

CS 152 Computer Architecture and Engineering

Lecture 9 - Virtual Memory

Dr. George Micheliogiannakis
EECS, University of California at Berkeley
CRD, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

<http://inst.eecs.berkeley.edu/~cs152>

Administrivia

- PS2 and lab 2 due Wednesday next week (March 2nd)
- Quiz 2 is on Monday March 7th

Last time in Lecture 9

- Protection and translation required for multiprogramming
 - Base and bounds was early simple scheme
- Page-based translation and protection avoids need for memory compaction, easy allocation by OS
 - But need to indirect in large page table on every access
- Can use multi-level page table to hold translation/protection information, but implies multiple memory accesses per reference
- Can use “translation lookaside buffer” (TLB) to cache address translations (sometimes known as address translation cache)
 - Still have to walk page tables on TLB miss, can be hardware or software talk
- Virtual memory uses DRAM as a “cache” of disk memory, allows very cheap main memory

Question of the Day

- How would you design a TLB prefetcher?

Memory Management


- Can separate into orthogonal functions:
 - Translation (mapping of virtual address to physical address)
 - Protection (permission to access word in memory)
 - Virtual memory (transparent extension of memory space using slower disk or flash storage)
- But most modern systems provide support for all the above functions with a single page-based system

Modern Virtual Memory Systems

Illusion of a large, private, uniform store

Protection & Privacy


several users, each with their private address space and one or more shared address spaces
page table \leftrightarrow name space




Demand Paging

Provides the ability to run programs larger than the primary memory


Hides differences in machine configurations




The price is address translation on each memory reference



Hierarchical Page Table




Page-Based Virtual-Memory Machine (Hardware Page-Table Walk)



- Assumes page tables held in untranslated physical memory


Address Translation: *putting it all together*



Page Fault Handler


- When the referenced page is not in DRAM:
 - The missing page is located (or created)
 - It is brought in from disk, and page table is updated
 - Another job may be run on the CPU while the first job waits for the requested page to be read from disk
 - Could be different thread of the same address space
 - If no free pages are left, a page is swapped out
 - Pseudo-LRU replacement policy, implemented in software
- Since it takes a long time to transfer a page (msecs), page faults are handled completely in software by the OS
 - Untranslated addressing mode is essential to allow kernel to access page tables

Handling VM-related exceptions




- Handling a TLB miss needs a hardware or software mechanism to refill TLB
- Handling a page fault (e.g., page is on disk) needs a *restartable* exception so software handler can resume after retrieving page
 - Precise exceptions are easy to restart
 - Can be imprecise but restartable, but this complicates OS software
- Handling protection violation may abort process
 - But often handled the same as a page fault

Address Translation in CPU Pipeline




- Need to cope with additional latency of TLB:
 - slow down the clock?
 - pipeline the TLB and cache access?
 - virtual address caches
 - parallel TLB/cache access

Virtual-Address Caches




Alternative: place the cache before the TLB



- one-step process in case of a hit (+)
- cache needs to be flushed on a context switch unless address space identifiers (ASIDs) included in tags (-)
- *aliasing problems* due to the sharing of pages (-)
- maintaining cache coherence (-) (*see later in course*)

Virtually Addressed Cache (Virtual Index/Virtual Tag)




Translate on *miss*

Question

- What is the benefit of separating instruction and data TLBs?
- And the downside?

Aliasing in Virtual-Address Caches



Two virtual pages share one physical page

Tag	Data
VA ₁	1st Copy of Data at PA
VA ₂	2nd Copy of Data at PA

Virtual cache can have two copies of same physical data. Writes to one copy not visible to reads of other!


General Solution: *Prevent aliases coexisting in cache*

Software (i.e., OS) solution for direct-mapped cache


VAs of shared pages must agree in cache index bits; this ensures all VAs accessing same PA will conflict in direct-mapped cache (early SPARCs)

Question

- How can we parallelize TLB and cache access?



Concurrent Access to TLB & Cache (Virtual Index/Physical Tag)




Index L is available without consulting the TLB

=> *cache and TLB accesses can begin simultaneously!*

Tag comparison is made after both accesses are completed

Cases: $L + b = k$, $L + b < k$, $L + b > k$

Virtual-Index Physical-Tag Caches: Associative Organization



After the PPN is known, 2^a physical tags are compared


How does this scheme scale to larger caches?

