



Introduction

The Operating-System Design Dilemma

Clearly, the operating system design must be strongly influenced by the type of use for which the machine is intended. Unfortunately it is often the case with ‘general purpose machines’ that the type of use cannot easily be identified; **a common criticism of many systems is that, in attempting to be all things to all individuals, they end up being totally satisfactory to no-one.** [2]

Trivial Pursuit in Computer Science

Q: “*What is an elephant?*”

A: “*A mouse with an operating system.*”

General Purpose System

- being prepared on all eventualities — „Eier legende Wollmilchsau“
e.g., enforcing $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \textit{scheduling} \\ \textit{protection} \\ \textit{security} \end{array} \right\}$ in a single- $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \textit{process} \\ \textit{program} \\ \textit{user} \end{array} \right\}$ environment
- optimized towards the most probable and common “standard” use case
– at the cost of all the cases that deviate from the artificially defined norm
- no (system) function is free of charge — not even a “sleeping beauty”



... **System** provides general services for a broad range of applications

- shows up with a rich set of system functions
 - trying to cover all of the demands stated by the various user programs
- aims at providing users with the best possible compromise
 - there can't be only one optimal solution to a number of various problems
- follows some sort of *black-box model* by its (mostly) fixed system interface

... **Function** same as above, but services become attributes of a single function

General Purpose Function — printf(3)

```
wosch@hawaii 37> uname -smrm
Linux hawaii.cs.uni-magdeburg.de 2.2.14 i686
wosch@hawaii 38> echo `main(){printf("Hello world!\n");}` > hello.c
wosch@hawaii 39> gcc -O6 -c hello.c; gcc -static -o hello hello.o
wosch@hawaii 40> hello
Hello world!
wosch@hawaii 41> ls -l hello*
-rwxr-xr-x 1 wosch ivs 932099 Dec 1 11:08 hello*
-rw-r--r-- 1 wosch ivs 33 Dec 1 11:06 hello.c
-rw-r--r-- 1 wosch ivs 908 Dec 1 11:07 hello.o
wosch@hawaii 42> size hello hello.o
text data bss dec hex filename
195562 5064 3340 203966 31cbe hello
29 0 0 29 1d hello.o
```

General Purpose Function_(contd.)

```
skiff@cluster6:~$ uname -smnm
Linux skiff@cluster6.headfields.org 2.4.0-test1-a67-mk1-cr12 armv4l
skiff@cluster6:~$ echo `main(){printf("Hello world!\n");}` > hello.c
skiff@cluster6:~$ gcc -O6 -c hello.c; gcc -static -o hello hello.o
skiff@cluster6:~$ ./hello
Hello world!
skiff@cluster6:~$ ls -l hello*
-rwxr-xr-x 1 guest users 989494 Mar 6 03:13 hello
-rw-r--r-- 1 wosch ivs 34 Mar 6 03:13 hello.c
-rw-r--r-- 1 wosch ivs 616 Mar 6 03:13 hello.o
skiff@cluster6:~$ size hello hello.o
text data bss dec hex filename
214638 4208 3252 221998 3632a hello
42 0 0 42 2a hello.o
```

```
wosch@cluster6 37> uname -smnm
Linux cluster6 2.2.17-4 alpha
wosch@cluster6 38> echo `main(){printf("Hello world!\n");}` > hello.c
wosch@cluster6 39> gcc -O6 -c hello.c; gcc -static -o hello hello.o
wosch@cluster6 40> hello
Hello world!
wosch@cluster6 41> ls -l hello*
-rwxr-xr-x 1 wosch ivs 2073622 Mar 6 11:43 hello*
-rw-r--r-- 1 wosch ivs 1888 Mar 6 11:43 hello.c
-rw-r--r-- 1 wosch ivs 1888 Mar 6 11:43 hello.o
wosch@cluster6 42> size hello hello.o
text data bss dec hex filename
427176 19634 7088 453896 6edba hello
62 0 0 62 3a hello.o
```

