



Midterm results



- Mean: 42.39, median: 44

1 / 42

Midterm results



- Systems students should insist on a CDF!

1 / 42

Administrivia

- Recall we will have a resurrection final
 - Don't panic if you didn't do well on midterm
 - But make sure you understand all the answers
 - There may be questions on same topics on the final
- ...but only if you got > 0 on the midterm
 - You should withdraw from class if you did not take the midterm
- Lab 3 section Friday

2 / 42

Outline

- 1 Malloc and fragmentation
- 2 Exploiting program behavior
- 3 Allocator designs
- 4 User-level MMU tricks
- 5 Garbage collection

3 / 42


Dynamic memory allocation

- Almost every useful program uses it
 - Gives wonderful functionality benefits
 - ▷ Don't have to statically specify complex data structures
 - ▷ Can have data grow as a function of input size
 - ▷ Allows recursive procedures (stack growth)
 - But, can have a huge impact on performance
- Today: how to implement it
 - Lecture based on [Wilson]
- Some interesting facts:
 - Two or three line code change can have huge, non-obvious impact on how well allocator works (examples to come)
 - Proven: impossible to construct an "always good" allocator
 - Surprising result: memory management still poorly understood


4 / 42

Why is it hard?

- Satisfy arbitrary set of allocation and frees.
- Easy without free: set a pointer to the beginning of some big chunk of memory ("heap") and increment on each allocation:




- Problem: free creates holes ("fragmentation")
Result? Lots of free space but cannot satisfy request!



5 / 42

More abstractly

freelist

- **What an allocator must do?** 

- Track which parts of memory in use, which parts are free
- Ideal: no wasted space, no time overhead

- **What the allocator cannot do?**

- Control order of the number and size of requested blocks
- Know the number, size, or lifetime of future allocations
- Move allocated regions (bad placement decisions permanent)

`malloc(20)?`

20	10	20	10	20
----	----	----	----	----

- **The core fight: minimize fragmentation**

- App frees blocks in any order, creating holes in “heap”
- Holes too small? cannot satisfy future requests

6 / 42


What is fragmentation really?

- **Inability to use memory that is free**
- **Two factors required for fragmentation**

1. Different lifetimes—if adjacent objects die at different times, then fragmentation:



- ▶ If all objects die at the same time, then no fragmentation:



2. Different sizes: If all requests the same size, then no fragmentation (that's why no external fragmentation with paging):



7 / 42

Important decisions


- **Placement choice: where in free memory to put a requested block?**

- Freedom: can select any memory in the heap
- Ideal: put block where it won't cause fragmentation later (impossible in general: requires future knowledge)

- **Split free blocks to satisfy smaller requests?**

- Fights internal fragmentation
- Freedom: can choose any larger block to split
- One way: choose block with smallest remainder (best fit)

- **Coalescing free blocks to yield larger blocks**



- Freedom: when to coalesce (deferring can save work)
- Fights external fragmentation

8 / 42

Impossible to “solve” fragmentation

- **If you read allocation papers to find the best allocator**

- All discussions revolve around tradeoffs
- The reason? There cannot be a best allocator

- **Theoretical result:**

- For any possible allocation algorithm, there exist streams of allocation and deallocation requests that defeat the allocator and force it into severe fragmentation.

- **How much fragmentation should we tolerate?**

- Let M = bytes of live data, n_{\min} = smallest allocation, n_{\max} = largest – How much gross memory required?
- Bad allocator: $M \cdot (n_{\max}/n_{\min})$
 - ▶ E.g., only ever use a memory location for a single size
 - ▶ E.g., make all allocations of size n_{\max} regardless of requested size
- Good allocator: $\sim M \cdot \log(n_{\max}/n_{\min})$

9 / 42

Pathological examples

- **Suppose heap currently has 7 20-byte chunks**



- What's a bad stream of frees and then allocates?

- **Given a 128-byte limit on malloced space**

- What's a really bad combination of mallocs & frees?

