CS162 Operating Systems and Systems Programming Lecture 12

**Address Translation** 

# March 4<sup>th</sup>, 2015 Prof. John Kubiatowicz http://cs162.eecs.Berkeley.edu

Acknowledgments: Lecture slides are from the Operating Systems course taught by John Kubiatowicz at Berkeley, with few minor updates/changes. When slides are obtained from other sources, a a reference will be noted on the bottom of that slide, in which case a full list of references is provided on the last slide.

## **Recall: Starvation vs Deadlock**

- Starvation vs. Deadlock
  - Starvation: thread waits indefinitely
    - » Example, low-priority thread waiting for resources constantly in use by high-priority threads
  - Deadlock: circular waiting for resources
    - » Thread A owns Res 1 and is waiting for Res 2 Thread B owns Res 2 and is waiting for Res 1



Deadlock ⇒ Starvation but not vice versa
 » Starvation can end (but doesn't have to)
 » Deadlock can't end without external intervention

- Mutual exclusion
  - Only one thread at a time can use a resource.
- Hold and wait
  - Thread holding at least one resource is waiting to acquire additional resources held by other threads
- No preemption
  - Resources are released only voluntarily by the thread holding the resource, after thread is finished with it
- Circular wait
  - There exists a set  $\{T_1, ..., T_n\}$  of waiting threads
    - »  $T_1$  is waiting for a resource that is held by  $T_2$
    - $T_2$  is waiting for a resource that is held by  $T_3$
    - » ...
    - $T_n$  is waiting for a resource that is held by  $T_1$

**Recall: Address translation** 



- Address Space:
  - All the addresses and state a process can touch
  - Each process and kernel has different address space
- Consequently, two views of memory:
  - View from the CPU (what program sees, virtual memory)
  - View from memory (physical memory)
  - Translation box (MMU) converts between the two views
- Translation essential to implementing protection
  - If task A cannot even gain access to task B's data, no way for A to adversely affect B

• With translation, every program can be linked/loaded into same region of user address space 3/4/15 4 4

#### **Recall: General Address Translation**



3/4/15

Kubiatowicz CS162 ©UCB Spring 2015



- Could use base/limit for dynamic address translation translation happens at execution:
  - Alter address of every load/store by adding "base"
  - Generate error if address bigger than limit
- This gives program the illusion that it is running on its own dedicated machine, with memory starting at 0
  - Program gets continuous region of memory
- Addresses within program do not have to be relocated when program placed in different region of DRAM Kubiatowicz CS162 ©UCB Spring 2015 6

## **Issues with Simple B&B Method**



- Fragmentation problem
  - Not every process is the same size
  - Over time, memory space becomes fragmented
- Missing support for sparse address space
  - Would like to have multiple chunks/program
  - E.g.: Code, Data, Stack
- Hard to do inter-process sharing
  - Want to share code segments when possible
  - Want to share memory between processes
  - Helped by providing multiple segments per process

## More Flexible Segmentation



- Logical View: multiple separate segments
  - Typical: Code, Data, Stack
  - Others: memory sharing, etc
- Each segment is given region of contiguous memory
  - Has a base and limit
- Can reside anywhere in physical memory 3/4/15 Kubiatowicz CS162 ©UCB Spring 2015



## Intel x86 Special Registers



RPL = Requestor Privilege Level TI = Table Indicator (0 = GDT, 1 = LDT) Index = Index into table

Protected Mode segment selector

Typical Segment Register Current Priority is RPL Of Code Segment (CS)



#### 3/4/15

## Example: Four Segments (16 bit addresses)



## Example of segment translation

0x240	main:	la \$a0, varx jal strlen				
0x244				Seg ID #	Base	Limit
 0x360	strlen:	 li	\$v0, 0 ;count	0 (code)	0×4000	0×0800
0x364 0x368	loop:	lb beg	\$t0, (\$a0) \$r0.\$t1, done	1 (data)	0×4800	0×1400
				2 (shared)	0×F000	0×1000
0x4050	varx	aw	0x314159	3 (stack)	0×0000	0×3000

Let's simulate a bit of this code to see what happens (PC=0x240):

- Fetch 0x240. Virtual segment #? 0; Offset? 0x240 Physical address? Base=0x4000, so physical addr=0x4240 Fetch instruction at 0x4240. Get "la \$a0, varx" Move 0x4050 → \$a0, Move PC+4→PC
- 2. Fetch 0x244. Translated to Physical=0x4244. Get "jal strlen" Move 0x0248 → \$ra (return address!), Move 0x0360 → PC
- Fetch 0x360. Translated to Physical=0x4360. Get "li \$v0,0" Move 0x0000 → \$v0, Move PC+4→PC
- Fetch 0x364. Translated to Physical=0x4364. Get "lb \$t0,(\$a0)" Since \$a0 is 0x4050, try to load byte from 0x4050 Translate 0x4050. Virtual segment #? 1; Offset? 0x50 Physical address? Base=0x4800, Physical addr = 0x4850, Load Byte from 0x4850→\$t0, Move PC+4→PC

