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AN ALTERNATIVE TO PAGING

View memory as a set of segments of no particular size, with no particular ordering.

This corresponds to typical modular approaches taken to program development.

The length of a segment depends on the complexity of the function (e.g., $\text{sqrt}$).
WHAT IS A SEGMENT?

Segmentation supports the user-view of memory that the logical address space becomes a collection of (typically disjoint) segments.

Segments have a **name** (or a **number**) and a **length**. Addresses specify **segment**, and **offset** within segment.

To access memory, user program specifies \textit{segment + offset}, and the compiler (or, as in MULTICS, the OS) translates, in contrast to paging where the user is unaware of the memory structure and everything is managed invisibly.

With paging, the user is unaware of memory structure — everything is managed invisibly.
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IMPLEMENTING SEGMENTS

Logical addresses are pairs, \((\text{segment}, \text{offset})\)

For example, the compiler might construct distinct segments for global variables, procedure call stack, code for each procedure/function, local variables for each procedure/function

Finally the loader takes each segment and maps it to a physical segment number
Implementing Segments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Others!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Maintain a **Segment Table** for each process:

- If there are too many segments then the table is kept in memory, pointed to by **ST Base Register** (STBR)
- Also have an **ST Length Register** (STLR) since the number of segments used by different programs will diverge widely
- ST is part of the process context and hence is changed on each process switch
- ST logically accessed on each memory reference, so speed is critical
IMPLEMENTING SEGMENTS: ALGORITHM

1. Program presents address \((s, d)\).
2. If \(s \geq \text{STLR}\) then give up
3. Obtain table entry at reference \(s + \text{STBR}\), a tuple of form \((b_s, l_s)\)
4. If \(0 \leq d < l_s\) then this is a valid address at location \((b_s, d)\), else fault

- The two operations \(b_s, d\) and \(0 \leq d < l_s\) can be done simultaneously to save time
- Still requires 2 memory references per lookup though, so care needed
- E.g., Use a set of associative registers to hold most recently used ST entries
- Similar performance gains to the TLB description earlier
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PROTECTION

Segmentation's big advantage is to provide protection between components.

That protection is provided *per segment*; i.e. it corresponds to the logical view.

*Protection bits* associated with each ST entry checked in usual way, e.g., instruction segments should not be self-modifying, so are protected against writes.

Could go further — e.g., place every array in its own segment so that array limits can be checked by the hardware.
SHARING

Segmentation also facilitates sharing of code/data:

- Each process has its own STBR/STLR
- Sharing is enabled when two processes have entries for the same physical locations
- Sharing occurs at segment level, with each segment having own protection bits
  - For data segments can use copy-on-write as per paged case
- Can share only parts of programs, e.g., C library but there are subtleties
SHARING: SUBTLETIES

- For example, jumps within shared code
  - Jump specified as a condition + transfer address, i.e., (segment, offset)
  - Segment is (of course) this one
  - Thus all programs sharing this segment must use the same number to refer to it, else confusion will result
  - As the number of users sharing a segment grows, so does difficulty of finding a common shared segment number
  - Thus, specify branches as PC-relative or relative to a register containing the current segment number
  - (Read only segments containing no pointers may be shared with different seg numbers)
SHARING SEGMENTS

- Wasteful (and dangerous) to store common information on shared segment in each process segment table
- Assign each segment a unique **System Segment Number** (SSN)
- **Process Segment Table** simply maps from a **Process Segment Number** (PSN) to SSN
EXTERNAL FRAGMENTATION RETURNS

Long term scheduler must find spots in memory for all segments of a program. Problem is that segments are variable size — thus, we must handle fragmentation.