- **Next: two allocators (best fit, first fit) that, in practice, work pretty well**

- “pretty well” = $\sim 20\%$ fragmentation under many workloads

10 / 42

Pathological examples

- **Suppose heap currently has 7 20-byte chunks**



- What's a bad stream of frees and then allocates?

- Free every other chunk, then alloc 21 bytes

- **Given a 128-byte limit on malloced space**

- What's a really bad combination of mallocs & frees?

- **Next: two allocators (best fit, first fit) that, in practice, work pretty well**

- “pretty well” = $\sim 20\%$ fragmentation under many workloads

10 / 42

Pathological examples

- Suppose heap currently has 7 20-byte chunks




- What's a bad stream of frees and then allocates?
- Free every other chunk, then alloc 21 bytes
- Given a 128-byte limit on malloced space
 - What's a really bad combination of mallocs & frees?
 - Malloc 128 1-byte chunks, free every other
 - Malloc 32 2-byte chunks, free every other (1- & 2-byte) chunk
 - Malloc 16 4-byte chunks, free every other chunk...
- Next: two allocators (best fit, first fit) that, in practice, work pretty well
 - "pretty well" = ~20% fragmentation under many workloads

10 / 42

Best fit

- Strategy: minimize fragmentation by allocating space from block that leaves smallest fragment

- Data structure: heap is a list of free blocks, each has a header holding block size and a pointer to the next block



- Code: Search freelist for block closest in size to the request. (Exact match is ideal)
- During free (usually) coalesce adjacent blocks
- Potential problem: Sawdust
 - Remainder so small that over time left with "sawdust" everywhere
 - Fortunately not a problem in practice

11 / 42

Best fit gone wrong

- Simple bad case: allocate n, m ($n < m$) in alternating orders, free all the n s, then try to allocate an $n + 1$
- Example: start with 99 bytes of memory
 - alloc 19, 21, 19, 21, 19

19	21	19	21	19
----	----	----	----	----

 - free 19, 19, 19:

19	21	19	21	19
----	----	----	----	----

 - alloc 20? Fails! (wasted space = 57 bytes)
- However, doesn't seem to happen in practice

12 / 42

First fit

- Strategy: pick the first block that fits
 - Data structure: free list, sorted LIFO, FIFO, or by address
 - Code: scan list, take the first one
- LIFO: put free object on front of list.
 - Simple, but causes higher fragmentation
 - Potentially good for cache locality
- Address sort: order free blocks by address
 - Makes coalescing easy (just check if next block is free)
 - Also preserves empty/idle space (locality good when paging)
- FIFO: put free object at end of list
 - Gives similar fragmentation as address sort, but unclear why

13 / 42

Subtle pathology: LIFO FF

- Storage management example of subtle impact of simple decisions
- LIFO first fit seems good:
 - Put object on front of list (cheap), hope same size used again (cheap + good locality)
- But, has big problems for simple allocation patterns:
 - E.g., repeatedly intermix short-lived $2n$ -byte allocations, with long-lived $(n + 1)$ -byte allocations
 - Each time large object freed, a small chunk will be quickly taken, leaving useless fragment. Pathological fragmentation

14 / 42

First fit: Nuances

- First fit sorted by address order, in practice:
 - Blocks at front preferentially split, ones at back only split when no larger one found before them
 - Result? Seems to roughly sort free list by size
 - So? Makes first fit operationally similar to best fit: a first fit of a sorted list = best fit!
- Problem: sawdust at beginning of the list
 - Sorting of list forces a large requests to skip over many small blocks. Need to use a scalable heap organization
- Suppose memory has free blocks:

20	→	15
----	---	----

 - If allocation ops are 10 then 20, best fit wins
 - When is FF better than best fit?

