Topic relevant selected content from the highest rated entries, typeset, printed and shipped.

Combine the advantages of up-to-date and in-depth knowledge with the convenience of printed books.

A portion of the proceeds of each book will be donated to the Wikimedia Foundation to support their mission: to empower and engage people around the world to collect and develop educational content under a free license or in the public domain, and to disseminate it effectively and globally.

The content within this book was generated collaboratively by volunteers. Please be advised that nothing found here has necessarily been reviewed by people with the expertise required to provide you with complete, accurate or reliable information. Some information in this book maybe misleading or simply wrong. The publisher does not guarantee the validity of the information found here. If you need specific advice (for example, medical, legal, financial, or risk management) please seek a professional who is licensed or knowledgeable in that area.

Sources, licenses and contributors of the articles and images are listed in the section entitled "References". Parts of the books may be licensed under the GNU Free Documentation License. A copy of this license is included in the section entitled "GNU Free Documentation License"

All used third-party trademarks belong to their respective owners.

Contents

Articles

References

Article Licenses

Comparison of application virtual machines

This article lists some software virtual machines that are typically used for allowing application bytecode to be portably run on many different computer architectures and operating systems. The application is usually run on the computer using an interpreter or just-in-time compilation. There are often many implementations of a given virtual machine, each covering a different functionality footprint.

Comparison of virtual machines

The table here summarizes elements for which the virtual machine designs intended to be efficient, not the list of capabilities present in any implementation.

Virtual machine instructions process data in local variables using a main **model of computation**, typically that of a stack machine, register machine, or random access machine often called the memory machine. Use of these three techniques is motivated by different tradeoffs in virtual machines vs physical machines, such as ease of interpretation, compilation, and verifiability for security.

Memory management in these portable virtual machines is addressed at a higher level of abstraction than in physical machines. Some virtual machines, such as the popular JVM, are involved with addresses in such a way as to require safe automatic memory management by allowing the virtual machine to trace pointer references, and disallow machine instructions from manually constructing pointers to memory. Other virtual machines, such as LLVM, are more like traditional physical machines, allowing direct use and manipulation of pointers. CIL offers a hybrid in between, offering both controlled use of memory (like the JVM, which allows safe automatic memory

management), while also offering an 'unsafe' mode that allows direct manipulation of pointers in ways that can violate type boundaries and permission.

Code security generally refers to the ability of the portable virtual machine to run code while only offering it a prescribed set of capabilities. For example, the virtual machine might only allow the code access to a certain set of functions or data. The same controls over pointers which make automatic memory management possible and allow the virtual machine to ensure typesafe data access are used to assure that a code fragment is only allowed to certain elements of memory and cannot sidestep the virtual machine itself. Other security mechanisms are then layered on top as code verifiers, stack verifiers, and other techniques.

An **interpreter** allows programs made of virtual instructions to be loaded and immediately run without a potentially costly compilation into native machine instructions. Any virtual machine which can be run can be interpreted, so the column designation here refers to whether the design includes provisions for efficient interpretation (for common usage).

Just-in-time compilation or **JIT**, refers to a method of compiling to native instructions at the latest possible time, usually immediately before or during the running of the program. The challenge of JIT is more one of implementation than of virtual machine design, however, modern designs have begun to make considerations to help efficiency. The simplest JIT techniques simply perform compilation to a code-fragment similar to an offline compiler. However, more complicated techniques are often employed, which specialize compiled code-fragments to parameters that are known only at runtime (see Adaptive optimization).

Precompiling refers to the more classical technique of using an offline compiler to generate a set of native instructions which do not change during the runtime of the program. Because aggressive compilation and optimization can take time, a precompiled program may launch faster than one which relies on JIT alone for execution. JVM implementations have mitigated this startup cost by using interpretation initially to speed launch times, until native code-fragments can be generated through JIT.

