

15-410

“...We are Computer Scientists!...”

Virtual Memory #1

Oct. 4, 2006

Dave Eckhardt

Bruce Maggs

Synchronization

Mid-term *probably* Tuesday 10th

- If you get conflict-detail mail from me today, please answer it today

Homework 1

- Out soon
- Goal: study aid for mid-term exam
 - (We'll release solutions @ deadline, for exam study)

Outline

Text

- Chapters 8, 9

The Problem: logical vs. physical

Contiguous memory mapping

Fragmentation

Paging

- Type theory
- A sparse map

Logical vs. Physical



It's all about address spaces

- Generally a complex issue
 - IPv4 \Rightarrow IPv6 is mainly about address space exhaustion


Review

- Combining .o's changes addresses
- But what about *two* programs?

Every .o uses same address space




Linker Combines .o's, Changes Addresses




What About *Two* Programs?

stack  FFFFFFF000


stack  FFFFE000

bss  00010300

bss  00010300

data  00010200

data  00010100

code  00010000

code  00010000

Logical vs. Physical Addresses

Logical address

- Each program has its own *address space*
 - fetch: address \Rightarrow data
 - store: address, data \Rightarrow .
- As envisioned by programmer, compiler, linker

Physical address

- Where your program ends up in memory
- They can't *all* be loaded at 0x10000!

Reconciling Logical, Physical

Could run programs at addresses other than linked

- Requires using linker to “relocate one last time” at launch
- Done by some old mainframe OSs
- Slow, complex, or both

Programs could *take turns* in memory

- Requires swapping programs out to disk
- Very slow

We are computer scientists!

- Insert a level of indirection
- Well, get the ECE folks to do it for us

Type Theory

Physical memory behavior

- $\text{fetch: address} \Rightarrow \text{data}$
- $\text{store: address, data} \Rightarrow .$

Process thinks of memory as...

- $\text{fetch: address} \Rightarrow \text{data}$
- $\text{store: address, data} \Rightarrow .$


Goal: each process has “its own memory”

- $\text{process-id} \Rightarrow \text{fetch: (address} \Rightarrow \text{data)}$
- $\text{process-id} \Rightarrow \text{store: (address, data} \Rightarrow .)$

What *really* happens

- $\text{process-id} \Rightarrow (\text{virtual-address} \Rightarrow \text{physical-address})$

Simple Mapping Functions



P1

If $V > 8191$ **ERROR**

Else $P = 1000 + V$

P2

If $V > 16383$ **ERROR**

Else $P = 9192 + V$

Address space ==

- Base address
- Limit

Contiguous Memory Mapping

Processor contains two *control registers*

- Memory base
- Memory limit

Each memory access checks

`If V < limit`

`P = base + V;`

`Else`

`ERROR /* what do we call this error? */`

Context switch

- Save/load user-visible registers
- Also load process's base, limit registers

Problems with Contiguous Allocation

How do we *grow* a process?

- Must increase “limit” value
- Cannot expand into another process's memory!
- Must move entire address spaces around
 - Very expensive

Fragmentation

- New processes may not fit into unused memory “holes”

Partial memory residence


- Must *entire* program be in memory at same time?

Can We Run Process 4?

**Process exit creates
“holes”**

**New processes may be
too large**

**May require moving entire
address spaces**



Term: “External Fragmentation”


**Free memory is small
chunks**

Doesn't fit large objects

**Can “disable” lots of
memory**

Can fix

- Costly “compaction”
 - aka “Stop & copy”



Term: “Internal Fragmentation”


Allocators often round up

- 8K boundary (*some* power of 2!)

