Virtual Memory & Caching (Chapter 12-17)

CS 4410 Operating Systems

Last Time: Address Translation

- Paged Translation
- Efficient Address Translation
	- Multi-Level Page Tables
	- **Inverted Page Tables**
	- TLBs

This time: **Virtual Memory & Caching**

What is Virtual Memory?

- Each process has illusion of large address space
	- 2 x bytes for x-bit addressing
- However, physical memory is usually much smaller
- How do we give this illusion to multiple processes?
	- Virtual Memory: some addresses reside in disk

Process executes from disk!

RAM is really just another layer of cache

Swapping vs. Paging

Swapping

- Loads entire process in memory
- "Swap in" (from disk) or "Swap out" (to disk) a process
- Slow (for large processes)
- Wasteful (might not require everything)
- Does not support sharing of code segments
- Virtual memory limited by size of physical memory

Paging

- Runs all processes concurrently
- A few pages from each process live in memory
- Finer granularity, higher performance
- Large virtual mem supported by small physical mem
- Certain pages (read-only ones, for example) can be shared among processes

(the contents of) **A Virtual Page Can Be**

Mapped

• to a physical frame

Not Mapped (→ Page Fault)

- in a physical frame, but not currently mapped
- or still in the original program file
- or zero-filled (heap/BSS, stack)
- or on backing store ("paged or swapped out")
- or illegal: not part of a segment
	- → Segmentation Fault

Supporting Virtual Memory

Modify Page Tables with a *present* bit

- Page in memory \rightarrow present = 1
- Page not in memory \rightarrow PT lookup triggers **page fault**

Handling a Page Fault

Identify page and reason (r/w/x)

- access inconsistent w/ segment access rights \rightarrow terminate process
- access a page that is kept on disk:

 \rightarrow does frame with the code/data already exist? No? Allocate a frame & bring page in (next slide)

- access of zero-initialized data (BSS) or stack
	- Allocate a frame, fill page with zero bytes
- access of COW page

• Allocate a frame and copy

When a page needs to be brought in…

- Find a free frame
	- evict one if there are no free frames
- Issue disk request to fetch data for page
- Block current process
- Context switch to another process
- When disk request completes, update PTE
	- frame number, present bit, RWX bits
- Put current process in ready queue

When a page needs to be swapped out…

- Find all page table entries that refer to old page
	- Frame might be shared
	- Maintain a *Core Map* (frames → pages)
- Set each page table entry to invalid
- Remove any TLB entries
	- "TLB Shootdown"
- Write changes on page back to disk, if needed
	- Dirty/Modified bit in PTE indicates need
	- Text segments are (still) on program image on disk

Updated Context Switch

- Save current process' registers in PCB
- *Flush TLB (unless TLB is tagged)*
- Restore registers and PTBR of next process to run
- "Return from Interrupt"

Memory Hierarchy

Every layer is a cache for the layer below it.

Working Set

1. Collection of a process' most recently used pages (The Working Set Model for Program Behavior, Denning,'68) 2. Pages referenced by process in last Δ time-units

Thrashing

Excessive rate of paging Cache lines evicted before they can be reused

Causes:

- Too many processes in the system
- Cache not big enough to fit working set
- Bad luck (conflicts)
- Bad eviction policies (later)

Prevention:

- Restructure code to reduce working set
- Increase cache size
- Improve caching policies

Caching

- Assignment: where do you put the data?
- **Replacement: whom do you kick out?**

What do you do when memory is full?

Page Replacement Algorithms

- **Random:** Pick any page to eject at random
	- Used mainly for comparison
- **FIFO:** The page brought in earliest is evicted
	- Ignores usage
- **OPT:** Belady's algorithm
	- Select page not used for longest time
- **LRU:** Evict page that hasn't been used for the longest
	- Assumes past is a good predictor of the future
- **MRU:** Evict the most recently used page
- **LFU:** Evict least frequently used page
- And many approximation algorithms

Expectation

• more frames (i.e., larger cache) \rightarrow *not* more misses

First-In-First-Out (FIFO) Algorithm

- *Reference string*: 1, 2, 3, 4, 1, 2, 5, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5
- **3 frames** (3 pages in memory at a time per process):

 \leftarrow contents of frames after reference

page fault (miss) hit

marks arrival time

9 page faults

First-In-First-Out (FIFO) Algorithm

- *Reference string*: 1, 2, 3, 4, 1, 2, 5, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5
- **4 frames** (4 pages in memory at a time per process):

 \leftarrow contents of frames after reference

4 marks arrival time

10 page faults

more frames \rightarrow more page faults?

Belady's Anomaly

Optimal Algorithm (OPT)

- Replace frame that will not be used for the longest
- 4 frames example

6 page faults

Question: How do we tell the future? Answer: We can't

OPT used as upper-bound in measuring how well your algorithm performs

OPT Approximation

In real life, we do not have access to the future page request stream of a program

 \rightarrow Need to make a guess at which pages will not be used for the longest time

Reference string: 1, 2, 3, 4, 1, 2, 5, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 Least Recently Used (LRU) Algorithm

page fault hit marks most recent use

8 page faults

Implementing LRU

- On reference: Timestamp each page
- On eviction: Scan for oldest page

Problems:

- Large page lists
- Timestamps are costly

Solution: **approximate LRU**

- Note: LRU is already an approximation
- Exploit *use* (REF) bit in PTE

Clock Algorithm

- To allocate a frame, inspect the *use* bit in the PTE at clock hand and advance clock hand
- Used? Clear *use* bit and repeat

Other Algorithms

MRU: Remove the most recently touched page

• Good for data accessed only once, *e.g.* a movie file

LFU: Remove page with lowest usage count

• Use multiple bits. Shift right by 1 at regular intervals.

MFU: remove the most frequently used page

Local versus Global Replacement

- So far, we have tacitly assumed that all frames are shared by all processes
	- This is called "global replacement"
- But is it fair?
	- Badly behaved processes can ruin the experience of processes with good locality
- Local replacement: divided the frames up evenly between the processes
	- Can lead to under-utilization