Last time in Lecture 8

- 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

- Address spaces accessed sparsely
  - Can use multi-level page table to hold translation/protection information, but implies multiple memory accesses per reference

- Address space access with locality
  - 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
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 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*
Recap: Hierarchical Page Table
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Recap: Page-Based Virtual-Memory Machine
(Hardware Page-Table Walk)

- Assumes page tables held in untranslated physical memory
Address Translation: **putting it all together**

Virtual Address

- **TLB Lookup**
  - **hit**
  - **miss**

  - **Page Table Walk**
    - the page is
      - ≠ memory
    - ∈ memory

    - **Page Fault**
      (OS loads page)
    - **Update TLB**
    - **Protection Fault**

  - **Protection Check**
    - **denied**
    - permitted

  - Physical Address
    (to cache)

Where?

---

**SEGFAULT**
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
  - 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 page fault (e.g., page is on disk) needs *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.
- A 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 (-)
Virtually Addressed Cache (Virtual Index/Virtual Tag)

Translate on *miss*
Aliasing in Virtual-Address Caches

Two virtual pages share one physical page

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 SPARC systems)
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

How does this scheme scale to larger caches?

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

How does this scheme scale to larger caches?
CS152 Administrivia

- PS 2 due Wednesday Feb 21
- Lab 2 out on Friday in Section
- Midterm in class Monday Feb 26
  - Covers lectures 1 – 9, plus assigned problem sets, labs, readings

- No lecture Monday Feb 19
  - President’s Day Holiday
Start thinking of class projects and forming teams of two

Proposal due Monday March 5th

Proposal should be one page PDF including:

- Title
- Team member names
- What are you trying to do?
- How is it done today?
- What is your idea for improvement and why do you think you’ll be successful
- What infrastructure are you going to use for your project?
- Project timeline with milestones

Mail PDF of proposal to instructors

Give a <5-minute presentation in class in discussion section time on March 5th
Concurrent Access to TLB & Large L1
The problem with L1 > Page size

Can VA_1 and VA_2 both map to PA?
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
Suppose VA1 and VA2 both map to PA and VA1 is already in L1, L2 (VA1 ≠ VA2).

After VA2 is resolved to PA, a collision will be detected in L2.

VA1 will be purged from L1 and L2, and VA2 will be loaded ⇒ no aliasing!
Anti-Aliasing using L2 for a Virtually Addressed L1

Physically-addressed L2 can also be used to avoid aliases in 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?**
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.
- 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.

\[ \text{All these steps are done in hardware!} \]

- 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
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
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