15 / 42

First fit: Nuances

- **First fit sorted by address order, in practice:**
 - Blocks at front preferentially split, ones at back only split when no larger one found before them
 - Result? Seems to roughly sort free list by size
 - So? Makes first fit operationally similar to best fit: a first fit of a sorted list = best fit!
- **Problem: sawdust at beginning of the list**
 - Sorting of list forces a large requests to skip over many small blocks. Need to use a scalable heap organization
- **Suppose memory has free blocks:**

20			
----	--	--	--

 \rightarrow

15	
----	--

 - If allocation ops are 10 then 20, best fit wins
 - When is FF better than best fit?
 - Suppose allocation ops are 8, 12, then 12 \implies first fit wins

15 / 42

Some worse ideas

- **Worst-fit:**
 - Strategy: fight against sawdust by splitting blocks to maximize leftover size
 - In real life seems to ensure that no large blocks around
- **Next fit:**
 - Strategy: use first fit, but remember where we found the last thing and start searching from there
 - Seems like a good idea, but tends to break down entire list
- **Buddy systems:**
 - Round up allocations to power of 2 to make management faster
 - Result? Heavy internal fragmentation

16 / 42

Outline


- 1 Malloc and fragmentation
- 2 Exploiting program behavior
- 3 Allocator designs
- 4 User-level MMU tricks
- 5 Garbage collection

17 / 42


Known patterns of real programs

- So far we've treated programs as black boxes.
- Most real programs exhibit 1 or 2 (or all 3) of the following patterns of alloc/dealloc:


- *Ramps*: accumulate data monotonically over time



- *Peaks*: allocate many objects, use briefly, then free all




- *Plateaus*: allocate many objects, use for a long time



18 / 42


Pattern 1: ramps



- **In a practical sense: ramp = no free!**
 - Implication for fragmentation?
 - What happens if you evaluate allocator with ramp programs only?

19 / 42

Pattern 2: peaks




- **Peaks: allocate many objects, use briefly, then free all**
 - Fragmentation a real danger
 - What happens if peak allocated from contiguous memory?
 - Interleave peak & ramp? Interleave two different peaks?

20 / 42


Exploiting peaks

- **Peak phases: allocate a lot, then free everything**
 - Change allocation interface: allocate as before, but only support free of everything all at once
 - Called “arena allocation”, “obstack” (object stack), or `alloca/procedure call` (by compiler people)
- **Arena = a linked list of large chunks of memory**
 - Advantages: alloc is a pointer increment, free is “free”
No wasted space for tags or list pointers



21 / 42

Pattern 3: Plateaus



trace of perl running a string processing script

- **Plateaus: allocate many objects, use for a long time**
 - What happens if overlap with peak or different plateau?

22 / 42

Fighting fragmentation

- **Segregation = reduced fragmentation:**
 - Allocated at same time ~ freed at same time
 - Different type ~ freed at different time
-
- **Implementation observations:**
 - Programs allocate a small number of different sizes
 - Fragmentation at peak usage more important than at low usage
 - Most allocations small (< 10 words)
 - Work done with allocated memory increases with size
 - Implications?

23 / 42

Outline

- 1 Malloc and fragmentation
- 2 Exploiting program behavior
- 3 Allocator designs
- 4 User-level MMU tricks
- 5 Garbage collection


24 / 42

Slab allocation [Bonwick]

- **Kernel allocates many instances of same structures**
 - E.g., a 1.7 kB `task_struct` for every process on system
- **Often want contiguous physical memory (for DMA)**
- **Slab allocation optimizes for this case:**
 - A **slab** is multiple pages of contiguous physical memory
 - A **cache** contains one or more slabs
 - Each cache stores only one kind of object (fixed size)
- **Each slab is full, empty, or partial**
- **E.g., need new `task_struct`?**
 - Look in the `task_struct` cache
 - If there is a partial slab, pick free `task_struct` in that
 - Else, use empty, or may need to allocate new slab for cache
- **Advantages: speed, and no internal fragmentation**

25 / 42

Simple, fast segregated free lists




- **Array of free lists for small sizes, tree for larger**
 - Place blocks of same size on same page
 - Have count of allocated blocks: if goes to zero, can return page
- **Pro: segregate sizes, no size tag, fast small alloc**
- **Con: worst case waste: 1 page per size even w/o free, After pessimal free: waste 1 page per object**
- **TCMalloc [Ghemawat] is a well-documented malloc like this**
 - Also uses “thread caching” to reduce coherence misses

