

Why kernel space sucks

(Or: *Deconstructing two myths*)

(Or: *An abridged history of kernel-userspace interface blunders...*)



Michael Kerrisk

© 2011

mtk@man7.org

<http://man7.org/>



Who am I?

- Professionally: programmer (primarily); also teacher and writer
- Working with UNIX and Linux for nearly 25 years
- Linux *man-pages* maintainer since 2004
 - 117 releases to date
 - written or cowritten ~250 of ~950 man pages
 - lots of API testing, many bug reports
- Author of a book on the kernel-userspace API
- IOW: I've spent **a lot** of time looking at the interface



Intro: Why Userspace Sucks

- Paper/talk by Dave Jones of Red Hat
 - First presented at Ottawa LS 2006
- A lead-in to deconstructing a couple of myths
- *Why Userspace Sucks* → WUSS
 - <http://www.kernel.org/doc/ols/2006/ols2006v1-pages-441-450.pdf>
 - <http://www.codemonkey.org.uk/projects/talks/ols2k6.tar.gz>
 - <http://lwn.net/Articles/192214/>



Motivation for WUSS

- We (kernel developers) have created a magnificently performant kernel
- But, can we make it better?
 - Why does it take so long to boot, start applications, and shut down?
 - Why does my idle laptop consume so much battery power?



Findings from WUSS

- DJ starts instrumenting the kernel, and finds...
 - Boot up: 80k `stat()`, 27k `open()`, 1.4k `exec()`
 - Shutdown: 23k `stat()`, 9k `open()`
- Userspace programmers wreck performance doing ***crazy*** things!
 - `open()` and reparse same file multiple times!
 - read config files for **many** devices not even present!
 - `stat()` (or even `open()`) 100s of files they never need
 - timers triggering regular unnecessary wake-ups



Conclusions from WUSS

- Room for a lot of improvement in userspace!
- Userspace programmers should be aware of and using trace and analysis tools
 - (perf, LTTng, ftrace, systemtap, strace, valgrind, powertop, etc.)





Kernel space



Userspace

“We (kernel developers) are much smarter than those crazy userspace programmers”



Kernel space



User space

Something's wrong with this picture...

Let's question a couple of myths...

- **Myth 1:** Kernel programmers (can) always get things right (in the end)
- **Myth 2:** Code is always the best way to contribute to Free Software



Myth 1

Kernel programmers
(can) always get things right
(in the end)

*Except, there's (at least) one place
where they don't: the interface*

The kernel-userspace interface


- Application programming interface (API) presented by kernel to userspace programs
 - System calls (← I'll focus here)
 - Pseudo-file systems (/proc, /sys, etc.)
 - *ioctl()* interfaces (device drivers)
 - Netlink sockets
 - Obscure pieces (AUXV, VDSO, ...)



API designs must be done
right first time

Why must APIs be right first time?

- Code fixes \neq API fixes



Why is fixing APIs so hard?

- Usually, “fixing” an interface means *breaking* the interface for some applications



“We care about user-space interfaces to an insane degree. We go to extreme lengths to maintain even badly designed or unintentional interfaces.

Breaking user programs simply isn't acceptable.”

[LKML, Dec 2005]



We have to live with our mistakes!

*So: any API mistake by kernel
hackers creates pain that **thousands**
of userspace programmers must live
with for **decades***

**So, what does it mean
to get an API right?**

Doing (kernel-userspace) APIs right

- Properly designed and implemented API should:
 - be bug free!
 - have a well thought out design
 - simple as possible (but no simpler)
 - easy to use / difficult to misuse
 - be consistent with related/similar APIs
 - integrate well with existing APIs
 - e.g., interactions with `fork()`, `exec()`, threads, signals, FDs?
 - be as general as possible
 - be extensible, where needed; accommodate future growth trends
 - adhere to relevant standards (as far as possible)
 - be as good as, or better than, earlier APIs with similar functionality
 - be maintainable over time (a multilayered question)



**So how do kernel
developers score?**

(BSDers, please laugh *quietly*)

