CSE P 501 – Compilers

Memory Management and Garbage Collection Hal Perkins Winter 2016

UW CSE P 501 Winter 2016

W41

References

- Uniprocessor Garbage Collection Techniques Wilson, IWMM 1992 (longish survey)
- The Garbage Collection Handbook
 Jones, Hosking, Moss, 2012 (book)
- Earlier version of this lecture by Vijay Menon, CSE 501, Sp09; Jim Hogg, CSE P 501 Sp14

UW CSE P 501 Winter 2016

Program Memory

- Typically divided into 3 regions:
 - Global / Static: fixed-size at compile time; exists throughout program lifetime
 - Stack / Automatic: per function, automatically allocated and released (local variables)
 - Heap: Explicitly allocated by programmer (malloc/new/cons)
 - Need to recover / recycle storage for reuse when no longer needed

nta

Coz

Manual Heap Management

- Programmer calls free/delete when done with storage
- Pro
 - Cheap
 - Precise
- Con
 - How do we enumerate the ways? the pain?
 - Buggy, huge debugging costs, ...

UW CSE P 501 Winter 2016





Bugs

- Forget to free => eventually run out of memory
 - called a "memory leak"
- · Call free, but continue to use!
 - called "use-after-free", or "dangling pointer"
 - memory corruption wrong answers; crash if lucky!
 - major source of security issues
 - detect via "pool poisoning"



Garbage Collection



- Automatically reclaim heap memory no longer in use by the program
 - Simplify programming
 - Better modularity, concurrency
 - Avoids huge problems with dangling pointers
 - Almost required for type safety
 - But not a panacea still need to watch for stale pointers, GC's version of "memory leaks"
 - · i.e., pointers in live data to no-longer-used data

UW CSE P 501 Winter 2016





Heap Characteristics

- Most objects are small (< 128 bytes)
- Object-oriented and functional code allocates a huge number of short-lived objects
- Want allocation, recycling to be fast and low overhead



Allocation

- Usually multiple free lists organized by size for small objects (8, 16, 24, 32, ... depends on alignment); additional list for large blocks
 - Regular malloc does exactly the same
- Allocation
 - Grab a free object from the right free list
 - No more memory of the right size triggers a collection

What is Garbage?

- An object is *live* if it is still in use
- GC needs to be conservative
 - OK to keep memory no longer in use
 - Not ok to reclaim something that is live
- An object is *garbage* if it is not live

Reachability

- Root set : the set of global and local (stack + register) variables visible to active procedures
- Heap objects are *reachable* if:
 - They are directly accessible from the root set
 - They are accessible from another reachable heap object (pointers/references)
- Liveness implies reachability (conservative approximation)
- Not reachable implies garbage

UW CSE P 501 Winter 2016

Tracing Collectors

- Mark the objects reachable from the root set, then perform a transitive closure to find all reachable objects
- All unmarked objects are dead and can be reclaimed
- Various algorithms: mark-sweep, copying, generational...

Mark-Sweep Collection

- Mark phase find the live objects
 - Transitive closure from root set marking all live objects
- Sweep phase
 - Sweep memory for unmarked objects and return to appropriate free list(s)







Reachability

- Compiler produces:
 - A stack-map at GC safe points
 - Stack map: enumerate global variables, stack variables, live registers (tricky stuff! Why?)
 - GC safe points: new(), method entry, method exit, back edges (thread switch points)
 - Stop all threads at one of their GC safe points and then ok to do a collection

– Type information blocks

• Identifies reference fields in objects (to trace the heap)

UW CSE P 501 Winter 2016

Mark-Sweep Evaluation

- Pro
 - Space efficiency
 - Incremental object reclamation
- Con
 - Relatively slower allocation time (free lists vs. "next chunk of heap")
 - Can have poor locality of objects allocated at around the same time
 - Redundant work rescanning long-lived objects
 - "Stop the world I want to collect"

UW CSE P 501 Winter 2016

Semispace Copying Collector

- Idea: Divide memory in half
- A TO NO
- Storage allocated from one half of memory
- When full, copy live objects from old half ("from space") to unused half ("to space") & swap semispaces
- Fast allocation next chunk of to-space
- Requires copying collection of entire heap when collection needed

UW CSE P 501 Winter 2016

Semispace collection



- Same notion of root set and reachable as in mark-sweep collector
- Copy each object when first encountered
- Install forwarding pointers in from-space referring to new copy in to-space
- Transitive closure: follow pointers, copy, and update as it scans
- Reclaims entire "from space" in one shot
 - Swap from- and to-space when copy done

UW CSE P 501 Winter 2016

Semispace Copying Collector Evaluation

• Pro

- Fast allocation
- Locality of objects allocated at same time
- Locality of objects connected by pointers (can use depthfirst or other strategies during the mark-copy phase)
- Con
 - Wastes half of (virtual?) memory
 - Other copying/compacting collectors solve some of this
 - Be careful with VM don't want compacting to thrash
 - Redundant work rescanning long-lived objects
 - "Stop the world I want to collect"

UW CSE P 501 Winter 2016

Generational Collectors

- Generational hypothesis: young objects die more quickly than older ones (Lieberman & Hewitt '83, Ungar '84)
- Most pointers are from younger to older objects (Appel '89, Zorn '90)
- So, organize heap into young and old regions, collect young space more often



GC Tradeoffs

- Performance
 - Mark-sweep often faster than semispace
 - Generational better than both
- Mutator performance
 - Semispace is often fastest
 - Generational is better than mark-sweep
- Overall: generational is a good balance
- But: we still "stop the world" to collect

UW CSE P 501 Winter 2016



✓● Parallel/concurrent garbage collection

- Found in some production collectors
 - Tricky stuff can't debug it into correctness there be theorems here
- Locality issues
 - Object collocation
 - GC-time analysis
- Distributed GC

UW CSE P 501 Winter 2016

Compiler & Runtime Support

- GC tightly coupled with safe runtime (e.g., Java, CLR, functional languages)
 - Total knowledge of pointers (type safety)
 - Tagged objects with type information
 - Compiler maps for information
 - Objects can be moved; forwarding pointers

What about unsafe languages? (e.g., C/C++)

- Boehm/Weiser collector: GC still possible without compiler/runtime cooperation(!)
 - New versions of malloc (& free) + GC to manage heap
 - If it looks like a pointer, it's a pointer
 - Mark-sweep only GC doesn't move anything
 - Allows GC in C/C++ but constraints on pointer bittwiddling
 - Surprisingly effective, particularly if program uses pointers as in a type-safe language (e.g., no pointer mangling, no (void*)int tricks, etc.)

Boehm/Weiser Collector

- Useful for development/debugging

 Less burden on compiler/runtime implementor
- Used in various Java and .net prototypes, research implementations, production code if sufficiently effective
- Similar ideas for various tools to detect memory leaks, etc.

A bit of perspective...

- Automatic GC has been around since LISP I in 1958
- Ubiquitous in functional and object-oriented programming communities for decades
- Mainstream since Java(?) (mid-90s)
- Now conventional wisdom?