

| | | | |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Name | UBID | Seat | Side |
| | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Question: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Total |
| Points: | 10 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 25 | 25 | 100 |
| Score: | | | | | | | | | | | |

CSE 421/521 Final Exam

11 May 2015

Please fill out your name and UB ID number above. Also write your UB ID number at the bottom of each page of the exam in case the pages become separated.

This final exam consists of four types of questions:

1. **Ten multiple choice** questions worth one point each. These are drawn directly from the second-half lecture slides and intended to be (very) easy.
2. **Six short answer** questions worth five points each. You can answer as many as you want, but we will give you credit for your best four answers for a total of up to 20 points. You should be able to answer the short answer questions in four or five sentences. These are mostly (but not entirely) drawn from second-half material.
3. **One medium answer** question worth 20 points drawn from second-half material. Your answer to the medium answer should span a page or two.
4. **Two long answer** questions worth 25 points each, integrating material from the entire semester. Your answer to the long answer question should span several pages.

Please answer each question as **clearly** and **succinctly** as possible—feel free to draw pictures or diagrams if they help. The point value assigned to each question is intended to suggest how to allocate your time. **No aids of any kind are permitted.**

There are 15 scratch pages at the end of the exam. When using them, please clearly indicate which question you are answering.

I have neither given nor received help on this exam.

Sign and Date: _____

Multiple Choice

1. (10 points) Answer all **ten** of the following questions. Each is worth **one** point.

- (a) Our unexpected April 1st visitor was
 handing out beads. wearing a blue body suit. not shy. Nick DiRienzo.
- (b) What was one approach that Wickizer et. al used to improve Linux scalability to many cores?
 Increasing the length of OS critical sections Sloppy counters Reducing application performance Asking Zihe
- (c) The RAID design principle can be best summarized as
 building expensive things from many inexpensive parts. building reliable things from many unreliable parts. five levels. striping.
- (d) Filesystems use _____ to map filename components to inode numbers.
 inodes directories superblocks Guru
- (e) After a crash, which of the following would indicate data loss for a journaling filesystem?
 multiple checkpoints journal entries after the last checkpoint incomplete journal entries
- (f) Which of the following makes it *easier* to virtualize the x86 architecture?
 hardware page tables instructions that are not classically virtualizable
 multiple privilege levels Jinghao's blog
- (g) Which of the following is *not* a good hint that a page might be a good page to swap out?
 It hasn't been used for a while It's clean It's currently loaded into a core's TLB
- (h) Applications will run exactly the same in a virtual machine as they would on real hardware.
 True False
- (i) Which of the following applications has become very similar to the traditional operating system?
 The web browser iTunes Microsoft Word sys161
- (j) We discussed all of the following kernel designs *except*
 microkernels. monolithic kernels. exokernels. xenokernels.

6. (5 points) Recall that in RAID level 1 (RAID 1) array, both drives store identical contents. (Assume the drives are spinning disks.) First, explain why you would expect to see a significant performance difference between reads and writes to and from a RAID 1 array (3 points). Second, describe how to coordinate RAID 1 reads to further improve performance (2 points).

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Medium Answer

8. (20 points) The Exobrowser v. The Exokernel

James Mickens has described his Atlantis browser as an “exokernel browser”—which we will (without permission) shorten to the exobrowser. This terminology reflects that Atlantis shares design principles from the exokernel OS design proposed and implemented by the Dawson Engler, Frans Kaashoek, and other members of the MIT Parallel and Distributed Operating Systems (PDOS) group, in another research paper we read this semester.

First, describe how the exokernel interface differs from the traditional monolithic OS interface (5 points). Second, describe how the exobrowser interface differs from the traditional monolithic browser interface (5 points). Finally, pick one of the design goals that inspired the original exokernel OS design. Describe it (5 points), and discuss how it translates to the exobrowser (5 points).

10. (25 points) Cross-Device I/O Sharing

Today, a growing number of users interact with multiple personal computing devices: smartphones, tablets, laptops, and desktops. In this multi-device world, the single-device silos that traditional operating system designs were intended to operate seem increasingly obsolete and can prevent seemingly natural cross-device interactions. To illustrate this, consider the following two examples:

- Alice has music playing on her smartphone. When she sits down at her laptop, she wants the music to seamlessly begin playing from her laptop speakers.
- Bob is playing a racing game on his tablet. But instead of controlling it by tilting the tablet, which disrupts his view of the display, he wants to control the tablet game by tilting his smartphone.

To support such scenarios, let's consider how the OS may be able to provide a common platform for cross-device I/O sharing.

To begin, observe that operating systems such as Linux typically reuse the file abstraction to expose many different types of I/O devices to processes. For example, to play music through the sound card the music player would write to the pseudo-file `/dev/audio` and to read gyroscope (tilt) readings the game would read from the pseudo-file `/dev/gyroscope`. Like other places where Linux reuses the file abstraction, there are no contents stored on disk for these pseudo-files. Instead, file operations are converted into the necessary communication with the appropriate device.

Given this information, first describe a design for an OS cross-device I/O sharing system that would allow applications to make use of I/O devices on other nearby devices (10 points). Second, explain why it might be preferable in this case to modify the OS, rather than implement per-application solutions (5 points).

Third, imagine that you were presenting your design to a skeptical audience¹. Discuss two aspects of your approach that you would need to evaluate to demonstrate that this was a workable solution (5 point each).

¹Let's say, a future boss. Or Linus Torvalds.