CS 61C: Great Ideas in Computer Architecture

Virtual Memory

Instructor: Alan Christopher
Review of Last Lecture

• Multiple instruction issue increases max speedup, but higher penalty for a stall
  – Superscalar because can achieve CPI < 1
  – Requires a significant amount of extra hardware

• Employ more aggressive scheduling techniques to increase performance
  – Register renaming
  – Speculation (guessing)
  – Out-of-order execution
Agenda

• Virtual Memory
• Page Tables
• Administrivia
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• VM Performance
Memory Hierarchy

- Regs
- L1 Cache
- L2 Cache
- Memory
- Disk
- Tape

- Upper Level: Faster
- Lower Level: Larger

Earlier: Caches

Next Up: Virtual Memory
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Virtual Memory

• Next level in the memory hierarchy
  – Provides illusion of very large main memory
  – Working set of “pages” residing in main memory
    (subset of all pages residing on disk)

• **Main goal:** Avoid reaching all the way back to disk as much as possible

• **Additional goals:**
  – Let OS share memory among many programs and protect them from each other
  – Each process thinks it has all the memory to itself
Virtual to Physical Address Translation

- Each program operates in its own virtual address space and thinks it’s the only program running
- Each is protected from the other
- OS can decide where each goes in memory
- Hardware gives virtual \( \rightarrow \) physical mapping
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• Divide into equal sized chunks (about 4 KiB - 8 KiB)
• Any chunk of Virtual Memory can be assigned to any chunk of Physical Memory ("page")

Mapping VM to PM
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Virtual Memory Mapping Function

• How large is main memory? Disk?
  – Don’t know! Designed to be interchangeable components
  – Need a system that works regardless of sizes

• Use lookup table (page table) to deal with arbitrary mapping
  – Index lookup table by # of pages in VM (not all entries will be used/valid)
  – Size of PM will affect size of stored translation
Address Mapping: Page Table

• **Page Table functionality:**
  - Incoming request is Virtual Address (VA), want Physical Address (PA)
  - Physical Offset = Virtual Offset (page-aligned)
  - So just swap Virtual Page Number (VPN) for Physical Page Number (PPN)

• **Implementation?**
  - Use VPN as index into PT
  - Store PPN and management bits (Valid, Access Rights)
  - Does NOT store actual data (the data sits in PM)
Virtual Address:

1) Index into PT using VPN

2) Check Valid and Access Rights bits

3) Combine PPN and offset

4) Use PA to access memory
Page Table Entry Format

• Contains either PPN or indication not in main memory

• Valid = Valid page table entry
  – 1 → virtual page is in physical memory
  – 0 → OS needs to fetch page from disk

• Access Rights checked on every access to see if allowed (provides protection)
  – Read Only: Can read, but not write page
  – Read/Write: Read or write data on page
  – Executable: Can fetch instructions from page
Page Tables (1/2)

- A page table (PT) contains the mapping of virtual addresses to physical addresses
- Page tables located in main memory – Why?
  - Too large to fit in registers ($2^{20}$ entries for 4 KiB pages, 32 bit address space)
  - Faster to access than disk and can be shared by multiple processors
- The OS maintains the PTs
  - Each process has its own page table
    - “State” of a process is PC, all registers, and PT
  - OS stores address of the PT of the current process in the Page Table Base Register

Can page the page table if necessary!
Page Tables (2/2)

- *No external fragmentation:* all pages are the same size, so can utilize all available slots
- OS must reserve "swap space" on disk for each process
  - Running programs requires hard drive space!
- To grow a process, ask Operating System
  - If unused pages in PM, OS uses them first
  - If not, OS swaps some old pages (LRU) to disk
Review: Paging Terminology

• Programs use *virtual addresses (VAs)*
  - Space of all virtual addresses called *virtual memory (VM)*
  - Divided into pages indexed by *virtual page number (VPN)*

• Main memory indexed by *physical addresses (PAs)*
  - Space of all physical addresses called *physical memory (PM)*
  - Divided into pages indexed by *physical page number (PPN)*
**Question:** How many bits wide are the following fields?

- 16 KiB pages
- 40-bit virtual addresses
- 64 GiB physical memory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VPN</th>
<th>PPN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(B) 26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G) 24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P) 22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Y) 26</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Administrivia (1/2)

• Project 3 (partners) due Sunday 8/10
• Performance contest due 8/10
• Final – Fri 8/15, 9am-12pm, 155 Dwinelle
  – MIPS Green Sheet provided again
  – Two two-sided handwritten cheat sheets
    • Can re-use your midterm cheat sheet!
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Retrieving Data from Memory

1) Access page table for address translation

2) Access correct physical address

Requires two accesses of physical memory!
Virtual Memory Problem

• 2 physical memory accesses per data access = SLOW!

