Synchronization

Checkpoint 2

- Friday, in Wean 5207
  - As before, we expect *everybody* to attend
  - Hash function will be different (watch e-mail)
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

Client 

| Request | Send |

Client 

| Receive | Response |
Server View

Request ➔ Receive ➔ Server

Send ➔ Response ➔ Server
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
Receiver Prepares
Client Sends Request

Client ▶ Request ▶ Send ▶ Receive ▶ Server
Send Matches Receive

Client → Request → Send → Request → Receive → Server

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

Client → Request → Send → Request → Receive → Server

Client → Receive
Server Posts Reply
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 \textit{process} or to \textit{mailbox}?

Process model
\begin{itemize}
  \item send(P, msg)
  \item receive(Q, &msg) or receive(&id, &msg)
\end{itemize}

No need to set up “communication link”
\begin{itemize}
  \item But you need to know process id's
  \item You get only one “link” per process pair
\end{itemize}
Naming

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

Where do mailbox id's come from?

“name server” approach
- `box = createmailbox();`
- `register(box1, “Terry's process”);`
- `boxT = lookup(“Terry's process”);`

File system approach – **great** (if you have one)
- `box = 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 $\Rightarrow$ 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**
- `sendmsg()`/`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

\[ d = \text{computeNthDigit}(\text{CONST_PI}, 3000); \]
- Abstract away from “who computes it”
- Should “work the same” when remote Cray does the job

Issues

- Must specify server \textit{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”
struct node {
    int value;
    struct node *neighbors[4];
} nodes[1024];

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

n = occupancy(nodes, nnodes);
bn = 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 1\textsuperscript{st} 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 ≈ 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