Memory Management

- We’re beginning a new multiple-lecture topic
  - goals of memory management
    - convenient abstraction for programming
    - isolation between processes
    - allocate scarce memory resources between competing processes, maximize performance (minimize overhead)
- mechanisms
  - physical vs. virtual address spaces
  - page table management, segmentation policies
  - page replacement policies

Virtual Memory from 10,000 feet

- The basic abstraction that the OS provides for memory management is virtual memory (VM)
  - VM enables programs to execute without requiring their entire address space to be resident in physical memory
    - program can also execute on machines with less RAM than it “needs”
  - many programs don’t need all of their code or data at once (or ever)
    - e.g., branches they never take, or data they never read/write
    - no need to allocate memory for it, OS should adjust amount allocated based on its run-time behavior
  - virtual memory isolates processes from each other
    - one process cannot name addresses visible to others; each process has its own isolated address space
- VM requires hardware and OS support
  - MMU’s, TLB’s, page tables, …

In the beginning…

- First, there was batch programming
  - programs used physical addresses directly
  - OS loads job, runs it, unloads it
- Then came multiprogramming
  - need multiple processes in memory at once
    - to overlap I/O and computation
  - memory requirements:
    - protection: restrict which addresses processes can use, so they can’t stomp on each other
    - fast translation: memory lookups must be fast, in spite of protection scheme
    - fast context switching: when swap between jobs, updating memory hardware (protection and translation) must be quick
Virtual Addresses

- To make it easier to manage memory of multiple processes, make processes use virtual addresses
  - virtual addresses are independent of location in physical memory (RAM) that referenced data lives
    - OS determines location in physical memory
  - instructions issued by CPU reference virtual addresses
    - e.g., pointers, arguments to load/store instruction, PC, ...
  - virtual addresses are translated by hardware into physical addresses (with some help from OS)
- The set of virtual addresses a process can reference is its address space
  - many different possible mechanisms for translating virtual addresses to physical addresses
    - we’ll take a historical walk through them, ending up with our current techniques

Old technique #1: Fixed Partitions

- Physical memory is broken up into fixed partitions
  - all partitions are equally sized, partitioning never changes
  - hardware requirement: base register
    - physical address = virtual address + base register
    - base register loaded by OS when it switches to a process
  - how can we ensure protection?
- Advantages
  - simple, ultra-fast context switch
- Problems
  - internal fragmentation: memory in a partition not used by its owning process isn’t available to other processes
  - partition size problem: no one size is appropriate for all processes
    - fragmentation vs. fitting large programs in partition

Fixed Partitions (K bytes)

- Obvious next step: physical memory is broken up into variable-sized partitions
  - hardware requirements: base register, limit register
  - physical address = virtual address + base register
  - how do we provide protection?
    - if (physical address > base + limit) then... ?
- Advantages
  - no internal fragmentation
    - simply allocate partition size to be just big enough for process
    - (assuming we know what that is!)
- Problems
  - external fragmentation
    - as we load and unload jobs, holes are left scattered throughout physical memory
**Variable Partitions**

- physical memory

- limit register
  - P3's size

- base register
  - P3's base

- virtual address

- offset

- yes

- no

- raise protection fault

**Modern technique: Paging**

- Solve the external fragmentation problem by using fixed sized units in both physical and virtual memory

**User’s Perspective**

- Processes view memory as a contiguous address space from bytes 0 through N
  - virtual address space (VAS)

- In reality, virtual pages are scattered across physical memory frames
  - virtual-to-physical mapping
  - this mapping is invisible to the program

- Protection is provided because a program cannot reference memory outside of it's VAS
  - the virtual address 0xDEADBEEF maps to different physical addresses for different processes

**Paging**

- Translating virtual addresses
  - a virtual address has two parts: virtual page number & offset
  - virtual page number (VPN) is index into a page table
  - page table entry contains page frame number (PFN)
  - physical address is PFN::offset

- Page tables
  - managed by the OS
  - map virtual page number (VPN) to page frame number (PFN)
    - VPN is simply an index into the page table
    - one page table entry (PTE) per page in virtual address space
    - i.e., one PTE per VPN
Paging

Paging example

- assume 32 bit addresses
  - assume page size is 4KB (4096 bytes, or $2^{12}$ bytes)
  - VPN is 20 bits long ($2^{20}$ VPNs), offset is 12 bits long