**Some memory is wasted
inside each segment**

Can't fix via compaction

Effects often non-fatal



Swapping

Multiple user processes

- Sum of memory demands > system memory
- Goal: Allow *each process* 100% of system memory

Take turns

- Temporarily evict process(es) to disk
 - Not runnable
 - Blocked on *implicit* I/O request (e.g., “swapread”)
- “Swap daemon” shuffles process in & out
- Can take *seconds* per process
 - Modern analogue: laptop suspend-to-disk

Contiguous Allocation \Rightarrow Paging

Solve multiple problems

- Process growth problem
- Fragmentation compaction problem
- Long delay to swap a whole process


Divide memory more finely

- **Page** = small region of *virtual* memory ($\frac{1}{2}$ K, 4K, 8K, ...)
- **Frame** = small region of *physical* memory
- [I will get this wrong, feel free to correct me]

Key idea!!!

- Any page can map to (occupy) any frame

Per-process Page Mapping



Problems Solved by Paging

Process growth problem

- Any process can use any free frame for any purpose


Fragmentation compaction problem

- Process doesn't need to be contiguous, so don't compact

Long delay to swap a whole process

- Swap *part* of the process instead!

Partial Residence



Data Structure Evolution

Contiguous allocation

- Each process was described by (base,limit)

Paging

- Each *page* described by (base,limit)?
 - Pages typically one size for whole system
- Ok, each *page* described by (base address)
- Arbitrary page \Rightarrow frame mapping requires some work
 - Abstract data structure: “map”
 - Implemented as...

Data Structure Evolution

Contiguous allocation

- Each process was described by (base,limit)

Paging

- Each *page* described by (base,limit)?
 - Pages typically one size for whole system
- Ok, each *page* described by (base address)
- Arbitrary page \Rightarrow frame mapping requires some work
 - Abstract data structure: “map”
 - Implemented as...
 - » Linked list?
 - » Array?
 - » Hash table?
 - » Skip list?
 - » Splay tree?????

Page Table Options

Linked list

- $O(n)$, so $V \Rightarrow P$ time gets longer for large addresses!

Array

- Constant time access
- Requires (large) contiguous memory for table


Hash table

- Vaguely-constant-time access
- Not really bounded though


Splay tree

- Excellent amortized expected time
- *Lots* of memory reads & writes possible for one mapping
- Probably impractical


Page Table Array




Paging –Address Mapping




Paging –Address Mapping



Paging –Address Mapping



Paging –Address Mapping



Paging –Address Mapping

User view

- Memory is a linear array

OS view

- Each process requires N frames

Fragmentation?

- **Zero** external fragmentation
- Internal fragmentation: average $\frac{1}{2}$ page per region

Bookkeeping

One page table for each process

One global frame table

- Manages free frames
- (Typically) remembers who owns each frame

Context switch

- Must “activate” switched-to process's page table

Hardware Techniques

Small number of pages?

- “Page table” can be a few registers
- PDP-11, 64k address space
 - 8 “pages” of 8k each –8 registers

Typical case

- Large page tables, live in memory
 - Where?
 - » Processor has “Page Table Base Register” (names vary)
 - » Set during context switch

Double trouble?

Program requests memory access

Processor makes *two* memory accesses!

- Split address into page number, intra-page offset
- Add to page table base register
- *Fetch page table entry (PTE) from memory*
- Add frame address, intra-page offset
- *Fetch data from memory*

Solution: “TLB”

- Not covered today

Page Table Entry Mechanics

PTE conceptual job

- Specify a frame number

PTE flags

- Specified by OS for each page/frame
- Protection
 - Read/Write/Execute bits
- Valid bit
 - Not-set means access should generate an exception
- Dirty bit
 - Set means page was written to “recently”
 - Used when paging to disk (later lecture)

Page Table Structure

Problem

- Assume 4 KByte pages, 4-Byte PTEs
- Ratio: 1024:1
 - 4 GByte virtual address (32 bits) \Rightarrow 4 MByte page table
 - *For each process!*

One Approach: Page Table Length Register (PTLR)

- (names vary)
- Programs don't use entire virtual space
- Restrict a process to use entries 0...N
- On-chip register detects out-of-bounds reference
- Allows small PTs for small processes
 - (as long as stack isn't far from data)