Bugs

Bugs

- *utimensat(2)* [2.6.22]
 - Set file timestamps
 - Multiple bugs!
 - http://linux-man-pages.blogspot.com/2008/06/whats-wrong-with-kernel-userland_30.html
 - Fixed in 2.6.26
- *signalfd()* [2.6.22]
 - Receive signals via a file descriptor
 - Didn't correctly obtain data sent with *sigqueue(2)*
 - Fixed in 2.6.25



Bugs

- Examples of other interfaces with significant, easy to find bugs at release:
 - *inotify* [2.6.13]
 - *splice()* [2.6.17] (<http://marc.info/?l=linux-mm&m=114238448331607&w=2>)
 - *timerfd* [2.6.22] (<http://marc.info/?l=linux-kernel&m=118517213626087&w=2>)



Bugs—what's going on?

- There's a quality control issue; **way too many** bugs in released interfaces
- Pre-release testing insufficient and haphazard:
 - Too few testers (maybe just kernel developer)
 - No unit tests
 - Insufficient test coverage
 - No clear specification against which to test
- Even if bug is fixed, users may still need to care
 - special casing for kernel versions



Thinking about design

Code it now, think about it later

- Vanishing arguments:
 - *readdir(2)* ignores *count* argument
 - *getcpu(2)* [2.6.19] ignores *tcache* argument
 - *epoll_create()* [2.6] ignores *size* arg. (must be > 0) since 2.6.8
- Probably, argument wasn't needed to start with
 - Or: recognized as a bad idea and made a no-op



Code it now, think about it later

- *futimesat()* [2.6.16]
 - Extends *utimes()*
 - **Proposed** for POSIX.1-2008
 - Implemented on Linux
 - POSIX.1 members realize API is insufficient
→ standardized different API
 - *utimensat()* added in Linux 2.6.22



Code it now, think about it later

- Dec 2003: Linux 2.6 added *epoll_wait()*
 - File descriptor monitoring
 - (improves on *select()*)
 - Nov 2006, 2.6.19 added *epoll_pwait()* to allow manipulation of signal mask during call
 - But, already in 2001, POSIX specified *pselect()* to fix analogous, well-known problem in *select()*



Consistency

Interface inconsistencies

- *mlock(start, length)*:
 - Round *start* down to page size
 - Round *length* up to next page boundary
 - *mlock(4000, 6000)* affects bytes 0..12287
- *remap_file_pages(start, length, ...)* [2.6]:
 - Round *start* down to page boundary
 - Round *length* **down** to page boundary(!)
 - *remap_file_pages(4000, 6000, ...)* ? → **0..4095**
- User expectation: similar APIs should behave similarly



Confusing the users

- Various system calls allow one process to change attributes of another process
 - e.g., *setpriority()*, *ioprio_set()*, *migrate_pages()*, *prlimit()*
- Unprivileged calls require credential matches:
 - Some combination of caller's UIDs/GIDs matches some combination of target's UIDs/GIDs



Confusing the users

- But, much inconsistency; e.g.:
 - *setpriority()*: $eid == t-uid \parallel eid == t-eid$
 - *ioprio_set()*: $uid == t-uid \parallel eid == t-uid$
 - *migrate_pages()*: $uid == t-uid \parallel uid == t-suid \parallel eid == t-uid \parallel eid == t-suid$
 - *prlimit()*: $(uid == t-uid \ \&\& \ uid == t-eid \ \&\& \ uid == t-suid) \ \&\& \ (gid == t-gid \ \&\& \ gid == t-guid \ \&\& \ gid == t-sgid) \ \&\&$
- Inconsistency may confuse users into writing bugs
 - **Potentially, security related bugs!**
- <http://linux-man-pages.blogspot.com/2010/11/system-call-credential-checking-tale-of.html>



Generality

Is the interface sufficiently general?