- let's translate virtual address $0x13325328$
  - VPN is $0x13325$, and offset is $0x328$
  - assume page table entry $0x13325$ contains value $0x03004$
    - page frame number is $0x03004$
    - VPN $0x13325$ maps to PFN $0x03004$
  - physical address = PFN::offset = $0x03004328$

Page Table Entries (PTEs)

- PTE's control mapping
  - the valid bit says whether or not the PTE can be used
  - says whether or not a virtual address is valid
  - it is checked each time a virtual address is used
  - the reference bit says whether the page has been accessed
  - it is set when a page has been read or written to
  - the modify bit says whether or not the page is dirty
  - it is set when a write to the page has occurred
  - the protection bits control which operations are allowed
    - read, write, execute
  - the page frame number determines the physical page
    - physical page start address = PFN << (#bits/page)

Paging Advantages

- Easy to allocate physical memory
  - physical memory is allocated from free list of frames
    - to allocate a frame, just remove it from its free list
    - external fragmentation is not a problem!
    - complication for kernel contiguous physical memory allocation
      - many lists, each keeps track of free regions of particular size
      - regions' sizes are multiples of page sizes
      - "buddy algorithm"
  - Easy to "page out" chunks of programs
    - all chunks are the same size (page size)
    - use valid bit to detect references to "paged-out" pages
    - also, page sizes are usually chosen to be convenient multiples of disk block sizes
Paging Disadvantages

- Can still have internal fragmentation
  - process may not use memory in exact multiples of pages
- Memory reference overhead
  - 2 references per address lookup (page table, then memory)
  - solution: use a hardware cache to absorb page table lookups
    - translation lookaside buffer (TLB) – next class
- Memory required to hold page tables can be large
  - need one PTE per page in virtual address space
  - 32 bit AS with 4KB pages = \(2^{20}\) PTEs = 1,048,576 PTEs
  - 4 bytes/PTE = 4MB per page table
    - OS’s typically have separate page tables per process
    - 25 processes = 100MB of page tables
  - solution: page the page tables (!!!)
    - (ow, my brain hurts...more later)

Making it all efficient

- Original page table schemed doubled the cost of memory lookups
  - one lookup into page table, a second to fetch the data
- Two-level page tables triple the cost!!
  - two lookups into page table, a third to fetch the data
- How can we make this more efficient?
  - goal: make fetching from a virtual address about as efficient as fetching from a physical address
  - solution: use a hardware cache inside the CPU
    - cache the virtual-to-physical translations in the hardware
    - called a translation lookaside buffer (TLB)
    - TLB is managed by the memory management unit (MMU)

Managing TLBs

- Address translations are mostly handled by the TLB
  - >99% of translations, but there are TLB misses occasionally
  - in case of a miss, who places translations into the TLB?
- Hardware (memory management unit, MMU)
  - knows where page tables are in memory
    - OS maintains them, HW access them directly
  - tables have to be in HW-defined format
  - this is how x86 works
- Software loaded TLB (OS)
  - TLB miss faults to OS, OS finds right PTE and loads TLB
  - must be fast (but, 20-200 cycles typically)
    - CPU ISA has instructions for TLB manipulation
    - OS gets to pick the page table format

TLBs

- Translation lookaside buffers
  - translates virtual page #s into PTEs (not physical addr)
  - can be done in single machine cycle
- TLB is implemented in hardware
  - is a fully associative cache (all entries searched in parallel)
  - cache tags are virtual page numbers
  - cache values are PTEs
  - with PTE + offset, MMU can directly calculate the PA
- TLBs exploit locality
  - processes only use a handful of pages at a time
    - 16-48 entries in TLB is typical (64-192KB)
    - can hold the “hot set” or “working set” of process
  - hit rates in the TLB are therefore really important
Managing TLBs (2)

• OS must ensure TLB and page tables are consistent
  – when OS changes protection bits in a PTE, it needs to invalidate the PTE if it is in the TLB
• What happens on a process context switch?
  – remember, each process typically has its own page tables
  – need to invalidate all the entries in TLB! (flush TLB)
    • this is a big part of why process context switches are costly
  – can you think of a hardware fix to this?
• When the TLB misses, and a new PTE is loaded, a cached PTE must be evicted
  – choosing a victim PTE is called the "TLB replacement policy"
  – implemented in hardware, usually simple (e.g. LRU)