Memory Footprints

Program	Size (in Bytes)				
	Linux			Solaris	Windows
	i686	arm	ppc	alpha	ppc
hello	203966	221998	245452	453898	183373
hello.o	29	42	60	62	38
%	0.014	0.018	0.024	0.013	0.02
					≈0.094

No Isolated Phenomenon

```
wosch@cluster 37> uname -smnm
Linux statler 2.2.15ppc3 ppc
wosch@cluster 38> echo `main(){printf("Hello world!\n");}` > hello.c
wosch@cluster 39> gcc -O6 -c hello.c; gcc -static -o hello hello.o
wosch@cluster 40> hello
Hello world!
wosch@cluster 41> ls -l hello*
-rwxr-xr-x 1 wosch ivs 1051922 Mar 6 11:32 hello*
-rw-r--r-- 1 wosch ivs 32 Mar 6 11:32 hello.c
-rw-r--r-- 1 wosch ivs 684 Mar 6 11:32 hello.o
wosch@cluster 42> size hello hello.o
text data bss dec hex filename
236908 4804 3740 245462 3becc hello
60 0 0 60 3c hello.o
```

```
wosch@nithau 37> uname -smnm
SunOS nithau 5.7 sun4u
wosch@nithau 38> echo `main(){printf("Hello world!\n");}` > hello.c
wosch@nithau 39> gcc -O6 -c hello.c; gcc -static -o hello hello.o
wosch@nithau 40> hello
Hello world!
wosch@nithau 41> ls -l hello*
-rwxr-xr-x 1 wosch ivs 299008 Mar 6 20:01 hello*
-rw-r--r-- 1 wosch ivs 860 Mar 6 20:01 hello.c
-rw-r--r-- 1 wosch ivs 860 Mar 6 20:01 hello.o
wosch@nithau 42> size hello hello.o
text data bss dec hex filename
173660 6741 3072 183373 2cc5d hello
38 0 0 38 26 hello.o
```

”General Purpose” Considered Harmful?

- it depends—the interface alone is not always the cause of all evil
 - much more crucial tends to be the function’s internal software structure
 - * degree of modularization, modul interdependencies, uses relation, . . .
 - black-boxing aims at hiding exactly these internals from the user
 - * much in the same way as an *abstract data type* (ADT) [1]
 - the desired features may be present internally, but they remain hidden
- one might expect puts(3) to be the “streamlined” printf(3) alternative

Special Purpose Function — puts(3)

```
wosch@hawaii 37> uname -snrm
Linux hawaii.cs.uni-magdeburg.de 2.2.14 i686
wosch@hawaii 38> echo 'main(){puts("Hello world!");}' > hello.c
wosch@hawaii 39> gcc -O6 -c hello.c; gcc -static -o hello hello.o
wosch@hawaii 40> hello
Hello world!
wosch@hawaii 41> ls -l hello*
-rwxr-xr-x 1 wosch ivs 932715 Mar 7 16:16 hello*
-rw-r--r-- 1 wosch ivs 30 Mar 7 16:16 hello.c
-rw-r--r-- 1 wosch ivs 908 Mar 7 16:16 hello.o
wosch@hawaii 42> size hello hello.o
text data bss dec hex filename
195759 5076 3360 204195 31da3 hello
28 0 0 28 1c hello.o
```

Where the Shoe Pinches

- exposition of the *system architecture* 11
- structure of the *object modules* 12
- function of the *binder* 15
- capabilities of the *compiler* 17
- features of the *programming language* 18

Where the Shoe Pinches_(contd.) System Architecture

- printf(3) supports formatted I/O in many respects:
 1. assortment of plain data types and sizes
 - int, unsigned, float, char, char*; short, long, double
 2. various kinds of numbering schemes
 - dual, octal, decimal, hexa-decimal
 3. different formats
 - left/right aligned, user-defined field widths
- not every application exploits all these features
 - “Hello World!”: a left-aligned character string (char*)
- but nonetheless, every application is charged with all these features

