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Synchronization

Scoreboard

- Congratulations to groups who are on the board...
  - Some groups are clearly ahead of the game!
- That URL again
  - http://www.cs.cmu.edu/~410/scoreboard.html
Synchronization

**Project 3 tactical considerations**

- Getting the shell running is important
  - We won't build a hand-load kernel for each test!
  - Test harness relies on shell to launch programs
- Getting a body of code *solid* is important
  - Better for `exec()` to work 1,000 times than `thr_fork` once
  - It is important to read the hurdle *web page* and the hurdle form early and often!
- Run tests as soon as you can
  - Scoreboard can be a source of inspiration!
- Carefully consider the P3extra overtime
  - In general, getting a really solid kernel is the best thing
    - For your grade
    - For your education!
Outline

A Pattern Language (for client-server messaging)
  - Client view, server view, world view

IPC – InterProcess Communication

RPC – Remote Procedure Call

Textbook
  - OSC - Sections 3.4-3.6
  - OS:P+P - missing
Client View

1. Client sends a request.
2. Client receives a response.
Server View
Reality?

Those views are correct with respect to each viewer.
The kernel's view is more complex.
Reality?

Those views are *correct with respect to each viewer*

The kernel's view is more complex

- Data transfer, obviously
- Buffering (maybe)
- Blocking
- Matching a live request against a blocked request, or else blocking
Reality?

Those views are *correct with respect to each viewer*

The kernel's view is more complex

- Data transfer, obviously
- Buffering (maybe)
- Blocking
- Matching a live request against a blocked request, or else blocking

What does “the whole story” look like?
Receiver Prepares

Server

Receive
Client Sends Request
Send Matches Receive

Client → Request → Send → Receive → Request → Receive → Server
Client Posts Receive

Client

Request

Send

Request

Receive

Server

Receive

Server

Receive
Server Posts Reply

Client → Request → Send → Request → Receive → Send → Response → Server

Client → Receive

Server → Receive

Server → Send
Reply Matches Receive
Reply Matches Receive

Other event sequences are possible!
Scope of “IPC”

Communicating processes on one machine

What about multiple machines?

- Virtualize single-machine IPC
- Switch to a “network” model
  - Failures happen
  - Administrative domain switch
  - ...
  - (“RPC”)


IPC parts

Naming
Synchronization/buffering
Message body issues
  - Copy vs. reference
  - Size
Naming

Message sent to process or to mailbox?

Process model
- send(P, msg)
- receive(Q, &msg) or receive(&id, &msg)

No need to set up “communication link”
- But you need to know process id's
- You get only one “link” per process pair
Naming

Mailbox model
- send(box1, msg)
- receive(box1, &msg) or receive(&box, &msg)

Where do mailbox id's come from?
“name server” approach
mybox = createmailbox();
register(mybox, “Terry's process”);
boxT = lookup(“Terry's process”);

File system approach – great (if you have one)
mybox = createmailbox(“/tmp/Terry”);
Multiple Senders

**Problem**
- Receiver needs to know who sent request

**Typical solution**
- “Message” not just a byte array
- OS imposes structure
  - sender id (maybe process id and mailbox id)
  - maybe: type, priority, ...
Synchronization

**Issue**
- Does communication imply synchronization?

**Blocking send()?**
- Ok for request/response pattern
- Provides assurance of message delivery
- *Bad* for producer/consumer pattern

**Non-blocking send()?**
- Raises buffering issue (below)
Synchronization

Blocking receive()?
- Ok/good for “server thread”
  - Remember, de-scheduling is a kernel service
- Ok/good for request/response pattern
- Awkward for some servers
  - Abort connection when client is “too idle”

Pure-non-blocking receive?
- Ok for polling
- Polling is costly
Synchronization

**Receive-with-timeout**

- Wait for message
- Abort if timeout expires
- Can be good for highly-reliable or real-time systems
- What timeout value is appropriate?
  - Depends on each specific and complete system
  - Timeout values are error prone
Synchronization

Meta-receive
- Specify a group of mailboxes
- Wake up on first message

Receive-scan
- Specify list of mailboxes, timeout
- OS indicates which mailbox(es) are “ready” for what
- Unix: select(), poll()
Buffering

Issue
- How much space does OS provide “for free”?
- “Kernel memory” limited!

