

TAL — **Feature Model**

Operating-System Engineering

Thread Abstraction Layer — TAL

- design fundamental abstractions related to the following topics:

  - control flows 2
  - low-level scheduling 10
  - CPU management 12
  - compiler dependencies 17

- aim at providing a *minimal subset of thread functions*

Context Saving

- a thread's context is made of the contents of its processor registers
  - its size depends on the CPU and the compiler/programming language
  - it needs to be temporarily saved during phases of thread inactivity
- stack-based context-saving shall come true:
  1. stack all CPU registers
  2. stack non-volatile CPU registers
  3. policy 1. as well as policy 2.



- the system description must contain at least one of these variants: *or-feature*

Control Flow Invocation

- provide a thread concept basing on an *asymmetric invocation* mechanism
  - allow the spawning of a thread "inline" at (almost) any point of execution
  - the spawned thread preempts the spawning thread, it runs until completion
  - upon completion the spawned thread terminates and releases control
- inherit the (total) processor context to the spawned thread
  - the only private piece of context of the thread is its stack
  - thus thread invocation only implies exchanging the stack



- upon completion, the processor context is (re-)inherited to the resumed thread

Control Flow Exchange

- extend the thread concept by means of a *symmetric invocation* mechanism
  - exchanging the flows of control happens in a coroutine-like fashion
  - a control-releasing thread remembers its resumption point (return address)
  - the thread's resumption point will be saved on the thread's run-time stack
- the threads all share the same processor context ($\rightarrow$ p. 3)
  - thus thread resumption only implies a stack change
- resumption happens "inline", at any point of execution



Context Switching

- extend the thread concept by a *coroutine* style of context switching
  - context saving (restoring) happens before (after) a resumption point
- provide thread switching in two ways:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{inline} \\ \text{procedural} \end{array} \right\} \text{taking care of the} \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{complete} \\ \text{non-volatile} \end{array} \right\} \text{context}$$

  - requires the context-saving feature ($\rightarrow$ p. 2)
- threads need to save/restore their contexts by themselves



Types of Coroutines



Code Binding

- extend the thread concept to support the binding of *user-defined code*
- three bindings are nice to have:
  1. any sort of code fragment
  2. pointer to function
  3. specialized (virtual) function
- any or none of them is valid
  - *optional features*
- aims at "user-friendliness"



Stack Space Supply

- provide a concept for *compile-time stack-space allocation* for a thread
  - a specialization of the fundamental thread abstraction (→ p. 3)
  - a (programming-language) representation as a template class, e.g.
- purpose is to somehow provide means for "user-friendliness"
  - an abstraction that should be optional, nevertheless



- the feature is nice to have, yet it's non-functional and thus could be void

Threading Concept



Scheduling

- the threading concept already provides a limited form of *thread scheduling*
  - threads are expected to be scheduled cooperatively, under the user's control
    - much in a same way as ordinary coroutines
  - they keep on executing until control over the CPU is relinquished explicitly

- there is no (central) system-level thread scheduler
  - thread scheduling is entirely in hand of the application
  - this gives a maximum/minimum of flexibility/support



- CPU protection and other more enhanced policies are subjects for specialization

Scheduling Concept



Processor Type

- thread implementations depend on the capabilities of the underlying processor

  concrete processor the thread concept must be implemented from scratch+
    - encompassing assembly-language programming to some extent
    - resulting into a "native implementation" running on the bare machine

  abstract processor the programming language provides a thread concept –

- hardware abstractions are required
  - hiding processor peculiarities
  - enabling portability at user level

- processor as an *alternative feature*



Register Access

- abstractions to access the CPU's registers aid processor-state management
  - reading and writing of registers of the CPU's programming model
  - made feasible e.g. using "inline assembler" and/or `asm()` statements

- a measure to improve the handling of processor-dependent stuff
  - achieving portability is not the purpose at this level of abstraction

- means of operator overloading would be nice to have
  - assignment operators and type casts as in C++, e.g.

State Buffering

- use register-access functions to save the processor state into a *state buffer*
  - provide primitives to save and restore the processor state
  - the buffer is not implicitly allocated on the stack (→ p. 2)
- hide hardware peculiarities as far as possible
  - the primitives' interface promotes CPU independency
- don't enforce portability: let it go an *optional feature*
  - some users want to explore the CPU by themselves
- but there is the need to distinguish between different sorts of registers . . .



Sorts of Registers

- the register set considered depends on both the concrete and abstract processor
- concrete . . .
  - general purpose
  - special purpose
  - floating-point
- abstract . . .
  - register banks
- sets of *or-features*



CPU Concept



Compiler

- programming language and compiler implement an *abstract processor*
  - sooner or later, both typically undergo more or less major revisions
  - software should differentiate between the various compiler releases
    - similar to differentiating amongst conrete processors (→ p. 12)
  - portability by far does not only mean to be hardware independent
- programs may depend on the capabilities of that processor
  - e.g. register access using inline assembler (→ p. 13)



- being compiler-independent may be as difficult as being hardware-independent

Compiler Concept



Summary

- system-software design[1] must differentiate between two sorts of requirements:

  functional requirements
  - threading concept, scheduling concept
  - CPU concept (except processor type)

  non-functional requirements
  - compiler concept
  - processor type

- domain-analysis quality largely depends on the analyst's domain experience

[1] In general, of course this should hold for any kind of software design.

TAL **Concept**