26 / 42

Typical space overheads

- Free list bookkeeping and alignment determine minimum allocatable size:
- If not implicit in page, must store size of block
- Must store pointers to next and previous freelist element




- Allocator doesn't know types
 - Must align memory to conservative boundary
- Minimum allocation unit? Space overhead when allocated? [demo mtest]

27 / 42

Getting more space from OS

- On Unix, can use `sbrk`
 - E.g., to activate a new zero-filled page:



```
/* add nbytes of valid virtual address space */
void *get_free_space(size_t nbytes) {
    void *p = sbrk(nbytes);
    if (p == (void *) -1)
        error("virtual memory exhausted");
    return p;
}
```

- For large allocations, `sbrk` a bad idea
 - May want to give memory back to OS
 - Can't with `sbrk` unless big chunk last thing allocated
 - So allocate large chunk using `mmap`'s `MAP_ANON`

28 / 42

Outline

- Malloc and fragmentation
- Exploiting program behavior
- Allocator designs
- User-level MMU tricks
- Garbage collection


29 / 42

Faults + resumption = power

- Resuming after fault lets us emulate many things
 - "All problems in CS can be solved by another layer of indirection"
- Example: sub-page protection
- To protect sub-page region in paging system:



- Set entire page to most restrictive permission; record in PT




- Any access that violates permission will cause a fault
- Fault handler checks if page special, and if so, if access allowed
- Allowed? Emulate write ("tracing"), otherwise raise error

30 / 42

More fault resumption examples

- Emulate accessed bits:
 - Set page permissions to "invalid".
 - On any access will get a fault: Mark as accessed
- Avoid save/restore of floating point registers
 - Make first FP operation cause fault so as to detect usage
- Emulate non-existent instructions:
 - Give inst an illegal opcode; OS fault handler detects and emulates fake instruction
- Run OS on top of another OS!
 - Slam OS into normal process
 - When does something "privileged," real OS gets woken up with a fault.
 - If operation is allowed, do it or emulate it; otherwise kill guest
 - IBM's VM/370. VMware (sort of)




31 / 42

Not just for kernels

- User-level code can resume after faults, too. Recall:
 - `mprotect` – protects memory
 - `sigaction` – catches signal after page fault
 - Return from signal handler restarts faulting instruction
- Many applications detailed by [Appel & Li]
- Example: concurrent snapshotting of process
 - Mark all of process's memory read-only with `mprotect`
 - One thread starts writing all of memory to disk
 - Other thread keeps executing
 - On fault – write that page to disk, make writable, resume

32 / 42

Distributed shared memory



- **Virtual memory allows us to go to memory or disk**
 - But, can use the same idea to go anywhere! Even to another computer. Page across network rather than to disk. Faster, and allows network of workstations (NOW)

33 / 42

Persistent stores

- **Idea: Objects that persist across program invocations**
 - E.g., object-oriented database; useful for CAD/CAM type apps
- **Achieve by memory-mapping a file**
 - Write your own “malloc” for memory in a file
- **But only write changes to file at end if commit**
 - Use dirty bits to detect which pages must be written out
 - Or emulate dirty bits with *mprotect/sigaction* (using write faults)
- **On 32-bit machine, store can be larger than memory**
 - But single run of program won't access > 4GB of objects
 - Keep mapping of 32-bit memory pointers ↔ 64-bit disk offsets
 - Use faults to bring in pages from disk as necessary
 - After reading page, translate pointers—known as *swizzling*

34 / 42

Outline

- 1 Malloc and fragmentation
- 2 Exploiting program behavior
- 3 Allocator designs
- 4 User-level MMU tricks
- 5 **Garbage collection**