- a single reference to printf(3) entails a number of follow-up references
 - to functions called unconditionally
 - * e.g., output of the assembled character buffer using write(2) +
 - to functions called conditionally
 - * e.g., output of character '-' when displaying a negative int +
 - * e.g., output of an unsigned after having parsed format '%u' +
 - :
 - * e.g., the option for an int although '%i' gets never parsed –
 - similar holds for variables, constants, and other addressable units
- “monolithic source modules” of that kind result in overloaded object modules

Where the Shoe Pinches_(contd.)

foo.cc — example of a source-module structure similar to printf(3)

```
#define LINE_SIZE 64
char line[LINE_SIZE];
int slot;

void resetline () {
    for (int i = 0; i < LINE_SIZE; i++)
        line[i] = '\0';
    slot = 0;
}

void flushline () {
    write(1, line, slot);
}

void writeline (char c) {
    line[slot++] = c;
}
```

```
wosch@hawaii 40> g++ -O6 -fno-rtti -fno-exceptions -fno-inline -c foo.cc
wosch@hawaii 41> nm -v foo.o
```

```
U write
00000000 t gcc2_compiled.
00000000 B line
00000000 T resetline__Fv
00000024 T flushline__Fv
0000003c T writeline__Fc
00000040 B slot
00000058 T putcharacter__Fc
00000080 T putstring__Fpc
000000a8 T putunsigned__Fui
000000ec T putnumber__Fii
wosch@hawaii 42> size foo.o
```

text	data	bss	dec	hex	filename
270	0	68	338	152	foo.o

Resolution of symbol putstring__Fpc causes not only the (static) binding of function putstring(), and of all other objects/functions (or object modules) directly or indirectly referenced by that source, but also of all unreferenced objects/functions (e.g. putnumber() and putunsigned()) contained in the same object module—and this holds recursively.

Where the Shoe Pinches_(contd.)

Binder

- the usual case is to consider an entire object module as binding unit
 - not the actually referenced functions/objects of that particular module
 - the consequence is a larger memory footprint → p. 14
- static binding can benefit from the output generated by a compiler
 - many compilers leave a .size assembler pseudo-instruction → p. 16
 - many assemblers and/or linkers don't make capital out of this
- dynamic binding seems to be the solution to these problems, if any
 - but at which other costs? — even this (nice) feature is not for free!

Where the Shoe Pinches_(contd.)

- the output of `gcc ... -S foo.cc` ?
 - `.size` leaves the actual object size
 - ... to be kept in the symbol table
 - ... to be used by the linker
 - ... to extract `putstring()`
- not every compiler does like this
 - not every assembler notices `.size`
 - not every linker binds selectively
- tools that do not work always properly

```
.align 4
.global putstring__FPC
.type putstring__FPC,@function
putstring__FPC:
    pushl %ebp
    movl %esp,%ebp
    pushl %ebx
    movl 8(%ebp),%ebx
    jmp .L21
    .p2align 4,,7
.L18:
    movsbl %al,%eax
    pushl %eax
    call putcharcharacter__FPC
    addl $4,%esp
.L21:
    movb (%ebx),%al
    incl %ebx
    testb %al,%al
    jne .L18
    movl -4(%ebp),%ebx
    leave
    ret
.Lfe5:
.size putstring__FPC,.Lfe5-putstring__FPC
```

Where the Shoe Pinches_(contd.)

- a compile-time option such as “`-fdismember`” would be nice to have
 - to cut a single (monolithic) source module in pieces of compilation units
 - * each of which being the source-code representation of a binding unit
 - to create object modules which, likewise, export a single reference only
 - * thus to outwit the binder and link only the truly referenced parts
 - to archive the (possibly many) “slim” object modules in a library
- an extensive local data and control flow analysis alone is not enough
 - functions unreachable inside a source module may be reachable from outside
- a global analysis is not always feasible—and wouldn’t solve our problem

Where the Shoe Pinches_(contd.)