## Observations about Segmentation

- Virtual address space has holes
  - Segmentation efficient for sparse address spaces
  - A correct program should never address gaps (except as mentioned in moment)

» If it does, trap to kernel and dump core

- When it is OK to address outside valid range:
  - This is how the stack and heap are allowed to grow
  - For instance, stack takes fault, system automatically increases size of stack
- Need protection mode in segment table
  - For example, code segment would be read-only
  - Data and stack would be read-write (stores allowed)
  - Shared segment could be read-only or read-write
- What must be saved/restored on context switch?
  - Segment table stored in CPU, not in memory (small)
  - Might store all of processes memory onto disk when switched (called "swapping")

## What if more segments than will fit into memory?



#### • Extreme form of Context Switch: Swapping

- In order to make room for next process, some or all of the previous process is moved to disk

» Likely need to send out complete segments

- This greatly increases the cost of context-switching
- Desirable alternative?
  - Some way to keep only active portions of a process in memory at any one time
  - Need finer granularity control over physical memory

- Must fit variable-sized chunks into physical memory
- May move processes multiple times to fit everything
- Limited options for swapping to disk
- Fragmentation: wasted space
  - External: free gaps between allocated chunks
  - Internal: don't need all memory within allocated chunks

Paging: Physical Memory in Fixed Size Chunks

- Solution to fragmentation from segments?
  - Allocate physical memory in fixed size chunks ("pages")
  - Every chunk of physical memory is equivalent
    - » Can use simple vector of bits to handle allocation: 00110001110001101 ... 110010
    - » Each bit represents page of physical memory 1  $\Rightarrow$  allocated, 0  $\Rightarrow$  free

- Should pages be as big as our previous segments?
  - No: Can lead to lots of internal fragmentation
     » Typically have small pages (1K-16K)
  - Consequently: need multiple pages/segment

## How to Implement Paging?



- Page Table (One per process)
  - Resides in physical memory
  - Contains physical page and permission for each virtual page » Permissions include: Valid bits, Read, Write, etc
- Virtual address mapping
  - Offset from Virtual address copied to Physical Address
     » Example: 10 bit offset ⇒ 1024-byte pages
  - Virtual page # is all remaining bits
     » Example for 32-bits: 32-10 = 22 bits, i.e. 4 million entries
     » Physical page # copied from table into physical address
     Check Page Table bounds and permissions

3/4/15



## What about Sharing?



## Memory Layout for Linux 32-bit



http://static.duartes.org/img/blogPosts/linuxFlexibleAddressSpaceLayout.png

3/4/15

### **Summary: Simple Page Table**



## **Summary: Simple Page Table**



### **Summary: Simple Page Table**



- What needs to be switched on a context switch?
  Page table pointer and limit
- Analysis
  - Pros
    - » Simple memory allocation
    - » Easy to Share
  - Con: What if address space is sparse?
     » E.g. on UNIX, code starts at 0, stack starts at (2<sup>31</sup>-1).
     » With 1K pages, need 4 million page table entries!
  - Con: What if table really big?
     » Not all pages used all the time ⇒ would be nice to have working set of page table in memory
- How about combining paging and segmentation?
  - Segments with pages inside them?
  - Need some sort of multi-level translation

### Multi-level Translation: Segments + Pages

- What about a tree of tables?
  - Lowest level page table > memory still allocated with bitmap
  - Higher levels often segmented
- Could have any number of levels. Example (top segment):



- What must be saved/restored on context switch?
  - Contents of top-level segment registers (for this example)
  - Pointer to top-level table (page table)

3/4/15

## What about Sharing (Complete Segment)?





### **Summary: Two-Level Paging**



3/4/15

### **Summary: Two-Level Paging**



- · Pros:
  - Only need to allocate as many page table entries as we need for application

» In other wards, sparse address spaces are easy

- Easy memory allocation
- Easy Sharing

» Share at segment or page level

- Cons:
  - One pointer per page (typically 4K 16K pages today)
  - Page tables need to be contiguous
    - » However, previous example keeps tables to exactly one page in size
  - Two (or more, if >2 levels) lookups per reference

» Seems very expensive!

## Summary

- Segment Mapping
  - Segment registers within processor
  - Segment ID associated with each access
     » Often comes from portion of virtual address
     » Can come from bits in instruction instead (x86)
  - Each segment contains base and limit information
     » Offset (rest of address) adjusted by adding base
- Page Tables
  - Memory divided into fixed-sized chunks of memory
  - Virtual page number from virtual address mapped through page table to physical page number
  - Offset of virtual address same as physical address
  - Large page tables can be placed into virtual memory
- Multi-Level Tables
  - Virtual address mapped to series of tables
  - Permit sparse population of address space