Shared libraries are a facility to reuse segments of native code across multiple running programs. In modern operating systems, this generally means using virtual memory to share the memory pages containing a shared library across different processes which are protected from each other via memory protection. It is interesting that aggressive JIT techniques such as adaptive optimization often produce code-fragments unsuitable for sharing across processes or successive runs of the program, requiring a tradeoff be made between the efficiencies of precompiled and shared code and the advantages of adaptively specialized code. For example, several design provisions of CIL are present to allow for efficient shared libraries, possibly at the cost of more specialized JIT code. The JVM implementation on Mac OS X uses a Java Shared Archive (apple docs $\left[1\right]$) to provide some of the benefits of shared libraries.

List of application virtual machine implementations

In addition to the portable virtual machines described above, virtual machines are often used as an execution model for individual scripting languages, usually by an interpreter. This table lists specific virtual machine implementations, both of the above portable virtual machines, and of scripting language virtual machines.

References

- [1] http://developer.apple.com/mac/library/documentation/Java/Conceptual/Java14Development/00-Intro/JavaDevelopment.html
- [2] http://doc.cat-v.org/inferno/4th_edition/dis_VM_specification
- [3] http://www.is-research.de/info/vmlanguages/
- [4] http://java.sun.com/javase/
- [5] http://luajit.org/
- [6] http://www.mirandabanda.org/cog/
- [7] http://wiki.squeak.org/squeak/2267
- [8] http://vmkit.llvm.org/
- "libJIT vs LLVM discussion" Rhys Weatherley (libJIT) and Chris Lattner (LLVM) (http://lists.gnu.org/ archive/html/dotgnu-libjit/2004-05/index.html)

External links

• List of Java Virtual Machines (JVMs), Java Development Kits (JDKs), Java Runtime Environments (JREs) (http:/ /java-virtual-machine.net/other.html)

Comparison of platform virtual machines

Platform virtual machines are software packages which emulate the whole physical computer machine, often giving multiple virtual machines on one physical platform. The table below compares basic information about platform virtual machine (VM) packages.

General information

Features

- Providing any virtual environment usually requires some overhead of some type or another. Native usually means that the virtualization technique does not do any CPU level virtualization (like Bochs), which executes code more slowly than when it is directly executed by a CPU. Some other products such as VMWare and Virtual PC use similar approaches to Bochs and QEMU, however they use a number of advanced techniques to shortcut most of the calls directly to the CPU (similar to the process that JIT compiler uses) to bring the speed to near native in most cases. However, some products such as coLinux, Xen, z/VM (in real mode) do not suffer the cost of CPU-level slowdowns as the CPU-level instructions are not proxied or executing against an emulated architecture since the guest OS or hardware is providing the environment for the applications to run under. However access to many of the other resources on the system, such as devices and memory may be proxied or emulated in order to broker those shared services out to all the guests, which may cause some slow downs as compared to running outside of virtualization.
- OS-level virtualization is described as "native" speed, however some groups have found overhead as high as 3% for some operations, but generally figures come under 1%, so long as secondary effects do not appear.
- See [21] for a paper comparing performance of paravirtualization approaches (e.g. Xen) with OS-level virtualization
- Requires patches/recompiling.
- Exceptional for lightweight, paravirtualized, single-user VM/CMS interactive shell: largest customers run several thousand users on even single prior models. For multiprogramming OSes like Linux on zSeries and z/OS that make heavy use of native supervisor state instructions, performance will vary depending on nature of workload but is near native. Hundreds into the low thousands of Linux guests are possible on a single machine for certain workloads.

Other features

• VirtualBox User Manual, Chapter 9.9; requires usage of VBoxManage internalcommands createrawvmdk which says:*This is a development tool and shall only be used to analyse problems. It is completely unsupported and will change in incompatible ways without warning.*

- Windows Server 2008 R2 SP1 and Windows 7 SP1 have limited support for redirecting the USB protocol over RDP using RemoteFX.[29]
- Windows Server 2008 R2 SP1 adds accelerated graphics support for certain editions of Windows Server 2008 R2 SP1 and Windows 7 SP1 using RemoteFX.[30] [31]

Restrictions

This table is meant to outline restrictions in the software dictated by licensing or capabilities.

