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Announcements
• Project 3 page table design document
  – Should have received feedback – ask us questions if you’re still unclear
• Project 3 due April 13
• Th Apr 6, 7pm, 655 McBryde: attend town-hall meeting regarding planned restructuring of 6th floor undergrad space

Memory Management Wrap-Up, Address Spaces & User-level Threads

Mem Mgmt Without Virtual Memory
• Book spends a great deal of time on it
  – Historically important, and still important for VM-less devices (embedded devices, etc.)
• Imagine if we didn’t have VM, it would be hard or impossible to
  – Retain the ability to load a program anywhere in memory
  – Accommodate programs that grow or shrink in size
  – Use idle memory for other programs
  – Move/relocate a running program in memory
• VM drastically simplifies systems design

User-level Memory Management
• Goals:
  – Minimize fragmentation
  – Speed
  – Maximize locality
  – Provide for some error detection
• Typical algorithms:
  – First-fit, best-fit
  – No universally best algorithm: can always construct worst case sequence
• Conservative heap growth
  – “wilderness preservation”

Address Spaces & Protection Domains
• Normal case: each user process has its own address space & own protection domain
• Sharing an address space means to put the same meaning to a particular virtual address
• Sharing a protection domain means to have the same access rights to a particular piece of memory
• The two are not always identical:
  – Single address space OS (all processes share one address space – ideally 64bit) – advantage: can use pointers as names for objects
Address Space & Threads

- In Pintos: one thread per address space
- More combinations in real world:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of address spaces</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>many</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 thread/space</td>
<td>MS-DOS, MacOS-9</td>
<td>Traditional Unix, BSD 4.3, 4.4, SVR3, Pintos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>many threads/space</td>
<td>Embedded Systems, Pilot (1978)</td>
<td>VMS, Mach, WinNT, Solaris, Linux</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kernel-level vs User-level Threads

- Threads on previous slide were “kernel-level” threads
  - Kernel knows about them:
    - Have kernel-assigned thread id + TCB
    - Have their own kernel stack
  - Alternative: it is also possible to build “user-level” threads
    - Kernel is unaware of them
  - Combinations of these models are possible as well

User-level Threads

- Usually implemented using library
  - (recall: core of context switching code in Pintos did not require any privileged instructions – so can do it in a user program also)
- Similar to “co-routine” concept
- Advantages
  - can be lightweight
  - context switches can be fast (don’t have to enter kernel, and since shared address space no TLB switch required)
  - can be done (almost) portably for any OS

User-level Threads - Issues

- How can traditional RUNNING/READY/BLOCKED state model be implemented?
  - Problem: RUNNING->BLOCKED transitions should cause another READY thread to be scheduled
  - Q.: what happens if user-level thread calls “read()” system call and blocks in kernel?
  - Must use elaborate mechanisms that avoid blocking in the kernel
  - Redirect all system calls that might block entire process and replace them with non-blocking versions
  - Overhead: may require additional system call
  - Since kernel sees only one thread, can use at most 1 CPU – not truly SMP-capable

Managing Stack Space

- Stacks require continuous virtual address space
  - On 32-bit systems: virtual address space fragmentation can result
  - only have 3GB total in user space for code, data, shared libs – limits the number of threads
- What size should stack have?
  - This is an issue for both ULT & KLT
- How to detect stack overflow (or grow stack)?
  - Detect in software or in hardware (or ignore)
  - Stack growth usually only available in KLT implementations
  - Compiler support can create discontiguous stacks
- Related Issues: how to implement
  - Get local thread id “pthread_self()”
  - Thread-local storage (TLS)

Preemption vs Nonpreemption

- Implementing preemption in user-level threads requires timer-interrupt like notification facility (SIGALRM in Unix)
  - But then overhead of saving all state returns
- Truly lightweight user-level threads are non-preemptive
  - Makes implementing locks really easy – no need for atomic instructions!
  - But then: cannot preempt uncooperative threads, lose ability to round-robin schedule
Aside: UNIX/POSIX Signals

- General notification interface that is used for many things in POSIX-like systems
- Examples (read kill(2), signal(2), signal(?)):
  - Job control (Ctrl-C, Ctrl-Z) send SIGINT/SIGSTOP to process
  - Processes can send each other (or themselves) signals
  - Signals are used for error conditions: SIGSEGV, SIGILL
  - Also used for timers, I/O conditions, profiling
- Default handling depends on signal: ignore, terminate, stop, core-dump
  - Processes can override handling
  - Kernel may invoke signal handlers if so instructed: like interrupt handlers – same issues apply wrt safety
- POSIX signals are per-process, complex rules describe which thread within process may handle a signal