1. Usually resolved with best/first fit algorithm
2. External frag may cause process to have to wait for sufficient space
3. Compaction can be used in cases where a process would be delayed

Tradeoff between compaction/delay depends on average segment size

- Each process has just one segment reduces to variable sized partitions
- Each byte has its own segment separately relocated quadruples memory use!
- Fixed size small segments is equivalent to paging!
- Generally, with small average segment sizes, external fragmentation is small — more likely to make things fit with lots of small ones (box packing)
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SEGMENTATION VERSUS PAGING

- Protection, Sharing, Demand etc are all per segment or page, depending on scheme
- For **protection and sharing**, easier to have it per logical entity, i.e., per segment
- For **allocation and demand access** (and, in fact, certain types of sharing such as COW), we prefer paging because:
  - Allocation is easier
  - Cost of sharing/demand loading is minimised

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>logical view</th>
<th>allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>segmentation</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paging</td>
<td>bad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMBINING SEGMENTATION AND PAGING

1. **Paged segments**, used in Multics, OS/2
   - Divide each segment $s_i$ into $k = \lceil (l_i/2^n) \rceil$ pages, where $l_i$ is the limit (length) of the segment
   - Provision one page table per segment
   - Unfortunately: high hardware cost and complexity; not very portable

2. **Software segments**, used in most modern OSs
   - Consider pages $[m, \ldots, m + l]$ to be a segment
   - OS must ensure protection and sharing kept consistent over region
   - Unfortunately, leads to a loss of granularity
   - However, it is relatively simple and portable

Arguably, main reason hardware segments lost is portability: you can do software segments with just paging hardware, but cannot (easily) do software paging with segmentation hardware
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SUMMARY: VIRTUAL ADDRESSING

- Direct access to physical memory is not great as have to handle:
  - Contiguous allocation: need a large lump, end up with external fragmentation
  - Address binding: handling absolute addressing
  - Portability: how much memory does a "standard" machine have?
- Avoid problems by separating concepts of virtual (logical) and physical addresses (Atlas computer, 1962)
- Needham's comment "every problem in computer science can be solved by an extra level of indirection"
SUMMARY: VIRTUAL TO PHYSICAL ADDRESS MAPPING

- Runtime mapping of logical to physical addresses handled by the MMU. Make mapping per-process, then:
  - Allocation problem split:
    - Virtual address allocation easy
    - Allocate physical memory 'behind the scenes'
  - Address binding solved:
    - Bind to logical addresses at compile-time
    - Bind to real addresses at load time/run time
- Modern operating systems use paging hardware and fake out segments in software
SUMMARY: IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- **Hardware support**
  - Simple base reg enough for partitioning
  - Segmentation and paging need large tables

- **Performance**
  - Complex algorithms need more lookups per reference plus hardware support
  - Simple schemes preferred eg., simple addition to base

- **Fragmentation**: internal/external from fixed/variable size allocation units

- **Relocation**: solves external fragmentation, at high cost
  - Logical addresses must be computed dynamically, doesn't work with load time relocation

- **Swapping**: can be added to any algorithm, allowing more processes to access main memory

- **Sharing**: increases multiprogramming but requires paging or segmentation

- **Protection**: always useful, necessary to share code/data, needs a couple of bits
EXTRAS
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DYNAMIC LINKING

Relatively new appearance in OS (early 80's). Uses *shared objects/libraries* (Unix), or *dynamically linked libraries* (DLLs; Windows). Enables a compiled binary to invoke, at runtime, routines which are dynamically linked:

- If a routine is invoked which is part of the dynamically linked code, this will be implemented as a call into a set of stubs
- Stubs check if routine has been loaded
- If not, linker loads routine (if necessary) and replaces stub code by routing
- If sharing a library, the address binding problem must also be solved, requiring OS support: in the system, only the OS knows which libraries are being shared among which processes
- Shared libs must be stateless or concurrency safe or copy on write

Results in smaller binaries (on-disk and in-memory) and increase flexibility (fix a bug without relinking all binaries)
DYNAMIC LOADING

- At runtime a routine is loaded when first invoked
- The dynamic loader performs relocation on the fly
- It is the responsibility of the user to implement loading
- OS may provide library support to assist user
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