Note: No limit means no enforced limit. For example, a VM with 1 TB of memory cannot fill a host with only 8 GB memory, and no memory swap disk, so it will have a limit of 8 GB physically.

Hyper-V limit source: http://technet.microsoft.com/en-us/library/ee405267(WS.10).aspx

References

- [1] "Cooperative Linux FAQ" (http://colinux.wikia.com/wiki/FAQ). Retrieved on 2009-01-27.
- [2] http://kvm.qumranet.com
- [3] http://www.linux-kvm.org/page/PowerPC
- [4] http://lxc.sourceforge.net/
- [5] http://www.maconlinux.org/
- [6] http://www.ovpworld.org
- [7] QEMU Official OS Support List (http://www.claunia.com/qemu)
- [8] http://pkgsrc.se/wip/qemu-qvm86
- [9] http://simh.trailing-edge.com/
- [10] http://www.virtutech.com/
- [11] http://www.serenityvirtual.com/
- [12] http://www.trango-vp.com
- [13] Oracle VM VirtualBox® User Manual, Chapter 3: Configuring virtual machines | Mac OS X Server guests (http://www.virtualbox.org/ manual/ch03.html#intro-macosxguests)
- [14] Oracle and Virtual Iron (http://www.oracle.com/us/corporate/Acquisitions/virtualiron/)
- [15] Can run a guest OS without modifying it, and hence is generally able to run any OS that could run on a physical machine the VM simulates
- [16] http://www.linux-kvm.com/content/running-windows-smp-guests
- [17] http://www.redhat.com/virtualization/rhev/desktop/rhevm/
- [18] http://www.novell.com/linux/products.html#linuxvirtualization
- [19] Imperas (http://www.imperas.com)
- [20] http://www.vmware.com/products/player/features.html#c6062
- [21] http://www.cs.princeton.edu/~mef/research/vserver/paper.pdf
- [22] "Virtual Machine Manager" (http://virt-manager.et.redhat.com/). . Retrieved 2010-02-20.
- [23] "Sheepdog is a distributed storage system for KVM" (http://www.osrg.net/sheepdog/). . Retrieved 2010-05-20.
- [24] "KVM Migration" (http://www.linux-kvm.org/page/Migration). . Retrieved 2010-05-20.
- [25] "VirtualBox Changelog" (http://www.virtualbox.org/wiki/Changelog-3.0). . Retrieved 2009-06-30.
- [26] "VirtualBox Changelog 3.1" (http://www.virtualbox.org/wiki/Changelog-3.1). . Retrieved 2010-10-01.
- [27] "[[VMGL (http://www.cs.toronto.edu/~andreslc/xen-gl)] (formerly Xen-GL)"]. .
- [28] http://www.vmware.com/products/workstation/new.html
- [29] http://technet.microsoft.com/en-us/library/ff817581(WS.10).aspx
- [30] http://technet.microsoft.com/en-us/library/ff817578(WS.10).aspx
- [31] http://technet.microsoft.com/en-us/library/ff817602(WS.10).aspx
- [32] (http://www.vmware.com/pdf/vmware_player310.pdf) Getting Started Guide VMware Player 3.1
- [33] (http://www.vmware.com/pdf/vmserver2.pdf) VMware Server User's Guide VMware Server 2.0
- [34] (http://www.vmware.com/pdf/vsphere4/r41/vsp_41_config_max.pdf) Configuration Maximums VMware® vSphere 4.1
- [35] (http://www.vmware.com/pdf/vsphere4/r41/vsp_41_config_max.pdf) Configuration Maximums VMware® vSphere 4.1
- [36] (http://www.virtualbox.org/manual/ch01.html) Oracle VM VirtualBox User Manual. Accessed 2011-04-07

