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Introduction

- Observation: Modern multicore hardware is a network, and exhibits classic networking effects
- The OS should be designed as a distributed system
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▶ Can shared data structures take advantage of this?
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Node heterogeneity

- Within a system:
  - Programmable NICs
  - GPUs
  - FPGAs (in CPU sockets)

- Architectural differences on a single die:
  - Streaming instructions (SIMD, SSE, etc.)
  - Virtualisation support, power management
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  - Programmable NICs
  - GPUs
  - FPGAs (in CPU sockets)

- Architectural differences on a single die:
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- Existing OS architectures have trouble accommodating this
Dynamic changes

- Hot-plug of devices, memory, (cores?)
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Dynamic changes

- Hot-plug of devices, memory, (cores?)
- Power-management
- Partial failure
Summary

▶ Latency, heterogeneity, dynamic changes
▶ All classic characteristics of a distributed, networked system
▶ Why don’t we program the machine this way?
The OS as a distributed system

What are the implications of building an OS as a distributed system?

- Extreme position: clean slate design
- Fully explore ramifications
- No regard for compatibility
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Message passing vs. shared memory

- Access to remote shared data can be seen as a blocking RPC
  - Processor stalled while line is fetched or invalidated
  - Limited by latency of interconnect round-trips
- Performance scales with size of data (number of cache lines)
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- Access to remote shared data can be seen as a blocking RPC
  - Processor stalled while line is fetched or invalidated
  - Limited by latency of interconnect round-trips
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- By sending an explicit RPC (message), we:
  - Send a compact high-level description of the operation
  - Reduce the time spent blocked, waiting for the interconnect
- Potential for more efficient use of interconnect bandwidth
- Cf. RPC vs. DSVM in distributed systems
Why message passing?

- We can reason about it
- Decouples system structure from inter-core communication mechanism
  - Communication patterns explicitly expressed
  - Naturally supports heterogeneous cores
  - Naturally supports non-coherent interconnects (PCIe)
- Better match for future hardware
  - …with cheap explicit message passing (e.g. Tile64)
  - …without cache-coherence (e.g. Intel 80-core)
Message passing vs. shared memory: tradeoff

2×4-core Intel (shared bus)

### Graph:

- **Axes:**
  - **Y-axis:** Latency (cycles × 1000)
  - **X-axis:** Cache lines

### Lines:

- 2 cores, shared
- 8 cores, shared
- 2 cores, message
- 8 cores, message

### Key:

- **Shared:** clients modify shared array (no locking)
- **Message:** URPC to server core

---
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Replication
Given no sharing, what do we do with the state?

- Some state naturally partitions
- Other state must be replicated
- Used as an optimisation in previous systems:
  - Tornado, K42 clustered objects
  - Linux read-only data, kernel text
- We argue that replication should be the default
Consistency

- How do we maintain consistency of replicated data?
- Depends on consistency and ordering requirements, e.g.:
  - TLBs (unmap) single-phase commit
  - Memory reallocation (capabilities) two-phase commit
  - Cores come and go (power management, hotplug) agreement
Change of programming model: why wait?

- In a traditional OS, achieving consistency implies blocking
- e.g. unmap, global TLB shootdown

Idea: change programming model:
- Don’t wait: do something else in the meantime
- Make such operations split-phase from user space
  - Propose a change, receive success/failure notification

\[ \Rightarrow \text{tradeoff latency vs. overhead} \]
Heterogeneity

- Message-based communication handles core heterogeneity
  - Can specialise implementation and data structures
- Doesn’t deal with other aspects
  - What should run where?
  - How should complex resources be allocated?
- Our solution based on constraint logic programming [Schüpbach et al., MMCS’08]
- System knowledge base stores rich, detailed representation of hardware, performs online reasoning
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**User space:**
- App
- App
- Application
- Application

**OS:**
- OS node
  - State replica
- OS node
  - State replica
- OS node
  - State replica
- OS node
  - State replica

**Hardware:**
- ARM NIC
- ia32-64 CPU
- ia32-64 CPU
- GPU

Async messages

Interconnect
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Optimisation
Sharing as an optimisation in multikernels

- We’ve replaced shared memory with explicit messaging
- But sharing/locking might be faster between some cores
  - Hyperthreads, or cores with shared L2/3 cache

⇒ Re-introduce shared memory as optimisation
  - Hidden, local
  - Only when faster, as decided at runtime
  - Basic model remains split-phase

Traditional OSes | Finer-grained locking | Clustered objects, partitioning | Distributed state, replica maintenance
---|---|---|---
Shared state, one-big-lock | | | 
Multikernel
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Conclusion

- Modern computers are inherently distributed systems
  - Communication latency, network effects
  - Heterogeneity
  - Dynamic behaviour
- We should be programming them as such
  - Message passing vs. sharing
  - Replication, consistency
  - Explicit management of heterogeneity
- Multikernel: a new OS architecture based on these ideas
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- Modern computers are inherently distributed systems
  - Communication latency, network effects
  - Heterogeneity
  - Dynamic behaviour
- We should be programming them as such
  - Message passing vs. sharing
  - Replication, consistency
  - Explicit management of heterogeneity
- **Multikernel**: a new OS architecture based on these ideas
- **Barrelfish**: our implementation

www.barrelfish.org