Page Table Structure

Key observation

- Each process page table is a *sparse mapping*
- Many pages are not backed by frames
 - Address space is sparsely used
 - » Enormous “hole” between bottom of stack, top of heap
 - » Often occupies 99% of address space!
 - Some pages are on disk instead of in memory

Refining our observation

- Each process page table is a *sparse mapping*
- Page tables are not randomly sparse
 - Occupied by *sequential memory regions*
 - Text, rodata, data+bss, stack

Page Table Structure

How to map “sparse list of dense lists”?


We are computer scientists!

- Insert a level of indirection
- Well, get the ECE folks to do it for us


Multi-level page table

- Page directory maps large chunks of address space to...
- ...Page tables, which map pages to frames


Multi-level page table




Multi-level page table




Multi-level page table




Multi-level page table




Multi-level page table



Multi-level page table



Multi-level page table



Sparse Mapping?

Assume 4 KByte pages, 4-byte PTEs

- Ratio: 1024:1
 - 4 GByte virtual address (32 bits) \Rightarrow 4 MByte page table

Now assume page *directory* with 4-byte PDEs

- 4-megabyte page table becomes 1024 4K page tables
- Plus one 1024-entry page directory to point to them
- Result: 4 Mbyte + 4Kbyte (this is better??)

Sparse Mapping?

Assume 4 KByte pages, 4-byte PTEs

- Ratio: 1024:1
 - 4 GByte virtual address (32 bits) \Rightarrow 4 MByte page table

Now assume page *directory* with 4-byte PDEs

- 4-megabyte page table becomes 1024 4K page tables
- Plus one 1024-entry page directory to point to them
- Result: 4 Mbyte + 4Kbyte (this is better??)

Sparse address space...

- ...means most page tables contribute nothing to mapping...
- ...would all be full of “empty” entries...
- ...so just use a “null pointer” in page directory instead.
- Result: empty 4GB address space specified by 4KB directory

Sparse Mapping?

Sparsely populated page directory


- Contains pointers only to non-empty page tables

Common case

- Need 2 or 3 page tables
 - One or two map code, data
 - One maps stack
- Page directory has 1024 slots
 - Two are filled in with valid pointers
 - Remainder are “not present”

Result

- 2-3 page tables
- 1 page directory
- Map entire address space with 12-16Kbyte, not 4Mbyte



Segmentation

Physical memory is (mostly) linear


Is virtual memory linear?

- Typically a set of “regions”
 - “Module” = code region + data region
 - Region per stack
 - Heap region

Why do regions matter?

- Natural protection boundary
- Natural *sharing* boundary

Segmentation: Mapping



Segmentation + Paging

80386 (does it *a/!*)

- Processor address directed to one of six segments
 - CS: Code Segment, DS: Data Segment
 - 32-bit offset within a segment -- CS:EIP
- Descriptor table maps selector to segment descriptor
- Offset fed to segment descriptor, generates linear address
- Linear address fed through page directory, page table

x86 Type Theory

Instruction \Rightarrow segment selector

- [PUSHL implicitly specifies selector in %SS]

Process \Rightarrow (selector \Rightarrow (base,limit))

- [Global,Local Descriptor Tables]

Segment, address \Rightarrow linear address

Process \Rightarrow (linear address high \Rightarrow page table)

- [Page Directory Base Register, page directory indexing]

Page Table: linear address middle \Rightarrow frame address

Memory: frame address, offset \Rightarrow ...

Summary

Processes emit virtual addresses

- segment-based or linear

A magic process maps virtual to physical

No, it's *not* magic

- Address validity verified
- Permissions checked
- Mapping may fail (trap handler)

Data structures determined by access patterns

- Most address spaces are *sparsely allocated*

Quote

Any problem in Computer Science can be solved by an extra level of indirection.

-Roger Needham