External links

- Technical comparison of Linux virtualization technologies (http://virt.kernelnewbies.org/TechComparison).
- Unix for Windows FAQ (http://www.unix.com/answers-frequently-asked-questions/ 16634-unix-environments-ms-windows.html) at Unix.com

Comparison of VMware Fusion and Parallels Desktop

Represented by their respective products, VMware and Parallels are the two major commercial competitors in the Mac consumer virtualization market. Both products are based on hypervisor technology and allow users to run an additional 32- or 64-bit x86 operating system in a virtual machine alongside Mac OS X on an Intel-powered Mac. The similarity in features and functionality between **VMware Fusion** and **Parallels Desktop for Mac** has given occasion for much comparison.

Features

Minimum system requirements

2007 Benchmark tests

On August 16, 2007, CNET published the results of several benchmarks^[1] in which Fusion demonstrated better performance than Parallels Desktop for Mac in SMP-aware applications, which Fusion supports while Parallels does not. It should also be noted that Boot Camp is a tool for natively booting Windows XP on Intel Macintosh and is not a virtualization product. This comparison is of limited value today, as both products have had 2 major upgrades since then.

This comparison was tested on an eight-core, 2.66 GHz MacPro running Mac OS X 10.4.10, Parallels Desktop 3.0 for Mac (build 4560) and VMware Fusion 1.0 (build 51348). Fusion and Parallels were both set to 1,024 MB of system memory and a 32 GB hard disk. Fusion was set to 128 MB of graphics memory, and Parallels Desktop for Mac was set to 64 MB of graphics memory (the maximum for each at that time) $\begin{bmatrix} 1 \end{bmatrix}$.

2008 Benchmark tests

In Volume 24, Issue 02 of MacTech, the editors published the results of one-step and task tests between VMware Fusion 1.0, Parallels Desktop 3.0 and Boot Camp and used a PC running Windows XP as a baseline comparison in a native PC environment.^[2]

- One-step Test: After clicking the mouse or pressing a key, this test requires no further human action.
- Task Test: This tests the interaction between Mac OS X and the virtual environment and requires multiple tests throughout the process.

MacTech found that the faster the physical host computer, the more similarly Parallels Desktop and VMware Fusion performed. MacTech did not test multiple processor performance. The following graphs displays the results in seconds. Shorter bars indicate faster performance.

Each test was run on a MacBook (2 GB RAM; 1.83 GHz Core Duo processor), a MacBook Pro (4GB RAM; 2.16 GHz Core 2 Duo processor) and a Mac Pro (4GB RAM; Quad Core configuration with two 2.66 GHz Dual-Core Intel Xeon processors). MacTech tested Parallels Desktop 3.0 for Mac Build 5160 and VMware Fusion 1.0 Build 51348. All tests were done on clean host systems with new installations of Mac OS X 10.4.10 and Office installations and included all of the most up-to-date patches. No third party software was installed other than Mac OS X, VMware Fusion, Parallels Desktop, Windows XP, Windows Vista, Adobe Reader and Microsoft Office.

2009 Benchmark tests

In March, 2009, Volume 25, Issue 04, MacTech^[3] published the results of a new series of benchmark tests that compared the performance between VMware Fusion 2.0.1 and Parallels Desktop 4.0 for Mac (build 3540), both running Mac OS X 10.5.5.

In most of MacTech's tests, Parallels Desktop performed 14-20% faster than Fusion; however, Fusion ran 10% faster than Parallels Desktop when running Windows XP 32-bit on 2 virtual processors.^[4]

The tests were performed on the White MacBook, MacBook Pro, iMac and MacPro. Both Fusion and Parallels Desktop were optimized for virtual machine performance. MacTech's test included launch and CPU tests, File and Network IO, Footprint, Application Launch, Application Performance and 3D and HD Graphics. In many cases, tests were performed after both Adam and Successful launches and were timed using a stopwatch.