- 2.6.22 added *timerfd(ufd, flags, utimerspec)*
 - Create timer that notifies via a file descriptor
- But API didn't allow user to:
 - Retrieve previous value when setting new timer value
 - Do a “get” to retrieve time until next expiration
 - <http://marc.info/?l=linux-kernel&m=118517213626087&w=2>
 - <http://lwn.net/Articles/245533/>
- Older APIs (*[gs]etitimer()*, POSIX timers) **did** provide this functionality!



Is the interface sufficiently general?

- Solution:
 - *timerfd()* disabled in kernel 2.6.23
 - 2.6.25 did it right:
 - *timerfd_create()*, *timerfd_settime()*, *timerfd_gettime()*
 - (API analogous to POSIX timers)
- Was an ABI breakage, but
 - Only in a single kernel version
 - Original API was never exposed via *glibc*



**Are we learning
from the past?**

Are we learning from past mistakes?

- Dnotify [2.4]
 - Directory change notification API
 - Many problems
- So, we added inotify [2.6.13]
 - But, inotify still doesn't get it all right
- Now [2.6.37] we have yet another API, fanotify
 - Designed for virus scanners
 - Adds some functionality
 - Doesn't provide all functionality of inotify
- Couldn't we have had a new API that did everything?



Extensibility

Is the interface extensible?

- Too often, an early API didn't allow for extensions
- Common solution is a *new* API, with a *flags* arg:
 - *umount()* → *umount2()* [2.2]
 - *epoll_create()* [2.6] → *epoll_create2()* [2.6.27]
 - *futimesat()* [2.6.16] → *epoll_create2()* [2.6.22]
 - *signalfd()* [2.6.22] → *signalfd4()* [2.6.27]
- When adding a new API, consider adding an (unused) *flags* argument to allow extensions



Futureproofing

- Suppose a syscall has a *flags* bit-mask arg.
- Implementation should always have check like:

```
if (flags & ~(FL_X | FL_Y))  
    return -EINVAL;  
// Only allow caller to specify flags  
// bits that have a defined meaning
```

- Without this check, interface is “loose”



Futureproofing

- Suppose user makes a call of form:

```
syscallxyz(-1); // flags has all bits set
```
- If implementer later adds `FL_Z`, an ABI breakage occurs for user's code
- Conversely: user has no way of checking if a kernel implements `FL_Z`
- Many system calls lack this kind of check!
 - Linux 3.2 examples: `sigaction(sa.sa_flags)`, `recv()`, `send()`, `clock_nanosleep()`, `msgrcv()`, `msgget()`, `semget()`, `shmget()`, `shmat()`, `semop(sops.sem_flg)`



Futureproofing

- Should checks be added after the fact?
 - e.g., `umount2()` [2.2] added check in 2.6.34;
`timerfd_settime()` [2.6.25] added check in 2.6.29
- But adding check can also create ABI breakage
 - Apps get errors where previously they did not
- ***Loose APIs allow the user to define interface***
 - Worst case: can't add new *flags* values to interface



Futureproofing failures

- 16 bits is enough for UIDs/GIDs...
 - 2.4: 32-bit UIDs/GIDs
- 32 bits is enough for file offsets
 - Okay, it was 1991, but Moore's law...
 - 2.4: 64-bit file offsets
- So we have
 - *oldstat()*, *stat()*, *stat64()*
 - *chown()*, *chown32()*
 - *open()*, *open64()*
 - and so on



