

91

Paging hardware overhead:

access memory 2x (*2x slower*)

Translation Look-Aside Buffer (TLB)

- Mapping logical page numbers to physical frame address requires two RAM references
	- The first access to fetch the page table entry (for mapping logical page number to physical frame number)
	- The second access to fetch the target data/instruction
- To reduce overhead, use a hash map (implemented in hardware) to resolve mapping from page numbers to frame address
	- Associate Memory (searched by page numbers)
- TLB holds (pid, page number, frame addr) tuples of recently used addresses

93

● Issues: TLB hit and TLB miss

Effective Memory Access Time

- RAM access time is around hundreds of nanoseconds
- TLB access time is usually as fast as CPU registers
- Without TLB: Always two RAM references
- With TLB
	- TLB hit: One TLB access (read) + One RAM Access
	- TLB miss: Two RAM accesses + One TLB (write/update)
- On modern CPUs, TLB can hold up to 4096 entries
- Statistical/Probabilistic Formula (explained)

Sample Effective Memory Access Time

TLB hit ratio: 80% TLB access time: 5ns RAM access time: 100ns

What is the effective memory access time?

- 80% TLB hit: 1 TLB access + 1 RAM access = 0.8 (5 + 100) = 0.8 x 105 = 84
- 20% TLB miss: 1 TLB access + 2 RAM access = 0.2 (5 + 200) = 0.2 x 205 = 41

Analyzed differently:

- TLB is always accessed: 5ns
- 80% TLB hit: 1 RAM access: 0.8 x 100 = 80ns
- 20% TLB miss: 2 RAM accesses: $0.2 \times 200 = 40$ ns

The total from either analysis: 125ns Without TLB the access time is 200ns

Managing (Huge) Page Tables

 $q7$

Page Table Management

- One page table (PT) per process
- The number of entries in PT is proportional to the process size
- The maximum number of entries in PT is determined by
	- The maximum size logical address space allowed by the architecture
	- The page size selected by the hardware
- Page tables must be stored in RAM (similar to memory for process)
- For MMU address translation hardware to work properly, page tables must be stored **contiguously in RAM**
	- Process can be stored non-contiguously but page tables cannot?
- It becomes an issue when the page table is **bigger** than the size of a **single page**

Issue: **Giant** & **Contiguous** Page Tables

Page Tables (like segment tables) are a *contiguous* "array" that may span multiple pages

Size of Page Table

Assumptions:

- 20-bit logical address
- 4 bytes per page table entry

103

Logical Address Structure

Logical address space $1GB (2^{30}$ bytes) with page (or frame) size 8KB (2^{13} bytes)

Page Table Structure

- Main use: maps logical page numbers to physical frame "address"
- A page table is treated like a **contiguous** array
- Its base address is stored in PTBR (Page Table Base Register)
- Each row in the page table holds the following information
	- Frame number where the page is mapped to
		- Attributes/flags: reference bit, access mode: R/W, R/O, shared?
- Choices of implementation
	- Small "page tables" can be stored on special CPU registers
	- Large page tables must be stored **contiguously** in the RAM. The size of a page table should fit a **single** frame!
	- Problem: what if the page table itself is too big to fit single frame?

Advantages of Paging

- Improvements over variable-size partitions
	- No compaction needed
	- No external fragmentation
	- A small fraction of internal fragmentation
	- Processes can be loaded into non-contiguous frames
- Swapping can be performed per-page (not the entire process)

Page Sharing and Protection

- Page Table Entries can store the following information
	- Protection/Access: R/W, R/O
	- Present/No-Present Bit: if a page is part of your process address space
- Implementation of "Shared Memory" on a paging-based CPU is straight forward
	- Assume two processes P1 and P2 share a physical frame #S
	- P1 maps the shared memory segment to its logical page #X
	- P2 maps the shared memory segment to its logical page #Y
	- The OS inserts
		- \blacksquare $X \Rightarrow S$ for P1's PTE
		- $Y \Rightarrow S$ for P2's PTE