¹3D Games tested were Civilization IV: Colonization and Portal. In Civilization, Parallels Desktop has faster FPS (Frames Per Second) and performed better on slower machines while Fusion has better, more detailed graphics. Fusion has difficulty showing the startup video, but Parallels Desktop's graphics are not as rich. When running Portal, Fusion is faster but its graphics are visibly lighter, while Parallels Desktop has better graphics and visual details.[6]

Cross-platform task tests

MacTech's cross platform tests timed how long it took users to perform multi-step tasks that moved data between Mac OS X and Windows. VMware Fusion, which is designed for increased isolation from the host, requires more manual steps to move data between the host and the virtual environment. Parallels Desktop, which is designed to run transparently with the Mac OS X host, requires fewer steps to perform the same tasks. Therefore, Parallels Desktop was faster.

Networking and file I/O tests

Parallels Desktop occasionally displayed lag anomalies while VMware Fusion's virtual drive performance was very close to that of a physical drive. VMware Fusion preferred a bridged connection for reliable performance, and Parallels Desktop was consistent regardless of the type of virtual network adaptor used.

Simultaneous use of VM and host OS

Parallel Desktop 5 always uses wired memory for hosted OS, while VMWare Fusion 3.0 uses active memory that can be swapped. Giving better performance to hosted VM, this leaves less memory to host OS programs and causes more swapping if you use VM and host OS programs at the same time.

2010 Benchmark tests

In 2010 MacTech^[7], Volume 26, Issue 01, published the results of a new series of benchmark tests showing a performance advantage for Parallels Desktop 5 across all subcategories, with an average of 30% faster.

References

- [1] Begun, Daniel (2007-08-17). "Inside CNET Labs: Windows virtual machine performance on the Mac" (http://crave.cnet.com/ 8301-1_105-9760910-1.html). CNET. . Retrieved 2007-10-04.
- [2] Ticktin, Neil. "Virtualization Benchmarking How do Boot Camp, Parallels Desktop, and VMware Fusion stack up?" (http://www.mactech. com/articles/mactech/Vol.24/24.02/VirtualizationBenchmark/). MacTech. . Retrieved February 2008.
- [3] Ticktin, Neil. "Head-to-Head: Parallels Desktop for Mac vs. VMware Fusion" (http://www.mactech.com/articles/mactech/Vol.25/25. 04/VMBenchmarks/). MacTech. . Retrieved March 2009.
- [4] http://www.mactech.com:16080/articles/mactech/Vol.25/25.04/VMBenchmarks/index-001.html
- [5] http://www.mactech.com/articles/mactech/Vol.25/25.04/VMBenchmarks/index-002.html
- [6] http://www.mactech.com/articles/mactech/Vol.25/25.04/VMBenchmarks/index-003.html

[7] Ticktin, Neil. "Head-to-Head: Parallels Desktop for Mac vs. VMware Fusion" (http://www.mactech.com/articles/special/ 1002-VirtualizationHeadToHead/index-001.html). MacTech. . Retrieved March 2010.

Adaptive Domain Environment for Operating Systems

Adeos (**Adaptive Domain Environment for Operating Systems**) is a nanokernel hardware abstraction layer (HAL) that operates between computer hardware and the operating system that runs on it.^[1] It is distinct from other nanokernels, in that it is not just a low level layer for an outer kernel. Instead it is intended to run several kernels together, which makes it similar to virtualization technologies.

Adeos provides a flexible environment for sharing hardware resources among multiple operating systems, or among multiple instances of a single OS, thereby enabling multiple prioritized domains to exist simultaneously on the same hardware.

Adeos has been successfully inserted beneath the Linux kernel, opening a range of possibilities, such as SMP clustering, more efficient virtualization, patchless kernel debugging and real-time systems for Linux.

Unusually among HALs, Adeos can be loaded as a Linux loadable kernel module to allow another OS to run along with it. In fact Adeos was developed in the context of RTAI (Real-Time Application Interface) to modularize it and to separate the HAL from the real-time kernel.

