

## Swapping

+ Consider 100K proc, $1 \mathrm{MB} / \mathrm{s}$ disk, 8 ms seek
$-108 \mathrm{~ms} * 2=216 \mathrm{~ms}$
- If used for context switch, want large quantum!
- Logical address space larger than physical memory
- Small processes faster
- "Virtual Memory"
- on special disk
- Abstraction for programmer
- Performance ok?
- Error handling not used
- Maximum arrays


## Motivation

- Pending I/O (DMA)
- don't swap
- DMA to OS buffers
- Unix uses swapping variant
- Each process has "too large" address space
- Demand Paging


Paging Implementation


## Page Fault

- Page not in memory
- interrupt OS => page fault
- OS looks in table:
- invalid reference? => abort
- not in memory? => bring it in
- Get empty frame (from list)
- Swap page into frame
$\downarrow$ Reset tables (valid bit = 1)
- Restart instruction



## Performance Example

$\rightarrow$ memory access time $=100$ nanoseconds

- swap fault overhead $=25 \mathrm{msec}$
$\uparrow$ page fault rate $=1 / 1000$
$\rightarrow$ EAT $=(1-\mathrm{p}) \times 100+\mathrm{p}$ x $(25 \mathrm{msec})$
$=(1-p) \times 100+\mathrm{p} \times 25,000,000$
$=100+24,999,900 \times \mathrm{p}$
$=100+24,999,900 \times 1 / 1000=25$ microseconds
- Want less than $10 \%$ degradation
$110>100+24,999,900 \times p$ $10>24,999,9000 \times p$ p < .00000004 or 1 fault in $2,500,000$ accesse


## Page Replacement

- Page fault => What if no free frames?
- terminate user process (ugh!)
- swap out process (reduces degree of multiprog)
- replace other page with needed page
\& Page replacement:
- if free frame, use it
- use algorithm to select victim frame
- write page to disk, changing tables
- read in new page
- restart process



## Page Replacement Algorithms

- Every system has its own
- Want lowest page fault rate
\& Evaluate by running it on a particular string of memory references (reference string) and computing number of page faults
- Example: 1,2,3,4,1,2,5,1,2,3,4,5




## Least Recently Used

$\uparrow$ Replace the page that has not been used for the longest period of time

$$
1,2,3,4,1,2,5,1,2,3,4,5
$$



## LRU Approximations

\& LRU good, but hardware support expensive

- Some hardware support by reference bit
- with each page, initially $=0$
- when page is referenced, set $=1$
- replace the one which is 0 (no order)
- enhance by having 8 bits and shifting
- approximate LRU



## LRU Implementation

- Counter implementation
- every page has a counter; every time page is referenced, copy clock to counter
- when a page needs to be changed, compare the counters to determine which to change
- Stack implementation
- keep a stack of page numbers
- page referenced: move to top
- no search needed for replacement



## Second-Chance

\& FIFO replacement, but ...

- Get first in FIFO
- Look at reference bit
- bit $==0$ then replace
- bit $==1$ then set bit $=0$, get next in FIFO
$\uparrow$ If page referenced enough, never replaced
$\rightarrow$ Implement with circular queue




## Counting Algorithms

- Keep a counter of number of references
- LFU - replace page with smallest count
- if does all in beginning, won't be replaced
- decay values by shift
- MFU - smallest count just brought in and will probably be used
$\rightarrow$ Not too common (expensive) and not/00 good



## Allocation of Frames

- How many fixed frames per process?
- Two allocation schemes:
- fixed allocation
- priority allocation



## Enhanced Second-Chance

- 2-bits, reference bit and modify bit
$\rightarrow(0,0)$ neither recently used nor modified - best page to replace
$\rightarrow(0,1)$ not recently used but modified - needs write-out
$\rightarrow(1,0)$ recently used but clean - probably used again soon
$\leftrightarrow(1,1)$ recently used and modified - used soon, needs write-out
$\rightarrow$ Circular queue in each class -- (Macint



## Fixed Allocation

- Equal allocation
- ex: 93 frames, 5 procs $=18$ per proc ( 3 in pool)
$\downarrow$ Proportional Allocation
- number of frames proportional to size
- ex: 64 frames, s1 = 10, s2 = 127
- $\mathrm{f} 1=10 / 137 \times 64=5$
- $\mathrm{f} 2=127 / 137 \times 64=59$
$\downarrow$ Treat processes equal


## Priority Allocation

- Use a proportional scheme based on priority
- If process generates a page fault
- select replacement a process with lower priority
* "Global" versus "Local" replacement
- local consistent (not influenced by others - global more efficient (used more often)



## Thrashing

\& If a process does not have "enough" pages, the page-fault rate is very high

- low CPU utilization
- OS thinks it needs increased multiprogramming
- adds another procces to system
- Thrashing is when a process is busy swapping pages in and out



## Cause of Thrashing

$\downarrow$ Why does paging work?