• Since locality in pages of data, there must be locality in the translations of those pages

• Build a separate cache for the Page Table
  – For historical reasons, cache is called a Translation Lookaside Buffer (TLB)
  – Notice that what is stored in the TLB is NOT data, but the VPN → PPN mapping translations
TLBs vs. Caches

- TLBs usually small, typically 16 – 512 entries
- TLB access time comparable to cache (« main memory)
- TLBs usually are fully/highly associativity
Where Are TLBs Located?

• Which should we check first: Cache or TLB?
  – Can cache hold requested data if corresponding page is not in physical memory?  No
  – With TLB first, does cache receive VA or PA?  PA

Notice that it is now (usually) the TLB that does translation, not the Page Table!
Address Translation Using TLB

Virtual Address

TLB

Virtual Address Translation

Data Cache

Physical Address

Note: TIO for VA & PA unrelated
Typical TLB Entry Format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Dirty</th>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Access Rights</th>
<th>TLB Tag</th>
<th>PPN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Valid** and **Access Rights**: Same usage as previously discussed for page tables
- **Dirty**: Basically always use write-back, so indicates whether or not to write page to disk when replaced
- **Ref**: Used to implement pseudo-LRU
  - Set when page is accessed, cleared periodically by OS
  - If Ref = 1, then page was referenced recently
- **TLB Index**: VPN mod (# TLB sets)
- **TLB Tag**: VPN minus TLB Index (upper bits)
**Question:** How many bits wide are the following?

- 16 KiB pages
- 40-bit virtual addresses
- 64 GiB physical memory
- 2-way set associative TLB with 512 entries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Dirty</th>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Access Rights</th>
<th>TLB Tag</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLB Tag</th>
<th>TLB Index</th>
<th>TLB Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(B) 12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G) 18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P) 14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Y) 17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fetching Data on a Memory Read

1) Check TLB (input: VPN, output: PPN)
   - **TLB Hit:** Fetch translation, return PPN
   - **TLB Miss:** Check page table (in memory)
     - **Page Table Hit:** Load page table entry into TLB
     - **Page Table Miss (Page Fault):** Fetch page from disk to memory, update corresponding page table entry, then load entry into TLB

2) Check cache (input: PPN, output: data)
   - **Cache Hit:** Return data value to processor
   - **Cache Miss:** Fetch data value from memory, store it in cache, return it to processor
Page Faults

• Load the page off the disk into a free page of memory
  – Switch to some other process while we wait
• Interrupt thrown when page loaded and the process' page table is updated
  – When we switch back to the task, the desired data will be in memory
• If memory full, replace page (LRU), writing back if necessary, and update both page table entries
  – Continuous swapping between disk and memory called “thrashing”
Performance Metrics

• VM performance also uses Hit/Miss Rates and Miss Penalties
  – **TLB Miss Rate**: Fraction of TLB accesses that result in a TLB Miss
  – **Page Table Miss Rate**: Fraction of PT accesses that result in a page fault

• Caching performance definitions remain the same
  – Somewhat independent, as TLB will always pass PA to cache regardless of TLB hit or miss
Data Fetch Scenarios

- Are the following scenarios for a single data access possible?
  - TLB Miss, Page Fault  Yes
  - TLB Hit, Page Table Hit  No
  - TLB Miss, Cache Hit  Yes
  - Page Table Hit, Cache Miss  Yes
  - Page Fault, Cache Hit  No
**Question:** A program tries to load a word at X that causes a TLB miss but not a page fault. Are the following statements TRUE or FALSE?

1) The page table does not contain a valid mapping for the virtual page corresponding to the address X
2) The word that the program is trying to load is present in physical memory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P)</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Y)</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Updating Scenarios

• Using $V = \text{valid}$, $D = \text{dirty}$, $R = \text{ref}$ to mean that field is set to the shown value for \textit{any} entry in either PT or TLB

• Which of the following scenarios for a single data access are possible?
  - Read, $D = 1$ \hspace{1cm} \textbf{No}
  - Write, $R = 1$ \hspace{1cm} \textbf{Yes}
  - Read, $V = 0$ \hspace{1cm} \textbf{No}
  - Write, $D = 0$ \hspace{1cm} \textbf{Yes}
Technology Break
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VM Performance

• Disk is the level of the memory hierarchy that sits below main memory
  – TLB comes before cache, but affects transfer of data from disk to main memory
  – Previously we assumed main memory was lowest level, now we just have to account for disk accesses