Page Table Design Constraints

- The memory hardware views a page table as a *contiguous* 1D array
- Page tables must fit into **a single physical frame** in RAM
- The size of page tables is determined by the **size of the address space** supported by the CPU architecture (and NOT by the amount of RAM installed)
- When page tables exceed the size of a physical frame, the page tables themselves must be designed to be **pageable** (can be stored non-contiguously into several physical frames)

Managing Huge Page Tables

- Hierarchical Paging
- **Hashed Page Tables**
- Inverted Page Tables

Page Table Size Considerations

- How many bytes required per page table entry (PTE) ○ What information stored in each PTE?
- How many entries per page table?
- How many PTEs can fit into a physical frame?

Paging hardware overhead for 2-level page tables

access memory 3x

=

⅓ x slower

2-Level PTs: address translation example

Address Format Details

THE Effect of frame size to logical address space size

Assume two-level paging

Assume 4-byte PTEs

Assume 8-byte PTEs

Hierarchical Page Tables

- Modern CPUs support larger logical (and physical) address space
	- Giga (2^{30}) => Tera (2^{40}) => Peta (2^{50}) => Exa (2^{60})
	- 48-bit address space on Intel/AMD CPUs
- Larger address spaces require more bits stored in the PTE ○ Page Table Entries must grow from 4 bytes to 8 bytes
- Increasing PTE size implies **fewer entries** can be stored in a physical frame
- Fewer PTE entries implies fewer bits per page number field
- Fewer bits per page number field implies more fields (deeper hierarchy) to cover

Intel/AMD Examples

- 64-bit architecture
- Supported page sizes: $4KB$ (2^{12}), $2MB$ (2^{21}), $4MB$ (2^{22}), $1GB$ (2^{31})
- 52-bit physical address (2^{52} bytes = 4 Petabytes)
- Logical address spaces
	- \circ 32-bit logical address (2³² bytes = 4 Gigabytes)
	- \circ 48-bit logical address (2⁴⁸ bytes = 256 Terabytes)
- Hierarchical Paging: 2-, 3-, and 4-level paging

Hashed Page Tables

Observations

- Each level of hierarchical paging adds one more memory access
	- 1-level ⇒ 2x memory references (50% effective memory bandwidth)
	- 2-level ⇒ 3x memory references (33% effective memory bandwidth)
	- 3-Level \Rightarrow 4x memory references (25% effective memory bandwidth)
	- 4-Level \Rightarrow 5x memory references (20% effective memory bandwidth)
- Page tables are treated as a linear contiguous array but the array is **mostly sparse**
- Proposed solution: replace the sparse array with a hash table (**one hash table per process**)

Inverted Page Tables

- **Observations**
	- Each page table may consume lots of memory space
		- Intel/AMD 48-bit 4-level paging consumes 2^{36} x 8 bytes = 2^{39} bytes = 512 GB
	- Each process must maintain its own page table
	- A page table maps a logical page address to a physical frame address
- **Proposed Solution**
	- Use a **global** "reverse" map that maps physical frame addresses to logical page addresses
	- The number of entries in the inverted table = number of frames in RAM
		- Each entry holds the pair (owner pid, logical page mapped to the frame)
	- Only one global table required (instead of one table per process)

Inverted Page Tables: One "global" page table

IA-32 Segmentation and Paging (Combined)

- IA-32 architecture supports both segmentation and paging
	- Segmentation: *Section 3.4.5 Intel System Programming Guide*
	- Paging: *Section 4.3 Intel System Programming Guide*
- Address translation is a 2-step process
	- The CPU generates the logical address (14-bit segment id, 32-bit offset) + 2-bit protection mode
	- Segmentation hardware translates the 46-bit address into **32-bit linear address (Figure 3-5)**
	- The paging hardware translates the 32-bit linear address to physical frame address (Figures 4-2, 4-3)
- Total 16K (2^{14}) segments
	- 8K private segments (local)
	- 8K shared segments (global)