Maintainability

When good ideas go astray

- Traditional UNIX gives root all privileges
 - All or nothing is risky!
- Linux divides root privileges into separate pieces:
 - `CAP_AUDIT_CONTROL`, `CAP_AUDIT_WRITE`, `CAP_CHOWN`, `CAP_DAC_OVERRIDE`, `CAP_DAC_READ_SEARCH`, `CAP_FOWNER`, `CAP_FSETID`, `CAP_IPC_LOCK`, `CAP_IPC_OWNER`, `CAP_KILL`, `CAP_LEASE`, `CAP_LINUX_IMMUTABLE`, `CAP_MAC_ADMIN`, `CAP_MAC_OVERRIDE`, `CAP_MKNOD`, `CAP_NET_ADMIN`, `CAP_NET_BIND_SERVICE`, `CAP_NET_BROADCAST`, `CAP_NET_RAW`, `CAP_SETFCAP`, `CAP_SETGID`, `CAP_SETPCAP`, `CAP_SETUID`, `CAP_SYSLOG`, `CAP_SYS_ADMIN`, `CAP_SYS_BOOT`, `CAP_SYS_CHROOT`, `CAP_SYS_MODULE`, `CAP_SYS_NICE`, `CAP_SYS_PACCT`, `CAP_SYS_PTRACE`, `CAP_SYS_RAWIO`, `CAP_SYS_RESOURCE`, `CAP_SYS_TIME`, `CAP_SYS_TTY_CONFIG`, `CAP_WAKE_ALARM`
- Great! But which capability do I use for my new feature?
- Hmm, `CAP_SYS_ADMIN` looks good
- `CAP_SYS_ADMIN`, the new root, **231 uses in 3.2**



Standards and portability

Needlessly breaking portability

- *sched_setscheduler()*
 - POSIX says: successful call must return previous policy
 - Linux: successful call returns 0
 - **No** good reason for this inconsistency
 - Developers must special case code for Linux



**Actually,
it wasn't just us...**

We're just traditionalists...

- These kinds of problems predate Linux:
 - API of System V IPC is awful!
 - Semantics of *fcntl()* locks when FD is closed render locks useless for libraries
 - *select()* modifies FD sets in place, forcing reinitialization inside loops
 - *poll()* gets it right: uses separate input and output args
 - and so on...



Overall grade?

C+

Why do these API problems keep happening?

- Excessive focus on code as primary contribution of value for a software project
- Poor feedback loop between developers and users

Myth 2

Code is always the best way to contribute to Free Software

“Show me the code!”

“Show me the code!”

*But anyone can write code,
and if the design is good
but the code is bad,
the code can usually be fixed*

“Show me the code!”

*Sometimes,
other sentences are more appropriate,
and encourage contributions that are
as (or more) valuable*

**“Show me the users'
requirements!”**

“Show me the users' requirements”

- Does the API serve needs of *multiple* users, or is it just one developer scratching an itch?
 - Beware of limited perspectives!
- Is the API designed for **generality**?
- Is the API **extensible** for possible future requirements?



**“Show me the design
specification / documentation!”**

“Show me the design spec. / documentation!”

- How do we know if implementation deviates from intention?
- What shall we code our tests against?
- Writing documentation turns out often to be a natural sanity check for design
- A decent man page suffices
 - Many of the bugs mentioned earlier were found while writing man pages...
 - It's all a question of when it's written...



“Show me the design review!”

“Show me the design review!”

- Did other people actually review your design?
- Is the API:
 - as simple as possible?
 - easy to use / difficult to misuse?
 - consistent with related/similar APIs?
 - well integrated with existing APIs?
 - as general as possible
 - extensible?
 - following standards, where relevant?
 - at least as good as earlier APIs with similar functionality?
 - maintainable?



“Show me the tests!”

“Show me the tests!”

- Did you (the developer) write some tests?
- **More importantly:** did someone else write some tests?
- Do the tests cover all reasonable cases?
- Do you test for *unreasonable* cases?
 - Do unexpected inputs generate suitable error returns?
- While writing tests, did you find the interface easy to use / difficult to misuse? (Did you consequently make some design changes?)
- What bugs did you discover during testing?



Finally...


- *If you're a potential contributor, don't fall into the trap of believing that code is the only (or best) vehicle for contribution*
- *As a maintainer, are you letting your project down by failing to encourage these other types of contribution?*

Thanks!

(slides up soon at <http://man7.org/conf/>)

Michael Kerrisk
mtk@man7.org
<http://man7.org/>

Linux *man-pages* project
mtk.manpages@gmail.com
<http://man7.org/linux/man-pages/>



Mamaku (Black Tree Fern) image (c) Rob Suisted
naturespic.com



New Zealand Blue Penguin (Korora)
Image (c) livescience.com

No Starch Press, 2010
<http://man7.org/tlpi/>