35 / 42


Garbage collection

- **In safe languages, runtime knows about all pointers**
 - So can move an object if you change all the pointers
- **What memory locations might a program access?**
 - Any globals or objects whose pointers are currently in registers
 - Recursively, any pointers in objects it might access
 - Anything else is *unreachable*, or *garbage*; memory can be re-used
- **Example: stop-and-copy garbage collection**
 - Memory full? Temporarily pause program, allocate new heap
 - Copy all objects pointed to by registers into new heap
 - Mark old copied objects as copied, record new location
 - Start scanning through new heap. For each pointer:
 - Copied already? Adjust pointer to new location
 - Not copied? Then copy it and adjust pointer
 - Free old heap—program will never access it—and continue

36 / 42

Concurrent garbage collection

- **Idea: Stop & copy, but without the stop**
 - *Mutator* thread runs program, *collector* concurrently does GC
- **When collector invoked:**
 - Protect from space & unscanned to space from mutator
 - Copy objects in registers into *to space*, resume mutator
 - All pointers in scanned *to space* point to *to space*
 - If mutator accesses unscanned area, fault, scan page, resume



37 / 42

Heap overflow detection

- **Many GCed languages need fast allocation**
 - E.g., in lisp, constantly allocating cons cells
 - Allocation can be as often as every 50 instructions
- **Fast allocation is just to bump a pointer**

```
char *next_free;
char *heap_limit;

void *alloc (unsigned size) {
    if (next_free + size > heap_limit) /* 1 */
        invoke_garbage_collector (); /* 2 */
    char *ret = next_free;
    next_free += size;
    return ret;
}
```

- **But would be even faster to eliminate lines 1 & 2!**

38 / 42


Heap overflow detection 2

- **Mark page at end of heap inaccessible**
 - `mprotect (heap_limit, PAGE_SIZE, PROT_NONE);`
- **Program will allocate memory beyond end of heap**
- **Program will use memory and fault**
 - Note: Depends on specifics of language
 - But many languages will touch allocated memory immediately
- **Invoke garbage collector**
 - Must now put just allocated object into new heap
- **Note: requires more than just resumption**
 - Faulting instruction must be resumed
 - But must resume with different target virtual address
 - Doable on most architectures since GC updates registers

39 / 42

Reference counting

- **Seemingly simpler GC scheme:**
 - Each object has "ref count" of pointers to it
 - Increment when pointer set to it
 - Decrement when pointer killed (C++ destructors handy—c.f. `shared_ptr`)
- **Works well for hierarchical data structures**
 - E.g., pages of physical memory




```
void foo(bar c) {  
    bar a b;  
    a = c; // c.refcnt++  
    b = a; // a.refcnt++  
    a = 0; // c.refcnt--  
    return; // b.refcnt--  
}
```

- ref count == 0? Free object

40 / 42

Reference counting pros/cons

- **Circular data structures always have ref count > 0**
 - No external pointers means **lost memory**
- **Can do manually w/o PL support, but error-prone**
- **Potentially more efficient than real GC**
 - No need to halt program to run collector
 - Avoids weird unpredictable latencies
- **Potentially less efficient than real GC**
 - With real GC, copying a pointer is cheap
 - With refcounts, must update count each time & possibly take lock (but C++11 `std::move` can avoid overhead)



41 / 42

Ownership types

- **Another approach: avoid GC by exploiting type system**
 - Use ownership types, which prohibit copies
- **You can move a value into a new variable (e.g., copy pointer)**
 - But then the original variable is no longer usable
- **You can *borrow* a value by creating a pointer to it**
 - But must prove pointer will not outlive borrowed value
 - And can't use original unless both are read-only (to avoid races)
- **Ownership types available now in Rust language**
 - First serious competitor to C/C++ for OSes, browser engines
- **C++11 does something similar but weaker with unique types**
 - `std::unique_ptr`, `std::unique_lock`,...
 - Can `std::move` but not copy these

42 / 42


```
#include <stdio.h>
#include <stdlib.h>

int
main()
{
    char *p1 = malloc(1);
    char *p2 = malloc(1);
    printf("%p - %p = %ld\n", p2, p1, p2 - p1);
}
```