Last Time in Lecture 16

- Memory Management
  - Address translation: base and bound, segmentation, paging
  - (Hierarchical) Page tables, TLB
  - Address protection
  - Page fault handler
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 (+)
- protection (-)
- cache needs to be flushed on a context switch unless address space identifiers (ASIDs) included in tags called process-identifiers (PID) (-)
- aliasing problems due to the sharing of pages (-)
- I/O uses physical addresses (-)
Processes and Context Switches

- ARMv7 MMU uses ASIDs to distinguish between individual tasks. Linux assigns an 8-bit value (a max of 256 ASIDs) to each task. Linux has a bitmap of ASIDs currently in use.

- When a process exits, the entries associated with that particular ASID is invalidated from the BP, caches, and TLBs.

- If all ASIDs are taken when a new process starts, all entries in the BP, caches, and TLBs are invalidated. The ASIDs are then again allocated on a first-come first-serve basis as if no tasks were running before.

- All threads within a process share the same ASID.

- OS stores one PTBR (Page Table Base Register) in the PCB (Process Control Block) and switches PTBR on context switch.

- On a context switch:
  - X86 flushes the entire TLB
  - MIPS and SPARC uses PID in TLB entries
Miss rate vs. virtually addressed cache size

(Agarwal 1987, H&P 5th edition)
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)

Tag | Data
--- | ---
VA\(_1\) | 1st Copy of Data at PA
VA\(_2\) | 2nd Copy of Data at PA
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
Concurrent Access to TLB & Large L1

The problem with L1 > Page size

Can VA₁ and VA₂ 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
Anti-Aliasing Using L2 [*MIPS R10000,1996*]

- 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
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Atlas Revisited

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Virtual Addresses</th>
<th>Page Table</th>
<th>Memory</th>
<th>Physical Addresses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0–4K</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4K–8K</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8K–12K</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12K–16K</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16K–20K</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20K–24K</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24K–28K</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28K–32K</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32K–36K</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36K–40K</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram showing memory mapping with frames 0, 1, and 2:
- Frame 0: 0–4K
- Frame 1: 4K–8K
- Frame 2: 8K–12K
Atlas Revisited

- One PAR for each physical page (frame)

- 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

*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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