Architecture

Adeos implements a queue of signals. Each time that a peripheral sends a signal, the different operating systems that are running in the machine are awakened, in turn, and must decide if they will accept (handle), ignore, discard, or terminate the signal. Signals not handled (or discarded) by an OS are passed to the next OS in the chain. Signals that are terminated are not propagated to latter stages.

External links

- Adeos Home Page $^{[2]}$
- Adeos Workspace^[3]

References

- [1] "Adaptive Domain Environment for Operating Systems" (http://whitepapers.zdnet.co.uk/0,1000000651,260088515p,00.htm). whitepapers.zdnet.co.uk. February 15, 2001. . Retrieved 2009-09-02.
- [2] http://home.gna.org/adeos/
- [3] https://gna.org/projects/adeos/

ALGOL 68C

The **ALGOL68C** computer programming language compiler was developed for the CHAOS OS for the CAP capability computer at Cambridge University in 1971 by Stephen Bourne and Mike Guy as a dialect of ALGOL 68. Other early contributors were Andrew D. Birrell^[1] and Ian Walker.

The initial compiler was written in PSYCO (the Princeton SYntax COmpiler by Edgar T. Irons) and implemented by J.H. Mathewman at Cambridge. The language was called Z was subsequently morphed into ALGOL 68. ALGOL68C was built to develop the CAMbridge ALgebra system called CAMAL.

Subsequent work was done on the compiler after Bourne left Cambridge University in 1975. Garbage collection was added and the code base is still running on an emulated OS/MVT using Hercules.

The **ALGOL68C** compiler generated *ZCODE* output, that could then be either compiled into the local machine code by a *ZCODE* translator or run interpreted. *ZCODE* is a register-based intermediate language. This ability to interpret or compile *ZCODE* encouraged the porting of ALGOL 68C to numerous different computer platforms. Aside from the *CAP capability computer* the compiler was ported to systems including CMS, TOPS-10 and Z80.

Popular Culture

A very early predecessor of this compiler was used by Guy and Bourne to write the first life game programs on the PDP-7 with a DEC 340^[2] display (see Scientific American article) "For long-lived populations such as this one Conway sometimes uses a *PDP-7* computer with a screen on which he can observe the changes. The program was written by M. J. T. Guy and S. R. Bourne. Without its help some discoveries about the game would have been difficult to make." Scientific American 223 (October 1970): 120-123.

Various Liverpool Software Gazette issues detail the Z80 implementation. The compiler required about 120Kb of memory to run, hence the Z80's 64Kb memory is actually too small to run the compiler. So ALGOL 68C programs for the Z80 had to be cross compiled from ALGOL 68C running on the larger *CAP capability computer* or an IBM 370 mainframe.

Algol 68C and Unix

Stephen Bourne subsequently reused ALGOL 68's revered $\mathbf{if} \sim \text{then} \sim \text{else} \sim \mathbf{fi}$, $\text{case} \sim \text{in} \sim \text{out} \sim \text{case} \sim \text{and for} \sim \text{while}$ ~ **do** ~ **od** clauses in the common Unix Bourne shell, but with in's syntax changed, out removed, and od replaced with <u>done</u> (to avoid conflict with the od utility).

After Cambridge, Bourne spent nine years at Bell Labs with the Seventh Edition Unix team. As well as developing the Bourne shell, he ported ALGOL 68C to Unix on the DEC PDP-11-45 and included a special option in his Unix debugger "adb" to obtain a stack backtrace for programs written in ALGOL68C. Here is an extract from the Unix 7th edition adb $^{[3]}$ manual pages:

```
NAME
       adb - debugger
SYNOPSIS
       adb [-w] [ objfil [ corfil ] ]
[...]
COMMANDS
[...]
        $modifier
              Miscellaneous commands. The available modifiers
              are:
```

```
\lceil \ldots \rceil a ALGOL 68 stack backtrace. If address is
        given then it is taken to be the address of
        the current frame (instead of r4). If count
        is given then only the first count frames
        are printed.
```
ALGOL 68C extensions to Algol 68

Below is a sampling of some notable extensions:

- Automatic $op :=$ for any operator, e.g. $* :=$ and $+ :=$
- UPTO, DOWNTO and UNTIL in loop-clauses;
- displacement operator $(:=:=)$
- ANDF, ORF and THEF *syntactic elements*.
- separate compilation ENVIRON clause and USING clause
- scopes not checked
- bounds in formal-declarers
- CODE ... EDOC clause for embedding ZCODE

The ENVIRON and USING clauses.