• Same CPI, AMAT equations apply, but now treat main memory like a mid-level cache
Typical Performance Stats

Caching
- cache entry
- cache block (≈32 bytes)
- cache miss rate (1% to 20%)
- cache hit (≈1 cycle)
- cache miss (≈100 cycles)

Demand paging
- page frame
- page (≈4Ki bytes)
- page miss rate (<0.001%)
- page hit (≈100 cycles)
- page fault (≈5M cycles)
Impact of Paging on AMAT (1/2)

- Memory Parameters:
  - L1 cache hit = 1 clock cycles, hit 95% of accesses
  - L2 cache hit = 10 clock cycles, hit 60% of L1 misses
  - DRAM = 200 clock cycles (≈100 nanoseconds)
  - Disk = 20,000,000 clock cycles (≈10 milliseconds)

- Average Memory Access Time (no paging):
  \[ 1 + 5\% \times 10 + 5\% \times 40\% \times 200 = 5.5 \text{ clock cycles} \]

- Average Memory Access Time (with paging):
  \[ 5.5 \text{ (AMAT with no paging)} + ? \]
Impact of Paging on AMAT (2/2)

- Average Memory Access Time (with paging) =
  \[ 5.5 + 5\% \times 40\% \times (1-HR_{Mem}) \times 20,000,000 \]

- AMAT if \( HR_{Mem} = 99\% \)?
  \[ 5.5 + 0.02 \times 0.01 \times 20,000,000 = 4005.5 \ (\approx 728x \ slower) \]
  \[ \text{1 in 20,000 memory accesses goes to disk: 10 sec program takes 2 hours!} \]

- AMAT if \( HR_{Mem} = 99.9\% \)?
  \[ 5.5 + 0.02 \times 0.001 \times 20,000,000 = 405.5 \]

- AMAT if \( HR_{Mem} = 99.9999\% \)?
  \[ 5.5 + 0.02 \times 0.000001 \times 20,000,000 = 5.9 \]
Impact of TLBs on Performance

• Each TLB miss to Page Table ~ L1 Cache miss

• **TLB Reach:** Amount of virtual address space that can be simultaneously mapped by TLB:
  - TLB typically has 128 entries of page size 4-8 KiB
  - $128 \times 4 \text{ KiB} = 512 \text{ KiB} = \text{just 0.5 MiB}$

• What can you do to have better performance?
  - Multi-level TLBs
  - Variable page size (segments)
  - Special situationally-used “superpages”

*Conceptually same as multi-level caches*

*Not covered here*
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Virtual Memory Motivation

• Memory as cache for disk (reduce disk accesses)
  - Disk is so slow it significantly affects performance
  - Paging maximizes memory usage with large, evenly-sized pages that can go anywhere

• Allows processor to run multiple processes simultaneously
  - Gives each process illusion of its own (large) VM
  - Each process uses standard set of VAs
  - Access rights provide protection
Paging Summary

• Paging requires address translation
  – Can run programs larger than main memory
  – Hides variable machine configurations (RAM/HD)
  – Solves fragmentation problem

• Address mappings stored in page tables in memory
  – Additional memory access mitigated with TLB
  – Check TLB, then Page Table (if necessary), then Cache
Hardware/Software Support for Memory Protection

- Different tasks can share parts of their virtual address spaces
  - But need to protect against errant access
  - Requires OS assistance
- Hardware support for OS protection
  - Privileged supervisor mode (a.k.a. kernel mode)
  - Privileged instructions
  - Page tables and other state information only accessible in supervisor mode
  - System call exception (e.g. syscall in MIPS)
Context Switching

• How does a single processor run many programs at once?

• **Context switch:** Changing of internal state of processor (switching between processes)
  – Save register values (and PC) and change value in Page Table Base register

• What happens to the TLB?
  – Current entries are for a different process (similar VAs, though!)
  – Set all entries to invalid on context switch
• User program view:
  - Contiguous memory
  - Start from some set VA
  - “Infinitely” large
  - Is the only running program

• Reality:
  - Non-contiguous memory
  - Start wherever available memory is
  - Finite size
  - Many programs running simultaneously

• Virtual memory provides:
  - Illusion of contiguous memory
  - All programs starting at same set address
  - Illusion of ~infinite memory (2^{32} or 2^{64} bytes)
  - Protection, Sharing

• Implementation:
  - Divide memory into chunks (pages)
  - OS controls page table that maps virtual into physical addresses
  - Memory as a cache for disk
  - TLB is a cache for the page table