Question

- Does virtual tag, physical index make sense?

Concurrent Access to TLB & Large L1


The problem with $L1 > \text{Page size}$



Can VA₁ and VA₂ both map to PA ?

If they differ in the lower 'a' bits alone, and share a physical page.

A solution via Second Level Cache




Usually a common L2 cache backs up both Instruction and Data L1 caches

L2 is “inclusive” of both Instruction and Data caches


- Inclusive means L2 has copy of any line in either L1

Anti-Aliasing Using L2 [MIPS R10000,1996]




- Suppose VA1 and VA2 both map to PA and VA1 is already in L1, L2 ($VA1 \neq VA2$)
- After VA2 is resolved to PA, a collision will be detected in L2 (L2 is in physical space).
- VA1 will be purged from L1 and L2, and VA2 will be loaded \Rightarrow *no aliasing!*

Anti-Aliasing using L2 for a Virtually Addressed L1




Atlas Revisited

- One PAR for each physical page
- PAR's contain the VPN's of the pages *resident in primary memory*
- *Advantage:* The size is proportional to the size of the primary memory
- *What is the disadvantage ?*
- *How does this work with caches?*
 - *Is a TLB necessary?*




Hashed Page Table: Approximating Associative Addressing



- Hashed Page Table is typically 2 to 3 times larger than the number of PPN's to reduce collision probability. **What does this mean?**
- It can also contain DPN's for some non-resident pages (not common)
- If a translation cannot be resolved in this table then the software consults a data structure that has an entry for every existing page (e.g., full page table)

Power PC: Hashed Page Table



- Each hash table slot has 8 PTE's <VPN,PPN> that are searched sequentially
- If the first hash slot fails, an alternate hash function is used to look in another slot
- All these steps are done in hardware!*
- Hashed Table is typically 2 to 3 times larger than the number of physical pages
- The full backup Page Table is managed in software

VM features track historical uses:

- Bare machine, only physical addresses
 - One program owned entire machine
- Batch-style multiprogramming
 - Several programs sharing CPU while waiting for I/O
 - Base & bound: translation and protection between programs (supports *swapping* entire programs but not demand-paged virtual memory)
 - Problem with external fragmentation (holes in memory), needed occasional memory defragmentation as new jobs arrived
- Time sharing
 - More interactive programs, waiting for user. Also, more jobs/second.
 - Motivated move to fixed-size page translation and protection, no external fragmentation (but now internal fragmentation, wasted bytes in page)
 - Motivated adoption of virtual memory to allow more jobs to share limited physical memory resources while holding working set in memory
- Virtual Machine Monitors
 - Run multiple operating systems on one machine
 - Idea from 1970s IBM mainframes, now common on laptops
 - e.g., run Windows on top of Mac OS X
 - Hardware support for two levels of translation/protection
 - Guest OS virtual -> Guest OS physical -> Host machine physical

Virtual Memory Use Today - 1

- Servers/desktops/laptops/smartphones have full demand-paged virtual memory
 - Portability between machines with different memory sizes
 - Protection between multiple users or multiple tasks
 - Share small physical memory among active tasks
 - Simplifies implementation of some OS features
- Vector supercomputers have translation and protection but rarely complete demand-paging
- (Older Crays: base&bound, Japanese & Cray X1/X2: pages)
 - Don't waste expensive CPU time thrashing to disk (make jobs fit in memory)
 - Mostly run in batch mode (run set of jobs that fits in memory)
 - Difficult to implement restartable vector instructions

Virtual Memory Use Today - 2

- Most embedded processors and DSPs provide physical addressing only
 - Can't afford area/speed/power budget for virtual memory support
 - Often there is no secondary storage to swap to!
 - Programs custom written for particular memory configuration in product
 - Difficult to implement restartable instructions for exposed architectures

Question of the Day

- How would you design a TLB prefetcher?

Acknowledgements

- These slides contain material developed and copyright by:
 - Arvind (MIT)
 - Krste Asanovic (MIT/UCB)
 - Joel Emer (Intel/MIT)
 - James Hoe (CMU)
 - John Kubiatowicz (UCB)
 - David Patterson (UCB)

- MIT material derived from course 6.823
- UCB material derived from course CS252