

Virtualization for Embedded Systems Lecture for the Embedded Systems Course CSD, University of Crete (April 23, 2015)

Manolis Marazakis (maraz@ics.forth.gr)

FORTH-ICS Institute of Computer Science (ICS)

Foundation for Research and Technology – Hellas (FORTH)

What does virtualization look like (informally) ?



Virtualization for Embedded Systems

2



Uses of virtual machines

- Multiple (identical) OS'es on same platform
 - > The original raison d'être
 - These days mostly driven by server consolidation
- Interesting variants of this:
 - Different OSes (e.g. Linux + Windows)
 - Old version of same OS
 - OS debugging (most likely uses Type-II VMM)
 - Checkpoint-restart
 - minimize lost work in case of crash
 - useful for debugging, incl. going backwards in time
 - re-run from last checkpoint to crash, collect traces, invert trace from crash
- Live system migration
 - Load balancing, Environment take-home
- Ship application with complete OS
 - Reduce dependency on environment

How about embedded systems?



Virtualization to enable h/w-s/w co-design

- How to co-design/co-develop H/W + S/W for a system ?
 - Limited availability
 - Bugs in the production environment cannot be reproduced in the laboratory
 - Difficult to debug on-site
 - Narrow time windows
 - Sometimes in a dangerous environment ...

Debugging challenges

- Is it a problem in the driver or in the device?
- Is the firmware faulty? Is it wrongly loaded/configured?
- Is the hardware damaged?
- How can we reproduce the bug?
- Do we have easy access to the environment?
- Is it remotely located?



Writing (and testing) device drivers ... without hardware

Shift Left

- Hardware + Software = Complete product
- Feature-complete software by A-0 silicon
- · Software needs to happen earlier



[source: PJ Waskiewicz & Shannon Nelson - Linux Plumbers Conference, 2011]



Processor consolidation



Source: OS course slides by Gernot Heiser – UNSW/NICTA/OKL - 2008

Virtualization for Embedded Systems



License separation

Use case 1a: License separation

- → Linux desired for various reasons
 - familiar, high-level API
 - large developer community
 - free
- → Other parts of system contain proprietary code
- → Manufacturer doesn't want to open-source
- → User VM to contain Linux + GPL





Software architecture abstraction

Use case 1b: Software-architecture abstraction

- → Support for product series
 - range of related products of varying capabilities
- → Same low-level software for high- and medium-end devices
- → Benefits:
 - time-to-market
 - engineering cost





Dynamic processor allocation

Use case 1c: Dynamic processor allocation

- → Allocate share of base-band processor to application OS
 - Provide extra CPU power during high-load periods (media play)
 - Better processor utilisation ⇒ higher performance with lower-end hardware
 - HW cost reduction





Certification re-use

Use case 2: Certification re-use

- → Phones need to be certified to comply with communication standards
- → Any change that (potentially) affects comms needs re-certification
- → UI part of system changes frequently
- → Encapsulation of UI
 - provided by VM
 - avoids need for costly recertification





User-configured OS

Use case 2a: Open phone with user-configured OS

- → Give users control over the application environment
 - perfect match for Linux
- → Requires strong encapsulation of application environment





Personal + Enterprise environment

Use case 2b: Phone with private and enterprise environment

- → Work phone environment integrated with enterprise IT system
- → Private phone environment contains sensitive personal data
- → Mutual distrust between the environments ⇒ strong isolation needed





Separate systems code from apps

Use case 2c: Security

- → Protect against exploits
- → Modem software attacked by UI exploits
 - Compromised application OS could compromise RT side
 - Could have serious consequences
 - e.g. jamming cellular network
- → Virtualization protects
 - Separate apps and system code into different VMs





Isolation of Personal from Enterprise functions

Use case 3: Mobile internet device (MID) with enterprise app

- → MID is open device, controlled by owner
- → Enterprise app is closed and controlled by enterprise IT department
- → Hypervisor provides isolation





Minimal Trusted Computing Base

Use case 3a: Environment with minimal trusted computing base (TCB)

- → Minimise exposure of highly security-critical service to other code
- → Avoid even an OS, provide minimal trusted environment
 - need a minimal programming environment
 - goes beyond capabilities of normal hypervisor
 - requires basic OS functionality