- Locality model
- process migrates from one locality to another
- localities may overlap
$\leftarrow$ Why does thrashing occur? - sum of localities > total memory size
$\rightarrow$ How do we fix thrashing?
- Working Set Model
- Page Fault Frequency



## Working Set Example

$\rightarrow T=5$
$+1,23231,243474334112221$
$\mathrm{W}=\{1,2,3\} \quad \mathrm{W}=\{3,4,7\} \quad \mathrm{W}=\{1,2\}$

- if $T$ too small, will not encompass locality
- if $T$ too large, will encompass several locylities
- if $T \Rightarrow$ infinity, will encompass entire prequat.
$\rightarrow$ if $D>m=>$ thrashing, so suspend a pucessm
- Modify LRU appx to include Working



## Page Size

$\star$ Old - Page size fixed, New -choose page size
$\star$ How do we pick the right page size? Tradeoffs:

- Fragmentation
- Table size
- Minimize I/O
$\bullet$ transfer small (.1ms), latency + seek time large (10ms)
- Locality
- small finer resolution, but more faults

$\rightarrow$ Historical trend towards larger page sizes.
- CPU, mem faster proportionally than disks


## Program Structure

```
int A[1024][1024];
for (i=0; i<1024; i++)
        for (j=0; j<1024; j++)
            A[i][j] = 0;
```

$\rightarrow 1024$ page faults
$\rightarrow$ stack vs. hash table

- Compiler
- separate code from data
- keep routines that call each other together
$\uparrow$ LISP (pointers) vs. Pascal (no-pointers


## Prepaging

$\star$ Pure demand paging has many page faults initially

- use working set
- does cost of prepaging unused frames outweigh cost of page-faulting?



## Program Structure

- consider:
int A[1024][1024];
for (j=0; j<1024; j++)

$$
\text { for }(i=0 ; i<1024 ; i++)
$$

$$
\mathrm{A}[\mathrm{i}][\mathrm{j}]=0 \text {; }
$$

- suppose:
- process has 1 frame
-1 row per page
- => $1024 \times 1024$ page faults!



## Priority Processes

- Consider
- low priority process faults,
- bring page in
- low priority process in ready queue for awhile, waiting while high priority process runs
- high priority process faults
- low priority page clean, not used in a while => perfect!
- Lock-bit (like for I/O) until used once


## Real-Time Processes

- Real-time
- bounds on delay
- hard-real time: systems crash, lives lost
- air-traffic control, factor automation
- soft-real time: application sucks
- audio, video
$\uparrow$ Paging adds unexpected delays
- don't do it
- lock bits for real-time processes



## Virtual Memory and WinNT

- Page Replacement Algorithm
- FIFO
- Missing page, plus adjacent pages
- Working set
- default is 30
- take victim frame periodically
- if no fault, reduce set size by 1
- Reserve pool
- hard page faults
- soft page faults



## Virtual Memory and Linux

$\rightarrow$ Regions of virtual memory

- paging disk (normal)
- file (text segment, memory mapped file)
- New Virtual Memory
- exec() creates new page table
- fork() copies page table
- reference to common pages
- if written, then copied
- Page Replacement Algorithm
- second chance (with more bits)



## Capacity Planning Then and Now

- Capacity Planning in the good old days
- used to be just mainframes
- simple CPU-load based queuing theory
- Unix
$\rightarrow$ Capacity Planning today
- distributed systems
- networks of workstations
- Windows NT
- MS Exchange, Lotus Notes




## Caching and Prefetching

- Start process
- wait for "Enter"
$\rightarrow$ Start perfmon
- Hit "Enter"
- Read 1 4-K page
- Exit
- Repeat