Separate compilation in ALGOL 68C is done using the ENVIRON and USING clauses. The ENVIRON saves the complete environment at the point it appears. A separate module written starting with a USING clause is effectively inserted into the first module at the point the ENVIRON clause appears.

ENVIRON and USING are useful for a *top-down* style of programming, in contrast to the *bottom-up* style implied by traditional library mechanisms.

These clauses are kind of the *inverse* of the **#include** found in the C programming language, or **import** found in Python. The purpose of the ENVIRON mechanism is to allow a program source to be broken into manageable sized pieces. Note that it is only necessary to parse the shared source file once, unlike a **#include** found in the C programming language where the include file needs to be parsed for each source file that includes it.

Example of ENVIRON clause

A file called *mylib.a68*:

```
BEGIN
   INT dim = 3; # a constant #
    INT a number := 120; # a variable #
    ENVIRON EXAMPLE1;
   MODE MATRIX = \left[ \text{dim} \right, \text{ dim} \right] REAL; # a type definition #
    MATRIX m1;
   a number := ENVIRON EXAMPLE2;
    print((a number))
END
```
Example of USING clause

A file called *usemylib.a68*:

```
USING EXAMPLE2 FROM "mylib"
BEGIN
  MATRIX m2; # example only #
  print((a number)); \# declared in mylib.a68 \#print((2 UPB ml)); # also declared in mylib.a68 #
  ENVIRON EXAMPLE3; # ENVIRONs can be nested #
   666
END
```
Restrictions to the language from the standard ALGOL 68

- no algol68 FLEX and variable length arrays.
- MODE STRING implemented without FLEX.
- The PAR parallel clause was not implemented.
- nonstandard transput.
- others...

A translator/compiler for ALGOL 68C was available for the PDP-10 and System/360 as well as a number of other computers.

References

- [1] Andrew D Birrell (December 1977). "System Programming in a High Level Language" (http://birrell.org/andrew/papers/thesis.pdf) (PDF). *Dissertation submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy*. University of Cambridge. . Retrieved 04-22 2007.
- [2] http://www.aceware.iinet.net.au/acms/ItemDetail.asp?lngItemId=175&
- [3] http://modman.unixdev.net/?sektion=1&page=adb&manpath=v7man

Notes

• S.R. Bourne, A.D. Birrell and I. Walker, *Algol68C reference manual*, Cambridge University Computer Laboratory, 1975

External links

- Cambridge Algol 68: on the historical roster of computer languages (http://hopl.murdoch.edu.au/ showlanguage.prx?exp=667) - includes 10+ publication references.
- A TRANSPORTATION OF ALGOL68C PJ Gardner, University of Essex (http://portal.acm.org/ft_gateway. cfm?id=807148&type=pdf) - March 1977 (From 370 to DECsystem-10)

Amazon Machine Image

An **Amazon Machine Image (AMI)** is a special type of virtual appliance which is used to instantiate (create) a virtual machine within the Amazon Elastic Compute Cloud. It serves as the basic unit of deployment for services delivered using $EC2$ ^[1]

Contents

Like all virtual appliances, the main component of an AMI is a read-only filesystem image which includes an operating system (e.g., Linux, UNIX, or Windows) and any additional software required to deliver a service or a portion of it.^[2]

The AMI filesystem is compressed, encrypted, signed, split into a series of 10MB chunks and uploaded into Amazon S3 for storage. An XML manifest file stores information about the AMI, including name, version, architecture, default kernel id, decryption key and digests for all of the filesystem chunks.