Secure payments

Use case 3b: Point-of-sale (POS) device

- → May be stand-alone or integrated with other device (eg phone)
- → Financial services providers require strong isolation
 - dedicated processor for PIN/key entry
 - use dedicated virtual processor ⇒ HW cost reduction





Digital Rights Management ... on open device

Use case 4: DRM on open device

- → Device runs Linux as app OS, uses Linux-based media player
- → DRM must not rely on Linux
- Need trustworthy code that
 - loads media content into on-chip RAM
 - decrypts and decodes content
 - allows Linux-based player to disply
- → Need to protect data from guest OS





IP protection

Use case 4a: IP protection in set-top box

- → STB runs Linux for UI, but also contains highly valuable IP
 - highly-efficient, proprietary compression algorithm
- → Operates in hostile environment
 - reverse engineering of algorithms
- → Need highly-trustworthy code that
 - loads code from Flash into on-chip RAM
 - decrypts code
 - runs code protected from interference





Processor consolidation: control + infotainment

Use case 5: Automotive control and infotainment

- → Trend to processor consolidation in automotive industry
 - top-end cars have > 100 CPUs!
 - cost, complexity and space pressures to reduce by an order of magnitude
 - AUTOSAR OS standard addressing this for control/convenience function
- → Increasing importance of Infotainment
 - driver information and entertainment function
 - not addressed by AUTOSAR
- Increasing overlap of infotainment and control/convenience
 - eg park-distance control using infotainment display
 - benefits from being located on same CPU





Enterprise vs Embedded Systems VMs

Homogenous vs heterogenous guests

- → Enterprise: many similar guests
 - hypervisor size irrelevant
 - VMs scheduled round-robin





- hypervisor resource-constrained
- interrupt latencies matter





Isolation vs Cooperation

Enterprise

- → Independent services
- → Emphasis on isolation
- Inter-VM communication is secondary
 - performance secondary
- VMs connected to Internet (and thus to each other)

Embedded

- → Integrated system
- → Cooperation with protection
- → Inter-VM communication is critically important
 - performance crucial
- VMs are subsystems accessing shared (but restricted) resources



Isolation vs Cooperation : Scheduling





Devices in enterprise virtual machines

- → Hypervisor owns all devices
- Drivers in hypervisor
 - ineed to port all drivers
 - · huge TCB

→ Drivers in privileged guest OS

- can leverage guest's driver support
- need to trust driver OS
- still huge TCB!





Devices in embedded virtual machines

- → Some devices owned by particular VM
- Some devices shared
- → Some devices too sensitive to trust any guest
- → Driver OS too resource hungry
- → Use isolated drivers
 - protected from other drivers
 - · protected from guest OSes





Inter-VM Communication

Modern embedded systems are multi-user devices!



Virtualization for Embedded Systems



Inter-VM Communication

Different "users" are mutually distrusting

- → Need strong protection / information-flow control between them
- → Isolation boundaries ≠ VM boundaries
 - some are much smaller than VMs
 - individual buffers, programs
 - some contain VMs
 - some overlap VMs
- Need to define information flow between isolation domains



- strict control over who has access to what
- strict control over communication channels







High safety & reliability requirements

- → Software complexity is mushrooming in embedded systems too
 - millions of lines of code
- → Some have very high safety or reliability requirements
- → Need divide-and-conquer approach to software reliability
 - Highly componentised systems to enable fault tolerance





Componentization for IP Blocks

- → Match HW IP blocks with SW IP blocks
- → HW IP owner provides matching SW blocks
 - encapsulate SW to ensure correct operation
 - Stable interfaces despite changing HW/SW boundary



Componentization for Security

- → *MILS architecture*: multiple independent levels of security
- → Approach to making security verification of complex systems tractable
- → Separation kernel provides strong security isolation between subsystems
- → High-grade verification requires small components





ARM TrustZone

→ ARM TrustZone extensions introduce:

- new processor mode: monitor
 - similar to VT-x root mode
 - banked registers (PC, LR)
 - can run unmodified guest OS binary in non-monitor kernel mode
- new privileged instruction: SMI
 - enters monitor mode
- new processor status: secure
- partitioning of resources
 - memory and devices marked secure or insecure
 - in secure mode, processor has access to all resources
 - in insecure mode, processor has access to insecure resources only
- monitor switches world (secure ↔ insecure)
- really only supports one virtual machine (guest in insecure mode)
 - need another hypervisor and para-virtualization for multiple guests