Programming Language

- a problem lies in the overloaded and monolithic interface of `printf(3)`
 - an actual parameter decides upon which of the many operations to perform
 - a format-string interpreter fetches instructions and reads their operands
 - references to functions implementing the instructions are hard encoded
- moreover, `printf(3)` is not a programming-language but a library concept
 - thus, static format-string analysis becomes not the compiler’s task
 - consequently, unused functions cannot be eliminated at compile-time
- an integrated programming system looks nice—but is not everybody’s darling

Where the Shoe Pinches_(contd.)

<iostream.h>

- ```
#include <iostream.h>

void main () {
 cout << "Hello world!" << endl;
}
```
- `ostream` provides specialized operations
    - by overloading operator “<<”
  - users see a function set to choose from
    - “`ostream& operator << (const char *)`” and “`endl`” is all one needs
    - other operators are not used, not referenced and, hence, need not be linked
    - the question is whether or not `ostream` makes up a single compilation unit
  - at a first glance object-orientation or C++ is really the right way to go

```
wosch@hawaii 37> uname -snrm
Linux hawaii.cs.uni-magdeburg.de 2.2.14 i686
wosch@hawaii 38> vi hello.cc
wosch@hawaii 39> g++ -O6 -c hello.cc; g++ -static -o hello hello.o
wosch@hawaii 40> hello
Hello world!
wosch@hawaii 41> ls -l hello*
-rwxr-xr-x 1 wosch ivs 1403951 Mar 9 16:13 hello*
-rw-r--r-- 1 wosch ivs 73 Mar 9 16:09 hello.cc
-rw-r--r-- 1 wosch ivs 1248 Mar 9 16:13 hello.o
wosch@hawaii 42> size hello hello.o
text data bss dec hex filename
300921 19564 3812 324297 4f2c9 hello
44 52 0 96 60 hello.o
```

## An Omnipresent Problem

- the `printf(3)` and `iostream.h` examples are no exceptions
  - existing software-development tools leave much to be desired
  - nonetheless is “user-friendly” software exceedingly required
- a highly modular and application-oriented software structure is needed
  - beginning at the “drawing-board” where the software design takes place
  - ending on the spot where the software implementation is been carried out
- certain software-engineering principles must be applied (more) consequently

## That’s the State of the Art

- operating systems provide nice features for optimized storage management
  - virtual memory** enables the execution of uncomplete programs, i.e. the programs must not necessarily be entirely present in main memory to be executed. A program’s memory footprint varies with the size of the process’s working set (of pages).
  - shared libraries** work similar. In addition, their use leads to a significant reduction of the disk-memory space occupied by the executable programs.
- but these are only good for higher-level (system) software abstractions
  - what’s about the virtual-memory or shared-library system itself ?
  - what’s about device driver, process management, scheduling etc. ?
- lower-level (system) software cannot always make a profit from it !

## An Operating-System Problem?

- no . . .
  - it’s a general problem concerning all kinds of software :-(
- . . . but operating systems are highly sensitive to software deficiencies
  - they generally are of functionally high complexity
  - they come up with a durability that lies in the order of decades
  - they are often expected to show a broad applicability
- operating systems are key technology — in the past, present, and future

## Preventive Measures

- the design and development of an operating system as a program family
  - establishment of a many-layered functional hierarchy
  - creation of a manufacture of “standardized” (reusable) units
  - construction of a rich set of small and simple modules
- a careful use of object orientation in the implementation process
  - composition of abstract data types by means of classes
  - use of inheritance to promote the functional enrichment of the system
  - thriftiness in the employment of late-binding
- *understand application programs as final operating-system specializations*

## Bibliography

- [1] B. H. Liskov and S. Zilles. Programming with Abstract Data Types. *SIGPLAN Notices*, 9(4), 1974.
- [2] A. M. Lister and R. D. Eager. *Fundamentals of Operating Systems*. The Macmillan Press Ltd., fifth edition, 1993. ISBN 0-333-59848-2.
- [3] D. L. Parnas. Designing Software for Ease of Extension and Contraction. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, SE-5(2):128–138, 1979.

## Application-Oriented Operating Systems

Some users may require only a subset of services or features that other users need. These **‘less demanding’ users** may demand that they are not be forced to pay for the resources consumed by the unneeded features. [3]