Options
- No buffering
  - implies blocking send
- Fixed size, undefined size
  - Send blocks *unpredictably*
A Buffering Problem

P1

send(P2, p1-my-status)
receive(P2, &p1-peer-status)
A Buffering Problem

**P1**

send(P2, p1-my-status)
receive(P2, &p1-peer-status)

**P2**

send(P1, p2-my-status)
receive(P1, &p2-peer-status)

**What's the problem?**

- Can you draw a picture of it?
Message Size Issue

Ok to copy *small* messages sender ⇒ receiver

Bad to copy *1-megabyte* messages
  - (Why?)

Bad suggestion: “Chop up large messages”
  - Why?
Message Size Issue

Ok to copy *small* messages sender ⇒ receiver

Bad to copy *1-megabyte* messages
  - (Why?)

Bad suggestion: “Chop up large messages”
  - Evades the issue!
“Out-of-line” Data

Message can refer to memory regions

- (page-aligned, multiple-page)
- Either “copy” or transfer ownership to receiver
- Can share the physical memory
  - Mooooo!
“Rendezvous”

Concept
- Blocking send
- Blocking receive

Great for OS
- No buffering required!

Theoretically interesting

Popular in a variety of languages
- (most of them called “Ada”)
Mach IPC – ports

Port: Mach “mailbox” object
- One receiver
  - (one “backup” receiver)
- Potentially many senders

Ports identify system objects
- Each task identified/controlled by a port
- Each thread identified/controlled by a port
- Kernel exceptions delivered to “exception port”
  - “External Pager Interface” - page faults in user space!
Mach IPC – Port Rights

**Receive rights**
- “Receive end” of a port
- Held by one task, not published
  - receive rights imply ownership

**Send rights**
- “Send end” - ability to transmit message to mailbox
- Frequently published via “name server” task
- Confer no rights (beyond “denial of service”)
Mach IPC – Message Contents

Memory regions
- In-line for “small” messages (copied)
- Out-of-line for “large” messages
  - Sender may de-allocate on send
  - Otherwise, copy-on-write

“Port rights”
- Sender specifies task-local port #
- OS translates to internal port-id while queued
- Receiver observes task-local port #
Mach IPC – Operations

**send**
- block, block(n milliseconds), don't-block
- “send just one”
  - when destination full, queue 1 message in *sender thread*
  - sender notified when transfer completes

**receive**
- receive from port
- receive from *port set*
- block, block(n milliseconds), don't-block
Mach IPC – “RPC”

Common pattern: “Remote” Procedure Call
- Really: “cross-task” procedure call

Client synchronization/message flow
- Blocking send, blocking receive

Client must allow server to respond
- Transfer “send rights” in message
  - “Send-once rights” speed hack

Server message flow (N threads)
- Blocking receive, non-blocking send
Mach IPC – Naming

**Port send rights are OS-managed capabilities**
- unguessable, unforgeable

**How to contact a server?**
- Ask the name server task
  - *Trusted* – source of all capabilities

**How to contact the name server?**
- Task creator specifies name server for new task
  - Can create custom environment for task tree
    - By convention, send rights to name server are located at a particular client port number (like stdin/stdout/stderr)
- System boot task launches nameserver, gives out rights
IPC Summary

Naming
  - Name server?
  - File system?

Queueing/blocking

Copy/share/transfer

A Unix surprise
  - \texttt{sendmsg()}/\texttt{recvmsg()} pass file descriptors!
RPC Overview

RPC = Remote *Procedure Call*

Concept: extend IPC across machines
- Maybe across “administrative domains”

Marshalling
Server location
Call semantics
Request flow
RPC Model

Approach

d = computeNthDigit(CONST_PI, 3000);

- Abstract away from “who computes it”
- Should “work the same” when remote Cray does the job

Issues

- Must specify server *somehow*
- What “digit value” is “server down”?
  - Exceptions useful in “modern” languages
Marshalling

Values must cross the network

Machine formats differ

- Integer byte order
- Floating point format
  - IEEE 754 or not
- Memory packing/alignment issues
Marshalling

