complexity

- **Modularity**
  - divide-and-conquer can often reduce growth (as function of size) from square to linear

- **Abstraction**
  - separation of interface from internals
    - or specification from implementation

- **Hierarchy**
  - builds on modularity by recursively grouping module sets
  - most surviving complex systems use it: army, company, etc
What was the point of that?

- Well, what do operating systems do?
  - Provide abstractions of system resources
    - processes, files, sockets, malloc, etc...
  - Isolate application writers from details and each other
- Also, tend to be highly complex
  - many objectives
    - performance, reliability, ease of use, security, maintainability, ...
  - desire for high utilization of resources
  - generality: support all applications well
- Also, the problem keeps changing
  - technology advances and new applications
  - ... and combining multiple systems (the soul of distributed systems) complicates everything further
The End-to-End Argument

- From J. H. Saltzer, D. P. Reed & D. D. Clark
- Briefly:

  Don’t implement some function in low-level software layers if higher-level software must help get that function right.
Example: Careful file transfer

- Node A wants to transfer a file to Node B
- File is stored on A’s local file system
- Transfer is successful if file is stored safely on B’s local file system
- A communication network moves packets from Node A to Node B
- User-level file transfer application runs at A and B
- What could go wrong?
- What can be done about it?
Possible Solutions

• Make each step as reliable as possible
  • File / storage system keeps checksums
  • Software is verified
  • Network layer handles lost/duplicate packets
  • Application on B confirms correct receipt and storage of file

• But last step is required no matter how reliable the intermediate steps are!
  • So repeating the checks at the internal points just adds overhead
  • Except...
Advice on System Design

• from Lampson’s “Hints for Computer System Design” in 9th SOSP, 1983

• Key principle is separating interface (how clients interact with the system) from implementation
  • Functionality
  • Speed
  • Fault tolerance
Functionality Hints

• Keep it simple
  • Do one thing at a time, and do it well
    • And get it right
    • Make it fast, rather than general or powerful
    • Don’t hide power
    • Leave it to the client

• Maintain stability/continuity
  • Keep basic interfaces stable
  • Keep a place to stand

• Get the implementation to work
  • Plan to throw one away, you will anyhow (Brooks)
  • Keep secrets
  • Divide and conquer
  • Use a good idea again

• Handle normal & worst case separately
Speed Hints

- Split resources in a fixed way if in doubt
- Use static analysis if you can
- Use dynamic translation when it's reasonable
- Cache results
- Use hints
- Use brute force
- Compute in the background
- Batch if possible
- Safety first
- Shed load to control demand
Fault Tolerance Hints

• End to end (saltzer)
• Log updates
• Make actions atomic or restartable
Some add’l practical techniques

• Control novelty
  • sources of excessive novelty
    • second-system effect, better technology, marketing pressure...
  • some novelty is necessary; the hard part is figuring out when to say NO

• Install feedback
  • design for iteration, iterate the design
  • something simple working first; one new problem at a time

• Find bad ideas fast
  • understand the design loop and examine the initial requirements
  • try ideas out, but don’t hesitate to scrap them

• Conceptual integrity
  • one mind controls design
  • good aesthetics yield better systems
    • also makes them much easier to debug and maintain
Major goals of 469

- Understand how OS design changes in response to
  - key technological advances (e.g., CPU vs. disk)
  - new application requirements (e.g., mobility, QoS)
  - advanced system objectives (e.g., fault tolerance, security)

- Understand key aspects of distributed systems
  - getting systems to talk to each other
  - marshalling separate resources to achieve common goals
  - figuring out where to perform particular functions

- Approach: case studies and existing experience
Major 469 Topics

• Operating system structure and internals
• Performance evaluation and benchmarking
• Communication models
• Concurrency, distributed event ordering, multi-party consensus
• Multiprocessor operating system issues
• Advanced virtual memory and storage systems
• Distributed systems
• Security
• Future environs
What’s next …

- Page in your OS knowledge from 369!

- Study options for operating system structure
  - 2 papers for next time:
    - Original UNIX paper (Ritchie & Thompson, 1974)
    - Original Mach paper (Acetta et al, 1986)