An AMI does not include a kernel image, only a pointer to the default kernel id, which can be chosen from an approved list of safe kernels maintained by Amazon and its partners (e.g., RedHat, Canonical, Microsoft). Users may choose kernels other than the default when booting an AMI.^[3]

Types of images

- **Public**: an AMI image that can be used by anyone.
- **Paid**: a for-pay AMI image that is registered with Amazon DevPay and can be used by any one who subscribes for it. DevPay allows developers to mark-up Amazon's usage fees and optionally add monthly subscription fees.
- **Shared**: a private AMI that can only be used by Amazon EC2 users who are allowed access to it by the developer.

References

- [1] Amazon. "Amazon EC2 Functionality" (http://aws.amazon.com/ec2/#functionality). .
- [2] Amazon. "Creating an Image" (http://docs.amazonwebservices.com/AmazonEC2/gsg/2006-06-26/creating-an-image.html). .
- [3] Feature Guide: Amazon EC2 User Selectable Kernels (http://developer.amazonwebservices.com/connect/entry.jspa?externalID=1345)

External links

- Creating and preparing AMIs (http://docs.amazonwebservices.com/AWSEC2/2008-02-01/DeveloperGuide/ CreatingAndBundlingAMIs.html)
- Amazon Web Services Developer Community : Amazon Machine Images (AMIs) (http://developer. amazonwebservices.com/connect/kbcategory.jspa?categoryID=171)

Application virtualization

Application virtualization is an umbrella term that describes software technologies that improve portability, manageability and compatibility of applications by encapsulating them from the underlying operating system on which they are executed. A fully virtualized application is not installed in the traditional sense^[1], although it is still executed as if it were. The application is fooled at runtime into believing that it is directly interfacing with the original operating system and all the resources managed by it, when in reality it is not. In this context, the term "virtualization" refers to the artifact being encapsulated (application), which is quite different to its meaning in hardware virtualization, where it refers to the artifact being abstracted (physical hardware).

Description

Limited application virtualization is used in modern operating systems such a Microsoft Windows and Linux. For example, *INI file mappings* were introduced with Windows NT to virtualize, into the registry, the legacy INI files of applications originally written for Windows 3.1.^[2] Similarly, Windows Vista implements a shim that applies limited file and registry virtualization so that legacy applications that try to save user data in a readonly system location that was writable by anyone in early Windows, can still work.^[3]

Full application virtualization requires a virtualization layer.^[4] Application virtualization layers replace part of the runtime environment normally provided by the operating system. The layer intercepts all file and Registry operations of virtualized applications and transparently redirects them to a virtualized location, often a single file.^[5] The application never knows that it's accessing a virtual resource instead of a physical one. Since the application is now working with one file instead of many files and registry entries spread

Illustration of an application running in a native environment and running in an application virtualization environment

throughout the system, it becomes easy to run the application on a different computer and previously incompatible applications can be run side-by-side. Examples of this technology for the Windows platform are BoxedApp, Cameyo, Ceedo, Evalaze, InstallFree, Citrix XenApp, Novell ZENworks Application VIrtualization, Endeavors Technologies Application Jukebox, Microsoft Application Virtualization, Software Virtualization Solution, VMware ThinApp and InstallAware Virtualization.

Related Technologies

Technology categories that fall under application virtualization include:

- Application Streaming. Pieces of the application's code, data, and settings are delivered when they're first needed, instead of the entire application being delivered before startup. Running the packaged application may require the installation of a lightweight client application. Packages are usually delivered over a protocol such as HTTP, CIFS or RTSP.^[6]
- Desktop Virtualization/Virtual Desktop Infrastructure (VDI). The application is hosted in a VM or blade PC that also includes the operating system (OS). These solutions include a management infrastructure for automating the creation of virtual desktops, and providing for access control to target virtual desktop. VDI solutions can usually fill the gaps where application streaming falls short.