Define a “network format”
- ASN.1 - “self-describing” via in-line tags
- XDR – not

“Serialize” language-level object to byte stream
- Rules typically recursive
  - Serialize a struct by serializing its fields in order
- Implementation probably should *not* be recursive
  - (Why not?)
Marshalling

Issues

- Some types don't translate well
  - Ada has ranged integers, e.g., 44..59
  - Not everybody really likes 64-bit ints
  - Floating point formats are religious issues
- Performance!
  - Memory speed $\approx$ network speed
- The dreaded “pointer problem”
Marshalling

```c
struct node {
    int value;
    struct node *neighbors[4];
} nodes[1024];

nnodes = sizeof(nodes) / sizeof(nodes[0]);

n = occupancy(nodes, nnodes);
b = best_neighbor(node);
i = value(node);
```

Implications?
Marshalling

\[ n = \text{occupancy}(\text{nodes, nnodes}); \]
- Marshall array – ok

\[ bn = \text{best\_neighbor}(\text{node}); \]
- Marshall graph structure – not so ok

\[ i = \text{value}(\text{node}); \]
- *Avoiding* marshalling graph – not obvious
  - “Node fault”??
Server Location

Which machine?
- Multiple AFS cells on the planet
- Each has multiple file servers

Approaches
- Special hostnames: www.cmu.edu
- Machine lists
  - AFS CellSrvDB /usr/vice/etc/CellSrvDB
- DNS SRV records (RFC 2782)
Server Location

Which port?

- Must distinguish services on one machine
  - Single machine can be AFS volume, vldb, pt server
- Fixed port assignment
  - AFS: fileserver UDP 7000, volume location 7003
  - /etc/services or www.iana.org/assignments/port-numbers
  - RFC 2468 www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc2468.txt
- Dynamic port assignment
  - Contact “courier” / “matchmaker” service via RPC
  - ...on a fixed port assignment!
Call Semantics

Typically, caller blocks
  - Matches procedure call semantics

Blocking can be expensive
  - By a factor of a million(!!) over real procedure call

“Asynchronous RPC”
  - Transmit request, do other work, check for reply
  - Not really “PC” any more
  - More like programming language “futures”
Fun Call Semantics

**Batch RPC**
- Send *list* of procedure calls
- Later calls can use results of earlier calls

**Issues**
- Abort batch if one call fails?
  - Yet another programming language?
- Typically wrecks “procedure call” abstraction
  - Your code must make N calls before 1st answer
Fun Call Semantics

**Batch RPC Examples**

- NFS v4, RFC 3010
- Bloch, A Practical Approach to Replication of Abstract Data Objects
Sad Call semantics

**Network failure**
- Retransmit request
  - How long?

**Server reboot**
- Does client deal with RPC session restart?
- Did the call “happen” or not?
  - Retransmitting “remove foo.c” all day long may not be safe!
Client Flow

**Client code calls stub routine**
- “Regular code” which encapsulates the magic

**Stub routine**
- Locates communication channel
  - If not established: costly location/set-up/authentication
- Marshals information
  - Procedure #, parameters
- Sends message, awaits reply
- Unmarshals reply, returns to user code
Server Flow

Thread pool runs *skeleton code*

**Skeleton code**
- Waits for request from a client
- Locates client state
  - Authentication/encryption context
- Unmarshals parameters
- Calls “real code”
- Marshals reply
- Sends reply
RPC Deployment

Define interface
- Get it right, you'll live with it for a while!
- AFS & NFS RPC layers ~15 years old

“Stub generator”
- Special-purpose compiler
- Turns “interface spec” into stubs & skeleton

Link stub code with client & server

Run a server!
Java RMI

Remote Method Invocation

Serialization: programmer/language cooperation

- Dangerously subtle!
  - Bloch, Effective Java

RMI > RPC

- Remote methods $\cong$ remote procedures
- Parameters can be (differently) remote
  - Client on A can call method of class implemented on B passing object located on C
    » (slowly)
RPC Summary

RPC is lots of fun
So much fun that lots of things don't do it
- SMTP
- HTTP

RPC = IPC
  + server location, marshalling, network failure, delays
  - special copy tricks, speed

Remote Objects?  Effective Java, Bitter Java